Projekt Paulus

Denmark
Public Errors, Unlawful Interventions and Their Consequences for Citizens

2006-2025
Separate supplement up to 7 October 2026
Final revised report - Statistics



Ole Bakkestrøm
Project Manager, Projekt Paulus

7 October 2026

Ex officio et ex conscientia.

English translation. Figures retain source notation: 1.000 = 1,000; 1,5 = 1.5.
Danish quotations are translated; source identifiers and URLs are unchanged.

Contents

1. Main find, knowledge and count model 4

2. National control arrangements and police outcomes 11

3. Municipal complaints, outcomes and reassessment 38

4. Practical studies: children, family and historical findings 91

5. Employment, Supplies and Pensions 264

6. Handicap, equal treatment, environment and other practices 468

7. The boundaries of children's and disabled barometers 617

8. Children, Parents, Disabilities and Youth Crime Board 1005

9. Health, Compensation and Psychiatric coercion 1047

10. Personal data and historical surveillance series 1201

11. Taxes: outages, stocks and time 1217

12. Foreigners and asylum: verification and compliance 1260

13. EMD: judgments, complaints and different rightholders 1273

14. Enforcement of human rights judgments 1290

15. United Nations: control, complaints and knowledge 1293

16. CPT and UPR: repeated findings and reactions 1327

17. Copenhagen children's cases: errors and consequences 1345

18. Time of intervention, repatriation and temporary protection of children 1349

19. The case of instruction: separation, time and jurisdiction 1357

20. Tibet: rights, proof and responsibility 1361

21. Stateless: breach of the Convention and 14 years of civil review 1366

22. Mink: legal, management and staff actions 1370

23. Defence and intelligence: Green Desert and Samsam 1374

24. Greenland: self-determination, family ties and repair 1379

25. Commission, audit, liability time limits and evidence retention 1384

26. Legal basis and liability comparison 1517

27. Judicial review, detention and restoration 1531

28. Denmark's knowledge, positive commitments and actual responsibility 1800

29. Cross-cutting evidence and documented consequences 1808

30. Main conclusions and concrete requirements 1866

31. Literature and source list 1868

1. Main find, knowledge and count model

Overall documented report for 2006-2025

With separate addition to 7 October 2026. Prepared after ordering municipalities, police, civil servants, authorities and politicians, with special testing of families, children and persons with disabilities. Date of check: October 7, 2026.

1. Main conclusion and reading path

The report documents repeated breaches of the law in the exercise of public authority and actual loss of family contact, freedom, help, support, privacy and bodily self-determination. It also documents institutional knowledge of serious problems. The strongest criticism therefore follows the whole chain: what did they do? competent bodies by knowledge and when was the citizen's right actually protected or restored? [R03; L04; TFLAN23; TFLANISM26; ERVA01-ERVA02; GL sources]

A letter of criticism, a remittal or an administrative closure does not in itself prove that the citizen's loss ended. The Langeland case demonstrates this specifically: in May 2026 the Ministry required renewed scrutiny of lawfulness, redress and sanctions following earlier oversight. The authorities' organisational initiatives did not in themselves document lawful practice or actual correction of the affected cases. [TFLANISM26, physical PDF 14-16]

The absence of personal punishment does not exempt the State from responsibility. Protection, effective investigation, timely review and redress must be assessed independently. In 2023 the UN Committee against Torture criticised, among other things, the narrow focus of certain police complaint investigations on individual criminal culpability. ECtHR case-law shows that an almost symbolic sanction following serious ill-treatment may be inadequate. The legal analysis in chapter 28 connects these verified legal sources with the report's specific findings. [PFK02, points 40-41; PFK04, paragraphs 123-125]

The report identifies several mechanisms that may limit or prevent liability: illegal administrative exemption practices, limited personal financial liability, protection of certain reporting bases, explicit immunity from fines and actual obstacles after lengthy proceedings. The rule, scope and effect of each mechanism are shown. Public employment does not give an ordinary criminal immunity. At the same time, the specific derogation shall not be withheld. [PFK06-PFK10; Chapters 26 and 28]

Time is part of the loss of rights. Remittal for reconsideration, a new decision, actual return home, assistance delivered and payment each have their own date. A child may still lack contact after a favourable appeal decision. A patient may obtain a right to compensation without regaining their health. A citizen may obtain a finding in their favour and wait further for support. The specific courses show why correction must be followed from paper to effect. [Chapters 9, 18 and 27-29]

In the case of family interventions, both the beginning and the continuation must be tested. A later plan cannot prove that the required basis existed on the day of the decision. The loss of family ties caused by neglected reunification must not be used as a reason for adoption. [PFK11, paragraphs 205, 208 and 212; Chapters 18 and 28]

In the children's sector, Rigsrevisionen found at least one of the measured breaches of the law in 69 per cent of 3.148 selected children's first placement trajectories in 2022-2024. The study itself describes the proportion as a lower-bound estimate. These are documented breaches of the law in this sample; the figure alone does not determine the validity of each placement. The 2019 pilot barometer, by contrast, examined 228 cases not appealed. Complaint cases, samples of cases not appealed and different tests of safeguards must therefore each have their own denominator. [RRAN26, physical PDF 22-32 and 38-54; BBP19; BBP19M, physical PDF 5]

No unknown national total is needed to demand action in the already documented courses. All figures retain the source’s unit, denominator, exclusions and version. Several errors may affect the same person, and several oversight bodies may deal with the same case. The report maintains five linked accounts: oversight, errors, persons, consequences and responsibility/redress. They are not added together into one invented victim total.

The total legal test shall be: **conclusion → original proof → relevant duty → knowledge of the actor; and competence → action or omission → legal deviation → citizens' follow → responsibility → concrete requirements.** The statement of a authority or court shall be tested against its original basis. Repeated information is not a new independent evidence. State responsibility, personal guilt and international straitjacket have their own conditions.

Route of reading: Chapter 1 gives main findings and controlled figures. Chapter 2-27 contains the full documentation of the sectors. Chapter 28 analyses the state's knowledge, obligations and liability exemptions. Chapter 29 summarises the concrete consequences, evidence chains and cover accounts. Chapter 30 concludes with the main conclusion and priority requirements. Literature and sources are collected at the end of Chapter 31.

What the reader will follow	Documentation in the report
Children, family, disability and actual repatriation	Chapter 3-8 and 17-19; Greenlandic programme in Chapter 24.
Health, waiting time, complaints and compensation	Chapter 9; health protection during detention also in Chapter 27.
Police, detention and liability	Chapters 2, 20 and 27.
Offences, tax appeals, residence and compliance	Chapters 3, 5, 6, 11 and 12.
Information, policy instructions and management	Chapters 10 and 19-25.
International findings and Denmark's reaction	Chapter 13-16.
Knowledge, investigation, sanction and redress	Chapters 26 and 28-30.
Numerical boundaries and source and evidence chains	Chapters 1 and 29; full list of literature and sources in Chapter 31.

Main figures checked

Each block of numbers below describes its own population. They are entries to the documentation of the report; they are not summed up to one national error count.

• **The pilot study for the Children's Day Barometer in 2019 included 228 uncontested cases from 12 municipalities:** 115 on family treatment and 113 on housing, of which four without consent. Among the various samples there were 70 / 228 missing current studies or updates without legal exception, 64 / 100 deadlines for studies and 99 / 226 missing for pre-decision interviews. The various errors may relate to the same case. The pilot's exclusion of pending cases has been retained; the figures are not added to the complaint figures as a documented personal union. All main figures and municipal annexes are now original checked. [BBP19, main figures; BBP19M, PDF5; BBP19K, PDF4-20]

• **Langeland’s 2023 analysis and the Ministry’s 2026 statement document a specific chain from known errors to insufficient subsequent oversight.** In the municipally selected sample of 12 cases, seven raised doubts about sufficient assistance; in one placement, the action plan came 11 months after placement. On 29. May 2026, the Ministry instructed the Appeals Board to reconsider legality, redress and possible sanctions. The earlier closure of supervision and increased staffing therefore did not prove that the affected citizens’ rights had been restored. [TFLAN23, PDF23-33; TFLANISM26, PDF1-16]

• **Historical complaint statistics contain documented hidden or changed outcome categories.** Landsskatteretten's original 2011-2012 reports provide administrative outcomes for 2009-2012 with precise denominators and rounded percentages; the category »other« can also include an actual reduction. The statistics on vehicles for people with disabilities change scope in 2010 and revise earlier annual figures. The report retains each version and exclusion so that hidden successful claims are not recorded as zero and the same year's cases are not counted several times. [LSRH11-LSRH12;HB06-HB10]

• **69 per cent of 3.148 selected children’s first placement processes had at least one measured breach of law in 2022-2024.** Rigsrevisionen’s 2026 report describes the proportion as a lower-bound estimate: not all five requirements were examined for each child, and the measurement method counts, among other things, planned/cancelled interviews as held. The 3.148 are different children within the study’s sample; the percentages cannot be converted into exact error counts or a national error rate. Unfinished delays are absent from the completed-duration samples. [RRAN26,PDF22-32,38-54]

• **In a 2025 review of 75 referral trajectories from September 2024, 72 were delayed for capacity reasons; 26 of 71 assessable letters lacked sufficient information about free choice of hospital.** The national quarterly average in the same follow-up reached 162 diagnostic assessment days in the second quarter of 2025.

Registration changes require separate reconciliation. From 1. January 2026,new rights apply to new referrals; they do not retrospectively remedy the examined families' courses. [CPsy25,PDF4-10; PsyL25,§§1-2]

• **45.022 overturnings among 150.345 municipal social and employment appeals determined on the merits, 2018-2024.** These are appeal outcomes, not 45.022 different individuals or a count of all municipal errors. [A20,A21,A24]

• **77 children's cases in Copenhagen 2013- 2016 with criticised case handling.** The sub-studies have different denominators; the original 78 cases became 77 by one exclusion. [R03]

• **59 ECtHR judgment records and 57 case courses in 2006-2025.** The annual statistics record 25 judgment records finding violations; the specific joining of cases gives 24 distinct courses with a final finding of a violation. Savran's superseded Chamber judgment explains the difference. The 30 article/subcategory findings belong to the annual statistics. None of the figures is a count of unique victims. [EMD-årstabeller; HUDOC-regnskab]

• **265 UN decision documents concerning 263 communication numbers in 2006-2025.** They include 57 favourable Views on the merits concerning violations or forward-looking protection, 45 without an established violation, 74 pure inadmissibility decisions, 88 pure discontinuances and one mixed outcome. In the inadmissible CAT case F.K., a separate Article 22 violation was also found because Denmark carried out the removal despite interim measures. Main outcomes alone therefore do not exhaust the violation count; documents and communication numbers are not unique people either. [FN-individuelt register; CAT/C/70/D/743/2016, § 8.2 and § 10]

• **1.669 supervisory cases in 2018- 2024 investigated by Rigsrevisionen:** 1.114 rejected, 555 examined further. The four powers examined - annulment, periodic penalty payments, actions for damages and fines - were not used in the controlled material. [RR18 / 2024]

• **7.422 amendments and remittals for reconsideration among 22.927 admissible municipal complaints in 2025**, after the demarcation of the number portal. The self-calculated share 32,4 per cent uses the portal denominator; the 46,8 per cent of the Danish map has a different delimitation. [Kommunaltal2025]

• **The target for appeal processing was changed from 13 to 30 weeks; in 2025 the time was around 35 weeks.** The closure of the review in 2025 was based on earlier processing times below the new target. It documents neither fulfilment of the old target nor actual assistance and redress for citizens. An administrative average target, a statutory time limit and a Convention requirement must each be assessed under their own rule. [AT07, pp. 3-4; AT13, pp. 8-11]

• **12.949 conduct decisions and 354 decisions expressing criticism in the police years checked, 2006-2025.** Before and after 2012, criminal cases have different population definitions. Criticism, prosecution and conviction are separate outcomes. [Politiudfald2006-2025]

• **The product cycle will be longer in the controlled 2018- 2024 series.** Justitia/ The 2025 version of the Bar Society records 4.604 completed courses in 2018 and 2.940 in 2024; the average increased from 3,3 to 6,2 months. In 2024, 152 courses were dismissed for the main relationship and an average duration of 7,7 months. The State Advocate's March 2026 audit records 2.941 completed 2024 runs and is maintained as a separate version. Fewer registered endings do not in themselves document fewer different custodians. [Justitia2025, p.68,70,81,96-98; RA2024, marts2026]

• **354 women's accounts of 488 contraception incidents in the Greenland investigation**, covering the period 1960-1991 and knowledge/reparation in 2025-2026. This is a self-referred historical sample, not a national population measurement or 488 different women. The 2026 Act contains a specific exemption from fines for authorities and their employees for failure to provide information for the compensation case. The exemption applies to this duty and must not be rewritten as general impunity. [GL-K01-GL-K04]

• **A documented national registration gap for healthcare errors in Kriminalforsorgen.** The ministerial reply of 23. June 2025 states that Øst does not register and retain reports after handling them. Vest has manually counted 38 incidents from 1. April 2024 to 1. June 2025, including 35 medication deviations. 38 is neither a national total nor a number of distinct prisoners. The court statistics also have different outgoing-case denominators: 2024 states 141 decided cases, while the outcome categories sum to 148. [KFUTH25,pp.2-3;KF24,pp.54-56]

Examples of concrete consequences and times of responsibility

The report connects the statistics with legal rights: an error can mean lost assistance, income, privacy, contact or liberty. A remittal may leave a citizen facing further waiting time. A child may remain separated from their family after a favourable appeal decision. Individual consequences must be documented from the decision to actual redress; they do not disappear because a complaint case has been administratively closed.

The extended timelines include unlawful contact restrictions, actual return home, ministerial separations, Tibet, stateless persons, mink, Green Desert, Samsam and Greenlandic reparations. The cases also show why a favourable decision, an ordered residence card, an offer of compensation and an actually restored right must be registered as different steps. Following Statsløsekommissionen's criticism, the personnel cases of two central officials were closed without further steps; the later civil review lasted more than 14 years from filing proceedings to Højesteret's decision. In the Tibet track, two suspended criminal sentences were imposed in 2025, more than 13 years after the earliest intervention. These are specific accountability timelines, not a calculated general time limit for citizens' loss of rights. [SL-kilder;TB-kilder]

In an original pre-trial detention case, 408.000 kroner for 240 days beyond the sentence imposed was upheld only 673 calendar days after release. In the Suldrup case, the authorities' halving of compensation and lost earnings was set aside; the High Court concluded the case 875 days after a mother's acquittal and release. According to her court testimony, her two minor children moved back upon her release. Return, full entitlement to compensation, actual payment and restoration of work and health are different steps. A three-year-old boy's exclusion from a municipal musical playgroup was found to be unlawful discrimination after 961 calendar days; payment and restored access are not documented in the decision. [ERVA01-ERVA02; KEN9536/2021]

The comparison with private individuals also follows the actual judicial outcome. In the fully checked 2017 case concerning a mother and grandmother travelling with one child, the prosecution sought 2-3 months' immediate imprisonment, but both were acquitted in the district court and high court. The sentence sought therefore cannot be presented as a sentence imposed or a general sentencing tariff. Scrutiny of public interventions requires the same precision about conduct, legal authority, elements of the offence and culpability, together with separate consideration of the authority's duties of protection and redress. [PB01,pp.1-3;PB03,pp.3-5]

Another fully read combination of convictions shows an actual conviction: one mother's 37 days of evading one child resulted in 40 days of conditional imprisonment with 60 hours of community service. At the same time, the embedded decision on family law describes that the basis was lacking on the day of the administrative decision, but that a later created situation was given importance. The report shall keep separate records of each stage of time and of each body. The comparison documents a concrete private penalty; public liability requires independent review of the corresponding act, guilt and duration of action. [PU22, PDF1-6]

References in tables and arguments indicate the source of the statement. The coverage status below refers to the actual count and source reading.

Coverage status

This is an overall cross-cutting report with verified series, concrete studies, legal sources and explicit coverage gaps. It is **not a full record of all published Danish control reports or all errors for 20 years**. Such a complete register cannot be claimed from the sources actually controlled. Where a series or a denominator is missing, it is explicitly stated; missing years are never recorded as zero. The cover accounts make the difference verifiable.

This definition applies to the completeness of the census. It does not alter the controlled findings or their seriousness. The report uses the reported outcome of each included statistic, mentions and exclusions, and specifies exactly where original data are still required.

Glossary before documentation chapters

Concept or abbreviation	Meaning of the report
Ankestyrelsen / AS / AST	The Danish Complaints and Supervisory Authority; source codes can use different abbreviations.
BFU	Child welfare assessment. The report examines content, timing and the rule in force at the time.
VISO	The national knowledge and specialist consultancy organisation in the social and special education fields.
Task Force	A process of advice and development on local administration. A completed course does not in itself document the correction of each citizen's case.
Children's barometers	The Board of Appeal's study of selected requirements for municipal children's cases. Every year and every question has its own population.
Remittal for reconsideration	The Board of Appeal shall refer the matter back to the Board of Appeal for reconsideration. It's a different step than actual help or repatriation.
Return	The decision to cease placing and actual movement shall be recorded separately. The destination must be indicated; the termination of placement is not always a reunion with a parent.
Resumption	An earlier case is taken up again. This does not, on its own, indicate that the outcome changes or the loss is remedied.
EMRK	European Convention on Human Rights.
EMD	European Court of Human Rights. Complaints, judicial files, final proceedings and breaches of Articles shall be counted separately.
United Nations Committees	Convention committees with different mandates for control and complaints. Recommendations, substantive opinions and procedural decisions have separate status fields.
CRC / CRPD / CAT	The UN Children's Committee, the Disabled Committee and the Torture Committee; the abbreviations are also included in document numbers.
CPT	Committee of the Council of Europe for the Prevention of Torture. Visiting reports and government responses are different sources.
OPCAT	The optional protocol to the UN Convention on the Torture of Preventive Visits. The Danish national control system is a different system from the CPT.
UPR	The UN's periodic assessment of a country's human rights situation. Recommendations are not individual judgments finding violations.
R2P	Responsibility to Protect: responsibility for the protection of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.
PCN / SDN	The former Patient Complaints Board and the Disciplinary Board of the Health Service. Their statistics have different units and historical versions.
Patient insurance / Replacement	The compensation scheme under its historical and current name. Recognised damage is not automatically documented errors of a public servant.
UTH / DPSD	Adverse event / Danish Patient Safety Database. Reports, classifications and people are different units.
LSR	National Tax Tribunal. Administrative decisions, court outcomes and compensation statistics have their own denominators.
Source code and locator	A brief reference to the source and the specific location: e.g. table, section, physical PDFs page or printed page. Physical and printed page numbers may be different.
Version	The specific publication or revision from which a figure originates. Later referrals may change an earlier year.
Unique persons	Various identified rightholders after documented interconnection. The number of cases, decisions or events does not replace this count.

2. Period, sources and what is counted

2006-2025 is 20 completed calendar years. Publications from 2026 on decisions in 2025 belong to the 2025 series. Events from 2026 are shown as a supplement. Older events and sources of law may explain the later knowledge or legal state, but are not counted as new events during the period.

Public servants, authorities and politicians are different subjects of responsibility. Politicians aren't all employees. The region, the municipality or the state may be responsible even when personal criminal liability has not been determined. Statistics relating to a system of private and public treatment places shall not be renamed "statistics on errors of public servants'.

Concept	Importance of the report	Example of incorrect aggregation
Application / notification	Complaints or information received	Notification = proven infringement
Decision	One recorded outage	More decisions = same number of people
Overturning	Amendment/annulment or remittal	Overturning=one criminal removal
Process error	Absence of legal action	Each process error = new child
Deficiency of residence	Lack of legal basis	Any error = own home shortage
Lack of competence	Wrong decision-making body	Legal basis therefore exists, the decision of the actor was lawful
Convention infringement	Determined or legally analysed breach	All committee recommendations = infringement judgments
Liability	Conditions for performance and debts	Critified employee = convicted employee
Person concerned	Identifiable rightholder	One child = automatically two different parents

The historical pre-trial detention statistics contain documented breaks in methodology: manual reports were replaced by POLSAS/QlikView in the 2011-12 series; the 2017 series recalculated historical data; from 2021 the endpoint became actual release, and interrupted periods were split. The report retains 35 checked annual versions for 2010-2023 rather than adding overlapping retrospective accounts together. Earlier Qlik tables on section 768 a deadlines also used an incorrect endpoint. [LV11 pp. 2-5; LV15 p. 6; LV17 pp. 2-3; LV21 pp. 2 and 6]

The four original pages of the 2019 report document 16 cases in which the statutory submission to the public prosecutor prior to a prolonged extension of the custody was not forthcoming. This is a proven procedural lack. The number of persons concerned, the other basis of the order and the actual period of validity require each case. The 82 references made by the statement are a different registration and are not used as a common national denominator for the 16 shortcomings. The number of the corresponding 16-page annex has been incorporated with the express status of secondary reproduction; the original annexes have not yet been checked. [LV19, p. 1-4; separate annex account]

The isolation series contains precisely lit day numbers and specific children's programmes. The 19 historical records of children cannot be referred to as 19 different children without identity coupling. The original for 2019 provides a rare actual coupling: 15 runs involve 13 people. Such coupling shall not be generalised to other years. [ISO2006-2017; ISO2019, method / personal information]

Five linked financial statements

Oversight: intakes, samples and decisions. **Errors:** established deficiencies, critical outcomes, deficiencies in competence/legal authority and Convention findings. **Persons:** distinct children, parents, patients and other rights holders. **Consequences:** the intervention’s actual duration, loss and the start of assistance. **Responsibility and redress:** punishment, employment-related response, cessation, reunification, repayment and compensation. The accounts are linked; they are not added together into one quantity.

A national aggregate requires case and person coupling between the accounts. Without coupling, sectoral amounts are given. Complaints, samples, judgments, notifications and children shall not be merged into a single total.

Name account for each publication

The verification requested for omitted cases shall include:

1. The population the report claims to describe and the actual sampling.
2. Number of cases sought / submitted and sorted out for reasons.
3. Already pending, lapsed / rejected cases and reassessments.
4. Number of cases examined per theme; different themes may have different denominators.
5. Findings, formal errors in confirmed cases and several errors in the same case.
6. Time, field of law, instance and version revisions.
7. Overlap with other publications, years or populations.

If one report counts the entire register and another counts a sample from it, they must not be added together. If the practice study excludes cases actually appealed, it can shed light on errors outside the complaint statistics. This does not, however, make every sample automatically additive: overlap, case year and unit must be checked. [V19]

The national appeal statistics from 2006 and 2012 provide a specific denominator example. The 2006 version reports 6.393 overturnings as 23 per cent of all 28.043 closures; using 24.915 cases determined on the merits as the denominator, the own calculation is 25,7 per cent. By contrast, the 2012 version’s 8.202 overturnings use 32.066 cases determined on the merits as the denominator. From 2007, a municipal amendment during an appeal may fall within the combined dismissed/discontinued category; this code therefore does not document that all such municipal decisions remained unchanged. The full tables, printed percentage versions and codes appear in chapter 3 with original references.

Where overlap is known, the union is **A+B−overlap**. A verified example is the Senior Pension Unit 2024: 287 overturnings and 170 cases with formal errors; 51 of the cases with errors are upheld. This gives 338 cases with an overturning or a formal error, not 457. [SP24]

In case of unknown overlap, an interval may only be used if A and B actually count the same type of unit. Minimum = max (A, B), maximum = A + B is a clean quantity limit; it is not an estimate of the true error population. Complaints and persons cannot be included in the same formula.

Reproducibility and source hierarchy

Statistical rows have a year, unit, numerator, denominator, sample and source. The original table locator is given when it has been checked. Known internally conflicting figures are retained with a choice of version or a separate note. A guessed figure is not inserted merely because it would make the table reconcile.

An original judgment, legislative text or control report has a different function of proof than a press summary or the reproduction of a later committee. A control report shall document the findings and method of the check; it shall not constitute an independent review of all the underlying original documents. Therefore, formulations such as the "report records" are used when this is what is actually documented.

For decisive claims, the chain is used **original source → concrete locator → defined statement → own calculation or legal conclusion;**. The authorities' own statements about corrections are sources of reaction. Compliance requires subsequent documentation.

2. National control arrangements and police outcomes

Control per. 7 October 2026. Public sources; no private case database. The Annex contains compact fact sheets and independent method assessments. Figures have the specified source / version status; an annual archive alone is not referred to as an annual series. Financial year 2025 and publication in 2026 are shown separately. The Matrix also refers to actually reviewed extension modules; it is not alleged that all public cases have been registered.

Coverage accounts

Zone	Actual verified number content	Missing for a full 20-year count of errors, affected and responsibility;
Local authorities / practicalities	National 2006 / 2012 originals: 13 tables 262 rows; national 2007-2011 versions; Talportal 2014-2025; 2013 transitions three originals actually read. Installation practice 2006 / 08 / 09 and inclusion / relocation 2011 all 63 / 73 / 94 / 107 / 65 pages with full reading tables in the special modules	Exact national full-year outcomes for 2013 do not appear in the transitional documents read. UDK 2021: all 90 pages have been fully reviewed. The 21 specifically allocated remaining main-report/annex items are complete; foster family 2014 parts 1/2/4+summary, all 108 pages, and FKU 2012, all 20 pages, have also been checked. The main original for BarnetsReform 2012, foster placement moves 2014 part 3 and FKU 2012 annex 1 have still not been obtained after documented searches. Person/reconsideration/redress linkage is required
The practice of the Regional Board before 2013	Central Jutland cash-assistance suspension 2012: all 17 main tables and 42 municipal rows;80 cases,76 hypothetical amendments/remittals. See regionale-naevn-midtjylland-kontanthjaelp2012.md	Other regional originals are the procurement / inventory scope; specifically controlled further courses are in the special modules; already complained / investigated excluded, no national error / person sum or actual refund series
Placed / children / h andicap	End 2006-2025, current implementations 2011-2025 and historical AS 2010 all 56 pages / 18 tables 325 rows. Actual 2007-10 start-ups 3693 / 3502 / 3254 / 2864; child disability 2022-2025	Malfunctions for child / parents and actual repatriation require personal connection; 3253 termination 2010 includes 18 years of cessation also with continued surveillance. Search flocks / places are not number of children or physical co-location
Ombudsman	Completed cases and criticisms 2006-2025, all 20 years	A case's criticism may relate to several errors / persons; proven errors of other control bodies overlap
Police	Actual annual decision outcomes 2006-2025,with degrees of criticism, criminal-case decisions and the 2012 transition; see politi-udfald-2006-2025.md/.json. Separate disciplinary accounting included	Connecting to unique employees / citizens and final judgment, discipline, compensation and restoration in the same event
Patient Replacement	Claims 2006-2025 and separate treatment/drug/person versions; annual originals 2006-2010 expanded with 77 tables, 712 factual rows and public/private/regional breakdown in three patient-insurance modules	Original 2011 / 12 full-year documents not obtained after documented archive / ODA / official trials; exact 2011 treatment denominator / drug 2012 not constructed from percentages. Recognition is not automatically employed culpa; actual payment / personal union requires separate coupling
Patient complaints / TV	Critical / marketing year and version break in special modules; PKS 2006 all 27 pages / 36 tables 328 rows; SDN 2011 all 34 pages official text, same 2437 outcomes. PPKN 2011- 2025, anchor board 2014- 2025 and selected regional predecessor years. UTH20 years; 2007 / 2012Part 1 and 2012Part 2 / learning annexes now materially controlled, Part 2 / learning Annex 531 factorial rows	The outstanding originals for 2009/2013DPSD and certain predecessor years for patient complaints/coercion are documented materials still to be obtained. UTH, patient complaints and coercion have their own denominators; public/private, the union of employees/patients and actual harm/cessation/redress require separate evidence
Data Protection Agency	All 2006- 2025 annual report's registered activity targets; 2018- 2025 also the 385 annual administrative report's table cells, time targets and version deviations. 16 supervisory groups, 19 public fines, 3 appeals and 11 original judgments controlled. See Data Protection -2006- 2017- extension.md and Data Protection -2018- 2025- expansion.md	Journals, complaints, breakup reviews, criticisms and judgments have different denominators. Historical critical percentage decision denominator, full sanction / person register and actual payment / restoration require additional register data; public / private and duplicates are kept separately
Rigsrevisionen	Annual audit main / ministerial / follow-up series 2006-2025 materially controlled; historical thematic and concrete critical events in the national audit years- historia.md and rrr-concrete-impact and tables.md. The 17 residue tables 2018- 2021: 86 rows / 165 numerical cells text / visually controlled in the National Audit -2018- 2021-remaining -annual tables .md. Report 11 / 2025 on placement published 2026: all 54 + 4 + 7 original pages, 80 factual rows and 84 municipal rows. See National Audit Posts 2026.md	The main annual series and 17 specified annual tables are completed; other criticism/methodology figures for 2006-2017 and remaining special reports/follow-ups are specific remaining gaps. A catalogue of 796 entries is not a content check. No national error/person total; individual redress/responsibility requires linkage

Zone	Actual verified number content	Missing for a full 20-year count of errors, affected and responsibility;
Children's baro meter and task force	Pilot 2019:all 42+6+20 pages, 228 cases not appealed; 2020-24:all 2059 municipality-annex rows and case-type annexes; disability barometers in their own modules. Central Task Force list of 43 processes:28 have checked analysis/status content, 15 lack such an obtained original. Five other schemes separately; all currently obtained main/annex originals in named modules have been read	28 checked sequences are not 28 sequences with all phases or proved reparation. Original pages/phases not obtained and the exact routes tried are listed in the 43 reconciliation. The 2019 pilot's previous 404 gap is closed. Exclusion, union of people and actual redress are separate register/record requirements
Honey.	All 2014- 2025 original five-actor outcomes; historical LSR 2006 s 31 tables 146 rows as well as administrative 2009-12 / Domases 2009- 12 with 26 tables 154 rows. 2007 management / warranty source 31 pages; 2013 financial original 16 pages read, no administrative matrix in it	Administrative 2007/08/2013 and court outcomes 2007/08 have still not been obtained after the routes tried. Rounded percentages do not give exact favourable-finding cells; union of people, actual repayment/interest and responsibility require case linkage
Aliens	Udlændingenævnet 2013- 2025: precise outages 2013-2021 and rounded percentages 2022- 2025; original 2006-2025 series of the Refugee Board for core decisions, resumption and time; Dublin 2014- 2025	Remaining delimited decision categories, children / age assessment, deductibility, actual stay and reunion. See the separate denominator modules
Judicial review	Den Særlige Klageret's original outcomes 2020-2025; 2013-2020 historical register account in original legal literature, clearly separated; specific reopening and accountability trajectories. See domstolskontrol-og-genoptagelsesregnskab.md	Historical original register 2006-2019, personal coupling, new convictions and restoration; resumption is not in itself an acquittal or judicial liability
Preservation, isolation and children	Actual pre-trial detention tables and versions; all annual solitary-confinement originals for 2006-2024 including children/time and the 2019 figures of 15 processes/13 people; interferences with liberty for under-15s and specific cessation processes. See isolation-originaler-boern-tid-og-versioner.md and the pre-trial detention/children modules	2025-isolation original, event-based deduplication and individual cessation / replacement. Isolation numbers do not automatically count illegal orders; penalty cells and other contact restrictions are other populations
Equal treatment	Actual 2018- 2025 series; all exit categories 2020- 2025 and concrete public events. See equaltreatment- fallout -reduction- and -restation.md	Previous years and other early years; classification public / private, actual reimbursement and deduced persons
Environment and level	Actual outcome of the appeal and procedural times with its own arrangements and transition years. See environment-plan-fallout-time and-limits.	Older predecessor register, actual physical compliance and linking incidents/people; remittal does not prove pollution has ceased
Defence and intelligence	TET: all 34 annual public reports 2014- 2025, 651 factorial rows; FE / PET / CFCS and disaggregated skills. Concrete Green Desert, Samsam and the annual audit defense findings. See the text-material-control account.md and the special modules	TET did not exist 2006-2013; it is not zero series. Confidential primary control certificates, total individual interventions and actual deletion / repair are not fully public. System controls are not persons
EMD, UN, CPT and UPR	EMD59 case files / 57 proceedings; FN265 period decisions + 5 in 2026; CPTsex visits / responses; UPR 2011 / 16 / 21 all 620 recommendations. 2026UPRandre 265 numbers and all 67 pages in four-ground originals controlled	Written UPR2026Add 1 not obtained after 6 routes; 174 supported / 91 recorded meeting statements in explicitly automatic FNprintout. Individual recommendation acceptance / compliance, cross-case personal union and actual repair shall not be derived from document numbers;
Politicians, ministers and commissions	Rigsret (Court of Impeachment), Mink, Tibet, Statsløse, Green Desert and other specifically document-verified time/accountability trajectories in the separate modules	No total national register for all acts involving liability; liability, discipline, penalties and actual compensation must continue to be separated

Own methodological conclusion: Denmark has several parallel layers of oversight, but their counts measure different events. A total of all complaints, overturnings, compensation awards, UTH and data breaches would both count unexamined allegations as established errors and count the same person and act several times. The documented counts must still be included within their own scope: incompatible categories must not be removed, but presented as separate counting layers.

1. Folketingets Ombudsmand - actually 20-year series

Unit: closed file, not citizens or all public decisions. Criticism means the total category of the source of criticism / recommendation / recommendation, etc. Before 2015, the category was rejected wider; from 2015, different treatment / help and formal refusals are distinguished. Criticism is therefore not a national error rate. The source also includes other institutions under the authority and outside the authority. The Court of Justice, private law and cases not investigated constitute a loss of selectivity. Annual archives.

Year	Criticism	Without criticism	Other aid (from 2015)	Rejected	Completed	PDF page with total
2006	217	629	-	3105	3951	30
2007	279	645	-	3264	4188	30
2008	162	520	-	3482	4164	30
2009	190	581	-	3644	4415	97
2010	137	738	-	3978	4853	68,76
2011	153	848	-	3921	4922	94,102
2012	83	603	-	3611	4297	86,94
2013	124	688	-	4424	5236	113
2014	166	396	-	4432	4994	108
2015	156	853	3019	832	4860	117
2016	153	693	2952	884	4682	125
2017	135	760	3262	905	5062	103
2018	121	643	3286	905	4955	103
2019	105	720	3771	978	5574	110
2020	138	952	3955	1162	6207	85
2021	78	737	3785	987	5587	77
2022	126	661	3529	942	5258	83
2023	92	732	4043	1197	6064	Annual Web Table
2024	81	825	4376	1157	6439	Annual Web Table
2025	98	821	5019	1187	7125	Annual Web Table

2010- 2012 outside criticism is own subtraction of reality-treated minus criticism: 875 − 137; 1001 − 153; 686 − 83. The others are directly tabular cells. The source's raw PDF's are not saved. Verified direct primary URLs:

- 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009.
- 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014.
- 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022.
- 2023 webtable, 2024 web table, 2025 web table.

2025 authority scope: State 70 criticism/3687 cases; municipality-region 24/1912; others within jurisdiction 4/161; outside 464; unspecified institution 901. The municipality-region total does not give the number of citizens affected by errors. 2025 annual review, pp.72-74 tables. The archive also contains cases of principle and supervision requiring separate case coding for error type/consequence/responsibility.

2. Police - Entry and Trial

2006-2011, former Public Prosecutor's Scheme

Year	Conduct	Criminal proceedings	Of which traffic	Of which death / serious damage § 1020a (2)	Total Entry
2006	405	584	277	20	989
2007	457	566	214	21	1023
2008	447	534	231	14	981
2009	424	629	290	12	1053
2010	407	564	228	12	971
2011	415	515	230	14	930

Unit: created cases. Traffic and Section 1020 (a) (2) are subsets of criminal proceedings; they do not have to be added again. Complaints / notifications are not found to be illegality. State Advocate General's 2011 Report, Table 1 prints.130 Institution breach 1 / 1 / 2012; older cases pending are dealt with separately in the DUP.

2012- 2025, Independent Policy Office

Year	Criminal proceedings	Traffic	§ 1020a (2) studies;	Conduct	Completed Table B
2012	435	430	21	726	1250
2013	433	446	16	652	1614
2014	496	456	11	651	1584
2015	466	480	21	509	1369
2016	464	547	26	508	1556
2017	426	769	17	464	1539
2018	446	717	20	610	1709
2019	484	901	14	711	2131
2020	526	939	15	788	2142
2021	449	758	11	876	2242
2022	481	775	15	1031	2145
2023	541	786	13	984	2183
2024	562	851	11	1016	2472
2025	602	863	20	1258	2388

The first four columns have been created; the last have been completed across the vintage year and including traffic note cases. Traffic and serious injury investigations are independent categories from 2012. No number is the number of convicted employees. 2012 closure includes 245 public prosecutor's cases; the table Cuden transitional cases gives 1005, not 1250. 2023 annual report, Table A / Bs.9-10; 2025 annual report, Table A / Bs.10-11 2025 total entry 4240 includes 307 ac-insights + 1190 others; real four categories 2743. These 1497 administrative / other cases may not be counted as further complaints about breaches of the law.

2024 behavioural outcomes: 1112 endings = 163 nots + 44 revoked + 50 temptations + 39 baseless + 690 none-critique + 3 regrettable + 26 inappropriate + 36 critical + 9 meget- critical able + 0 special-sense-critical + 52 other.

Criticism in the three degrees of criticism 45; other negative descriptions 29 must be separate. Penal proceedings 542 closed; 9 on the basis of indictment / fines / discontinuance / warning; this is not a case-law statistic. 2024 annual report, Table 4 prints.123 and Table 8 prints.128.

2025 time measurement:553 criminal cases; 221 from completed investigation→State Prosecutor took 286 days at DUP+55 at the State Prosecutor=341; 332 summarily dismissed/discontinued took 48 days; all 553 averaged 165 days. Traffic:569 closures, of which 323 forwarded:145+38=183 days. Source:2025 annual report table C. Different courses and denominators; no overall completion time for the citizen's court/disciplinary case is documented here.

3. Patienterstatningen - Annual Entry and Replacement

Unit: notified treatment providers/cases. A patient may have several cases. Notifications are not evidence of error. Acceptance is not automatically individual culpa either: the specialist rule, equipment, another method and the reasonableness rule have different conditions. Amounts awarded are not numbers of patients. All private treatment must be separated out when counting public responsibility.

Year	Treatment notification ed	Medicinal product notification ed	Overall, how separate published	Source Block
2006	4861	255	5116*	P1
2007	5416	338	5754*	P1
2008	5519	312	5831*	P1
2009	6319	356	6675*	P1
2010	7489	347	7836*	P1
2011	7993	379	8372*	P1
2012	-	-	9699	P2
2013	-	-	9804	P2
2014	-	-	10903	P2
2015	-	-	10617	P3
2016	-	-	11212	P3
2017	-	-	10391	P3
2018	-	-	10609	P3
2019	-	-	11549	P3
2020	-	-	10639	P3
2021	10770	1632	12402*	P4 / P5
2022	10974	1546	12520*	P4 / P5
2023	11789	1818	13607*	P4 / P5
2024	13316	1427	14743*	P4 / P5
2025	16621	1238	17859	P4 / P5

* Own addition, not source cells. No uniform 20 years revised version is available. 2011 P 1 introduction says 8375 against table addition 8372; the report warns provisional 2011 figures. 2024 annual report / statistics 2025 version said 14752 against 2026 version 14743; the difference must be as revision, not further cases. 2021 earlier extract 12404 against last 12402. No different versions are added together.

• P1 2006–2011 analysis, table 1/3/20, PDF pp.10/13/46. Treatment findings in favour 1482,1488,1506,2379,2518,2712; medicinal-product findings in favour 57,61,94,144,106,68. Medicinal-product decisions 321,243,264,404,425,352. Public

Hospital reports 4029,4366,4262,4724,5587,5965.2012- 2015 prognosis tables should not be used as observed figures.

• P2 Administrative 2017 annual report, Table 4 PDFs.10. Cases of the full year include treatment / medicines. 2017 reviews 9483 treatment + 908 medicine. 2017 times 186 day decision + 242 day count; the average values of the two phases cannot be summed up without cohort control to each patient's waiting time.

• P3 2020 annual report, Table 4 PDFs.13.2020 decision time 215 days, inventory time 215 days; part has aconto. The 2020 report describes the resumption of almost 16000 decisions in 8744 cases following Supreme Court judgment 4 / 12 / 2020 on interest rate calculation, PDFs.7-8. These are decisions and cases, not 16000 unique patients.

• P4 Treatment injuries 2025,27/5/2026 version, tables 1/2/3/4, PDF pp.3-7.2021-2025 decisions 9761,9456,12152,12680,13913; successful claims 2370,2067,2791,2810,3482. Public somatic hospital notifications 7170,7285,7763,7939,9098; accepted claims 1822,1557,1995,1994,1974.2025 successful claims under the specialist rule 2470 incl. psychiatry; successful claims under the reasonableness rule 922. Private insurance cases are included; home nursing/home care is public+private. Dentists enter in 2024; coverage extensions in 2016/2018 create breaks in the series.

• P5 Drug Injuries 2025,27/5/2026 version, table 1/3/4 PDF pp.2-4.2021-2025 decisions 1128,1611,1859,1580,1149; favourable findings 418,361,382,250,225.2025 awarded 62,87 million kroner; treatment+drugs 961,82 million kroner.7647 are compensation assessment decisions, not 7647 recognised patients.

Supplementary actual person-count check 2013-2017:7993,8572,8189,8562,8113 people, compared with 9312,10300,9707,10189,9464 treatment claims in this 2017 version's table 1. Treatment annual report 2017,PDF p. 12. The Faroe Islands' 16 claims in 2017 are excluded here; private insurance cases are included. Version/scope differs from the 2017 administrative annual report and later revised extracts; the person series must not be used as an automatic conversion factor for other years. Psychiatry coded by specialty name and treatment facility; adverse effects of psychiatric medication in another report.

4. The Data Protection Agency - public sector can be separated in 2025

Year	GDPRK Break Notifications	Complaints 2021-25
2018	2722	-
2019	7242	-
2020	8773	-
2021	8554	2237
2022	8816	1817
2023	9537	1767
2024	9624	1777
2025	9849	3128

2025 breaches: public sector 5167, private sector 4630, other 52=9849; breaches under the Law Enforcement Act excluded. 2025 complaints: public sector 1040, private sector 2080, other 8=3128. A notification is not an adjudicated finding of unlawfulness; several notifications may concern the same incident, and one may concern many people. Supervision counts 2021-25:512,513,504,518,525. 2025 annual review, PDF pp.26/38-39; 2025 annual report, table 3 A, PDF p.8. Annual archive 2006-2025 found. The specific statistical measures for 2006-2017 have now been verified against the originals in all 12 annual reviews; datatilsyn-2006-2017-udvidelse.md documents 7.944 new public-sector inquiry/complaint cases and 315 new public-sector supervision cases. New cases are not necessarily closed cases, and supervision cases are not a count of visits. Full national consequences for individuals and uniform denominators for criticism are still not quantified.

Whistleblower 2025 received 282:97 public sector/185 private sector; 273 closed, including 89 forwarded, of which 3 to the police. Forwarding is not a judgment or an established breach of official duty. 2024 received 186:73 public sector/113 private sector. Source: whistleblower section of the 2025 annual review. AULA decisions 2024are a specific public-institution source on risk assessment that must be coded separately by case for orders issued and affected individuals.

5. Rigsrevisionen - the impact of supervision and the loss of citizens' time;

Fact card R 1: Ankestyrelsen’s supervision,18/2024,2/6/2025, fig. 5, table 1/B/C, printed pp.16/26/36-37.2018-24 closed 1669=1114 declined+555 investigated. Annual totals 61,121,116,197,180,540,454; investigated 25,24,11,40,50,221,184. Children 750=552 declined+198 investigated; adults 919=562 declined+357 investigated.154 withdrawn/discontinued/forwarded are excluded from 1669. Response table 545 after merging:475 without a response,70 advisory opinions(80 registered cases, including4 advance opinions);0 annulment/coercive fine/compensation action/penalty. Cases investigated in 2023/24 took~1 year; all closed cases over 245 days 34%/25%. Follow-up measured on 498 selected closures,10%; not all 1669. Time analysis 1578/524 after date exclusions. **Source error:** table C adults-declined 2024 shows 191 but 202 total and 101 investigated; sum 191+101=292. Fig. 5 shows 270 declined overall;169 children+191 adults=360. Visual verification on 6/10/2026 confirms 191 on PDF page 44/printed p.37; the verification image was deleted after reading. No cell has been silently corrected.

Own criticism: the response and follow-up figures document a weak enforcement link in this particular population. An established error and a municipal assurance of subsequent correction are not evidence of actual restoration of the benefit, family relationship or rights of the citizen. Zero use of these four reactions is not proof that no employees were sanctioned by other means; that investigation is missing. The poor quality assessment by the National Audit Office rather than conscious decisions is an institutional assessment, no individual accountability and no exemption from liability.

Fact card R2: Child psychiatry, 10/2023,19/2/2024, annex 1/figures, printed methodology p. 31 ff. Register:42252 referral processes Q3/2019-Q1/2022 minus 1759 without a completion marker=40493; one patient may have several. More than 27000 processes exceeded 30 days in 2019-2022; average 76→115 days. Sample 382; 52% missing assessment plan, 63% missing information on extended choice; sub-denominators 260/252. Suspension 18/3-1/9/2020 requires separate delimitation. Three regions’ first meeting was systematically registered as a completed assessment. This documents measurement error, not merely waiting time. Further details in personstatistik.md; more than 27000 must not be called unique children.

Fact sheet R 3: Specialised palliative care, 17/2024,12/5/2025, summary/waiting-time figures. 7600 starts in 2023; typically 20 days against 24 in 2019.79% against the quality target of 90% within 10 days; Central Denmark 92%,Capital 65%,Zealand 72%.81% of cancer patients/70% with other diseases received the intervention before becoming too ill/dying. Quality targets are not automatically statutory time limits. Own analysis of consequences: delayed relief cannot be restored after death; a subsequent administrative correction does not replace the lost relief.

Rigsrevisionen's audit case archive contains many more sector studies. The number of reports or monetary amounts of financial errors must not be converted into a number of violations of citizens' rights. 2025 annual reportrecords 20 major studies; this means 20 studies, not 20 instances of unlawfulness.

6. Other Health Service Controls

STPK history: STPK in figures 2023 PDF, historical 2015-2021 tables. Pending at year end 5221,4603,4872,6406,9129,8211,6539; closed through dialogue 484,513,520,453,304,705,918.2017-2021 disciplinary outcomes: no criticism 75,3/85,0/83,2/78,6/79,2%; criticism 22,9/14,3/15,5/20,1/19,0%; aggravated criticism 1,9/0,7/1,3/1,2/1,8%. Criticism of treatment facilities 31,3/31,8/34,6/33,1/29,5%. Refusals to reopen are excluded; dental complaints from 1/6/2019 are included. Rounded percentages without a verified common denominator must not be converted into exact counts. Public+private are included; the oversight body was established in 2018; the predecessor originals actually obtained and the remaining gaps are specified in sundhedsaar-serier.md, patientklager2006-originalkontrol-og-naevnerkritik.md and disciplinarnaevn2011-originale-udfald-og-bevismangler.md. Current figures dashboard PowerBI 2020-2025 has not been fully read.

UTH fact sheet: Danish Patient Safety Database 2024,count/event/consequence tables. 489361 reports=127850 individual+361511 reported in aggregates. Aggregate reports:municipalities 354190,other regional 3799,hospital 2269,private 1253. Individual reports:medication 60463,care 13806,handover/information/records 13401. Patients/relatives 2887 reports. 6010 potentially fatal incidents are not 6010 deaths. Actually fatal category:municipal 0,5%,hospital 0,6%,other regional 0,4%,private 0,1%; percentages are rounded. Registered/closed/anonymised population, not unique patients, judgments or all incidents. The aggregate-reporting scheme changes in 2024; revision on reopening/deletion is possible. The 2025 transfer of tasks requires reconciliation.

Own criticism: UTH is important knowledge of actual risk / damage, which should neither be mixed with legally established breach of duty nor removed because the system is used for learning. An injury may occur iUTH, patient complaint and damages case

At the same time. The statement of liability shall link the incident with specific duty, action, damage and consequences for the responsible staff member.

7. Taxation and Aliens Control

Tax 2025: Figures from Skatteankestyrelsen 2025, table 3/4 PDF pp.8-9.10577 decisions/closures=2746 wholly/partly favourable findings+253 remitted+4606 upheld+235 made more adverse+698 other+2039 closed before the appeal body. Administrative closures without/with only limited consideration are excluded. 2021-2025 overall average months 17,4/17,5/18,6/13,9/13,0; National Tax Tribunal 29,7/32,9/31,4/28,0/24,6. Time excludes earlier periods on hold, including pending criminal/court proceedings. The Annual archive 2014–2025 has now been used to check the outcome tables in all 12 original reports. skatteklager-udfald-og-tid-2014-2025.md/.json contains 129.099 recorded decisions/closures and 35.759 wholly/partly favourable findings in five actors' series; these are case entries, not unique individuals. Historical administrative 2006/2009-2012 and court 2006/2009-2012 outcomes have subsequently been checked in the separate LSR modules. Administrative 2007/2008/2013 and court 2007/2008 outcomes have not been obtained after documented searches; reading the specified tables is not a declaration of full reading of the other content of each annual report. Own consequence analysis: a favourable finding may correct the tax; it does not automatically show full repayment/interest/losses from compulsory collection or punishment of employees.

Immigration 2025: Udlændingenævnet's annual statistics, cases concerning individuals.4134 incoming,3759 outgoing including those without a substantive decision,2402 pending at year-end; closed cases 192 days, age of pending cases 136 days. 'Cases concerning individuals' is not a documented national unique-person count or a count of unlawfulness. Annual archive 2013–2025 has now been used to verify all 13 years' measures against originals: udlaendingenaevn-udfald-og-tid-2013-2025.md/.json provides precise outcomes for 2013-2021 and the originals' rounded outcome percentages for 2022-2025. No exact counts are calculated from the rounded percentages. flygtningenaevn-udfald-og-personer-2006-2025.md/.json supplements this with core decisions, reopening decisions and time in all 20 originals, plus Dublin 2014-2025. Bounded other categories and actual redress are identified as specific outstanding items. Family separation, residence without rights or removal must be linked to decisions examined on the merits and actual effects, not merely incoming cases.

8. Documented facts, deficiencies and priority studies

Reproducible own sums of the annex's rows: Ombudsman 2006-2025 has 102.833 closed registered cases, including 2.794 in the criticism/recommendation/advice category. The previous police system 2006-2011 has 2.555 conduct cases and 3.392 criminal cases including traffic/serious injury. DUP 2012-2025 has 10.784 conduct cases,6.811 criminal cases,9.718 traffic cases and 231 serious injury investigations. GDPR breaches 2018-2025 total 65.117 notifications,2018 under a new legal regime. The patient table's mixed-version rows total 206.138 notifications; this is **a reproduction of precisely the selected source tables, not a uniform 20-year register total**. None of these sums is a count of illegalities, unique injured people or responsible employees. Machine-readable figures: kontrolserier.json. Sundhedsansvar.md supplements this with adverse coercion outcomes and separately formally unlawful approvals.

Documented: the control bodies detect negative decision outcomes, criticism, errors in registration, overcrowding of patients' rights and inadequate follow-up in specific, demarcated populations. The figures in the tables are neither a total of all Danish errors nor a basis for automatic acquittal of institutions / persons without registered criticism.

Not proven by these totals: all placements unlawful; all remittals invalid interventions; all patient injuries disciplinary offences; the same person's number of annual cohorts; a corresponding count of two parents per child; specific employees' intent; a national number of criminal breaches of official duty. Each hypothesis requires the case's primary material and specific application of the legal rule to the facts.
Required public data tracks:

1. Complaint / practice investigation-case-ID, initial authority / year, error type, result, person-ID and status of excluded - already pending.

2. Date of intervention, remittal/annulment, fresh municipal decision, actual effect/return home, further appeal and full duration.

3. Public / private actor and damage in health / data sources; unique affected persons and families across registers.

4. indictment, indictment, final judgment, disciplinary criticism, warning, sentence in the service, dismissal, compensation / recompense and management, with joint event ID.

5. All other annual reports / tables 2006-2025 and international inspections, conclusions and implementation.

The strongest sustainable statistical criticisms are the documented errors / negative outcomes in each population studied; then documented continued duration and weak follow-up; then lack of public interconnection to recovery and responsibility. A legal conclusion on the legal basis, EMRK, international law and specific legal order require separate legal annexes.

Controlled sums and their units

Restricted series	Calculated sum	What the summation means
The Ombudsman closed cases 2006-2025	102.833	Cases over 20 years of age; no person's delusion
The Ombudsman's criticism / recommendations 2006-2025	2.794	Source Critical Group; No National Illegality Rate
Politicikslager 2006-2011, behaviour	2.555	Cases set up in previous arrangements
Policy warehouse 2006-2011, criminal law	3.392	Including traffic and serious injury studies
DUP 2012- 2025, behaviour	10.784	Cases opened; separate category
DUP 2012-2025, criminal cases	6.811	Separate from traffic / studies in the new scheme
DUP 2012-2025, traffic	9.718	Cases set up; no court or person-total
DUP 2012- 2025, serious injury studies	231	Investigation entry; unproven number of police crimes
Police Disciplinary Summaries 2006-2025	1.454	Number of items; several items may relate to the same case / staff, several employees may be in one item
Patient reviews 2006-2025, shown version rows	206.138	Pure reproduction of mixed versions; non homogeneous error / person total

The sum is checked against the compact annual rows of control series.json. They can be deduced from the tables of this chapter and from the police outcome module. They shall not be merged across schemes, populations and entities. Complaints, placement status, interventions and EMDs shall each have their separate votes in the following chapters.

The actual outcome of the police complaint 2006-2025

Controlled October 7, 2026. All 20 years have been read in original fallout tables. The units are decision-making, not citizens or employees.

Year	Conduct settled	Criticism	Conviction / appropriate term	Punishment decided.	Testimony g	Transport Dedicated / indicted Basis	Indentation Dedicated / indicted Basis
2006	379	7	7	527	173	246 / 162	subset; see delimitation
2007	489	14	8	651	168	263 / 154	subset; see delimitation
2008	461	8	5	528	154	231 / 147	subset; see delimitation
2009	440	5	9	624	166	278 / 153	subset; see delimitation
2010	384	3	9	563	124	232 / 115	subset; see delimitation

Year	Conduct settled	Criticism	Conviction / appropriate term	Punishment decided.	Testimony g	Transport Dedicated / indicted Basis	Indentation Dedicated / indicted Basis
2011	435	7	11	575	137	237 / 125	subset; see delimitation
2012	632	25	16	279	15	330 / 70	9 / 2
2013	715	22	14	418	12	461 / 84	20 / 1
2014	643	30	15	468	14	463 / 97	10 / 1
2015	516	21	11	490	17	345 / 63	18 / 0
2016	521	24	15	453	12	475 / 98	16 / 0
2017	432	17	16	412	12	429 / 56	22 / 1
2018	521	11	20	409	7	566 / 76	16 / 3
2019	735	19	16	501	19	616 / 58	27 / 2
2020	710	9	13	534	18	635 / 67	14 / 0
2021	820	15	14	516	27	712 / 40	15 / 0
2022	960	30	21	474	19	490 / 26	15 / 0
2023	892	16	21	494	22	586 / 47	13 / 1
2024	1112	45	29	542	9	589 / 27	16 / 0
2025	1152	26	40	554	10	569 / 26	9 / 0

Behaviour 2006-2011: 2,588 decisions, 44 critical decisions. Behaviour 2012- 2025: 10,361 decisions, 310 critical decisions. Grand total: 12,949 decisions and 354 critical decisions. The sum is reproducible in JSON; they include 2012 transitional cases and are not unique persons.

Limitation and documented deviations

• 2006-2011 criminal proceedings include traffic and § 1020 a cases; they stand separately from 2012. 2009 source inconsistency: traffic 278 in Table 5 c, 277 in Table 4.

• 2012 outage includes 245 transitional cases concluded by the public prosecutor under the old regime: 106 punishments 25 traffic 3 emergency 111 behavior. Not extra entry cases. Critical 25 includes 9 from old regime; indictment 15 includes 8.

• Table 5 2012- 2015 includes the police director's traffic decisions, while Table 3 shows them separately. From 2016 Table 5 excludes guidance cases. Do not wait for Table 5 and orientation in 2012-2015.

• 2025 complaint -country count 4, circle 2; visually original controlled. Soft category 40 = 4 + 36; national sum 1152 follows the printed country totals.

• Criticism, indictment, judgment and disciplinary action are different outcomes. A case may relate to several employees; persons / employees / violations cannot be summed up from here.

• Table 5 on the basis of a rapid response is the subject of old criminal proceedings; any overlap in behaviour and subsequent reopening require file keys.

Control tracks

JSON contains all national categories in the controlled behavioral and criminal tables, including denominators and original URL / page references. Traffic and rapid reaction have been kept separate. The historical and recent criminal populations are not harmonised by an unjustified total.

Residual work

Annual actual judgments, acquitments, disciplinary measures, dispositions and full-time series are separate control tasks. They cannot be replaced by this series of events.

Police disciplinary action: reaction, delay and consequences of the citizen

All 18 annual public summaries 2008-2025 are checked for their numbered items and decision outcomes. This complements the 20-year policy outcomes; the two populations must not be merged. The summaries shall also cover matters outside the service and internal employment relationships. Therefore, they do not constitute a statistic of government violations against citizens alone. The original summaries are read in memory; the local annex contains its own categories, numbers and precise locators.

Annual accounts with an explicit counting unit

A row below counts **numbered summary items;**. An item may include several staff members and several different penalties; several items may belong to the same case. An employee can walk again between years. The figure is thus neither the number of unique cases, the number of employees, the number of convictions, nor the number of citizens. Own categorisation shows the primary stated outcome. Others include dematerialisation, transfer, suspension, management treatment, medical termination, self-termination and mixed penalties. The end category is a process category; it does not express an overall assessment of the legality of the action.

Year	Items	Warning	Reprimand	Essential fine	Abort	Completion	Other
2008	42	8	11	10	4	8	1
2009	42	9	11	10	3	9	0
2010	61	15	6	17	7	14	2
2011	93	39	12	27	1	14	0
2012	43	13	5	13	7	5	0
2013	54	20	10	11	4	6	3
2014	77	17	13	21	7	13	6
2015	79	14	19	18	9	18	1
2016	79	20	12	15	11	21	0
2017	97	11	28	25	6	25	2
2018	62	10	12	11	8	20	1
2019	99	15	27	18	8	28	3
2020	82	21	14	27	10	10	0
2021	77	36	6	27	5	3	0
2022	83	35	12	24	8	4	0
2023	70	38	8	15	6	2	1
2024	102	61	10	16	7	6	2
2025	88	42	13	12	12	6	3
Sum 2008-2025	1330	424	229	317	123	212	25

Votes: All primary categories sum up to the year's items. The category breakdown is the report's own and can be derived from the summary ID and physical page of the compact annex. It's not a new official statistics from the State Police. The reasons for the reaction and any temporary or previous reactions must be checked in each original before a specific person is concluded liable to the criminal or civil action.

Joint and joint positions: 2014 No. 18 includes two employees: one reprimand and one fine of DKK 1.000; the post is in others and counted once. 2013 No 45 contains both transfer and fine and is primarily a transfer. 2013 No 33 includes several employees in one fine post. 2015 numbers 53 and 54 have a common description and two numbered items. 2016 Nos 4 / 5 and 55 / 56 and 2017 Nos 52 / 53 and 67 / 68 are the same case with several numbered employees. A sum of postal numbers should therefore not be referred to as "unique cases'.

Departure on health grounds and resignation: 2014 nos. 46/56, 2017 no. 65 and 2018 no. 47 are separately coded as health-related. They are not included as disciplinary dismissals. 2024 no. 59 ends with the person's own resignation after a recommendation for dismissal; the recommendation is not an actual dismissal by the authority. 2011 no. 2 was initially put on hold for two years, but the summary reports subsequent closure; it is therefore not a case still pending on hold. These corrections prevent an inflated count of actual disciplinary penalties.

When the time of the proceedings weakens responsibility

PD01 - An almost four-year delay reduced the reaction. 2011 No 61, physical page 12-13, describes an arrest report for possible detention of 45- 50 detainees. The Attorney General and the Attorney General criticised the lack of care; criminal proceedings were suspended. The State police announced reprimand and indicated the almost four-year delay as mitigating because it could not be blamed on the employee. It's a proven effect on the sanction. The summary does not document how many of the 45-50 were actually imprisoned on the basis of the report. Therefore, they should not all be registered as proven victims of illegal imprisonment. The specific requirement is full control of the original report, each freedom decision and responsibility for the delay.

PD02 - One year of delay removed disciplinary proceedings. 2014 No 32, physical page 9, refers to a detained rape victim who was left unguarded. The recommendation was received only after a year. The National Police did not start disciplinary proceedings, although it also described the conduct as totally unacceptable and suitable for disciplinary treatment. This shows that an established control requirement may be eliminated during the use of the liability system itself. The documented consequence is the absence of disciplinary action; actual evidence or subsequent damage has not been proven in the summary. The requirement is responsible for the delay in reporting and checking of possible civil consequences.

Concrete citizens' consequences and different responsibilities

PD03 - Individual with Parkinson’s found only after more than 42 hours. 2015 no. 21, physical page 7, states that an individual called after a bicycle accident in a forest and explained that he could not get up by himself. No rescue effort was initiated. He was later found in a ditch. DUP criticised the conduct and found the action particularly regrettable; the National Police’s response was a warning. The authority’s specific knowledge of helplessness and the absence of a rescue effort must be examined under ECHR Articles 2 and 3 and the duties of service. The summary documents the time spent there and the response, but no final Convention judgment or compensation payment. The demand is examination of the emergency call recording, report, rescue process, harm and subsequent review; a warning does not replace these investigations.

PD04 - A private conflict over a child was supported by police. 2011 no. 65/66/75, physical pages 13-16, describes a police officer who directly summoned colleagues and removed a child shared with the mother from her while the patrol was present. Prosecution under § 155 ended in acquittal; the temporary transfer was revoked, and all three employment-related avenues were closed without disciplinary proceedings, with formal staff interviews. The summary’s account of an unjustified advantage is not in itself evidence of every criminal-law conduct element: the original judgment, the basis of parental responsibility and the child’s actual whereabouts are missing from this summary. Nor does the acquittal for abuse of office document an examination of all the child’s and mother’s rights. The demand is independent verification of this basis against the documents and actual reunification. The case illustrates the need to distinguish State responsibility, family law, criminal law and employment-related responses.

PD05 - The same course can accommodate punishment and an additional service response. 2017 No 64, physical page 16, indicates six unjustified entries in the register of the staff member's mother's road traffic criminal proceedings. The criminal penalty imposed under Section 155 was

3.500 DKK; the disciplinary fine was 1.000 DKK. It is one employee with two responsibilities, not two employees or two citizens' violations. The source demonstrates that the service does not generally exempt from punishment. At the same time, it is necessary to check who the information concerned and whether it was transmitted before a comparison with the intrusion of a private person into a system can be made.

PD06 - The public's defence and the response of the employees were different. 2016 No. 55 / 56, physical page 20-21, describes two officers' private taxis and subsequent arrest of the driver after the conflict of payment. The driver was sentenced in the city court to 30 days in prison, but the national court dismissed the action on the basis of the defence. The State police closed the two disciplinary proceedings without prosecution and requested the service. This is a concrete combination of actual outcomes in the same event. It does not document a private person's final sentence in 30 days: that sentence was amended. The original sentences, the actual detention and possible compensation are the necessary next evidence.

Legal follow-up and precise comparison

There is no general criminal immunity for case handlers or police. Clauses 155- 157 of the Criminal Code on abuse of service and negligence on duty are precisely separate means of liability. The specific difference is, among other things, the legal basis for intervention which the service may have, the payment of civil compensation by the authority and access to the response of the service. A private person does not have the authority of a municipality or police; in the case of deprivation of liberty, removal of child, violence or unwarranted access, the relevant general criminal provisions shall be tested with the same precision as regards action, guilt and cause. Penalties in Chapter 26 cannot be treated as actually measured penalties in these summaries.

The clearest documented criticism is that the Authority's own delay in PD01-02 became concrete for liability, while PD03 shows over 42 hours with the helpless citizen as the directly affected. No overall police total answers whether a citizen was helped, stopped the procedure or repaired. A liability system must therefore compare the date of the event, the time of the authority's knowledge, reporting, complaint, final sanction, actual restoration and damage. It cannot simply register the closed case.

Sources and necessary further information

• PD 2008: Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2008, 11 physical pages; entries 1-42. Decision sections and marked specific cases have been checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2009: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2009, 11 physical pages; items 1 -42. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2010: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2010, 15 physical pages; items 1 -61. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2011: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2011, 20 physical pages; items 1 -93. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2012: Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2012, 12 physical pages; entries 1-43. Decision sections and marked specific cases have been checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2013: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2013, 14 physical pages; items 1 -54. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2014: Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2014, 21 physical pages; entries 1-77. Decision sections and marked specific cases have been checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2015: Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2015, 22 physical pages; entries 1-79. Decision sections and marked specific cases have been checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2016: Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2016, 28 physical pages; entries 1-79. Decision sections and marked specific cases have been checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2017: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2017, 24 physical pages; items 1 -97. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2018: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2018, 24 physical pages; items 1 -62. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2019: Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2019, 34 physical pages; entries 1-99. Decision sections and marked specific cases have been checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2020: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2020, 26 physical pages; items 1 -82. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2021: Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2021, 25 physical pages; entries 1-77. Decision sections and marked specific cases have been checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2022: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2022, 27 physical pages; items 1 -83. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2023: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2023, 25 physical pages; items 1 -70. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2024: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2024, 30 physical pages; items 1 -102. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

• PD 2025: National Police Disciplinary Case Summary 2025, 27 physical pages; items 1 -88. The decision section and selected concrete steps are checked; summary ID and page in the compact annex.

The 2006-2007 annual summaries have now been found as public document copies at KRIM and full text in RAM. The following original control module adds 85 and 39 entries and extends the postal series to 1.454 for 2006-2025. The 2007 categories are consistent with report 1507 / 2009; binary identity with a government-hosted copy and the full service register require separate checks. For all years, case / employee linkage is also required between the DUP, the public prosecutor, the judgment and the staff decision and the actual termination, damage and repair of the citizen. The anonymisation of the summaries and the different entities prevent a documented national personal union. This is a specific lack of data; it does not downgrade the above verified trajectories.

Police disciplinary proceedings 2006-2007: the summaries found and the chain of responsibility;

The two previously missing annual summaries have been recovered as publicly available document copies held by KRIM. The entire 2006 summary's 17 pages and the entire 2007 summary's 10 pages have been read directly as text in memory. The 2007 pages 6-8 were reread after a truncated tool display. Physical pages 11/14 in 2006 and 8/10 in 2007 were also visually checked. No copies of the originals have been saved. The annual series below is the report's own categorisation; the compact verification annex contains each entry's number, physical page and primary outcome. The document copies' binary identity with a version hosted by an authority has not been verified. For 2007, the five active outcome categories and the total agree with report 1507/2009, printed page 97. This is a specific external reconciliation, not a full authenticity check of each case summary. [PD2006K; PD2007K; PDB1507]

Two years added to the postal accounts

Year / population	Numbered e items	Warning	Reprieve a	Essential fine	Disciplinary farewell	Completion	Other / mix ed
2006	85	13	15	25	9	12	11
2007	39	16	6	9	1	6	1
Sum 2006-2007	124	29	21	34	10	18	12
Previously controlled subseries 2008-2025	1.330	424	229	317	123	212	25
Total postal series 2006-2025	**1.454**	**453**	**250**	**351**	**133**	**230**	**37**

All year categories summer to the numbered postal series. The census shall cover both duties, private relations and internal employment. It is therefore not a national enumeration of illegal government interventions or victims. A criminal fine and a subsequent fine for the same staff member shall not constitute two posts. Temporary

the suspension is also not an additional final sanction. Termination may follow acquittal, self-termination or other grounds; it may not be translated without control into impunity for a proven crime.

Other outcomes in 2006 include four alcohol-related processes put on hold for two years, cases on hold during leave, transfers and combinations of fines and transfers. Entries 16 and 17 each combine a disciplinary fine of 1.000 kroner with removal from the custody officer function; entry 59 combines 1.500 kroner with a transfer. These three disciplinary fines therefore fall within the mixed category and are not absent from the source. They may be included in a separate count of all response components, but not added to the entry total. A recommendation for dismissal is not a completed dismissal, and voluntary resignation followed by closure of the case is not coded as a disciplinary dismissal by the authority.

Documented links between entries: 2006 nos. 11 and 73 concern the same police officer in different matters. Nos. 26 and 27 describe violent use of force and further degrading treatment of an arrested person respectively. No. 70 contains two employees and two detainees in one numbered entry. 2007 nos. 18/19 give identical descriptions of sleeping guard staff, and nos. 28/29 identical descriptions of a fatal shooting incident. The latter similarities must be linked through original case numbers before forming a union of cases or persons. Neither two distinct people killed nor two distinct incidents may be inferred solely from two entry numbers.

Reporting, suspension and termination have its own counting unit

The summary of the report of the 2007 Review shows the following:

Measure	2006	2007	Limitation
Notified cases	77	46	New alerts; not completed in the year
Suspended police officers	5	9	Person reaction during the process; not an additional final decision
Decisions in 2007	-	39	1 farewell, 1 other work, 9 fines, 6 reprimands, 16 warnings; the active categories sum up to 33
Completed numbered items in the read summaries	85	39	2006 also includes previously reported circumstances; the difference 85 / 77 is not a source error alone

The six 2007 entries without an active final response explain the difference between 39 and the 33 active categories in the copy read. The 46 reports must not be added to the 39 final entries to make 85 cases. The annual cohort, pending caseload, reopening and links to individuals are necessary for a proper account of case trajectories. [PDB1507, printed 96-97]

Monitoring of follow-up: three omitted cases and an unknown reaction chain

The report describes that at that time no systematic statistics were produced which coupled criticism or regret of the police's treatment of citizens with the subsequent staff decision. The declared view of the National Police that criticism should have a service consequence is a specified standard and not evidence of actual follow-up in each case.

A separate study covered 55 cases: 20 conduct complaints with criticism, 14 conduct complaints with an expression of regret without grounds for criticism, and 21 criminal cases without grounds for charges but with criticism or regret. There were a further three known cases involving criticism/regret that the study excluded: two cases concerning legal officers under the Ministry of Justice’s disciplinary jurisdiction and one case that the Director of Public Prosecutions had remitted and that had not yet been finally decided. The relevant known pool is therefore **55 examined plus 3 excluded = 58**. It is not a new national total and must not be added to the disciplinary series.

Outcome in the selected study,	Share declared	Names and meanings
Disciplinary reaction	31 %	55 cases examined; no exact integer indicated here
Confidential conversation	38 %	The same 55; conversation is not a criminal offence
One of the above	69 %	Informed amount of the volumes; not 69% of all policy stocks
No disciplinary response and no conversation known to the State Police.	31 %	Lack of known conversation is not proof that no local conversation took place

Outcome in the selected study,	Share declared	Names and meanings
Outcome of the investigation	3 cases	Two legal-officer cases and one pending remittal; must not disappear from the denominator

An employee in the police reserve employed under a collective agreement was not covered by the Civil Servants Act's disciplinary rules, but received a written warning. This employment distinction is not general criminal immunity. The specific criticism is the absence of a documented, complete chain from the citizen's successful complaint to accountability and redress, together with the omission of three already known cases from the follow-up study. The specific demand is for the full linkage between case records and personnel in the 58 cases, separate final outcomes for the excluded cases and information about citizens' harm, cessation and reparation. [PDB1507, printed 97-98 with both footnotes]

Specific interventions and consequences

PDH01 - Interview reports attributed to the wrong interviewer

2006 No. 15, physical page 5, describes three reports which a superior had prepared, but asked an aspirant to sign and introduce into POLAS, so that the reports appeared as the interview of the aspirant. The public prosecutor suspended the prosecution under Section 155 / 157, but criticised the procedure; the fine was DKK 800. It documents a specific problem in the origin of the evidence and the knowledge of the authority. This does not in itself prove that the content of the statements was false or that three citizens were convicted on the reports. The requirement is the original reports, sound or simultaneous notes, signatures, amending logs and the decisions in which the reports took effect. The legal difference must be derived from the incorrect source of evidence, evidence and result; liability cannot be closed by the fine imposed on the staff decision alone.

PDH02 - Handcuffs, foot on neck and denied toilet

2006 nos. 26-27, physical page 7, describes the use of force against a handcuffed person on the ground and further degrading treatment, including toilet conditions. Statsadvokaten assessed the use of force as unnecessary, questionable from a safety perspective and humiliating; no criminal prosecution was brought, while the fine was 800 kr. The additional matter resulted in a reprimand. The source supports specific criticism of treatment and use of force. ECHR Article 3 must be examined on the basis of the original sequence of events, intensity, duration, harm, necessity and subsequent investigation; the summary is not a final Convention judgment. The demand is for the grounds for arrest, use-of-force reports, medical records, witnesses and the entire investigation/complaint chain, together with individual reparation. The two entries do not provide a basis for automatically counting two different victims. [PD2006K]

PDH03 - A private conflict led to unwarranted arrest

2007 no. 31, physical page 8, describes showing police identification during a private argument without an official reason, unjustified arrest and an attempt to restrain the arrested person. The State Prosecutor and the Director of Public Prosecutions criticised the conduct; the National Police’s disciplinary fine was 800 kr. This is a directly documented example of an official position being used in a private conflict. The duration of the interference with liberty, the reasons for the penalty decision and a compensation decision are not given. Comparison with a private person must therefore start from the actual arrest and be assessed against the conduct and culpability elements of the provisions on deprivation of liberty; abuse of office has its additional avenue of public responsibility. A specific prison sentence for a private person cannot be invented. The demand is for the original course of the arrest, examination of legal authority, the investigation decision and actual compensation. [PD2007K; R05-R06]

PDH04 - Violence review was not received and dog bit without sufficient warning

2007 no. 11, physical pages 4-5, describes dismissive and rude treatment of an individual who wanted to report a violent assault; the individual left without the report being registered. The disciplinary fine was 800 kroner. No. 9, physical page 4, concerns a dog bite without sufficient justification and warning, likewise with a disciplinary fine of 800 kroner. The first matter requires examination of the authority’s received knowledge of violence, the duty to register and investigate, and the consequences of the missing reporting process; the second requires examination of the decision to use force, the necessary warning, injury and treatment. Positive duties to protect and investigate under ECHR Articles 2/3 must be applied according to the specific risk and treatment, rather than solely according to the heading of a disciplinary entry. The summaries state no overall assessment of harm or actual reparation. [PD2007K]

Actual punishment and professional response: the same staff member may receive both

Source / item	Penal outcome specified in: the summary;	Final service reaction	Control Point
2006 No 52, PDF11	The District Court's suspended sentence of 3 months changed to 40 days of immediate imprisonment in the High Court	Abort	Unjustified record information passed on to private investigator; not three months final penalty
2006 No 54, PDF11	6 months of urban law changed to 8 months unconditional	Abort	Fictitious confiscation statements in return for payment
2006 nr. 55, PDF11	10 days conditional change to 10 daily penalty payments of DKK 250 = DKK 2.500.	Transfer to other place of employment	The final penalty is fines; previous prison sentences must not stand as final
2006 No 56, PDF11-12	25 daily fines of 400 DKK = 10.000 DKK after § 157	Reprimand	Discipline in diet gave an inmate access to two cell phones
2006 No 59, PDF12	Greenlandic fine changed from DKK 6.000 to DKK 4.000.	1.500 DKK and transfer	Departure is not actually parting; separate Greenlandic legal basis
2006 No 71, PDF14-15	4 months conditional change to 60 days unconditional	Own-fund closure	Threats against former spouse / witness; own resignation must not conceal the criminal sentence
2006 No 72, PDF15	10 daily penalty payments of 250 DKK = 2.500 DKK.	500 kr.	Violence against two school pupils; two described injured persons in one post
2006 No 73, PDF15	2 daily fines of 300 DKK = 600 DKK.	800 kr.	Entry into the former spouse's house; same staff member as No 11
2007 No 6, PDF3	10 daily penalty payments of 400 DKK = 4.000 DKK.	Warning	Abuse of records by office staff; not an additional person for each track of responsibility
2007 No 8, PDF3-4	20 daily fines of 500 DKK = 10.000 DKK.	1.000 kr.	Disclosure and disclosure of previous partners
2007 No 27, PDF7	Greenlandic district court measure of 40 days changed to acquittal in the High Court	Own-fund closure	The first-instance outcome is not a final conviction

The table shows the outcome of the summaries; the original judgments are necessary for full control of grounds, guilt and final legal qualification. Penalties are stronger than a general claim of impunity: they show concrete prison sentences, fines and additional service reactions. They do not answer whether the citizen was compensated or whether all the elements responsible were tested. The response track of the Civil Service Tribunal and the financial responsibility of the Authority must therefore be conducted in parallel with the criminal justice track. [PD2006K; PD2007K]

Dismissed the application must be checked locally: 2006 No 70, physical page 14, describes the tape of the head and mouth of two arrears during transport, but indicates the city's acquittal and disciplinary proceedings closed. 2007 No 28 / 29, physical page 7-8, also indicates the acquittal in the described shooting. These summaries may justify the examination of the actual and human rights foundations of the events; they may not be reproduced as criminal convictions. Nor is it proof that each action and every positive commitment were independently examined.

The original headlines are not certain classification: 2006 No 57 describes private discothetics violence under a section on service, while No 70's arrest transport is outside the service. The report's assessment follows the action described, not just the organisational heading. A final service / private record requires the original work and incident information.

Time and responsibility

2006 entries 32/33 refer to the course of the case as mitigating without stating a precise duration. 2007 entry 35,physical page 9,concerns a fine of 400 kroner for street disorder; the disciplinary case was concluded only two years later with a reprimand. This documents the interval and response, but does not on its own establish how much of the response's leniency was due to delay. The later PD01/PD02 processes already checked document more directly that almost four years' delay reduced the response, and that a recommendation delayed by one year meant no disciplinary case was opened.

The specific demand is a dual account of time: the citizen's period of harm or continuing intervention and the authority's period up to investigation, accountability and actual reparation. A disciplinary fine, a closed case or a remittal provides no end date for the consequences for the citizen. The new 2006-2007 sources close the gap in entries for those years; the public anonymised summaries do not close the national gap in links between individuals, judgments and compensation.

All 124 postlocators and their own exit categories

The table makes the postal count reproducible. It reproduces its own categories and locators, not the originals' case-making.

Year	Item	Physical Page	Primary Outcome
2006	1	3	Other / mixed
2006	2	3	Warning
2006	3	3	Other / mixed
2006	4	3	Other / mixed
2006	5	3	Other / mixed
2006	6	3	Reprimand
2006	7	4	Other / mixed
2006	8	4	Completion
2006	9	4	Legal fine
2006	10	4	Warning
2006	11	4	Legal fine
2006	12	4	Warning
2006	13	5	Legal fine
2006	14	5	Warning
2006	15	5	Legal fine
2006	16	5	Other / mixed
2006	17	5	Other / mixed
2006	18	6	Warning
2006	19	6	Reprimand
2006	20	6	Warning
2006	21	6	Warning
2006	22	6	Legal fine
2006	23	6	Warning
2006	24	7	Warning
2006	25	7	Reprimand
2006	26	7	Legal fine
2006	27	7	Reprimand
2006	28	7	Reprimand
2006	29	7	Reprimand

Year	Item	Physical Page	Primary Outcome
2006	30	8	Reprimand
2006	31	8	Completion
2006	32	8	Reprimand
2006	33	8	Reprimand
2006	34	8	Legal fine
2006	35	8	Legal fine
2006	36	9	Legal fine
2006	37	9	Legal fine
2006	38	9	Legal fine
2006	39	9	Other / mixed
2006	40	9	Legal fine
2006	41	9	Legal fine
2006	42	9	Legal fine
2006	43	9	Legal fine
2006	44	10	Warning
2006	45	10	Legal fine
2006	46	10	Legal fine
2006	47	10	Legal fine
2006	48	10	Legal fine
2006	49	10	Legal fine
2006	50	10	Legal fine
2006	51	10	Warning
2006	52	11	Disciplinary leave
2006	53	11	Reprimand
2006	54	11	Disciplinary leave
2006	55	11	Other / mixed
2006	56	11	Reprimand
2006	57	12	Disciplinary leave
2006	58	12	Disciplinary leave
2006	59	12	Other / mixed
2006	60	12	Completion
2006	61	12	Legal fine
2006	62	13	Completion
2006	63	13	Reprimand

Year	Item	Physical Page	Primary Outcome
2006	64	13	Completion
2006	65	13	Warning
2006	66	13	Legal fine
2006	67	14	Disciplinary leave
2006	68	14	Completion
2006	69	14	Completion
2006	70	14	Completion
2006	71	14	Completion
2006	72	15	Legal fine
2006	73	15	Legal fine
2006	74	15	Completion
2006	75	15	Disciplinary leave
2006	76	16	Disciplinary leave
2006	77	16	Reprimand
2006	78	16	Warning
2006	79	16	Disciplinary leave
2006	80	16	Disciplinary leave
2006	81	17	Reprimand
2006	82	17	Completion
2006	83	17	Completion
2006	84	17	Other / mixed
2006	85	17	Reprimand
2007	1	3	Warning
2007	2	3	Other / mixed
2007	3	3	Warning
2007	4	3	Disciplinary leave
2007	5	3	Reprimand
2007	6	4	Warning
2007	7	4	Warning
2007	8	4	Legal fine
2007	9	4	Legal fine
2007	10	4	Warning
2007	11	4	Legal fine
2007	12	5	Warning

Year	Item	Physical Page	Primary Outcome
2007	13	5	Warning
2007	14	5	Warning
2007	15	5	Reprimand
2007	16	5	Warning
2007	17	5	Reprimand
2007	18	6	Completion
2007	19	6	Completion
2007	20	6	Legal fine
2007	21	6	Warning
2007	22	6	Warning
2007	23	6	Warning
2007	24	7	Legal fine
2007	25	7	Warning
2007	26	7	Legal fine
2007	27	7	Completion
2007	28	7	Completion
2007	29	8	Completion
2007	30	8	Warning
2007	31	8	Legal fine
2007	32	8	Reprimand
2007	33	8	Reprimand
2007	34	9	Warning
2007	35	9	Reprimand
2007	36	9	Completion
2007	37	9	Warning
2007	38	9	Legal fine
2007	39	10	Legal fine

Complaints about conduct: findings in favour, hidden timing errors and discontinuation of publication

Complaints about police operational decisions concern police actions and omissions within and outside criminal proceedings. They are a different population from DUP's conduct cases and criminal cases. The three original reports for 2018-2020 show both overturnings and already acknowledged errors that do not appear as a new overturning. The current statistics page states that joint annual publication has ceased; 2021-2025 must not be set to 0. [DKL01-04]

Populations and expressly omitted complaints

The reports omit DUP behavioral complaints, traditional decisions under the law on dogs and weapons, are subject to compensation for victims, the prosecution's own actions, and Greenland and the Faroe Islands. However, bans on zones and restaurants shall be included in the overall review. 2020 adds four subject words to change the categories from 8 to 12 in the Police Board's statement. An subject category is no unique case. [DKL01-03, delimitation section]

The 2018 original refers to 210 complaints as both received and decided in 2018.2019's original footnote 1 describes 2018 as incoming cases and 2019 as decided cases, and expressly says that some cases appear in both years. Both source formulations are retained;210+246 therefore does not represent 456 unique complaint cases. In addition, 2018 has no comprehensive register of police districts' first-instance decisions not appealed. [DKL01,p.2;DKL02,p.2,note1]

Year and instance	Population	Criticism / overturned	Partial	None criticism / not circumcised	Meaning
2018, Senior Authorities, Mixed Agencies	210	12	10	188	No homogeneous comparison with 2019's separate first / second-stage series
2019, Policy Court First Instance	1.660	281	99	1.280	380 findings in favour; approx. 23%
2019, overall second instance	133	18	3	112	21 overturnings; approx. 16%
2019, State Police First Instance	13	5	0	8	Claims over 50.000 DKK; criticism is not proof of actual payment
2020, Policy Court First Instance	1.553	238	93	1.222	331 findings in favour; approx. 21%
2020, overall second instance	103	8	6	89	14 overturnings; approx. 14%
2020, State police first instance	10	1	4	5	5 findings in favour;50%

The overall 2019 figure is 246=133 second instance+113 first instance; first instance 113=13 National Police+100 Regional Public Prosecutor. The 2020 figure is 227=103+124; first instance 124=10+114. The last 100/114 are complaints about time, with a special outcome model shown below. None of these instance totals deduplicates people or cases across instances. [DKL02,pp.5-9;DKL03,pp.5-9]

Poor handling time may be in the category of "consensus"

Year	Attorney General n s time complaints	New critique	New partial criticism	Enigma i setting	Already lamented by the agree	Overall acknowledged too long
2018	35 in mixed category	2 overturnings	1 part	32 not reversed	11 cases after note of the table; person / point overlap not shown	No total unique counter provided
2019	100	10	8	82	55 of 82	73 of 100 = 73%
2020	114	Not divided into new criticisms in the original	Not allocated	19 out of a long time	A large proportion of 95 were already recognized; precise numbers not provided	95 of 114, about 83%

The year 2019's 73 is thus 18 new critic outcomes + 55 already regretted. Using 18 alone removes 55 documented negative time outages from the accounts. It is a specific delimitation error, not a general estimate of the Authority's behaviour. 2020 also mentions citizens who, for the second time, complain about waiting time in the same case; therefore, annual occurrences are not unique. 2018's 11 should be included as separate control information, but without case ID point overlap cannot be clarified. [DKL01, p.3, note; DKL02, p.9-10; DKL03, p.8-12]

All category cells in the original tables and figures

2018's empty cells are shown as "-" and are kept in the register as unprinted cells, not as independent find of 0. The printed outflows 12 + 10 + 188 = 210 votes. [DKL01, p.3]

2018- category	Complaints	Reversed	Partial	Uncircumcised
Investigation	47	1	-	46
Intervention by the police	19	-	2	17
Priority of resources	2	-	-	2
Removal of vehicles	9	-	2	7
Communication with citizens	4	1	-	3
Zone prohibition	15	1	2	12
Restoration ban	6	1	-	5
Procedure	37	1	2	34
Duration of proceedings	35	2	1	32
Other	36	5	1	30

2019: Figures 1,3,4,6 and 7

Figure 1 = police districts' category entries; figure 3 = their favourable findings by category; figure 4 = overall second instance; figure 6 = favourable findings there; figure 7 = overall first instance. Figures 2 and 5 are the outcome rows in the main table.

Category	Figure 1	Figure 3	Figure 4	Figure 6	Figure 7
Priority of resources	80	16	6	0	0
Intervention by the police	80	13	8	0	3
Removal of vehicles	99	32	12	5	2
Duration of proceedings	100	31	-	-	-
Communication with citizens	129	28	12	1	0
Investigation	235	30	26	1	-
Procedure	366	90	47	10	1
Other	592	146	15	1	7
Duration of proceedings outside criminal procedure	-	-	0	0	-
Restoration ban	-	-	3	0	0
Zone prohibition	-	-	4	3	0
Duration of proceedings in criminal proceedings	-	-	-	-	100

2020: Figures 1,3,4,6 and 7

Figure 1 = police districts' category entries; figure 3 = their favourable findings by category; figure 4 = overall second instance; figure 6 = favourable findings there; figure 7 = overall first instance. Figures 2 and 5 are the outcome rows in the main table.

Category	Figure 1	Figure 3	Figure 4	Figure 6	Figure 7
Border control	19	5	1	0	0
Visitation	28	1	3	0	-
Driving tests	32	5	0	0	0
Duration of proceedings	42	19	-	-	-
Detention	44	9	2	0	0
Priority of resources	44	4	0	0	0
Intervention by the police	82	8	12	0	0
Communication with citizens	122	22	7	0	0
Removal of vehicles	129	66	4	0	1
Investigation	208	23	29	5	-
Procedure	355	82	16	3	1
Other	485	92	26	6	8
Restoration ban	-	-	0	0	0
Zone prohibition	-	-	3	0	0
Duration of proceedings in criminal proceedings	-	-	-	-	114

2019: figure 1 totals 1.681 category instances, but only 1.660 cases; 21 are assigned to two categories. Figure 3 gives 386 against 380 findings in the party's favour; 6 are assigned to two categories. 2020: similarly 1.590 against 1.553,37 assigned to two categories; 336 against 331 findings in the party's favour, 5 assigned to two categories. Time categories in the police districts' figures may also appear in the higher authorities' figure 7. "-" means that the category does not appear in that figure and must not be added to a national zero series. [DKL02,pp. 4-5; DKL03,pp. 4-5]

Specific interventions, loss and redress

Source and progress	Original documented error / reaction	Time and actual follow	Responsibilities and precise requirements
2018, Annex 2, Summary 2, p.7	The police returned the rental car to the company without any basis for acquiring it. The district did not criticise; the public prosecutor overturned and criticised.	The citizen lost access to the car; duration and compensation not disclosed.	Original seizure, civil-law basis for control, return date and loss must be linked; a finding in favour alone does not show redress.
2018 Summary 10, p.11	Personal data review May 2016; only investigating May 2017. The district rejected unreasonable time; the public prosecutor regretted one year of inactivity.	Complaint February 2018; expected indictment March 2018 is an expectation, not actual decision.	Requirements for effective investigation / decision date, limitation effect and proven loss.
2018, resu mé12 -13, p.12	Unmarked ground clearance at the control tent with bus damage: The National Police recognised responsibility. Separate deposit 31.000 kr for driver: The DA demanded 1.000 kr back; 30.000 for driver and 55.000 for business were retained.	Recognition/repayment decision; payment and timing not documented.	These amounts are the amount of the decision; 85.000 kr retained is not a proven unlawful collection.
2019, p.10	3 of 4 zone bans overturned; 2 following a District Court judgment concerning the absence of a camp, followed by a change of practice. In 11 complaints to the National Police concerning cars, 4 full+1 partial overturning due to insufficient hearing of the parties.	Illegal process and actual availability / movement interventions must follow the specific cases. The source found parking grounds in the car cases.	Party consultation errors document the specific process deviation; it does not automatically make each original parking basis non-existent.
2020, Annex 3, Summary 5, p.27	The police brought minors from private homes without re-assessment of the situation; the circle criticised this and the State Police confirmed it.	Actual pick-up; number of children, separation time, new legal basis and return not disclosed. Critics of pick-up must not disappear during the outcome "confirmed." Window replacement was rejected as not causally demonstrated.	Requirements for initial action basis, each decision during the course, contact and actual return of the child (s) and separate assessment of responsibilities.
2020 summary 6, p.27-28	Detention 08.42- 17.00 without offer of adequate care: regretted in the circle and confirmed.	8 hours 18 minutes is the own calculation of the stated time; later the clothing point was rejected and is not counted as proven clothing error.	The deviation in food provision is documented in the oversight chain; it must be examined independently in relation to dignity and, where relevant, Article 3 according to its specific severity.
2020, summary 13, p.31	Stolen car mistakenly unregistered as stolen after lodging license plates. The district had no criticism; the district attorney overturned.	The start of June 2018 → end of October 2018, about five months without proper registration. Exact dates and affected recovery not disclosed.	The investigation and property consequences of the error require original registrations; no replacement / discipline is shown.
2020, summary 14, p.31-32	Guilty fraud reported end September 2019, short investigation October, then wait; complaint June 2020, five reminders. The DA regretted time and unanswered requests and demanded information.	No actual start of investigation or end date shall be reported after the inspection decision.	Information requirements are a response; subsequent compliance, loss of the citizen and individual non-compliance shall be documented.
2020, p.11 and summary 16, p.32	Four first-instance cases concerning compensation after the courts set aside area bans: partial compensation under ECHR Article 13+TP4 Article 2+EAL section 26. One summary concerning a homeless citizen illustrates the group.	Amounts, prohibition days and actual payment not published here. The summary is not a fifth case.	Claims for all four original prohibitions, signatures, time, amount of decision and payment; at the same time, the private criminal comparison requires individual judicial review.

Conclusion: An affirmance can preserve an error already established, and a new alteration/remittal rate can omit 55 of 73 adverse timing outcomes. **Authority's statement:** The majority are described as agreement or no new alteration/remittal. **Original evidence:**2019's reconciliation of timing and 2020's specific collection of a child. **Deficiency:** The outcome code alone describes neither the entire error nor redress for the citizen. **Rule:** Requirements of statutory authority, proportionality, fact-finding and relevant ECHR protection. **Action:** The citizen is subjected to an intervention or awaits action by the authority while oversight is closed with an aggregate code. **Departure:** Omitting adverse partial results already established produces an incorrect account of errors; the specific departure from a right must be proved separately. **Consequence:** Continuing loss of liberty,

family/control relationship or access to investigation may persist after the review decision. **Responsibility:** The original authority and subsequent oversight/follow-up chain, and individuals according to specific duty and culpability. **Demand:** A de-identified process register must preserve all complaint points and original adverse outcomes, link instances and show actual cessation, return home, payment and personnel response.

Ethnicity complaints: the zero in the review is geographically and institutionally limited

The overall authorities of 2018 did not identify any such complaints. 2019 identified Copenhagen Police 3 passport control cases without criticism and without subsequent complaint, while Østjylland had 1 note case; overall register had none. 2020 had Copenhagen 3 and Western Region 1, all without criticism and subsequent complaint; overall register again none. A national wording on "no complaints' would thus remove the four known districts in each of 2019 and 2020. These are complaints, not four proven breaches of discrimination or different persons across years. [DKL01, p.3-4; DKL02, p.11; DKL03, p.12-13]

Fewer complaints after notifications do not prove fewer material rights violations. A conversation can end a record trail without any real test. Whether the registration provides sufficient guidance and effective redress to the citizen must be investigated against original request and termination; the reports do not publish the necessary data. The missing years 2006-2017 and 2021-2025 require the unidentified extracts of the National Police and Public Prosecutors, with first-time / repeated complaints and outcomes at each point. Observed total annual publication is documented; terminated underlying registration cannot be deduced from this.

3. Municipal complaints, outcomes and reassessment

Date of inspection: 6 October 2026. Contribution to the overall report. All figures below have been verified in named official primary publications. The statistical classification of the documents is reproduced; it does not constitute an independent review of each decision. The sub-contribution does not contain a complete 20-year year series.

1. The count that can be made

A complaint case, a decision altered or remitted, an established error, an unlawful intervention and an affected person are different units. Altered/remitted = altered/annulled + remitted. Remittal rejects the existing basis for the decision and requires reconsideration; the reason and final outcome must be coded separately. An affirmed case may also contain criticised formal errors. Alteration/remittal statistics therefore do not record all errors.

Local social and employment complaints

Decision year	Stated	Modified / oph Edible	Remitted	Reversed, calculated	Reality beh duck, name;	Overturning % published	Source
2017	18.460	3.198	4.724	7.922	26.282	30	A17
2018	18.644	3.736	4.440	8.176	26.820	30	A20
2019	16.209	3.407	4.404	7.811	24.020	33	A21
2020	16.692	2.741	4.163	6.904	23.596	29	A21
2021	15.538	2.130	3.350	5.480	21.018	26	A21
2022	12.838	2.045	3.506	5.551	18.389	30	A24
2023	13.504	2.034	3.659	5.693	19.197	30	A24
2024	11.898	1.472	3.935	5.407	17.305	31	A24

Selection: settled, substantive appeals against municipal decisions. Rejected and cancelled cases shall be omitted from the denominator. Decisions by the local authorities without a complaint Ankestyrelsen, not included. Cases modified by municipal reassessment must be examined separately and cannot be assessed in this series.

Adding 2018-2024 gives **45.022 overturned appeal cases among 150.345 appeal cases considered on the merits**. These are events distributed by decision year; person identification or deduplication of recurring courses is not documented. The sum is not a count of unique citizens, original decisions or unlawful interventions. 2017 is added separately if the scope then used is accepted as comparable; it provides a further 7.922 overturnings.

Source version: A20 indicates for 2020 16.690 confirmed and mentions 23.594; A21 indicates 16.692 and 23.596. This is where the later A21 version is used. The surrounding counter is in both 6.904. The A24 data retrieval is dated 11 April 2025 and indicates the possibility of post-registration.

Legislative areas in 2024: sub-quantities not to be added to the main series

Legal area	Amended/annulled	Remitted	Reversed	Reality-treated
Services Act	150	1.352	1.502	3.287
The law of the child	341	1.258	1.599	3.609
The Act on Assets	476	670	1.146	5.116
Sick day money law	345	356	701	3.227

Source: A24 Table 4.4, printed page 27. The child's law entered into force in 2024: the new division must be maintained in comparison.

2. Denmark map: 2024-2025

Decision year	Map area	Amended / repealed %	Remitted %	%	Absolute denominator verified here
2024	Social area	7,1	37,8	44,9	No
2025	Social area	6,2	40,6	46,8	No
2024	Child disability	7,6	41,3	48,9	No
2025	Child disability	10,6	48,0	58,6	No
2024	Adult disability	4,5	35,9	40,4	No
2025	Adult disability	1,8	41,5	43,3	No

Sources: D25S, D25B, D25V, published June 23, 2026. Percentages without absolute denominator cannot be converted into numbers at rounded percentages only. 2025 is the year of decision, 2026 is the year of publication; it is not 2026 cases.

The sub-areas of the social card overlap fully with the social card: adult and child handicapped cards are subsets. The adult card only covers sections 95, 96, 97 and 100 of the service law. The children's card includes special disability provisions in the child's law; these are not all child cases or all placement. Forced placement cannot be deduced from this map.

Specific source deviation: D25B also indicates 41,1% confirmed in 2025. 41,1 + 10,6 + 48,0 = 99,7. This cannot be explained by normal rounding to one decimal alone. The figure must be clarified in raw data; here there is no guessed correction.

Activity and persons next to the cards

The maps use activity data from 2024 alongside complaint outcomes for 2025. The number of benefit recipients is not the number of decisions. A person appears several times under different sections, but only once per section; activity cells with fewer than five recipients in a municipality are excluded/not displayed. Municipalities with joint reporting are excluded from some maps. D25S states that Tårnby, Dragør, Fredensborg, Fanø and Lyngby-Taarbæk are excluded from the activity count, while D25V states Tårnby and Dragør. This is exclusion from activity data and must not be described as exclusion from complaint figures without checking. Source: D26L pages 2-3 and the maps' notes.

3. Errors outside the complaint statistics and errors in confirmed cases

Source / year	Population and unit	Denominat ion	Critical Outcome	Selection, exclusion and overlap
Penalties § 36-37, Report 2024, P24	Investigated municipal sanctions, job / activity rate	96	28 would be amended; 3 remitted; 65 affirmed; total 31/96 hypothetical overturnings	Practice sample, not appeals decided on the merits. 42 job-ready and 54 assessed as ready for activation. Cannot be added to appeal counts for a decision year without checking year/ID/sample.
§ 7, April 2016, P16	Local decisions on incapacity for work	115	17 would be amended/remitted	Practical examination; actual complaint population is different. Subareas and causes of errors overlap; total 17 is the numerator.
Senior pensionsenh eden 2024, SP24	Reality-treated senior pension claims	1.138	46 amended; 241 remitted; 851 affirmed; 170 with procedural errors	Formal errors: 51 affirmed + 76 remitted + 43 altered. 287 alterations/remittals + 170 errors must not be summed; their union is 338 cases (=287+51), assuming the report's outcome categories. Not the main municipal series.

The 2019 guidance on legal safeguards expressly states that cases actually appealed are in practice not included in practice studies. This confirms Ole’s central point about different population samples. However, each study’s methodology annex must be verified separately; a qualitative process study including appeal cases is not automatically a legal practice study. V19.

The guide also indicates that remittal for reconsideration may be due to lack of information, new information, significant procedural errors or home-page deficiencies. A remittal for reconsideration must therefore be indicated as a reason before it is counted as

proven illegality. This delineates the specific statistical indicator and does not remove documented process errors or consequences.

4. Processing time and continuing consequences after remittal

Municipal Social and Employment Complaints of the Appeal Board

Year	Average completed treatment, weeks	Average rest period end-of-week	Source
2018	20	12,6	A20 Table 4.5, page 41
2019	17,9	12,7	A21 Table 4.5, page 39
2020	17,4	10,6	A21 Table 4.5, page 39
2021	14,3	11,0	A21 Table 4.5, page 39
2022	14,5	10,7	A24 Table 4.6, page 28
2023	17,5	14,0	A24 Table 4.6, page 28
2024	26,3	21,4	A24 Table 4.6, page 28
2025	approx. 35	Unverified	A25 page 11

Pending time is the age of cases not yet decided and cannot be added to the average processing time. Initial municipal processing, reassessment and processing following remittal for reconsideration fall outside the Appeals Board's average.

A24 source deviation: the text of the bread on page 28 indicates 21,4 weeks as treatment time, while Table 4.6 indicates 26,3. The increase in the bread text of just under nine weeks from 2023 votes by 26,3 − 17,5 = 8,8. Here, the table value is reproduced 26,3 and the deviation is explicitly retained.

Child cases and compulsory measures, older separate counts

Year	Compulsory placement and use of force, months	General municipal complaint, months	Source
2015	1,7	4,2	A17 Table 4.21, page 13
2016	1,6	4,4	A17 Table 4.21, page 13
2017	1,7	4,7	A17 Table 4.21, page 13

The coercion category combines compulsory placement and use of force. It must not be rewritten as an average exclusively for placements without consent. The complete separate annual series for 2006-2025 has not been verified in this contribution.

Entire case histories, including after remittal: the 2022 investigation

T22 reviews 39 complaints from 2018- 2019: 6 under § 95, 13 under § 96, 12 under § 112 and 8 under § 113. § 112 / 113 has been selected for particularly long / short treatment. This is not a representative national time distribution.

Pre-trade type	Verified time	Denominator/scope	Reference
Overall application → final decision § 95 / 96	Two longest 164 and 163 weeks; two shortest 14 and 18 weeks	19 cases selected	T22 page 33
After remittal, fresh municipal consideration + possible further appeal	44,4-67,9 weeks	3 remitted cases, §§ 95/96	T22 page 44
After remittal, fresh municipal consideration + possible further appeal	2,6-25 weeks	7 remitted cases, §§ 112/113	T22 page 45

These periods after remittal for reconsideration do not isolate the time until the new municipal decision, because renewed consideration by the Appeals Board may be included. A national series for date of remittal for reconsideration → actual assistance/redress and a new municipal decision is not published in the sources examined here. It must be requested separately with the same case identification.

5. Holes and necessary catch-ups

1. The historical outcomes were subsequently expanded with national 2006/2012 originals, 2007-2011 version tables and the portal's 2014-2025 rows; see the following modules. Before 1. July 2013,ordinary municipal appeals were considered by social appeals boards/employment appeals boards. The common row for the 2013 transitional year requires separate reconciliation of levels of jurisdiction and versions; missing parts are not set to zero.

2. The main series's municipal numerator / denominator for 2025 must be extracted from the number portal; the Danish map percentages cannot deliver it.

3. The complete register of all practice studies 2006-2025 with table counts, submitted/rejected cases and samples has not been fully extracted. P16/P24 above are verified examples, not a complete count.

4. Collect separate statements of municipal revaluations, new complaints after remittal for reconsideration, number of different citizens and errors in confirmed cases.

5. Obtain Ankestyrelsen's own decisions that were subsequently set aside; court losses must not be added to first-instance overturnings without case linkage.

6. 2026 is an ongoing year at the date of inspection; publications in 2026 relating to 2025 have been kept separate. No fictitious full year has been created for 2026.

Municipal Appeals Results - Enlargement 7 October 2026

Verified overall outcomes, social boards and Employment Appeals Board 2007-2011

Unit: complaint cases closed in the calendar year, national boards combined; not individuals or initial municipal decisions. Merits denominator = affirmed + altered + remitted. Altered/remitted is our own sum of altered + remitted.

Year	Stated	Modified	Remitted	Rejected / cancelled it	All cleared	Reality beha Name	Reversed (own sum)
2007	14.554	2.295	3.567	2.531	22.947	20.416	5.862
2008	17.824	2.679	3.991	3.026	27.520	24.494	6.670
2009	21.020	3.114	4.318	3.534	31.986	28.452	7.432
2010	24.458	3.406	4.900	3.667	36.431	32.764	8.306
2011	23.158	4.068	4.890	3.811	35.927	32.116	8.958

Source: Appeals Board, *Appeal Statistics Annual Statistics 2011*, June 2012, table 2.1 printed p. 3 / PDF page 5; table 3.1 printed p. 10 / PDF page 12. Primary report in a publicly available copy. The outcome table is based on the State Administrations' case-record information via the Ministry for Economic Affairs and the Interior. Annex 1 pp. 20-22 explains changes in registration and revisions. A municipal amendment while a board case is pending may be included in the dismissed/lapsed category; it is therefore not a pure dismissal count. Municipal reassessments before forwarding are not counted here. 800 Capital Region cases handled by Central Denmark are included only there in 2011. Annual rows from the same table must not be added to another edition of the same annual statistics. 2007 was re-extracted in 2008; minor differences from the first edition may occur. The 2010 refinement may give minor differences between areas of legislation.

2006: legal sample for comparison with the national original checked

Year	Stated	Repealed amended	Remitted	Rejected / rejected t	Dismissed	Completed by source	Reality, own sum;	Reversed, own sum;
2006	6.074	1.257	1.144	576	365	9.417	8.475	2.401

Source: Københavns Kommune's Employment Committee, meeting of 10. January 2008, item 5, annex 1 (one page), containing Ankestyrelsen's national statistics for the committee's areas of legislation: original annex. Social Services Administration benefits are excluded; some areas of legislation are not subdivided. Outcomes sum to 9.416, while the source states 9.417; the difference of one is retained. The source's 25,5 % alteration/remittal rate uses all 9.417 closed cases as the denominator. This row is a national subset of legislation. It must not be harmonised with the 2007 boards' merits denominator. No unique-citizen or reconsideration count.

Ankestyrelsen 2015- 2016: historical denominators, separate version

Year	Reality b treated municipality e cases	Dismissed	Done at everything, without rejected	Stated	Amended/annulle d	Remitted	Rejected
2015	27.990	2.889	30.879	Not broken down here	Not broken down here	Not broken down here	Absence of this total
2016	23.162	2.805	25.967	Not broken down here	Not broken down here	Not broken down here	Absence of this total

Source: Ankestyrelsen, *Annual Declaration 2017*, May 2018, Table 2.2 printed p. 4 / Physical PDF page 6 of KL-agenda Annex 19. June 2018. Extracts April 2018; 2015-2016 as a general rule maintained from the 2016 Annual Declaration. Rejected cases are omitted from the decision here but may be included in the received. Received and definitely does not relate to the same case report. The difference should therefore not be used as a refusal figure. Municipal decisions and Payment Denmark are separate areas. Feature transferred to Payout Denmark 1 May 2015. Children's and young people's committees and notifications are separate matters, not this municipal total; from 2016, these cases will be created per child instead of family.

Working status

2007-2011: national board outcomes in the 2011 version. 2006 and 2012: the full national original reports have now been checked in the following module with all 13 tables and 262 rows; 2006 concerns social appeals boards, 2012 social appeals boards and employment appeals boards. 2014-2025: national outcomes within the current portal's selectable legislative scope; historical totals are retained separately. The shared row for the transitional year 2013 still requires separate reconciliation. No missing value means zero.

Actual extract from Ankestyrelsen's Statistics Portal, 7. October 2026

Elections: Municipalities, laws, all 26 law groups, add national capital, year 2014- 2025. Total row / Whole country. Primary portal. Unit: closed complaints. Discontinuance is not reflected in the selected outcome targets.

Year	Reality	Stated	Amended/annulled	Remitted	Rejected
2014	35.590	27.019	3.964	4.607	3.590
2015	27.100	19.871	3.235	3.994	3.060
2016	22.491	15.916	2.935	3.640	3.062
2017	25.815	18.072	3.107	4.636	2.765
2018	26.861	18.666	3.757	4.438	2.550
2019	24.038	16.217	3.409	4.412	2.412
2020	23.608	16.692	2.746	4.170	2.367
2021	20.995	15.515	2.129	3.351	1.885
2022	18.415	12.860	2.045	3.510	1.759
2023	19.210	13.511	2.037	3.662	2.124
2024	17.307	11.900	1.473	3.934	2.421
2025	22.927	15.505	1.767	5.655	2.755

Current portal values constitute a separate version and delimitation. Historical annual statistics' figures for decisions on the merits in 2015 and 2016 are respectively 890 and 671 higher than this portal selection. The selectable list of laws does not include a separate Legal Protection and Administration in Social Matters Act category. This demonstrates a difference in coverage/coding but does not establish the entire explanation. Do not use the annual report's denominator together with the portal's outcome counts. Municipal reassessments before an appeal is forwarded and unique persons affected are not counted in the table.

2012: actual help after won denominator, delimited adult area

Ankestyrelsen, Kommuner's compliance with Board Decisions, November 2013: SEL § 83-86,95-99; 1.364 Board Decisions 2012; 145 registered amended / repealed, 14 omitted, 131 examined. Absence: error-coded authentication, other legal basis, removal / new application, or non-execution possible and without fixed date. Municipal questions; time limits and legality of reasons not verified.

Efficacy after Board decision, days	0-15	16-30	31-60	61-90	Exceeding 90	Denominatio n
All investigated	71	19	15	11	15	131
Direct change	42	9	6	3	5	65
Partial remittal for reconsideration	24	10	9	8	10	61

Other 5 cancellations effect within 10 days. 13 out of 90 had already been granted within 30 days before the municipality received the Board decision. 41 of 131 over 30 days. Names 65: 14 over 30 days despite no need for new decision. Names 61: 27 over 30 days. Locator: s.2,6-7,9-10,12-13, Annex 1 p.16-17 (PhysicPDF4,8-9,11-12,14-15,18-19).

Own analysis of significance: this measures the subsequent waiting time for assistance in this particular appeal population. For the consequences for citizens, it is crucial that an amended decision or a decision remitted for reconsideration does not in itself document that assistance has been delivered. Measurement begins at the board's decision; the preceding deprivation and waiting time may be longer. The figures are a sample of board decisions from 2012 and must not be added to a later overall 2012 total. Each row in the implementation table is a subdivision of 131, not an additional 131/65/61 citizens. Registration errors among the 14 exclusions mean that 145 does not represent 145 finally verified lawful amendments. The survey shows actual registered implementation, not a national compensation, return-home or reunification rate.

Fractures, unit of counting and actual aggregation

2006-2007: Municipal reform and the establishment of employment appeals boards change jurisdiction. Appeal statistics 2011 annex 1 p.21 expressly states that before 2007, cases not decided on the merits were included in the alteration/remittal denominator; from 2007 they are removed. Annulment without remittal is recorded as altered; annulment with remittal is recorded as remitted. Rejected/discontinued is combined and may include alteration by the municipality.

2013: Act no. 493/2013, entry into force and transition § 25–26, reproduced in the historical legislative notes to the Legal Protection and Administration in Social Matters Act: competence is transferred on 1. July 2013; pending board cases are completed by the Appeals Board/the Appeals Board's Employment Committee. Own implication: a correct 2013 annual series requires separate January-June board closures and July-December Appeals Board closures, together with verification of transferred case numbers. Before the reform, cases involving matters of principle in the Appeals Board constituted an additional level; the same course may appear in both board and Appeals Board statistics.

After 2013: Transfer of benefit areas to Payout Denmark and separate registration of children's and youth committees / notifications change the coverage area. The current selection of 26 legal groups cannot without explanation replace the total of the older annual accounts.

Our counting rule: Affirmed+altered+remitted must equal decisions on the merits. Altered+remitted constitutes alterations/remittals. Rejected and discontinued must be kept separately where the source permits. Reconsideration granting full relief before forwarding falls outside these complaint denominators. A fresh decision after remittal and a later appeal are new registered events, but may concern the same citizen and the same deprivation. None of the national series found documents unique-person keys.

Precise residual holes and prepared internal data requests

Nothing has been sent. 2006 and 2012's published national outcomes are now original controlled. The remaining fields of the register apply to transitional voting, re-evaluation and actual effect, not to the annual totals already presented.

Deficiency	Registry Manager or first competent recipient	Precise desired material
2013 overall outturn of the transitional year	Ankestyrelsen as well as the archives authority for the central government's records retrieval;	2013-Q1/Q2 board closures and 2013-Q3/Q4 Appeals Board closures, including transferred backlogs; coding manual before/after 1. July, old/new-case-ID linkage, second-instance cases involving matters of principle and exclusion of duplicate counting.
2014- 2025 portal versus historical annual financial statements	The statistical / register function of the Appeal Board	Explanation of versions and scope by year/by law; missing historical law/provision codes, legal-protection codes, day-care and integration codes; the right to obtain outcomes for the entire decided population. Explain the 2015 difference of 890 and the 2016 difference of 671; supply lapsed cases and dismissals separately.
Municipal reassessment before transmission 2006-2025	The case / ESDH registers of each municipality; Ankestyrelsen/ Ministry of Social Affairs and Housing for National Reporting if available	Annual complaints received, findings wholly/partly in the party’s favour on reassessment, upheld/forwarded cases, withdrawals and time limits. No national zero value can be inferred from the fact that the complaints did not reach the Appeals Board.
People and actual consequences following overturning	Municipal benefits / children's registers, Ankestyrelsen; DST for legal statistical coupling	Pseudonymous linkage keys, multiple appeals per person/family, date of first intervention, date of overturning/remittal for reconsideration, date of new decision, assistance delivered, actual return home/reunification, cessation date and duration of delay. Separate children, parents and adults with disabilities; remittal for reconsideration must not be coded as return home.

Control status: National 2006 / 2012 originals, 2007-2011 version tables and portal 2014- 2025 numbers are actually reach.262 rows from 2006 / 2012 are in the separate original module; they are not summed up with overlapping historical versions or the local legal sample. The 2013transition and the full municipal reassessment / follow-up series remain separate remains. No residue shall be filled in by extrapolation.

National appeals statistics found 2006 and 2012

The two previously missing original annual statistics have been recovered in public archive copies of the Appeals Board’s own publication addresses. The entire 2006 original of 19 pages and the entire 2012 original of 24 pages have been read in memory. All 13 numbered numerical tables have also been visually checked; all 262 table rows are in the separate table annex. Originals or images have not been stored. The archive date is the time of copying, not the statistical year or publication date.

The key result is that the report's national series for 2006 can be completed with 6.393 deleted / amended or remitted registrations and the row for 2012 with 8.202 modified or remitted; records. The names are different. The figures do not say how many different citizens were affected or whether the aid or family life was actually restored after the decision.

National accounts with actual delimitation

Year / publicionsversion	Stadfoe Stated	Revolve one or more or amended	Home t	Rejected / lost ist	Withdrawal	Other	Rejected / withdrawn aldet Total	End Total	Realite tsbehandlet	Entries recording overturned decisions
2006; July 2007	18.522	2.896	3.497	1.920	1.072	136	Non-separate total code	28.043	24.915	6.393
2012 / July 2013	23.864	3.601	4.601	In overall code	In overall code	In overall code	3.430	35.496	32.066	8.202

2006 source: Table 1, physical / printed p. 6, Table 3 p. 11 and Table 4 p. 14. 2012source: Table 2.1, physical p. 6 / printed p. 4, Table 3.1 physical p. 10 / printed p. 8 and Table 3.2 physical p. 11-12 / printed p. 9-10. 2006 original archive copy, The archive copy of the original of the 2012.
The 6.393 registrations in 2006 are 22,8% of all 28.043 cases closed, published as 23%. The report's Table 4, Note 1, explicitly applies all closed cases. If the 24.915 claims are taken as a comparator, the proportion becomes **25,7 %**, calculated in this report. This is another calculation and must be marked as such; the published 23% must not be overwritten.

In 2012, table 3.1 publishes 26 %, while table 3.2 publishes 25,5 %. Both tables use cases determined on the merits as the denominator. An own calculation using the published 8.202/32.066 yields 25,58 %, rounded to one decimal place **25,6 %**; the printed 25,5 % is retained as the original's information. Dividing the same numerator by all 35.496 closed cases yields **23,1 %**, which is only a supplementary own calculation. A time series placing the 2006 figure of 23 % alongside the 2012 figure of 26 % without checking the denominators may therefore give a misleading explanation of the change.

The alteration/remittal records for the two different years sum to **14.595**. This is a sum of annual records. Different decisions or repeated complaint processes for the same citizen cannot be identified in these published tables. The other tables, regional breakdowns, areas of legislation and historical retrospective accounts are subdivisions or repetitions of the populations and must not be added to this sum.

Which municipal corrections disappear in the total code?

The 2012 original methodological annex, physically pp. 20-21 / printed pp. 18-19, explains that the non-reality codes have been merged as from 1 January 2007. **rejected / cancelled**. The total code includes both rejection or reference, cancellation as a result of a change of decision in the municipality, cancellation for other reasons and other closures. The 3.430 registrations in 2012 cannot therefore be read as 3.430 complaints without changing the legal position of the citizen. A non-published part with a municipal change is included in the complaint. The number cannot be calculated from the total code.

The methodological annex also describes recording outright annulments as amendments and annulment followed by remittal as remittal. **An annulment and a remittal in the same decision are therefore not two new cases.** The note to table 2.1 refers to six earlier codes, while the methodological annex refers to seven, including two separate grounds for discontinuance. Both statements are retained; the original provides no separate reconciliation of this difference. The annex's statement that important information has not been lost does not prove that the number of municipal corrections can be inferred from the new combined code. It cannot be inferred from the published tables.

Children, disability and specific benefit groups

2006 covers the social boards in 14 state chambers and the board of the municipalities of Copenhagen and Frederiksberg. Several benefits are dealt with in the same broad legal group; the publication does not have data for individual paragraphs (preface, p. 4). It is therefore not a complete register of, for example, forced employment or different children.

Group 2006, Table 4, p. 14	Completed	Stated	Repealed / Modified a	Remitted	Overturning entries, own total	Printed per cent, mention all cleared
Specific support for children	1.018	612	78	166	244	24 %
Home help	288	142	33	58	91	32 %
Other offers for adults	1.365	775	156	304	460	34 %
Auxiliary products etc.	2.339	1.690	205	228	433	19 %
Use of force	127	44	22	3	25	20 %

This documents decision outcomes in the specified fields. The 244 child-related overturning entries are not 244 children in care or 244 placements without legal authority. Separate case type, identity linkage, legal grounds of error and actual redress are missing for such conclusions. Conversely, the 166 remittals must not be presented as documented delivery of the missing support.

In 2012, the social appeals boards closed 18.811 cases and the employment appeals boards 16.685. Table 3.2 gives, among other things, **10.466 closed cases concerning social services**, of which 1.070 were amended and 1.819 remitted for reconsideration; **201 concerning use of force against**

adults, of which 5 altered and 21 remitted; **69 concerning people with disabilities in employment**, of which 9 altered and 22 remitted. These groups are neither uniform populations of people nor documented as mutually separate groups of citizens. For additional expenses for adults, the methodology annex explains the division of the former group sections 100-106 into section 100, sections 101-102 and sections 103-106 (physical p. 21); the table does not publish the numbers of people in these groups.

Time trajectory and changing control targets

The 2006 weighted national average is **87 days** Against 89 in 2005. The general objective is referred to as 13 weeks / 91 days (p. 16). The average of the boards varies from **58 days in Frederiksborg to 151 days in West Zealand**; Funen is 99 and Storstrøm 111. There is no indication as to how many specific cases exceed the target or when the citizen's help was delivered. Average of completed cases is not a maximum waiting time.

The weighted national average for 2012 is **20,9 weeks**, comprising 19,8 in the employment appeals boards and 21,9 in the social appeals boards. The Capital Region is 29,3 weeks overall and **35,6 weeks in the social appeals board**. The national retrospective figures in table 4.1 are 15,9 weeks in 2010 and 18,0 in 2011. All regional and legislative time series are included in the table annex. The original does not state the distribution of waiting times or the time from a favourable finding to actual assistance/reunification.

The oversight targets in 2012 vary by quarter and region. Physical p. 14/printed p. 12 of the original gives these endpoints: the Capital Region's social appeals board **26 weeks in the first quarter and 17 in the last**, the employment appeals board **21 and 16**; Zealand's social appeals board **13 weeks in all four quarters**, the employment appeals board **17 and 13**. The full targets for the intervening quarters are not stated in this report. Meeting an increased target is not proof that the previous target or the individual's timely protection was secured.

For 2006, table 7 states that admission to residential accommodation without consent under section 109 g of the Social Services Act then in force was subject to a **14-day decision deadline** from receipt of the recommendation. The published 9-day average for use of force does not document compliance in every case. The 2012 annex reproduces Executive Order no. 853 of 23. August 2012 then in force: section 29 on a provisional decision in cases of urgent need or risk of substantial harm, and section 30 on a 4-week board deadline in certain employment cases and forwarding within 5 working days after reconsideration (physical p. 23/printed p. 21). These historical statutory texts have a limited scope; they do not document individual compliance or the rules in 2026.

The source's own inconsistencies are preserved.

The status of the originals' authority gives no reason to delete internal errors or select a version without explanation:

• **2006, Table 4, p. 14:** Overall assessment has six outcome cells that summer to 8 but print total 9. Sickness and birth benefits summed up to 4.609 but have printed total 4.608. Child benefit totals 97, but has printed a total of 93. Individual housing support sums up to 1.174 but has printed a total of 1.178. The original cells and totals are preserved, not harmonised.

• **2006 summary, p. 5 versus Table 1-2, p. 6 / 10:** The summary refers to Fyn by 23% and West Zealand by 27%; Table 1-2 indicates 29% and 25% for 2006, while 23% and 27% are in the 2005 column. The precise local mismatch shall be indicated if the summary is used.

• **2006, Table 2, p. 10:** Viborg has 44% in 2005 and 37% in 2006, but the change is printed as − 8 percentage points. Own subtraction is − 7; the printed − 8 is retained.

• **2006, p. 17:** The prose's statement that only active employment measures have an average exceeding 13 weeks is not supported by table 7. The table also has social pensions and collection of child maintenance at 93 days and legal safeguards/administration at 94 days, all exceeding 91 days.

• **2012, physical p. 16 / printed p. 14 versus table 4.2 physical p. 17 / printed p. 15:** The prosas indicate 19,5 weeks for social pension, new law, in the social board. The table indicates 20,3. Both are maintained, and the increase of 4,6 weeks at the same time is consistent with 20,3 minus 15,7, not with 19,5 minus 15,7.

• **2012:** The printed national 25,5% in Table 3.2 and the calculated 25,58% from the same published integers are treated separately as described above.

These are tangible inconsistencies in the published information. They do not in themselves prove which underlying registration is correct or that the decision of a particular citizen was illegal. A correction requires the relevant original extracts or a documented correction version.

Document control and precise residue

K01's gap in national originals for **2006 and 2012 is closed** for these two publications'13 numerical tables, text/methodology and published prose information. Both official publication pages and their PDF copies appear in the specific CDX finding. The 2006 original does **not** contain a complete national register of other labour-market appeal bodies before 2007; the transition in the annual series must still describe the change of jurisdiction.

The 2006 annex states that the last two quarters of the Copenhagen State and the Danish National Security Agency have been dealt with manually and that no separate annual statistics were submitted to the Danish Security Authority; the year is based on the four quarters (p. 19 and Table 1, Note 3). As of 1 January 2007, the municipal reform changed the board and the division of tasks. In 2012, complaints about child benefit, family allowances and the collection of maintenance allowances were moved to Ankestyrelsen from **1 October** at the same time as Denmark's acquisition. These cases are therefore missing in the last quarter of the year and cannot be counted as an actual decrease in errors or complaints (preface, physical p. 3 / printed p. 1). It was not until July 2013 that the boards ceased completely.

Actual remaining gaps: The graphs do not have precise data labels for every bar, and their exact underlying figures for cases opened/pending have not been turned into calculated guesses. For 2012, the prose separately gives 39.130 cases opened, 3.331 fewer than in 2011; this is saved as a numerical entry tied to the text, not read from the figure. For 2006, a fall of 1.995 cases opened is stated, but the exact annual intake figures cannot be derived from this fall alone. Municipality-by-statutory-provision tables/the data portal, the union of identities, grounds for errors, municipal amendments hidden in aggregate codes and actual redress are still not fully covered by these publications. Retrospective figures already found in later annual reports must not be added again on top of the original annual registers.

Ankestatistic 2006 and 2012: all original voice tables

All 13 numbered tables are included with original figures, separate source years, columns and physical/printed page locators. Table rows are registrations and overlapping breakdowns; they are not counts of distinct citizens. The historical retrospectives are versions of the same annual populations. Full stops are retained as the original's thousands separators; decimals use commas. A full stop or hyphen as a separate cell is not converted to zero. BAN means employment appeals board. Explanatory board additions in row names help keep identical law titles separate.

2006 - Table 1

Physical page (s) of the original: 6; printed page (s): 6. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Rejected / lost ist	Stated	Repealed amended	Remitted	Withdrawal	Other	Completed cases	Name % of GDP
Whole country 2005	2.247	19.161	3.049	3.858	1.382	127	29.824	38
Whole country 2006	1.920	18.522	2.896	3.497	1.072	136	28.043	38
Security Board 2) 3	260	2.373	226	548	146	37	3.590	40
Copenhagen 3)	270	2.062	308	366	95	2	3.103	41
Frederiksborg	152	1.073	151	151	92	1	1.620	41
Roskilde	79	612	93	135	37	5	961	31
West Zealand	116	1.385	158	275	44	22	2.000	25
High current	130	1.191	285	171	64	2	1.843	28
Bornholm	6	142	32	13	4	1	198	48
Funen	146	1.620	206	385	58	22	2.437	29
South Jutland	68	565	93	211	35	3	975	43
Ribe	53	874	89	218	36	0	1.270	38

Row	Rejected / lost ist	Stated	Repealed amended	Remitted	Withdrawal	Other	Completed cases	Name % of GDP
Vejle	178	1.749	169	184	82	14	2.376	41
Ringkøbing	92	703	216	174	68	2	1.255	48
Århus	200	2.206	301	206	199	14	3.126	41
Viborg	77	717	160	122	48	1	1.125	37
North Jutland	93	1.250	409	338	64	10	2.164	41

2006 - Table 2

Physical page (s) of the original: 10; printed page (s): 10. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Share Board decisions; 2005	Share Board decisions; 2006	Amendment percentage points, 2005-2006	Target figure 2006
Bornholm	40	48	8	40
Ringkøbing	56	48	-8	40
South Jutland	42	43	1	40
Frederiksborg	36	41	5	40
North Jutland	37	41	4	37
Copenhagen	43	41	-2	40
Århus	43	41	-2	40
Vejle	47	41	-6	40
Security Board	37	40	3	-
Ribe	32	38	6	40
Viborg	44	37	-8	40
Roskilde	42	31	-11	35
Funen	23	29	6	40
High current	39	28	-11	35
West Zealand	27	25	-2	35
Total	38	38	0	.

2006 - Table 3

Physical page (s) of the original: 11; printed page (s): 11. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Number admissibility; Cases 2006	Of which: name; Cases 2006	Share Council decisions per cent 2006	Share Council decisions per cent 2005
Health insurance	64	7	11	15
Individual housing support	993	182	18	15
Active social policy	7.044	1.937	27	28

Row	Number admissibility; Cases 2006	Of which: name; Cases 2006	Share Council decisions per cent 2006	Share Council decisions per cent 2005
Integration	168	47	28	27
General housing	210	61	29	21
Other legislation	37	11	30	36
Child benefit	78	29	37	36
Sickness benefit, etc.	4.197	1.723	41	43
Family allowances and advance payments	298	123	41	42
Social services	6.311	2.615	41	44
Social pension	4.165	1.896	46	47
An active employment intervention	935	448	48	53
Leave	2	1	50	0
Legal certainty and administration	326	199	61	64
Recovery of maintenance	21	14	67	34
Repatriation	3	2	67	50
Partial pension	4	3	75	67
Use of force	69	69	100	100
Total cases decided	24.915	9.367	38	38

2006 - Table 4

Physical page (s) of the original: 14; printed page (s): 14. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Rejected / lost ist	Stated	Repealed amended	Remitted	Withdrawal	Other	Completed cases	Reversed % of cases
Partial pension	0	3	1	0	0	0	4	25
Social pension	295	3.271	376	510	180	22	4.654	19
Early retirement pension	150	1.634	213	279	85	13	2.374	25
Personal allowances	84	1.056	47	113	52	4	1.356	12
Other provisions	61	581	116	118	43	5	924	25
An active employment effort	75	683	113	148	53	6	1.078	24
Offer-opportunity r, job plan	23	84	22	17	5	2	153	25
Wages, work experience, wage subsidies	11	84	11	20	7	2	135	23
Expenditure on aids, transport,	2	82	9	17	5	0	115	23
Flex jobs, etc.	33	403	69	82	34	0	621	24

Row	Rejected / lost ist	Stated	Repealed amended	Remitted	Withdrawal	Other	Completed cases	Reversed % of cases
Other provisions	6	30	2	12	2	2	54	26
Active social policy	493	5.186	772	1.086	250	38	7.825	24
Cash and start-up aid, unemployment benefit	142	1.286	402	293	87	16	2.226	31
Rehabilitation	59	757	120	220	41	4	1.201	28
Individual benefits	222	2.743	125	490	94	15	3.689	17
Reimbursement	50	329	118	69	18	3	587	32
Other provisions	20	71	7	14	10	0	122	29
Social services	449	4.556	707	1.047	275	26	7.060	25
Specific support for children	99	612	78	166	56	7	1.018	24
Offers for adults: Home help	26	142	33	58	28	1	288	32
Other offers for adults	69	775	156	304	57	4	1.365	34
Auxiliary products etc.	135	1.690	205	228	75	6	2.339	19
Taking care of dying	2	9	3	1	1	0	16	25
Other provisions	118	1.328	232	290	58	8	2.034	26
Legal certainty and administration	85	189	109	28	41	9	461	29
General assessment	0	4	4	0	0	0	9	44
Other provisions	85	185	105	28	40	9	452	29
Sickness and maternity benefits	271	3.153	594	452	126	13	4.608	23
Sickness benefit	195	1.886	490	383	93	10	3.057	29
Childbirth benefit	5	63	6	5	4	0	83	13
Other provisions	71	1.204	98	64	29	2	1.468	11
Leave	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	50
Health insurance	10	54	4	6	3	1	78	13
Family allowances and advance payments.	27	196	51	40	8	7	329	28
Family allowances	20	156	38	29	5	5	253	26

Row	Rejected / lost ist	Stated	Repealed amended	Remitted	Withdrawal	Other	Completed cases	Reversed % of cases
Other provisions	7	40	13	11	3	2	76	32
Child benefit	9	43	20	15	4	6	93	38
Individual housing support	130	791	87	115	51	0	1.178	17
General housing	17	182	8	20	31	1	259	11
Approval of general housing	3	7	1	3	3	0	17	24
Old-age housing	14	175	7	17	28	1	242	10
Recovery of maintenance	10	12	8	1	4	0	35	26
Integration Act	10	128	22	18	6	3	187	21
Use of force	28	44	22	3	27	3	127	20
Repatriation laws n	1	0	1	2	1	0	5	60
Other	10	30	2	5	12	1	60	11
Total	1.920	18.522	2.896	3.497	1.072	136	28.043	23

2006 - Table 5

Physical page (s) of the original: 15; printed page (s): 15. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Overturning percentage 2005	Overturning percentage 2006	Of which amended / repealed	Of which remitted
North Jutland	32	35	19	16
South Jutland	34	32	10	22
Ringkøbing	32	31	17	14
Viborg	25	25	14	11
High current	27	25	15	9
Funen	23	24	8	16
Ribe	27	24	7	17
Roskilde	22	24	10	14
Bornholm	20	23	16	7
Copenhagen	22	22	10	12
West Zealand	22	22	8	14
Security Board	22	21	6	15
Frederiksborg	18	18	9	9
Århus	18	17	10	7

Row	Overturning percentage 2005	Overturning percentage 2006	Of which amended / repealed	Of which remitted
Vejle	14	15	7	8
Whole country	23	23	10	12

2006 - Table 6

Physical page (s) of the original: 16; printed page (s): 16. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Number of days 2005	Number of days 2006	Change number of days
Frederiksborg	49	58	9
Bornholm	50	61	11
Copenhagen	76	68	-8
Ribe	62	69	7
Viborg	82	77	-5
Roskilde	50	78	28
Ringkøbing	160	79	-81
Security Board	103	81	-22
North Jutland	79	83	4
South Jutland	84	86	2
Vejle	95	88	-7
Århus	84	88	4
Funen	84	99	15
High current	112	111	-1
West Zealand	143	151	8
Weighted average for the whole country	89	87	-2

2006 - Table 7

Physical page (s) of the original: 17; printed page (s): 17. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Number of days 2005	Number of days 2006	Change number of days
Use of force 1)	10	9	-1
Repatriation Act	104	66	-38
General housing	70	69	-1
Partial pension	161	73	-88
Leave	57	78	21
Individual housing support	91	81	-10
Sickness benefit, etc.	89	83	-6
Family allowances, advances, etc.	92	84	-8

Row	Number of days 2005	Number of days 2006	Change number of days
Child benefit	82	84	2
Other legislation	63	84	21
Active social policy	99	85	-14
Social services	90	87	-3
Integration Act	83	89	6
Health insurance	80	90	10
Social pension	104	93	-11
Recovery of child support	82	93	11
Legal certainty and administration	118	94	-24
An active employment intervention	82	105	23
Total - weighted average	89	87	-2

2012 - Table 2.1

Physical page (s) of the original: 6; printed page (s): 4. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Stated	Modified	Remitted	Rejected / cancelled	Total completed
Whole country 2008	17.824	2.679	3.991	3.026	27.520
Whole country 2009	21.020	3.114	4.318	3.534	31.986
Whole country 2010	24.458	3.406	4.900	3.667	36.431
Whole country 2011	23.158	4.068	4.890	3.811	35.927
Whole country 2012	23.864	3.601	4.601	3.430	35.496
Employment appeals boards 2012	11.795	1.908	1.596	1.386	16.685
Capital	4.047	596	420	428	5.491
Zealand	1.984	335	481	279	3.079
South Denmark	2.867	463	255	273	3.858
Central Jutland	1.996	404	355	298	3.053
North Jutland	901	110	85	108	1.204
Social boards 2012	12.069	1.693	3.005	2.044	18.811
Capital	3.869	526	928	648	5.971
Zealand	2.209	267	536	299	3.311
South Denmark	2.938	338	470	448	4.194
Central Jutland	2.171	362	803	440	3.776
North Jutland	882	200	268	209	1.559

2012 - Table 2.2

Physical page (s) of the original: 9; printed page (s): 7. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Employment Appeals Board %	Social Board%	The two boards under one percentage point.
Whole country 2008	43	42	43
Whole country 2009	43	39	41
Whole country 2010	42	36	39
Whole country 2011	35	39	37
Whole country 2012	23	23	23
Capital	18	18	18
Zealand	27	28	28
South Denmark	22	23	23
Central Jutland	21	21	21
North Jutland	39	33	36

2012 - Table 3.1

Physical page (s) of the original: 10; printed page (s): 8. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Stated	Modified	Remitted	Reality processing t	Overturning %
Whole country 2008	17.824	2.679	3.991	24.494	27
Whole country 2009	21.020	3.114	4.318	28.452	26
Whole country 2010	24.458	3.406	4.900	32.764	25
Whole country 2011	23.158	4.068	4.890	32.116	28
Whole country 2012	23.864	3.601	4.601	32.066	26
Employment appeals boards 2012	11.795	1.908	1.596	15.299	23
Capital (BAN)	4.047	596	420	5.063	20
Zealand (BAN)	1.984	335	481	2.800	29
South Denmark (BAN)	2.867	463	255	3.585	20
Central Jutland (BAN)	1.996	404	355	2.755	28
North Jutland (BAN)	901	110	85	1.096	18
Social Board 2012	12.069	1.693	3.005	16.767	28
Capital (social boards)	3.869	526	928	5.323	27
Zealand (social boards)	2.209	267	536	3.012	27
South Denmark (social boards)	2.938	338	470	3.746	22
Midtjylland (Social Board)	2.171	362	803	3.336	35
North Jutland (social boards)	882	200	268	1.350	35

2012 - Table 3.2

Physical page (s) of the original: 11, 12; printed page (s): 9, 10. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Stated	Modified	Remitted	Rejected / cancelled a	Total completed	Overturning %.
Total Employment Appeals	11.795	1.908	1.596	1.386	16.685	22,9
Cash benefit - sickness and maternity	5.998	953	687	556	8.194	21,5
- sickness benefit;	5.831	923	677	530	7.961	21,5
- maternity benefit;	167	30	10	26	233	19,3
Active social policy (BAN)	2.916	687	573	516	4.692	30,2
Active employment measures	1.252	113	158	143	1.666	17,8
Integration Act (BAN)	30	6	3	4	43	23,1
Social pension (BAN)	1.530	122	151	114	1.917	15,1
- Social pension (new law, BAN)	1.425	107	138	100	1.770	14,7
- social pension (gl. lov, BAN),	105	15	13	14	147	21,1
Legal certainty etc. (BAN)	24	11	1	28	64	33,3
Disabled persons in occupations	29	9	22	9	69	51,7
Partial pension	2	1	0	0	3	33,3
Leave	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other legislation (BAN)	14	6	1	16	37	33,3
Total social boards	12.069	1.693	3.005	2.044	18.811	28
Active Social Policy (Social Affairs)	2.916	109	758	270	4.053	22,9
The Act of Integration (social boards)	47	3	11	9	70	23
Social pension (social boards)	1.190	130	174	170	1.664	20,3
- Social pensions (new law, social boards)	879	101	124	127	1.231	20,4
- social pension (applicable law, social security board),	311	29	50	43	433	20,3
Legal certainty etc. (social boards)	255	179	26	140	600	44,6
Social services	6.541	1.070	1.819	1.036	10.466	30,6
Use of force against adults	105	5	21	70	201	19,8

Row	Stated	Modified	Remitted	Rejected / cancelled a	Total completed	Overturning %.
Family allowances, advances, etc.	196	82	38	104	420	38
- the recovery of child support;	24	18	6	14	62	50
Child benefit	25	11	8	16	60	43,2
Housing aid	635	103	133	168	1.039	27,1
General housing	151	1	12	29	193	7,9
Repatriation Act	7	0	3	0	10	30
Other legislation (social boards)	1	0	2	32	35	66,7
Total	23.864	3.601	4.601	3.430	35.496	25,5

2012 - Table 4.1

Physical page (s) of the original: 15; printed page (s): 13. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Behaviour Females Court of First Instance 2010, weeks	Behaviour Females Court of First Instance 2011, weeks	Behaviour Females Court of First Instance 2012, weeks	Social name 2010, weeks	Social name 2011, weeks	Social name 2012, weeks	The two name together 2010, weeks	The two name together 2011, weeks	The two name together 2012, weeks
Capital	12	15,7	23,1	11,9	18,8	35,6	11,9	17,3	29,3
Zealand	9	16,5	16,7	7,6	13,2	13,5	8,2	14,9	15,1
South Denmark	10,7	14,0	18,4	14,2	15,0	17,9	12,6	14,5	18,1
Central Jutland	34,4	24,1	19,7	27,4	22,2	11,7	30,4	23,1	15,7
North Jutland	26,3	20,7	17,7	25,7	25,1	23,6	26,0	22,9	20,6
Whole country	16,1	17,7	19,8	15,7	18,2	21,9	15,9	18,0	20,9

2012 - Table 4.2

Physical page (s) of the original: 17; printed page (s): 15. Official original, archive copy.

Row	Number of weeks 2009	Number of weeks 2010	Number of weeks 2011	Number of weeks 2012
Employment appeals boards, total	17,0	16,1	17,7	19,8
Sickness benefit	22,9	-	18,0	20,0
- sickness benefit;	16,4	16,0	18,0	20,1
- maternity benefit;	16,0	17,6	18,2	18,4
Active social policy (BAN)	17,6	15,9	17,9	19,3
Active employment measures	15,6	12,9	13,5	16,2
Integration Act (BAN)	15,4	24,3	24,6	20,1
Social pension (new law, BAN)	18,3	18,0	19,7	24,0
Social pension (gl. lov, BAN)	17,4	21,4	19,3	20,6

Row	Number of weeks 2009	Number of weeks 2010	Number of weeks 2011	Number of weeks 2012
Legal certainty etc. (BAN)	8,0	9,3	23,0	14,6
Disabled persons in occupations	27,7	20,0	13,2	19,7
Partial pension	18,7	9,3	24,8	14,8
Leave	11,0	19,9	36,5	0
Other legislation (BAN)	10,7	24,7	0,0	11,0
Total social boards	16,6	15,7	18,2	21,9
Active Social Policy (Social Affairs)	14,4	13,2	14,1	18,2
The Act of Integration (social boards)	17,1	13,3	18,1	14,6
Social pensions (new law, social boards)	16,9	14,8	15,7	20,3
Social pension (applicable law, social security boards)	18,0	16,4	16,2	17,4
Legal certainty etc. (social boards)	15,4	16,2	14,7	24,3
Social services	17,9	17,3	24,0	23,8
Use of force against adults	3,5	5,5	19,2	11,2
Family allowances, advances, etc.	17,5	15,6	7,8	22,1
Recovery of child support	20,0	0	20,0	26,4
Child benefit	20,4	16,6	17,4	21,9
Housing aid	16,3	14,9	25,4	23,0
General housing	13,3	11,7	15,7	22,1
Repatriation Act	24,4	15,3	13,1	23,2
Other legislation (social boards)	7,6	12,4	7,6	6,9
Both boards together	16,8	15,9	18,0	20,9

Transitional year 2013: original case numbers, omitting complaints and waiting time targets

The rediscovered originals fill the first half-year's board counts with 16.780 decision entries. They do not provide a complete national 2013 matrix of upheld, amended, remitted and dismissed decisions. Ankestyrelsen's annual report also shows that cases relevant to the merger are excluded from its measurement of cases over 12 months. Target achievement therefore cannot be used as proof of timely review of the entire 2013 population.

Three independent primary sources have actually been read in relevant sections: Statsforvaltningerne's scanned half-year report(SFV13H), the consolidated annual report(SFV13A) and Ankestyrelsen's annual report(AS13A). SFV13H has been read visually on PDF1-8,15,19-20; SFV13A read as text on PDF1-13,25-29 and visually checked on 26/28; AS13A read as text on PDF1-20 and visually checked on 8/13/18/19. These are not complete readings of all accounting/balance-sheet pages. No public original or original image has been stored.

The first six months of Board decisions

SFV13H,PDF15/printed 13, and SFV13A,table 19, PDF28/printed 26, have the same counts:7.696 employment appeals board decisions and 9.084 social appeals board decisions. The subtotal of 16.780 is their sum, not an additional population. All regional cells appear below. Decision entries are neither unique appeal processes nor people. Outcome groups, reconsideration/discontinuance grounds and actual implementation are not published in this table. Before the reform, a board decision could be followed by further consideration of a question of principle by Ankestyrelsen.

AS13A, PDF7, states approximately 11.000 municipal appeal cases closed as a result of the transfer. This is a rounded statement, not an exact outcome matrix. It does not provide an exact national annual total of 27.780, and any duplicate registrations require links between case records/levels of jurisdiction. The approximately 16.000 or 17.000 pending cases transferred are stock figures, not additional concluded decisions.

Statsforvaltningen's original decision records

SFV13A, table 19,PDF28,and SFV13H, PDF15. First-half regional figures and national totals for both half-years are reproduced. Empty board/agricultural fields after the transfer of tasks do not mean zero decisions in Denmark. Family law and both boards are subtotals. The two adoption phases may concern the same process; no national union of people or error rate is formed.

Zone	HOV1H	SJL1H	SYD1H	MIDT1H	NORD1H	Country 1H	SFV2H
Marriage	5.631	3.012	4.393	3.361	1.733	18.130	16.233
Contributions	3.774	2.537	4.069	4.296	1.771	16.447	12.511
Advice / conflict ovation	442	59	517	258	318	1.594	1.274
Interview	2.339	1.567	2.151	1.997	566	8.620	7.938
Parental authority, registration	2.838	1.449	2.097	1.892	827	9.103	7.333
Parental authority, conciliation	1.620	1.155	1.499	1.337	459	6.070	5.516
Fatherhood	1.504	586	1.018	951	376	4.435	3.122
Recovery	1	0	27	0	0	28	27
Family, subtotal	18.149	10.365	15.771	14.092	6.050	64.427	53.954
Adoption phase 1	324	88	176	225	76	889	810
Adoption phase 3	177	158	155	132	93	715	795
Name cases	785	317	248	364	167	1.881	1.526
Guardianship	1.675	1.585	1.027	1.809	1.073	7.169	4.828
Banded products	50	27	25	21	12	135	78
Aliens	6.083	1.450	4.074	3.262	1.593	16.462	23.102
Unaccompanied refugee children	219	0	0	1	0	220	208
Right of entry	21	9	17	21	12	80	36
Psychiatric Patient Complaints Board	638	190	162	211	96	1.297	1.346
Fertility	1	5	22	4	11	43	31
Agriculture	33	169	522	348	215	1.287	Empty

Zone	HOV1H	SJL1H	SYD1H	MIDT1H	NORD1H	Country 1H	SFV2H
Employment Appeal Board	2.768	1.065	2.102	1.181	580	7.696	Empty
Social Board	3.540	1.384	1.919	1.602	639	9.084	Empty
Both boards, subtotal	6.308	2.449	4.021	2.783	1.219	16.780	Empty
Local authority supervision	209	84	140	185	82	700	773
Buildings	88	42	76	36	30	272	263
Other laws	4	3	6	3	8	24	26
Printed total	34.764	16.941	26.442	23.497	10.737	112.381	87.776

Names: actual waiting times and rest times before reform

SFV13A, Table 18, PDF26 / printed 24. SFV13H, Table 1, PDF5-6, marks the mean results as: **unweighted average**: a small region and a large region receive the same weight. The percentages below have the case population in their own region as the denominator; absolute old case figures are not available.

Objective / result first half of the year	HOV	SJL	SYD	MIDT	NORD
Employment, target weeks	20	15	18	20	20
Employment, result weeks	25	22	24	25	27
Social, target weeks	30	17	17	15	21
Social, result weeks	42	17	21	13	25
Employment, over 4 months of rest, maximum percentage	40	20	30	35	35
Employment, over 4 months of rest, actual percentage	61	47	27,6	51	41
Social, over 4 months rest, max.	50	20	30	15	42
Social, over 4 months rest, actual percentage	66	27	25,4	19	41

SFV13H publishes 24,6 weeks in employment appeals boards and 23,6 in social appeals boards; pending-time proportions of 46 and 36 per cent. Own calculation from the five regional values gives 24,6 and 23,6 weeks; the averages of the pending-time values are 45,52 and 35,68 per cent. Rounded average percentages are not converted into exact counts of old cases. The previously incorporated AT02 annex has a first-half-year result of 28,6/23,6 for social/employment boards; this source difference is retained. Period allocation, extraction and weighting must be reconciled against underlying data before forming one common time series.

The Appeal Board's own entrances, endings and stocks 2006-2013

AS13A Table 4, PDF8. All numbers are the original version, with task change 2013. They overlap with other registered complaints / injuries series and may not be added as additional complaints. Empty historical complexities don't mean zero.

Measure	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Authorization - established	5.424	3.857	4.657	5.950	7.036	7.853	8.735	40.090
Authorisation - Completed	5.311	4.103	4.775	5.234	6.852	8.364	8.324	22.765

Measure	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Funding - pending	852	965	978	1.619	1.864	1.232	1.588	24.629
Work injury - created	13.325	15.157	14.973	19.190	17.909	13.816	15.145	15.233
Work injury - completed	14.539	13.848	14.560	16.809	18.517	18.629	13.353	12.267
Work injury - pending	5.542	5.884	6.651	9.127	8.623	3.792	6.388	9.672
Work injury - average months	5,8	5,0	6,3	5,8	5,95	6,2	4,96	6,7
Work injury - complex months	Empty	Empty	Empty	Empty	Empty	Empty	5,8	8,1
Injury to work - non-complex months	Empty	Empty	Empty	Empty	Empty	Empty	2,8	3,3

The original's 35.032 cases closed at PDF7 correspond exactly to 22.765 budget-controlled + 12.267 work injuries. Therefore, the 12.267 should not be added to 35.032 despite the prosaic formulation of work injuries "beyond." The annual increase of 13.355 corresponds to 35.032 − (8.324 + 13.353). The area of funding also includes family law, payment of Denmark and previous basic complaints, so 22.765 are not municipal complaints alone. New 2006-2012 historical cells are reproduced as this version's retrospective, not new independent year populations.

The 12-month measurement omits merger cases and does not match its own table

AS13A, Table 9, PDF18, visually verified:

Original version	Number	Printed share	Denominator/scope
Under 12 months, Table 9	18.607	94,1%	Printed table, does not refer to independently shown
Over 12 months, Table 9	1.262	5,9%	The same table
Total determined in prose	21.347	-	Merger cases not included
Accidents at work above 12 m	1.144	10,1%	11.371 cases
Family rights over 12 m	28	0,9%	3.041 cases
Welfare over 12 m	90	1,3%	6.935 cases

The three prose denominators total 21.347 and their old cases 1.262. But the two counts in table 9 give 19.869, that is 1.478 fewer. 1.262/21.347=5,91%; 1.262/19.869=6,35%. To obtain the prose total by subtraction, the under-12-month count would have to be 20.085. **This is an independently calculated reconciliation value, not a documented correction to 18.607.** All printed values are retained; the underlying case records must determine where the difference arose.

At the same time, the defined denominators are smaller than the annual flow: occupational injury 11.371 as against 12.267 and 21.347 as against 35.032. The report explicitly omits merger-relevant cases, but does not specify the whole difference between the different flow / tempest populations. It cannot therefore be converted into a precise number of merger cases. The published target is 98% closure below 12 m, result 94,1%; a measured target of 96% is the target-result ratio, no new timely citizen's share. [AS13A, PDF13,18-19]

Notifications, interaction and quality control

AS13A, Table 7, PDF12-14	Contract objectives	Result	Unit / denominator
Compulsory placement/use of force	8	6,6	weeks on average; not individual time-limit checks
Notification	8	10,4	weeks on average
Rejected cases of principle	2	2,6	weeks on average
Reality dealt with in principle	7	8,1	months
Foreign pension	3	4,5	months
Other stock account	4,5	4,0	months
Insurance, Employment Committee	6	4,7	months
Working Environment Appeals Board	5,5	3,3	months
Equal Treatment Board	7	6,5	months
Special education	4	3,2	months
Uncomplex work injury	2,5	3,3	months
Industrial injury, complex	7	8,1	months
Contributions	85	54	per cent before service destination, absolute mention of deficiencies
Parental authority	85	89	%
Residence	85	97	%
Interview	85	82	%
Family / stepchild option	85	81	%
Name cases	85	93	%
Adoption Board	85	96	%
Internal quality	84	82,5	points, maximum 100, no factual legal percentage
AS successful in court	94%	665/704	judgements, not unique citizens

39 judgment registrations are the difference 704−665. The original does not specify the legal outcomes or union of persons for these 39; they must not all be relabelled as findings wholly in the citizen’s favour, unlawful placements or actual returns home. Nor may the measure of court findings in the citizen’s favour stand alone as evidence that unexamined cases gave the citizen the correct legal position.

PDF14-15 counts 38 points out of 100 and 5 of 8 targets fully met. Objective 5 on improvement following a practice study has been removed because the study is only available in April 2014. PDF12 originally says 9 goals. PDF15 refers to 19 time targets and 9 not observed; its subsequent wording on 4 areas is followed by nine named groups. The figures are kept at their own level. Internal legal sub-quality 86,7 on PDF19 is a different cut from total 82,5; inadequate information about expected waiting time is part of the overall quality shortage. Guidance for 85% of municipalities does not prove better decisions; the required quantitative user survey was not carried out and the municipalities were not able to explain any change in practice following a change in law.

Managed cleanup, citizens' time and concrete evidence requirements

SFV13A, PDF10-11, describes approximately 6.000 ongoing contributions on 1 July, about 9.0001. October and below 6.000 at the end of 2013; approximately 3.000 of the oldest cases were settled from mid-October to the end of the year. Stock and closures are overlapping cuts, not 24.000 persons.40-45 new employees had to be trained. The forward-looking 9 weeks 2014 is described for applications made after 1 January 2014; older cases receive special teams. The scope of the target must be consistent with the actual date of complaint of the citizens, not make old waiting periods invisible.

SFV13H, PDF5-6,uses an unweighted 64-per-cent average for a meeting within 35 days against a target of 70%. SFV13A, table 18,has regional values of 17,1/62,2/87,3/71,7/83,0 for the first half-year and 58,0 for the second; PDF11 discusses 58% for 2013 generally. Periods and unweighted/regional/national statistics therefore cannot be harmonised without underlying data. According to PDF11,the Capital Region accounts for approximately 30% of meetings. The half-year report's 32 children's groups, the annual report's 45 in the second half-year and the prose's 75 completed in 2013 do not reconcile to the same total:32+45=77. Not a sum of persons; the basis of grouping/period allocation must be clarified.

AS13A, PDF14, has 8.500 completed by 16.000 transferred arrears, while PDF15 refers to 17.000 transferred. Both are original versions, no hidden rounding correction. Task Force 2. September 2013 / 15% extra production until mid-2015 in PDF20 is a special settlement effort at Ankestyrelsen; it shall not be confused with the municipal task force samples. Future 4-5 months level in 2016 and planned 2.000 fewer pending occupational injury cases in 2014 are targets, not proof of actual implementation. Concerns 65% at the start of the year and 82% at the end of PDF18 indicate the development of service measurement, not actual reunification.

Conclusion → proof → order: The control system's own documents show excluded time courses, known backlog and an uncoordinated time denominator. It provides a well documented demand for the full flow of cases without interruption of the registration of the citizen's losses. The specific case / time-limit, justification, urgency and effectiveness obligations shall be tested from the application / action by appeal, new decision and actual assistance / contact / return. If a continued intervention lacks a valid current basis, necessary cessation and restoration measures shall be immediately tested; a statistical indication of organisational pressure is not a legal basis. The duty, knowledge, action and guilt of the institution, management and individual staff shall be identified separately. [R04, R19; AS13A, PDF13-20; SFV13A, PDF10-11]

Documented findings are the original figures, the exclusion of merger-related cases, the table discrepancy and the acknowledged oversight deficiencies above. Suspicions of continuing separation caused by errors, unremedied loss or individual criminal culpability require original citizen case records. Missing evidence consists of exact first-/second-half-year outcomes with transferred case-record keys, all inclusion/exclusion codes for time measurement, original deadline and urgent decisions and documentation of actual redress. K01's first-half-year count gap has been closed; the full 2013 outcome matrix and the links between individuals and effects remain specific outstanding items.

Local government 2006 figures: defined national committees and original re-assessment checks;

Two original municipal annexes, not the entire national denominator population

Both annexes to the Copenhagen committee dated 10. January 2008 have been read in full; the two tables on page 1 have also been visually checked. Page 2 of annex 2 has no further table. The national figures were selected by the areas covered by the Employment and Integration Administration. Social Administration benefits and repayment obligations are excluded; integration appeals may nevertheless contain both administrations' areas. Annex 2 also excludes appeals under the Act on Legal Protection and Administration in Social Matters that could not be allocated. Therefore, 9.417 is not Denmark's entire municipal appeal count for 2006.

The appeals board figures also exclude cases in which the municipality granted full relief on reconsideration, or partial relief without a maintained complaint. This is expressly stated in the contemporaneous committee minutes. The figure 819 represents closed board cases within this scope, not all complaints received by municipalities.

All eight municipal / national rows, Annex 1

Zone	Pr.1000 input.	Finish t	Dismisse d/ referred	Stadfoe Stated	Stad%	Modified	Change%	Cases remitted	Home%	Withdraw al	Omg%
Odense	2,1	396	31	269	67,9	34	8,6	47	11,9	15	20,5
Vejle	2,0	206	12	146	70,9	20	9,7	14	6,8	14	16,6
Frederiksber g	1,7	158	7	127	80,4	5	3,2	14	8,9	5	12,0
Copenhagen	1,6	819	41	502	61,3	70	8,5	162	19,8	44	28,3
Århus	1,6	460	30	331	72,0	45	9,8	26	5,7	28	15,5
Ålborg	1,2	241	12	144	59,8	48	19,9	31	12,9	6	32,9
Randers	0,9	82	5	63	76,8	7	8,5	2	2,4	5	11,1
Whole country, defined committee	1,7	9417	576	6074	64,5	1257	13,3	1144	12,1	365	25,5

All 16 rows after performance, Annex 2

Zone	Completed	Rejected / he nvist	Stadkæsta	Stad%	Modified	Change%	Remitted	Home%	Withdrawal	Omg%
LAB: Offer / Job Plan	2	0	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	50,0	1	50,0
LAB: guidance	5	1	2	40,0	0	0,0	1	20,0	1	20,0
LAB: assistance / intro / assistance	7	0	5	71,4	0	0,0	2	28,6	0	28,6
LAB: flex job	29	0	21	72,4	2	6,9	6	20,7	0	27,8
LAB: other	11	0	8	72,7	0	0,0	2	18,2	1	18,2
LAS: cash / take-off / unemployment benefit	276	16	149	54,0	47	17,0	46	16,7	18	33,8
LAS: Rehabilitation	138	6	79	57,2	5	3,6	45	32,6	3	36,3
LAS: other delimited	23	2	12	52,2	0	0,0	3	13,0	6	13,0
Sickness benefit	244	13	156	63,9	15	6,1	50	20,5	10	26,7
Pregnancy / maternity / adoption	12	0	12	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Dagpengelov: others	66	3	54	81,8	1	1,5	5	7,6	3	9,1
Leave	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Integration, mixed development	6	0	4	66,7	0	0,0	1	16,7	0	16,7
Repatriation	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Partial pension	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total, printed	819	41	502	61,3	70	8,5	162	19,8	43	28,3

Percentages reproduce the printed original. A dash means the original's dash, not zero errors. The printed definition of the alteration/remittal rate uses altered/annulled plus remitted divided by closed cases, including rejected/discontinued cases. This is a different denominator from the later merits-based percentage. Municipality rows are subsets of the national row and must not be added to it.

Arithmetic and linguistic deviations preserved in the source chain

The national outcome sum is 9.416, while closures are shown as 9.417. Copenhagen’s discontinued cases are 44 in annex 1 and 43 in annex 2. The benefit rows in annex 2 yield 819 closures, but the outcomes shown are 41 dismissed,502 upheld,70 amended,162 remitted and 43 discontinued, totalling 818. The integration row shows six closures, while four upheld and one remitted yield only five outcomes. No extra case or correction of discontinued cases is constructed to make the sum fit.

Annex 2 gives the overturning rate for flex jobs as 27,8 per cent, whereas(2+6)/29 gives 27,6 with normal rounding to one decimal place; cash/start assistance is given as 33,8 against 93/276=33,7; vocational rehabilitation 36,3 against 50/138=36,2; sickness benefits 26,7 against 65/244=26,6. Thus not all the original percentages can be recalculated from the displayed numerators and denominators.

The main account's remittal-for-reconsideration percentage of 19,5 also differs from the 19,8 in both annexes; the national figure of 1,7 per 1000 inhabitants is described in the text as a percentage, which is a different unit. None of these local reconciliations reduces the documented amendments/remittals for reconsideration to zero.

Inspection 2006, Report 2010: 18 of 40 reassessment deadlines exceeded

The Ombudsman's original sections 4.2.4-4.2.5 have been read physically PDF68-73; notification and closure physically 74. The 40 borrowed cases are selected control material, not a random national sample. The time shall be measured from the receipt of the municipality to the transmission, but the report shall deduct, where possible, waiting time for other information / observations. This, therefore, is not the whole calendar cycle of the citizen.

Group	Investigated	Exceeding 4 weeks	Average	Shortest	Longest	Separate information
Cash benefits, Case 1 -8	8	5	5 weeks	5 days	10 weeks 1 day	Three out of five delayed without notification
Reimbursement, Case 9-15	7	4	4 weeks less than 6 days	1 week 1 day	9 weeks 2 days	Four of four delayed without notification
Pensionsincrease, 16-20	5	3	5 weeks	5 days	9 weeks	Case 19 complaint 23.12.2005, sent 27.1.2006
Auxiliary products, Case 21-30	10	0	Not available	Not available	Not available	All deadlines seemed to have been observed.
Early retirement, Case 31-40	10	6	6 weeks 4 days	1 week 2 days	15 weeks 4 days	One of six delayed without notification.

The disjoint groups give 40 cases and 18 deadline overruns/45 per cent: social services administration 9/25 and employment administration 9/15. The latter are the same 18 broken down by administration, not a further 18 errors. Missing notification comprises at least eight identified occurrences in the social assistance(3), repayment(4) and disability pension(1) groups; they are within the deadline group and are not added as eight new citizens. The incompletely counted pension-increase group is not changed to zero notification errors.

Case 6 is described with five days of treatment from a written complaint, but the report gives the impression of previous oral / personal complaints without journal notes. It is a proven lack of registration and a concrete, earlier starting issue, not a verified additional date. Case 8's receipt came one week after internal transfer, although the municipality had received the complaint about four weeks earlier. The report states that internal transfers do not reset the start of the deadline. Case 19 ranges from 23 December 2005 to 27 January 2006; it is included as a historical control case ending during the period, not as a new 2006 complaint.

The importance, responsibility and requirements of the evidence

Conclusion: The 2006 material already documents that the municipality's own reconsideration can delay access to review and that appeal statistics omit favourable municipal findings. **Original evidence:** The two statistical annexes, the minutes' express exclusions and the cases identified by the inspection. **Discrepancy:** An internal start date and unrecorded earlier contacts can shorten a reported waiting time; the printed 2006 totals and percentages require reconciliation. **Relevant rule:** The inspection report cites the reconsideration and notification rules applicable at the time, including the four-week deadline and immediate handling of urgent appeals. Historical section numbers are not current statutory text. **Act/omission and legal departure:**18 established missed deadlines and a specific failure to notify. **Significance for the outcome:** Delayed forwarding and insufficient information to the individual; substantive invalidity, actual loss of benefits and back payment require the individual case files. **Responsibility and specific demand:** Disclose original receipts, notes of oral appeals, grounds for postponement, forwarding, final outcomes and payment/assistance dates; count favourable findings on reconsideration separately before national aggregation.

The end of the report after the municipality's described actions is a check-out. It is not an original evidence of later actual timeliness in all new cases. Nor is any personal criminal guilt derived solely from the 18 temptations. The self-criticism of the lack of record keeping and information is maintained even when the total intervention time cannot yet be measured.

Reassessments, objections and complaint populations

Controlled October 7, 2026. This module fills in concrete parts of K03 and K04; it does not establish a national full re-assessment series. A row may contain several decision events in the same case. The number of cases cannot be converted into unique citizens without identifiers and the reconciliation of repetitive processes.

Municipal original statements

Product: loss of earnings [Gen- VAR24]

Period	Population	Decisions	Complaints	Amended by: reassessment;	Transmitted to AS	Withdrawn
2023	Section 42 of the Services Act, Varde	161	37	14	15	8
2024, first quarter	Law of the child § 87, Varde	32	1	1	0	0

The original's pp. 20-22 use both "proposed decision" and amended decision for the 14; their final decision status must be clarified before classification as unlawful final decisions. The own-initiative supervision covered 21 case files: 9 first-time decisions and 12 amendments on follow-up; unchanged follow-up decisions were not included. Four courses lasted 7-12 months; two decisions relied on irrelevant considerations. Overlap between the two findings is not stated. The one appeal case in 2024 was corrected for missing medical information and reasons; it is already included in the table. Locator: printed pp. 20-24, PDF pp. 22-26; delimitation p. 19/PDF21.

Copenhagen: Social Services [GEN-KK14]

Year	Reality complaints	Complaints of admissibility
2009	2.468	294
2010	2.421	439
2011	3.446	744
2012	2.960	624
2013	2.560	642
2014	2.256	598

Original PDF, table 7, p. 8. The exercise of public authority is included; service provision, including day and residential services, is excluded. 2009-2013 was updated on 28. October 2014; the 2014 count is dated 13. March 2015. Open reconsiderations are excluded from the outcome figure. A partly favourable finding may still lead to an appeal; a wholly favourable finding locally is not included as a new AS decision. The charts' exact reconsideration counts are not published in the PDF reviewed. The agenda text mentions both 598 and 584 procedural complaints in 2014; the table's 598 is used with the version conflict visible. The figures are complaints, not established errors.

Copenhagen: Beskæftigelses- og Integrationsforvaltningen [GEN-KKBIF24]

Year	Citizen's Adviser formal complaints;	BIF's formal complaint	Original sum	Reality complaints
2023	246	630	876	1.702
2024	277	579	856	1.861

PDF-s.2-3, Table 1-2. The original states that complaints sent by the Citizens' Adviser to BIF are included in BIF's statement. Therefore, the original arithmetic sum 876 / 856 is not verified number of unique formalities. Reassessment results are not set out in the Annex. Reality complaints and formal complaints shall not be added together as persons either.

Housing aid: actual pre-control and post-control [Gen- UK21]

Period and unit	2019	2020, January-September	Total
Recovery proceedings	1.300.000	950.000	2.250.000
Official letters	800.000	600.000	1.400.000
Objections	30.000	20.000	50.000
Finding in favour on objection	17.000	11.000	28.000
Complaints	2.239	1.073	3.312
Finding in favour on appeal	100	30	130
As decided on in substance	615	326	941
AS Confirmed	520	282	802
AS remitted	22	15	37
AS amended	73	29	102
AS repealed	0	0	0

Table 6.1,p. 56: the large, rounded process volumes are the original's figures, not exact register counts. AS table 2.2,p. 17, is a different decision population. The sample is 45 reconsideration processes with favourable findings, without AS consideration, selected before September 2020; two cases nevertheless contained new information. Table 3.2/6.2,pp. 25/58:

AS Assessment	Initial decision	New Decision
Correct	19	26
Not correct	20	11
Partly correct	1	3
Cannot be determined / otherwise	5	5

All 11 new incorrect decisions followed originally correct decisions (p.57). Five correct amendments were due to changed practice (p.25). 45 sequences are 90 decision events, not 90 individuals. The sample does not document the error rate among the 28.000 objections. The publication page states that principle notice 27-22 subsequently changed practice concerning specific benefit amounts.

2026: survey of workflows [GEN- AS26]

The survey includes 93 managers from 84 municipalities and 107 case handlers from 83: 200 replies from 89 different municipalities; two partial replies. All 98 municipalities were invited. Several answers may come from the same municipality. In addition, group interviews in four municipalities, five citizens' advisers in three interviews and four experts. Prior to the complaint, respondents provided oral + written 29%, oral 19%, written 6%, no 35%, other 11%; following the complaint 21%, 15%, 31%, 26%, 7%. These are respondents' information on the most recent case, not nationally counted changes, deadlines or illegality. Locator: method s.47-50; contact p.17-19; summary p.7-9 2026 is not included in 2006-2025 -sums.

Importance of the report count and evidence requirements

The lack of a national series of re-assessments is an independent blind spot: citizens can get a change of decision before Ankestyrelsen receive a complaint. It cannot be counted as zero error or completed by adding municipal examples to national appeals volume. On the contrary, change alone does not prove that the first decision was wrong. The housing aid sample also shows the need for verification of the decision issued after the complaint.

For a complete census, a balanced extract from the municipality's journal systems and the register of the Appeal Board is required: stable pseudonymised case and person identifier; statutory provision; first date of decision and outcome;

complaint date; full/partial relief, maintenance of the decision, withdrawal and rejection; new information or a change in the legal position; forwarding date; AS decision date/outcome; subsequent municipal decision and actual implementation. Repeat complaints, multiple decisions in the same case, Borgerrådgiveren's referrals and annual renewed decisions must be deduplicated separately.

K03 is partly substantively completed by the counts above. The national 20-year series, a complete list of all locally published reconsideration statistics and the underlying raw outcome cells for Copenhagen 2014 constitute a specific data need; the entire known 8-page annex has now been read as text and PDF2-7 visually checked in the separate module, where no precise outcome labels are available. K04: the housing benefit study's 66 pages and both separate 12-page annexes have now been fully checked as to substance. All tables, figures, samples and case trajectories are set out in genberegning-boligstoette2021-fulde-tabeller-og-genvurderingsforloeb.md; the specific links between individuals and payment timing are still not published here.

Housing support 2021: full original control of tables, re-evaluation and annexes

The entire main report on 66 pages and both separate 12-page annexes are text-read in memory. All 10 numbered tables and 7 figures in the main report have been checked; Figure 2.1 is a straight line diagram without numbers. In addition, the two summaries of cases in Annex 2 have been visually checked. No original or original image is stored locally. The verification below replaces the previous status of unread subtables and annexes.

This is the same 45 selected courses as in GEN- UDK 21. Before / after decisions, the sub-groups of the Annex and the re-calculation months provide no additional population. The April 2021 version of the publication is registered according to its current practice; no conclusion is drawn on the current legal situation.

Sources and actual controls

Original	Pages	SHA256	URL
Main report	66	b59629e0ed69afce5be44571d7f7b2ea46ff77503beea8a18d0525b41f17ba03	https://www.ast.dk/Media/639136624739533665/18-30107-2-afgoerelser-om-genberegning-af-boligstoette-ankestyrelsens-undersoegelse-af-u-20890868_1024439_0.pdf
Annex 2: UDK18 Dec 2020	12	b8ebdceed6f93f3aa5f4034cd1e2e45853daaf5a8055f383b5031061d0a88a68	https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732332192107429/Bilag-2-til-Ankestyrelsens-unders%C3%B8gelse-af-Udbetaling-Danmarks-genvurdering-af-p%C3%A5klagede-afg%C3%B8relser-om-genberegning-af-bolig.pdf
Annex 3: STAR	12	0086b7ac316c1bcb772452dab4a11cde909002954b18dbe03e2d3ab97e48b254	https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732361226441244/bilag-3-vejledende-udtalelser-fra-styrelsen-for-arbejdsmarked-og-rekruttering.pdf

PDF page number and printed page number are the same. Visual inspection of the main report: 8, 16, 17, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 44, 45, 49, 56, 58. Annex 2: p.9-10 Annex 3 contains three opinions, no case statistics table.

Samples, exclusions and overlap

Main report pp.7/57/59-60: UDK submitted the 45 most recent recalculation cases before September 2020 in which relief was granted on reconsideration. They had therefore not been subject to appeal proceedings in Ankestyrelsen. New information was to be excluded, but ID 3 and 34 were retained as examples even though they should have been excluded. The study is expressly not representative.

On the other hand, Annex 2 p.4 / 7 states that all 13 system decisions were submitted incorrectly and, in the opinion of the UDK, fall outside the scope of the Directive; therefore, the UDK uses 32 manual originals as a learning basis. This does not alter the actual 45-denominator of the main report. Date of birth and local case number are fields in Annex 1, but there is no public person key or full 45 case list. Duplicated exclusion and household integrity have not been documented.

Objections before a decision, complaints to the UDK and complaints forwarded to Ankestyrelsen are different process steps. Official letters are decisions only when the time limit expires without objection; Graph 2.1 / p.16-20 makes a distinction between them. National flows cannot therefore be summed up as errors, persons or independent cases.

All numerical tables and figures

Table 2.1: Housing Support Act, actual complaints

1.719 / 1.578 / 3.297 complaints; 2020 January-September. Source: Main Report PDF-s.16.

Outcome	2019	2020 Jan-September	Total	Original share%
Staging	1.362	1.316	2.678	81,2
Remittal for reconsideration	184	155	339	10,3
Repeal	1	4	5	0,2
Amendment	172	103	275	8,3
Total	1.719	1.578	3.297	100

Table 2.2: recalculation, admissible complaints

615 / 326 / 941 appeals; sub-set of Table 2.1. Source: Main Report PDF-s.17.

Outcome	2019	2020 Jan-September	Total	Original share%
Staging	520	282	802	85,2
Remittal for reconsideration	22	15	37	3,9
Repeal	0	0	0	0
Amendment	73	29	102	10,8
Total	615	326	941	100

Table 3.2 and 6.2; Figure 1.1; repeated separately in Table 4.1 / 5.1

45 procedures, one original and one new decision in each. Source: Main Report PDF-p.8 / 25 / 29 / 44 / 58.

Classification	Original	New
Correct	19	26
Not correct	20	11
Partly correct	1	3
Unable to settle	5	5

Table 3.3: reasons for correct calculation

19 correct original / 26 correct new; categories overlap. Source: Main Report PDF-p.26

Reason	Original	New
Accruals	0	20
One-off amount / decision amount	7	0
Proper income	19	26
Other	2	3

Table 3.4: Form of decision

45 original / 45 new. Source: Main Report PDF-p.27.

Form	Original	New
System Decision	13	0
Non-system decision	32	44
Unexplained	0	1
Total	45	45

Table 3.5: Original form of decision and accuracy

13 system decisions / 32 other / 45 total. Source: Main Report PDF-p.28.

Classification	System	Other	Total
Correct	4	15	19
Not correct	9	11	20
Partly correct	0	1	1
Unable to settle	0	5	5
Total	13	32	45

Figure 3.1: topic of recalculation

45 courses; several topics per case. Source: Main Report PDF-p.24.

Subject	Number
Distribution of income	35
Stop	1
Changes in income	45
Other	7

Figure 4.1: Characteristics of original decisions

Figure title says 20 not correct; bread text includes partial / unexplained, see deviations. Source: Main Report PDF-s.30.

Characteristics	Graph Cell
Double payout	14
Domino effect	1
System Error	5

Figure 4.2: Correct original decisions

19 original decisions. Source: Main Report PDF-p.35.

Characteristics	Number
Startup	7

Characteristics	Number
Repayment / regulation	5
Income not allocated	2
Domino effect	5

Figure 5.1: incorrect new decisions

11 new decisions; grapevgend read visually, the categories of the summary differ. Source: Main Report PDF-p.45.

Characteristics	Graph Cell
Repayment / regulation	4
Startup	7

Figure 5.2: Correct New Decisions

26 new decisions; system errors differ from the main text's 5. Source: main report PDF p. 49.

Characteristics	Graph Cell
System Error	4
Double payout	13
Domino effect	6
Overpayment	1
Relocation	2

Table 6.1: Payment Denmark's recalculation flow

2019 / January-September 2020; repeated monthly decisions, not persons. Source: Main Report PDF-p.56.

Event	2019	2020 Jan-September	Original total
Recovery proceedings	1.300.000	950.000	2.250.000
Official letters	800.000	600.000	1.400.000
Objections	30.000	20.000	50.000
Objections upheld	17.000	11.000	28.000
Success rate for objections %	57	55	-
Complaints	2.239	1.073	-
Appeals upheld	100	30	130

Annex 2 p.9: Manual decisions, initially incorrect

11 anonymous rows from the same 45 course; without case ID. Source: Annex 2 PDF-s.9.

Row	Type	Original	New
1	Double payout	No	Yes
2	Double payout	No	Yes

Row	Type	Original	New
3	Double payout	No	Yes
4	Double payout	No	Yes
5	Double payout	No	Yes
6	Double payout	No	Yes
7	Double payout	No	Yes
8	Double payout	No	Partial
9	Double payout	No	Yes
10	Domino effect	No	Yes
11	Relocation	No	Yes

Annex 2 p.10: Manual decisions, originally correct / new incorrect

8 anonymised rows from the same 45 course; without case ID. Source: Annex 2 PDF-p.10.

Row	Type	Original	New
1	Repayment / regulation	Yes	No
2	Repayment / regulation	Yes	No
3	Repayment / regulation	Yes	No
4	Repayment / regulation	Yes	No
5	Quarterly income	Yes	No
6	Startup	Yes	No
7	Startup	Yes	No
8	Startup	Yes	No

Additional text figures and selection accounts

Sample 45; the sub-population of the series indicated in the workpiece. Source: Main Report PDF-p.6-7 / 23-26 / 34 / 41-48 / 55 / 57 / 59.

Statement	Number	Limitation
Housing support complaint 2019	6.555	All housing subsidies, not only recalculation
UDK amended complaints 2019%	12	All housing benefits; exactly counts not published here
Sample	45	Most recent sequence leading to finding in favour before submission in September 2020
Failure to submit new information cases	2	ID3 / 34 kept in 45
Other: technical reclassification	4	Part of 7 Other cases
Other: removal	2	Part of 7 Other cases
Other: extra household member	1	Part of 7 Other cases
Corrected originals and new	6	The same course of action, including 5 changes in practice
Practice changed among both correct	5	Not original error on report assessment

Statement	Number	Limitation
Income register assessed by correct original	8	19 correct originals
Income register assessed by correct new	17	26 correct new
Absence of income recording in the event of a system failure	3	5 System Error Mode
Dominoeffect -December 2019 original	5	6 domino effect courses; later practice
Dominoeffect -February 2020 original	1	6 domino effect courses; new practices should be known
New correct, original not correct	18	26 new correct
New correct, original part	1	26 new correct
New correct, original correct	6	26 new correct
New correct, original open	1	26 new correct
Wrong new, originally correct	11	All 11 according to heads.57
New non-system decision known	44	1 new has unsolved form; p.57 all 11 wrong are manual

Table 6.1 shows a dash as the appeal total; the body text on p. 57 states 3.312. 2.239+1.073=3.312 is also an own recalculation. 28.000/50.000=56% is an own calculation using rounded figures, not an original overall percentage. Favourable findings on objections are not necessarily established original illegality.

Deviations inside the originals

Search	Original information	Handling
Double payout, original	p.26 / p.31: 13 not correct; p.30 graph / p.29: 14; p.31 refers to one unresolved among 14	Maintain 13 / 14 and classification; no independent additional error
System error, original	p.9: 4 of 20; p.29 / p.30: 5; p.34: 4 not correct + 1 part	Graph groups may include partial decision
Start-up / back-up, new	p.44: 4 / 7; Figure 5.1: 7 / 4; p.45: 5 startup wrong + 2 partial; p.47: 4 post-payment	Graphlend controlled; no harmonisation
System error, new	Figure 5.2 / p.44: 4; p.52: 5 correct	Keep figure and text separately
Wrong New → Original System	p.11: 4; p.57: 2; Annex 2 p.10: 8 manual of 11 (3)	No verified common allocation amount
Case ID28	p. 33 cash assistance; p. 50 resource programme benefit	The same ID is kept together; the performance identity is not reconstructed
Relocation error	Main p. 55 missing registration/processing; annex 2 p. 10 already registered, incorrect handling of personal scope	Two explanations of authority, no independent original records published here
Annex 2 p.9	9 double-payment rows, of which 1 new partial; subsequent text says correct	The sub-status of the table is maintained
Annex 3 date	Annex 2 p.11: 28 June 2018; Annex 3: 10: 28 July 2018	The date deviation of the output is retained; second note 24 April 2018 explicitly

Local case IDs, economy and actual waiting time

The following 16 local IDs are deduced on the same report ID; repeated mention in pre- / post chapters gives the same row. The other 29 runways have not been published in this report. Rows without individual IDs in Annex 2 cannot be safely connected to these 16. An ID is not verified personal integrity.

Local ID	PDF Page	Progress	Amount / result	Efficacy / limit of evidence
1	33-34	Partial allocation by period; two earlier months of resource programme benefit in November	Partly correct p.33 / not correct p.34	No actual payment date
3	34-35/52	Double pension and additional household member	DKK 557 off in June; new decision DKK 557 back	Payment promised within 5 working days; actual bank post missing; new information should be deleted
5	36-37/46	Cash start-up and reimbursement SU	New decision partially correct; 721 kr. a conto announced	No actual payment date
8	42/50-51	Cash benefits / pensions and domino effect	Finding in favour; calculation promised after 2-3 months	New calculation decision actually 5 months later; bank date / amount missing
11	32/49-50	SU double paid	482 kr missing housing allowance; new payment of advance 482 kr.	Squeeze warning, unconfirmed effectiveness
16	37-38	Start-up benefit	Initially correct after the assessment of the report at that time	September / October paid in November; new result not case-tested
17	31-32	Delayed daily allowances	Requirement 1.866 DKK; no January 2020 amount; remaining 80 DKK for annual statement	Decision tree quarling; bank post missing
28	33/50	Double payout	2.573 DKK new payment on account; 237 DKK moved September → August	Originally social assistance, later resource programme benefit; identity/benefit conflict
29	53-54	Start explained as double payout	New wrong after report; 1.019 kr. a conto announced	No actual payment date
30	41/51-52	Domino effect June-October 2019	DKK 2.661 for October + DKK 121 for July announced	Squeeze, not actual bank date
32	38-39/47-4 8	Regulation of resourse ceforløbsbegiveningen	1.185 DKK income; 213 DKK a conto announced 2 Jan 2020	NemAccount rather than housing company; performance not documented
33	39-40/47	Repaid daily allowances	29.988 kr. income; finding in favour, but still no housing benefit in July	No net payment despite finding in favour
34	52	System View Error	658 kr. supplement required back	New information should be deleted; new correct decision may involve reimbursement
36	43	Deferred income correction	Opposition 20 Aug 2019; notification of new objection ca 20 Sep 2019	No conclusion on correctness or closure
44	45-46	Start of disability pension	518 kr. overpayment in December/January determined on the same day as finding in favour	Amount included in annual statement; finding in favour may shift debt
45	55	Daughter relocated 1 March 2019	637 kr. a conto announced	Income continues to be included; the cause of registration / proceedings is disputed in Annex 2;

Advance amounts and dates in decision excerpts are the authority's promises of payment unless a later event is specified. ID8 documents that the new calculation decision came only 5 months after a favourable finding; it does not document the bank payment date. ID33 shows a favourable finding without housing benefit in the recalculated month. ID44 shows that a favourable finding can result in debt for earlier months. Therefore no aggregate net loss or number of individuals whose position was corrected is calculated.

The table of the Annex and the state's knowledge

Annex 1 pp. 61-66 is a blank assessment form, not an additional dataset. It measures benefit/income type, form of decision, correctness, calculation, deficiencies in the factual basis and interpretation of practice. Multiple selections are permitted. No completed set of 45 forms, age tables or counts of person categories is published here.

Annex 2 p.5-8 is the UDK's own statement 18 Dec 2020: monthly cross-cutting review from August 2020 and possible search / resumption of uncontested decisions. UDK states that system errors and other affected cases were

corrected / resumed. There is no list, number, post-check or payment record with the statement. It is therefore counted as informed action, not verified full repair.

Annex 3 p.4-12 documents STAR's guidance on the distribution of income, specific exceptions and retention by post-regulation over the year. The source chain is STAR guidance → The Appeals Board's practice → EXCISE instructions / decisions. Annex 2 p.11 recognises the incorrect application of rules in the case of post-payment / regulation. At start-up / quarterly income, UDK describes other interpretation and wants clarification. The actual differences and date deviations are maintained above; the statements of authority do not automatically have the value of proof of proper practice.

Documented results and concrete residue

The known readable residue is closed: 90 original pages, all numerical figures / tables and both separate annexes are processed. The scoreboard 20 original not correct and 11 new not correct are the same 45 runs and must not be added to the national complaint numbers as individuals.

The remains are precise data needs at UDK /Ankestyrelsen: anonymised 45-case key and completed measurement forms, audit history of category / system number conflicts, concrete recovery cases without complaint and actual payment / set-off dates with net amounts. They are not unread annexes in the three publicly retrievable originals. No contact has been sent.

Copenhagen complaints statistics 2014: the whole annex and unlabelled outcomes

The well-known reading hole is completed: the entire 8-page annex dated March 13, 2015 is actually the RAM text read. PDF2-7 is also directly visually read in memory. All 7 table headers cover diagrams; the outcome diagrams on PDF6-7 have no precise number labels, percentage labels or outcome indicators. The printed year of the original from Table 7 can be reconciled; the size of the circular sectors cannot reasonably replace the missing figures. No official original or image is saved. [GEN-KK14F]

Table 7: All printed annual tables

Year	Reality complaints	Complaints of admissibility	Original site
2009	2468	294	PDF8
2010	2421	439	PDF8
2011	3446	744	PDF8
2012	2960	624	PDF8
2013	2560	642	PDF8
2014	2256	598	PDF8
Own sum 2009-2014	16.111	3.341	Sum of six original annual cells; not personal union

The original states that 2009-2013 was counted as at 28. October 2014.2014’s 2.256+598=2.854 is the same annual population already used. Full rereading creates no new appeal cases. Category totals for six years give 19.452 registration instances; the same citizen, multiple appeals and overlap between substantive and formal complaints are not identified.

Full scope of the other diagrams

Original	What the original actually shows	Specific figures / evidence
Table 1, PDF2	Two monthly curves divided into five control units; axis 0- 160 / 0- 40	No exact curve cells. Month / unit raw data required
Table 2, PDF3	Two distributions over 10 main types of case	No counters, no exact shares. Unclassified formality is included as category
Table 3, PDF4	Material part repeats the classification of the case; formal part has 10 complaints	Long time / missing answers, contact, decision terms, information and guidance are provided; no exact counters are available
Table 4, PDF5	Complainants in each of the two categories	The recipient track / person overlap of the same complaint cannot be deduced
Table 5, PDF6	Substantive outcomes: affirmation, finding wholly/partly in favour, late appeal, lapse, remainder; procedural outcomes: finding wholly in favour, affirmation, remainder, finding partly in favour	No precise numerators / denominators. Annual figures are not automatically mentioned for decided complaints
Table 6, PDF7	Appeal outcomes: affirmation, remittal, late appeal, lapse, amendment, remainder; the procedural section reports no forwarded appeals in 2014	No precise anchor cells. Absence of this recorded track is not the absence of all error of formality
Table 7, PDF8	All 12 printed annual cells reproduced above	No unread cell in the printed annual table

Separate figures and conflict of presentation

The submission for political consideration dated 22. April 2015 states that the service-provider area is excluded and that undecided complaints are not included in outcomes. It gives approximately 50.000 cases and 5,7% complaints. Formal outcomes are described as approximately half finding wholly/partly in the party's favour, a third upheld and a fifth other; appeal outcomes as approximately 70% upheld, 10% remitted for reconsideration and 2% amended. Just over half of forwarded complaints were undecided. These expressions of magnitude are not exact cell counts. The submission gives 598 formal complaints, but its parenthesis states 642→584 together with a 6,9% decrease. The annex gives 598; the conflict is retained. Reduction targets of 3%/10% and previous changes of 13,5%/2,9% must be kept separate from error rates. [GEN-KK14POL]

Highest sustainable criticism and demands

The submission by the municipality documents a limited track of complaints and an unsuccessful appeal outcome. It is an inventory of registered complaint activity, the access, registration and delimitation of which must be controlled by itself. A decrease in the number of complaints cannot only prove fewer illegal acts or better actual help. The absence of the export area makes a separate requirement for the registration of daily and daily offers concrete. The absence of raw cells also makes it practical to require the underlying tables rather than to estimate outcomes from coloured circular sectors.

The review of consequences must follow each original decision through municipal reassessment, a finding wholly/partly in the party's favour, forwarding, the appeal decision and actual provision, contact or payment. It must show which citizens continued to wait during the undecided part and when a registered finding in the party's favour took effect. The existing 8 original pages have been fully examined; the missing raw figures are no longer a gap in reading but a precise demand for documents from the municipality.

Time of the Board of Appeal, revised control objectives and effective protection

Conclusion: longer allowed waiting is not the restoration of rights

The national control programme demonstrates that the objective of 13 weeks of treatment of municipal complaints was not met, but was subsequently replaced by a target of 30 weeks. The end of the national audit in 2025 was based on the fact that the measured times were below the new target. It does not document that citizens had received help within 13 weeks or that losses during the waiting period were repaired. The Board of Appeal's annual report for 2025 then indicates about 35 weeks and failure to meet the 30-week target. This is an independent track of responsibility on actual access to testing and assistance. [AT07, p.3-4; AT13, p.8-11]

The report retains both remittal and redress actually carried out. An appeal decision closes one registered process; it does not show when a benefit was paid in arrears, assistance delivered or a child returned home.

Therefore, the development of the control measure is compared with original dates and the evidence missing between decision and actual effect. Timelimits, legal time limits and Convention requirements have different legal effects and must be tested separately.

The historical course and the modification of the measurement method

Control Point	Original number	Meaning of the citizen's review
The names, 2011	18,2 weeks social; 17,7 employment; 18,0 total	Country weighted average, not one uniform waiting period for all
The names, first half of 2013	28,6 social and 23,6 employment in the Annex figure	Average of regional times; weighting other than 2011
Transfer 1 July 2013	Some 17.000 cases pending	Stock of cases, not new or already decided
2014	7 months / 30 weeks; December 5,8 months / 25 weeks	Annual averages and December measurement are different
2015	4,2 months / 18 weeks	Continued above the previous target of 3,25 months / 14 weeks
2016	4,5 months / 20 weeks	The new target of 3,5 months is about 4,5 months of treatment.
2018, Rigsrevisionen	21,3 weeks for municipal complaints and Payment Denmark overall	30.206 cases closed; not all types of action brought by the Board of Appeal
2021, same control track	13,9 weeks total; municipal social 15,5; employment 13,5	The total includes Udbetaling Danmark; it is not solely municipal
2023 and 2024, final note 2025	18,5 and 27,5 weeks	Meets the new 30-week; does not meet the 13-week goal
2025, Annual Report of the Board of Appeal	About 35 weeks	The new target of 30 weeks was also exceeded.

Sources: AT01 physical PDF17 and 20; AT02 physical PDF24-27 and 31-34; AT03 p.4-6; AT05 physical PDF21; AT06 p.4; AT07 p.3-4; AT13 p.8-11 The complete series of figures, including the regional and quarterly differences, are listed in the following Annex with 14 tables and 200 rows of figures. A certain number is a number in a source, not a number of identified citizens.

The historical review also shows why the measurement method must accompany the figures. Rigsrevisionen’s 2014 report states 28,3 weeks for the social appeals boards and 24,7 weeks for the employment appeals boards for the second quarter of 2013; the annex states 28,6 and 23,6 for the first half-year. These are different periods and must not be interpreted as an arithmetic error. However, the report explains that the historical measure was based on the average of regional averages. A large and a small region can therefore receive the same weight. The national figures in the 2011 original are weighted by cases processed. The two series cannot be joined into one continuous national time series without recalculating the underlying counts. [AT01, physical PDF17; AT02, physical PDF24-25 and31]

Of the cases transferred, 35% were older than six months and 1% older than a year in July 2013. In March 2014 the corresponding figures were 36 percent and about 7 percent. A further 3.036 old cases had been decided until 28 February 2014. The 129 completed old cases in a special effort of 18 November-20 December 2013 are separate decision-making events. Some 4.500 cases were set up by two teams in December; the creation may not be changed to 4.500 decisions or re-established rights. [AT02, physical PDF24-27]

The 2017 control decision was not accepted as the end point by the State auditors, who maintained follow-up. In 2019, the old track was transferred to a new report. This transfer is also not evidence that the problems had been solved. The 2017 note conversion uses 4,3 weeks per month; it would be wrong to recalculate the printed targets by four weeks. [AT03; AT04]

The original 2018 population: 42.837 time-measured cases and several exclusions

Group, 2018	Number	Average, weeks	More than 13 weeks	More than one year
Local employment	16.614	21,2	70,5 %	2,7 %
Local social area	10.221	20,8	69,3 %	1,9 %
Payment Denmark	3.371	23,7	69,2 %	9,0 %
The three groups together	30.206	21,3	70,0 %	3,1 %
Injury at work	12.631	31,6	Not the same 13 weeks	8,7 %

Table 1 of the original, physical PDF21, constitutes the basis. The 30.206 and 12.631 are disjunction groups in this time scale and provide 42.837 time-measured cases. The average of 21,3 is not the average of four shown averages. The rounded percentages also do not give exact integer numbers of persons or temptations. [AT05]

The methodology of the report shows the following chain: 44.429 extracted cases minus 1.526 duplicates, 54 cases in wrong areas and 12 time-void registrations give 42.837. The 12 are explained in one place as missing date of receipt or a date of receipt after the decision, while the table box refers to missing date of decision. The actual cause of registration requires a vote; both sources are retained. The dates of the method section for withdrawals from the systems are in January 2018, although the population covers the whole of 2018. This chronology requires a source correction and is not amended tacitly until January 2019. [AT05, physical PDF49-50]

The analysis of internal workflows uses a different starting population of 42.891, which includes the 54 miscategorised cases again. Deducting 809 cases without records, 11.716 in Captia, 874 outside the period, 440 reopenings and 722 created after the period gives 28.330. This population forms the basis of the workflow analysis and cannot be equated with the 42.837 in the time calculation. Two of 11 record types have only a date and are assigned an estimated time of 06; nine have an actual timestamp. [AT05, physical PDF53 and56]

The process analysis describes an average of 4,3 weeks of administration, 9,3 weeks between work stages and 4,9 weeks of substantive case handling. This cannot be rewritten as meaning that the entire national appeal population experienced exactly 9,3 weeks of inactivity. However, the survey documents a separate capacity issue: time between work stages is part of the time during which the citizen awaits protection. The productivity calculation’s assumption of maintained quality is not a substantive check that the decisions are correct. The report expressly does not examine this. [AT05, physical PDF18 and27-28]

Special time limits and unexplained denominators

Table 3 in the 2018 report has been checked against the table image itself, physical PDF26. It states 103 notice cases with 0,7 per cent exceeding the deadline, 259 previously remitted cases with 0,4 per cent, 185 children’s cases with 27,0 per cent and 191 cases concerning insured unemployed people with 23,0 per cent. The average overrun for the last two groups is stated as 2,7 and 4,4 weeks respectively. [AT05]

For advance-notice and previously remitted cases, the counts shown include only cases without a registered request for further information. At that time, Ankestyrelsen could not generally register when the information was complete. The unknown number of other cases is therefore a specific exclusion from this deadline analysis. They must be counted neither as timely nor as unlawful without further documentation.

There is also an arithmetic vote: no integer share with the denominator 103 is rounded to 0,7 percent to one decimal. One case would give 0,97 percent; zero equals zero. The percentage shown therefore requires another denominator, a separate calculation method or a correction. This is a documented voting problem, not evidence of 0,721 citizens or of a certain hidden number. On the other hand, the corresponding combination of 259 and 0,4 per cent could be one case. A calculated option does not replace the original's unlit numerator.

In the 2022 follow-up, the reported proportion of deadline overruns for insured unemployed people falls from 23 per cent in 2018 to 0 per cent in 2021 and for children from 27 to 1 per cent. Previously remitted cases show 4 per cent overruns in 2021, while the text elsewhere describes 86 per cent timeliness for 2019-2021. These periods and selections must be reconciled before a common timeliness rate of 96 per cent is stated. Advance-notice cases show 0 in 2021. None of these improvements documents actual payment of arrears or a child's return home. [AT06, pp.5-6]

An annual percentage target does not necessarily cover all cases received. For example, the annual report 2022 limits the target of 10 weeks for payment Denmark / sickness benefit for cases received in the third and fourth quarter of 2022. Annual Report 2023 reproduces the same 2022 cohort. It shall not be renamed to all decisions or citizens by 2023. [AT10, physical PDF11; AT11, physical PDF12-13]

Four original citizens' programmes: the weeks of the Authority must be tested against the dates

The 2014 report has four examples. They are four examples of complaints, not four findings of material illegality. Three ended with confirmation and one with remittal for reconsideration back. A confirmation does not in itself resolve procedural rights or documented losses during the waiting period. [AT02, physical PDF33 -34]

The remitted sanctions case has the following printed dates:

Event	Date	Calculated interval to remittal on 10. March 2014
Municipal decision	13 November 2013	117 calendar days
Complaint	3 December 2013	97 calendar days
Commune transmission	16 January 2014	53 calendar days
Receipt by the Appeal Board	5 February 2014	33 calendar days
Remittal for reconsideration	10 March 2014	0

The municipality forwarded the case 44 days after the complaint. The original nevertheless states five weeks of processing in Ankestyrelsen and eight weeks in the municipality. These statements do not correspond to 53 and 44 days respectively. The five weeks are closer to 33 days from the acknowledgement; this is a possible calculation, not evidence of an undisclosed start registration. The sum of the printed 13 weeks gives 91 days, while complaint-to-remittal is 97 days. The calculations use the ordinary difference between dates without counting both endpoints. [AT02]

Meaning of proof: An unclear starting point may shorten the citizen's waiting time in the check-up than in the course of events. **Relevant rule and deviation:** Timely and effective review shall be assessed from the legally relevant events, including the reassessment and transmission of the municipality, with the specific deadline and its possible legal extension. A remittal for reconsideration shows the need for further processing; the original does not provide sufficient information on grounds of error, penalties or post-payment to establish them. **Consistency, responsibility and concrete requirements:** Submit the decision, appeal, receipt log, reassessment, reasoned extension, remittal for reconsideration, new decision and payment dates. The breakdown must show both the municipal and the state period. The actual fault and the financial consequences are determined from these evidence, not from an average.

The other examples include a health insurance case from 15 May 2013 to confirmation of 8 April 2014, a retirement case from 19 June 2013 to confirmation of 4 February 2014 and a speech valve case from 7 June 2013 to confirmation of 2 October 2013. In the pension case, a request for urgent treatment was rejected and a time forecast was extended. The examples show the actual history of the check; they do not document specific diagnostic effects, loss of payment or total loss of four different persons. [AT02]

Versions, resumption and verification of quality

Annual Report 2019 describes a specific break in registration: the transition to a new management information system in the fourth quarter brought 300-500 more pending cases into the same data basis. Cases in the administration's receipt and creation phase had previously been excluded. At the end of 2019, the figure was 8.012 against a target of 7.700; a separate Udbetaling Danmark/sickness-benefit track stood at 2.770 against 2.500. The time target for 2019 was 17 weeks as an interim target towards 13 in 2022, while the measured time was 18,7. The original thus documents both changed visibility of the queue and a specific already known overrun. The 300-500 represent changed registration of existing cases, not 300-500 new individuals or new breaches of law. [AT08, physical PDF12-13]

Information	Versions to stand separately	Specific control needs
Municipal times 2022	Annual Report 2022: 14,9 weeks; 2023-report review: 13,9; Case Statement 2022: 14,6	Identify population, post-registration and pre-comparison start date

Information	Versions to stand separately	Specific control needs
Timeline 2023	The target table indicates a maximum of 14 weeks; the main text refers to 13	Version and target atmosphere; 18,5 exceeds both
Recording	Rigsrevisionen's 2018 analysis includes the original receipt date; later case statistics use the reopening date	New technical start date does not actually remove previous deprivation
At the end of 2020	Municipal 2,4 months in the 2020 statistics against 3,0 in the 2021 statistics; occupational injury 3,1 against 4,1	Post-registration / method shall be documented; no tacit mixing
Ombudsman Criticism 2023 Report	Seven of 486 / 1,4% concerned closed 2022 cases	Not error rate among all the 2023 decisions of the Appeal Board
Ombudsman Criticism 2024 Report	Three of 518 / 0,6% concerned 2023 cases	The complaint-selected control group and time lag shall be maintained;
Access targets in the 2024 table	87 percent within 20 working days marked fourth quarter 2023	The original period shall not be rewritten to 2024;
Monthly curve Payment Denmark	Point between March 2026 and May 2026 marked April 2025	Data marking requires correction; the original mark is retained in the Annex

Sources: AT08-AT12; AT14-AT17. Retrospective differences may be due to post-registration, but the general information on ongoing updates does not prove the cause of each difference. Therefore, the versions and their boundaries are published. The achievement of the objective of the annual report to draw up a quality report is a delivery objective, not a finding that no decisions are flawed.

The Ombudsman's group is particularly important: seven critical decisions out of 486 cases closed are neither the critical percentage among all decisions nor a random sample of all citizens concerned. The purpose is to show documented errors and the source's control objectives with the correct denominator. Similarly, the 2024 figure is 343 surveillance cases older than six months and 216 older than 12 months overlapping stocks. They don't give 559 cases. [AT11-AT12]

The 2025 annual report's total underspend of 66,6 million kroner consists of 40,6 million in the appropriation-funded part and 26 million in the fee-funded part. The report describes that 25 million added in September could not be used to any significant extent during the year. At the same time, municipal case-processing time exceeded the target. This warrants specific scrutiny of the timing of funding, the management plan, recruitment and actual access to prompt assistance. It does not in itself document embezzlement, a particular employee's criminal omission or 66,6 million that should have been paid directly to complainants. [AT13, pp.8-11]

Court proceedings: concluded lawsuits do not equal the number of findings in favour or children

The Appeals Board’s 2021 case statistics count concluded court cases by level of jurisdiction: in 2019, respectively, 116 occupational injury cases, 1.066 children and young people cases and 30 other cases, totalling 1.212; in 2020, 80,1.012 and 29, totalling 1.121; in 2021, 84,1.093 and 31, totalling 1.208. These are registrations per level of jurisdiction. The same course may be counted again on appeal, and the original table does not state the outcome or the number of unique children, parents or workers. The three years total 3.541 registrations by level of jurisdiction, not 3.541 persons or 3.541 judgments finding in the party’s favour. [AT15, physical PDF11-12, table2.12]

A complete avenue of responsibility requires linkage of the administrative case, level of jurisdiction, judgment/order, outcome, grounds for error, reconsideration and actual implementation. The necessary outcomes cannot be inferred from the Appeals Board’s participation in almost all court cases. Participation is not upholding. Nor does the table state whether closure resulted from a judgment or another form of cessation. National administrative outcomes must therefore not be added to these registrations by level of jurisdiction as further new courses involving errors.

Legal Deviation, Liability and Specific Requirements

Documented error and control accounts: The old 13-week objective was not achieved in the completed control track; the target was changed to 30. 2025 also exceeded this. The sources document pending votes on dates, denominators, annual markings and target versions. The special-time track has observed exceedances in the populations indicated. The specific provision of time and its scope for extension must be linked to each case; exceeding an average administrative objective is not automatically the same legal breach.

Strongest sustainable argument: The State has repeated documented knowledge of waiting time and the consequences of a lack of prompt review. Changing the internal target does not change the citizen's need for effective protection or the underlying duties under national law and the ECHR. In child cases, time itself can weaken opportunities for contact and reunification, which must be examined in the specific case. In income-support and disability cases, waiting time must be linked to actual deprivation, expenses, missing support and the legal consequence of the later decision. The report's human rights chapters identify the verified judgments and rules; average time is used as evidence of the system's functioning, not as a substitute for individual application of the legal rules to the facts.

Suspicion requiring further proof: Whether a particular action was maintained without any legal basis during the whole or part of the waiting period; whether a person responsible knew of the invalidity and failed to act; whether certain losses were due to the waiting period; and whether a liability claim was outdated or was actually rejected. Statistics alone do not resolve these issues.

Responsibilities and requirements in order of priority: First, the actual cessation of unwarranted continued intervention and necessary temporary protection. Secondly, a fully informed, quick new decision, post-payment or concrete reunification, where the legal basis and evidence require it. Then the calculation of the entire time and effect of the loss as well as individual assessment of compensation, discipline and punishment. Public servants do not have a general criminal immunity and the lack of automatic suspensive effect does not make a tampering legal. Comparison with the punishment of individuals must be carried out on the same documented acts, calculations and legal conditions; the original private abduction sentences of the report show precisely why a prosecutor's sentence may not be presented as a sentenced sentence.

Specific demand for documents: Supply event extracts showing initial receipt, reassessment, forwarding, receipt of records, complete fact-finding, requests for urgency and suspension, decision, grounds for error, new decision, actual cessation/return home and payment. State reopenings and all exclusions. Use pseudonymous chain keys to distinguish cases, levels of jurisdiction and persons. A family with several children and several decisions must be countable both as one family and as several specifically identified rights holders, without creating new citizens at each level of jurisdiction.

The documented source chain goes from the original control reports and their tables to the shown figures and calculations. Subsequent actual assistance, payment and repatriation remain separate information that these national time reports do not contain. This specific balance shall be indicated as a necessary step of investigation, not as an acquittal of proven errors.

Original time and time tables of the Board of Appeal

This Annex contains 14 tables and 200 series of figures. Versions stand separately. Average cannot be summed to persons, errors or total intervention time.

T01. Name times regionally 2009-2011

Unit: weeks. Version: 2011-original, released June 2012. Original; Physical PDF17.

Zone / row	BAN09	BAN10	BAN11	Social 09	Social 10	Social 11	Both 09	Both 10	Both 11
Capital	13,0	12	15,7	9,5	11,9	18,8	11,3	11,9	17,3
Zealand	14,6	9	16,5	12.6	7,6	13,2	13,5	8,2	14,9
South Denmark	14,3	10,7	14,0	19,7	14,2	15,0	17,2	12,6	14,5
Central Jutland	30,5	34,4	24,1	27,1	27,4	22,2	28,6	30,4	23,1
North Jutland	16,1	26,3	20,7	16,8	25,7	25,1	16,5	26,0	22,9
Whole country	17,0	16,1	17,7	16,6	15,7	18,2	16,8	15,9	18,0

T02. Terms of office by field of law 2008-2011

Unit: weeks. Version: 2011-original, released June 2012. Original; Physical PDF20.

Zone / row	2008	2009	2010	2011
Employment appeals boards, total	15,5	17,0	16,1	17,7

Zone / row	2008	2009	2010	2011
Sickness benefit (gl. lov)	20,3	22,9	0	18,0
Sickness benefit (new law)	13,6	16,4	16,0	18,0
Maternity benefit	13,7	16,0	17,6	18,2
Active social policy 1	17,1	17,6	15,9	17,9
Active employment measures	13,9	15,6	12,9	13,5
Integration Act	21,1	15,4	24,3	24,6
Social pension (new law) 1	16,3	18,3	18,0	19,7
Social pension (applicable law) 1	16,9	17,4	21,4	19,3
Legal certainty, etc. 1	9,3	8,0	9,3	23,0
Disabled persons in occupations	16,8	27,7	20,0	13,2
Partial pension	37,2	18,7	9,3	24,8
Leave	9,2	11,0	19,9	36,5
Other legislation	21,4	10,7	24,7	0,0
Total social boards	14,9	16,6	15,7	18,2
Active social policy 1	12,9	14,4	13,2	14,1
Integration Act	13,6	17,1	13,3	18,1
Social pension (new law) 1	14,8	16,9	14,8	15,7
Social pension (applicable law) 1	15,0	18,0	16,4	16,2
Legal certainty, etc. 1	14,7	15,4	16,2	14,7
Social services	16,1	17,9	17,3	24,0
Use of force against adults	4,8	3,5	5,5	19,2
Family allowances, advances, etc.	15,6	17,5	15,6	7,8
Child benefit	14,4	20,4	16,6	17,4
Housing aid	14,9	16,3	14,9	25,4
General housing	13,3	13,3	11,7	15,7
Repatriation Act	.	24,4	15,3	13,1
Other legislation	7,2	7,6	12,4	7,6
Both boards together	15,2	16,8	15,9	18,0

T03. Social Board: quarterly targets

Unit: weeks. Version: RR19/2013, June 2014. Original; physical PDF32.

Zone / row a	11Q1	11Q2	11Q3	11Q4	12Q1	12Q2	12Q3	12Q4	13Q1	13Q2
Capital	13	13	13	13	26	20	18	17	30	30
Central Jutland	28	27	21	16	13	13	13	13	15	15

Zone / row a	11Q1	11Q2	11Q3	11Q4	12Q1	12Q2	12Q3	12Q4	13Q1	13Q2
North Jutland	24	24	16	13	24	24	20	16	21	21
Zealand	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	17	17
South Denmark	13	13	13	13	16	16	15	14	17	17

T04. BAN: Quarterly target

Unit: weeks. Version: RR19/2013, June 2014. Original; physical PDF32.

Zone / row a	11Q1	11Q2	11Q3	11Q4	12Q1	12Q2	12Q3	12Q4	13Q1	13Q2
Capital	13	13	13	13	21	19	17	16	20	20
Central Jutland	32	30	28	20	16	14	13	13	22	20
North Jutland	24	24	16	13	18	18	15	13	20	20
Zealand	13	13	13	13	17	15	13	13	15	15
South Denmark	13	13	13	13	16	16	15	14	18	18

T05. Regional actual times, visually read figure

Unit: weeks. Version: RR19/2013, the entire 1st half of 2013, not only the 2nd quarter. Original; physical PDF31.

Zone / row	Social 11	Social 12	Social 13H1	BAN11	BAN12	BAN13H1
Capital	18,8	35,6	45,4	15,7	23,1	24,4
Central Jutland	22,2	11,7	13,5	24,1	19,7	24,7
North Jutland	25,1	23,6	23,4	20,7	17,7	25,1
Zealand	13,2	13,5	16,8	16,5	16,7	20,3
South Denmark	15,0	17,9	21,1	14,0	18,4	23,2
Average of figure	18,2	21,9	28,6	17,7	19,8	23,6

T06. All case handling times 2018- 2020

Unit: months. Version: Extract February 2021; raster table 4.21 actually visually read. Original; Physical PDF13.

Zone / row	2018	2019	2020
Injury at work	7,1	6,3	4,9
Local authorities	4,8	4,2	4,0
Payment Denmark	5,5	3,4	2,7
Forced children	1,8	1,9	1,5
Notification	2,8	3,4	1,5
Family / adoption	4,4	4,4	1,5*
Health and safety at work	3,5	4,3	3,8
Equal treatment	9,3	6,6	9,8

Zone / row	2018	2019	2020
Special education	3,4	4,0	5,4
Adoption Board	3,2	1,8	2,0
Non-municipal employment	6,9	3,7	3,7
Local / regional supervision	6,3	3,0	3,1
Intermediate municipality	13,0	13,5	8,9
Su- anchor	6,6	6,4	4,5
Social supervision	6,1	6,1	6,0
Psychological Board	4,3	5,1	6,4
Other supervision	-	1,8	1,6
Other	2,2	1,8	1,5

T07. All rest periods end 2018- 2020

Unit: months. Version: Extract February 2021; raster table 4.22 actually visually read. Original; Physical PDF14.

Zone / row	2018	2019	2020
Injury at work	5,7	3,9	3,1
Local authorities	3,3	3,0	2,4
Payment Denmark	3,3	2,7	1,2
Forced children	1,4	1,0	0,9
Notification	2,0	1,0	1,0
Family / adoption	6,2	16,6	3,9*
Health and safety at work	1,9	2,5	2,2
Equal treatment	4,0	6,1	6,3
Special education	2,3	3,4	3,1
Adoption Board	1,2	3,0	0,65
Non-municipal employment	2,6	2,1	2,2
Local / regional supervision	7,6	6,7	8,2
Intermediate municipality	4,3	3,2	5,9
Su- anchor	5,8	2,8	1,9
Social supervision	2,4	2,7	7,1
Psychological Board	4,9	7,5	7,3
Youth Crime Board	-	0,9	1,0
Other supervision	-	1,9	4,4
Other	3,9	3,8	2,8

T08. All proceedings times 2019-2021

Unit: months. Version: Withdraw February 2022; retake date used. Original; Physical PDF21.

Zone / row	2019	2020	2021
Employment injuries	6,3	4,9	5,3
Local authorities	4,1	4,0	3,3
Payment Denmark	3,4	2,7	2,6
Forced actions in the field of children	1,9	1,5	1,4
Notification	3,4	1,5	1,6
Family	4,1	1,5	1,9
Adoption Board	1,7	2,0	1,4
Ankenævnet for Statens Uddannelsesstøtteordning (State Educational Support Appeals Board)	6,3	4,5	3,2
Arbejdsmiljøklagenævnet (Working Environment Appeals Board)	4,2	3,7	3,8
The Board of Appeal for Special Training	4,0	5,4	5,3
Ligebehandlingsnævnet	6,6	9,8	9,2
Psychologist's Board	5,1	6,5	7,3
Municipal and regional supervision	3,1	3,1	5,4
Other cases of supervision	1,9	1,6	1,6
Intermediate municipal dissent	13,3	8,9	9,1
Non-municipal employment cases	3,6	3,7	3,6
Other	1,5	1,2	1,5
Social supervision	6,2	5,7	7,9

T09. All rest periods end 2019-2021

Unit: months. Version: Withdraw February 2022; retake date used. Original; Physical PDF22.

Zone / row	2019	2020	2021
Employment injuries	4,0	4,1	4,0
Local authorities	3,1	3,0	2,8
Payment Denmark	2,8	1,7	1,9
Forced actions in the field of children	0,9	1,0	0,8
Notification	1,3	1,7	1,2
Family	6,3	4,6	3,9
Adoption Board	4,1	0,6	2,1
Ankenævnet for Statens Uddannelsesstøtteordning (State Educational Support Appeals Board)	3,1	2,0	1,8
Arbejdsmiljøklagenævnet (Working Environment Appeals Board)	2,3	2,2	1,7
The Board of Appeal for Special Training	3,5	3,4	4,6

Zone / row	2019	2020	2021
Ligebehandlingsnævnet	5,7	6,4	12,1
Psychologist's Board	7,7	7,6	8,1
Municipal and regional supervision	4,9	8,3	8,9
Other cases of supervision	1,9	4,4	10,0
Intermediate municipal dissent	6,9	7,7	3,7
Non-municipal employment cases	2,2	2,3	1,8
Other	4,5	3,1	1,5
Social supervision	2,7	7,1	6,9

T10. All processing times 2020-2022

Unit: weeks. Version: 2022 Annual Declaration own version. Original; Physical PDF24.

Zone / row	2020	2021	2022
Local authorities	17,5	14,4	14,6
Employment injuries	21,5	22,8	24,1
Payment Denmark	11,6	11,5	9,4
Forced actions in the field of children	6,5	6,2	6,8
Municipal and regional supervision	13,6	23,3	14,3
Notification of concern to a child or young person	6,7	6,8	6,7
Seniors' pensions	0,0	7,5	13,9
Ankenævnet for Statens Uddannelsesstøtteordning (State Educational Support Appeals Board)	19,5	13,9	17,6
Family	6,7	8,4	5,7
Psychologist's Board	28,2	31,6	33,9
Ligebehandlingsnævnet	42,5	40,0	54,6
The Board of Appeal for Special Training	23,5	23,2	24,3
Intermediate municipal dissent	38,8	39,4	25,7
Non-municipal employment cases	16,0	15,5	14,7
Arbejdsmiljøklagenævnet (Working Environment Appeals Board)	16,6	16,8	15,1
Other municipal and regional supervisory cases	6,9	7,1	10,6
Adoption Board	8,5	6,4	8,2
Social supervision	24,6	34,3	45,4
Other	6,9	6,1	6,0
Average length of proceedings	17,6	17,6	18,5

T11. All rest periods at the end of 2020-2022

Unit: weeks. Version: 2022 Annual Declaration own version. Original; Physical PDF25.

Zone / row	2020	2021	2022
Local authorities	11,1	11,6	10,6
Employment injuries	14,6	16,0	16,5
Payment Denmark	5,0	7,9	5,3
Forced actions in the field of children	3,9	3,3	3,9
Municipal and regional supervision	36,3	38,3	26,4
Notification of concern to a child or young person	4,2	4,0	4,0
Seniors' pensions	0,0	4,8	6,6
Ankenævnet for Statens Uddannelsesstøtteordning (State Educational Support Appeals Board)	8,6	8,4	14,3
Family	19,7	17,5	16,4
Psychologist's Board	33,7	35,1	29,5
Ligebehandlingsnævnet	27,3	53,0	64,6
The Board of Appeal for Special Training	13,4	19,6	14,7
Intermediate municipal dissent	33,5	15,6	14,2
Non-municipal employment cases	9,6	6,8	8,3
Arbejdsmiljøklagenævnet (Working Environment Appeals Board)	9,7	7,6	10,0
Other municipal and regional supervisory cases	18,7	33,3	29,2
Adoption Board	2,8	10,5	6,6
Social supervision	30,8	30,4	24,5
Other	13,0	13,9	12,3
Average rest period	21,0	24,7	26,3

T12. Municipal Month Times

Unit: weeks. Version: Actual figure configuration read 7.10.2026; date labels are preserved. Original; public figure.

Zone / row	Original monthly denomination	Average weeks
1	July 2025	34.4
2	August 2025	32.4
3	September 2025	34.2
4	October 2025	35.3
5	November 2025	34.1
6	December 2025	40.4
7	January 2026	34.6

Zone / row	Original monthly denomination	Average weeks
8	February 2026	31.3
9	March 2026	31
10	April 2026	31.7
11	May 2026	32.6
12	June 2026	31.2

T13. Injury at work monthly

Unit: weeks. Version: Actual figure configuration read 7.10.2026; date labels are preserved. Original; public figure.

Zone / row	Original monthly denomination	Average weeks
1	July 2025	27
2	August 2025	27.6
3	September 2025	29.5
4	October 2025	25.4
5	November 2025	30.5
6	December 2025	28.6
7	January 2026	26.4
8	February 2026	26
9	March 2026	26.4
10	April 2026	25.8
11	May 2026	29.9
12	June 2026	27

T14. Payment Denmark monthly periods

Unit: weeks. Version: Actual figure configuration read 7.10.2026; date labels are preserved. Original; public figure.

Zone / row	Original monthly denomination	Average weeks
1	July 2025	9.2
2	August 2025	10.1
3	September 2025	12.3
4	October 2025	13.5
5	November 2025	12.9
6	December 2025	11.3
7	January 2026	13
8	February 2026	14.3
9	March 2026	14.5
10	April 2025	15.6

Zone / row	Original monthly denomination	Average weeks
11	May 2026	17
12	June 2026	16.7

Current time and number series of the Appeal Board 2025-2026

All 24 original rows of tables have been read. The extract is dated August 25, 2026; the title of the website says 2025 and the second quarter 2026, while the columns alone say 2026. The text of the page does not specify here whether the number of 2026 is the number of the quarter or year so far; therefore, no full-year projection is made. Empty 2025 cells are maintained as not indicated. Ongoing post-registration may change previous versions.

Type of action	Week 2025	Decided 2025	Week 2026	Decided 2026
Municipal social and employment matters	35,1	22.927	32,0	14.706
Employment injuries	28,6	15.730	26,9	10.336
Payments Denmark cases	9,4	6.344	15,2	3.346
Cases dealt with by local and regional authorities	19,5	2.616	22,1	1.591
Children's and young people's committees	6,9	2.272	6,6	1.158
Administrative law	4,4	2.296	5,8	934
Notifications	6,7	1.726	7,5	712
Family	14,0	1.251	10,5	609
Cases in the Psychology Board	30,0	1.150	21,9	619
Cases before Ankenævnet for Statens Uddannelsesstøtteordninger (State Educational Support Appeals Board)	25,7	1.146	33,0	577
Seniors' pensions	32,6	1.203	15,6	373
Cases before Ligebehandlingsnævnet	54,3	593	62,2	478
Cases before the Board of Appeal for Special Training	22,7	333	28,8	177
Cases relating to unemployment benefit, early retirement, etc.	40,7	210	42,1	204
Other cases	39,5	162	31,6	70
Cases before Arbejdsmiljøklagenævnet (Working Environment Appeals Board)	12,6	133	14,4	75
Cases of inter-municipal dispute	63,7	115	84,1	80
Cases from Ungdomskriminalitetsrådet (Youth Crime Council)	6,3	81	6,2	42
Cases before the Administrative Board	8,5	60	8,4	33
Social surveillance cases	6,9	46	17,4	31
Supervision in the specialist office	11,6	35	4,5	28
Use of force	6,2	25	14,4	15
Udlændingestyrelsen	Not specified	Not specified	27,6	16

Type of action	Week 2025	Decided 2025	Week 2026	Decided 2026
Workers' Holidays	38,1	9	20,4	6

The number of decisions represents neither persons nor unlawful interventions. An average of 14,4 weeks in the use-of-force category requires examination of each case’s legal authority, time limit, start date and continuing interventions; it does not automatically show 15 identical breaches of law. Remittal for reconsideration and actual assistance/return home must be linked separately.

4. Practical Studies: Children, Family and Historical find

Date of check: October 7, 2026. This is a continuous register of numbers. Only the fields selected below are checked in the contents of the original reports. The metadata of the inventory is a separate work entry; it does not mean that all the tables of the reports have been checked.

Historical placement studies

Report	Selection and separation	Names and outcomes	Overlap and demarcation	Original coil de / locator
Installation e, December 2006	21 municipalities convened; one did not deliver. 125 cases, 24 outside the theme; 101 examined from 20 municipalities. Most recent decisions before 20 April 2006, after 1 January 2006. Cases already complained and dealt with are excluded; siblings: only eldest child included.	78 correct, 23 incorrect / 101. 98 referred to as volunteers, 3 without consent. Information: no missing 77, minor 6, significant 13, essential 5.	34 studies are outside the testing of new study requirements; relevant sub-denominator 67: 55 studies were available, 12 were missing. Not all children in the submitted families are counted.	PUD06, p. 11, 14-16, 52.
Placing e, February 2008	11 municipalities × 15 cases = 165 called. 20 outside the theme, 2 not submitted; 143 examined. Newest before 15 May 2007, after 1 January 2006. The defendant is excluded. Siblings: only eldest child.	51 correct, 92 incorrect / 143. Primary cause: 3 missing basis for placement, 21 missing basis for voluntary placement, 68 formal errors. 137 volunteers, 6 without consent.	Actual absence of consent in 22 cases: parents only 12, young person only 7, both 3. One is classified primarily as lacking a basis for placement; hence 21 in the primary-cause table. The 22 are included in the 92.	PUD08, p. 9, 12-16, 55-57, 63-65.
Location is December 2009	14 municipalities × 10 = 140 submitted. 15 excluded: indicted 1, youth sanction 1, protection 1, modified place 1, not placed 4, not among the latest decisions 7. 125 examined. Most recently before 1 January 2009. Siblings: only eldest child.	Table 2.2: 21 correct, 104 incorrect / 125. Table 2.5 and text of bread: 20 correct, 105 incorrect / 125. 121 volunteers, 4 without consent; 11 / 121 missing consent.	Unresolved original source conflict on one case; no tacit correction. Fail causes overlap. The four-month deadline for the study was added in 2009; therefore, raw error rates are not uniform over time.	PUD09, p. 13-18, 74.

Associates and verified internal conflicts in 2008

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Parents' consent, including purpose	Yes 122; no 15	137 volunteers	Table 2.11, p. 14
Consent from young people aged at least 15	Yes 46; no 10	56 young people	Table 2.12, p. 14
Investigation under Section 50	90; should be available, missing 40; still within four months 13	143	Table 2.13, p. 15
Content of available studies	High fulfillment 19; some 53; rings 17; none 0	89; one of 90 is omitted from the content study for future parents;	Table 2.14, p. 16
Content of action plans	High 4; some 63; call 33; none 4	104	Annex 3, Table 5, p. 65
Lack of information	No 61; less 43; significant 21; decisive 18	143	Table 2.9 and 2.10, p. 13-14
The same measure of information in municipal annexes	No 70; less 46; significant 11; decisive 16	143	Annex 3, Table 3, p. 64; contrary to the main tables

The Bread text on p. 12 indicates 69 formal primary causes; main table 2.8 and municipal annexes 68. The 3 + 21 + 68 = 92 main table is arithmetic coherent. The method of p. 56 delineates the most recent decisions before 15 May 2007; the later inventory of the National Audit Office indicates 1 July 2007. The original report's own method is recorded as a selection rule. Both conflicts must be resolved at the European level. Ankestyrelsenif the raw measurement forms are to be restored.

Additional child-related studies checked against originals

Report	Selection / opt-out	Expires and delfigures	Original / locator
Involvement, 2011	135 submitted, 14 sorted, 121 from 15 municipalities. Latest before 1 February 2010. The defendant / forwarded excluded; in the case of siblings the same day of the decision only oldest.	46 correct, 75 incorrect / 121. Discharge 25 / 43 incorrect; contact person 25 / 33; affixing 25 / 45. Overlapping error: study missing 33, late 8, content 1; action plan missing 29, late 32, content 1; consent 29; child conversation 14; information 19.	PUD-I11, printed p. 13-16, 79-81 / PDF p. 17-20, 83-85.
Moving / haunting, 2011	132 received, the report indicates 50 quits and 81 examined; 132 − 50 = 82, i.e. one unexplained case. 16 municipalities, 12-17-year-olds, January 2010-March 2011. The alleged, developmental / physical impairment and termination at 18 years is excluded.	14 correct, 67 incorrect / 81. Transfer 40 / 50 incorrect; return 27 / 31. Overlapping error: Child amalgamation rules 57; Action plan rules 42; consent missing without committee decision 19; no repatriation period 22.	PUD-H11, printed p. 9-12, 40-41, 57-59 / PDF p. 12-15, 43-44, 60-62.

In the involvement survey, the four-month time limit is not included in the main outcome, although measured separately. Reasons for errors must not be added to more cases than the 75. In the moving/return-home survey, return to the responsible municipality counts a move to that municipality, not return home to parents. The two surveys' publication in 2011 is not the decision year.

Children's Day Barometer 2024: actual counters

724 cases from 27 municipalities: 276 cases, of which 7 without consent; 448 family treatment / other interventions, 45 others. Decisions of 2022; procedure examined 2021-2022. Cases complained of and cases dealt with as notification cases in Ankestyrelsen should be excluded. The municipalities were asked for an additional 15-20 percent; absolutely submitted / opt-out is not indicated. [BB24, p. 5-6, 42-44]

Measurement	Outcome	Denomination	Page
Current investigation	New 371; updated 142; lawful reason for absence 53; not updated 82; complete absence 61	709	21
Four-month deadline	Compliance with 169; legal ground 15; exceeded 187	371	22
Length of the infringement	During week 13; week-month 49; month -three months 64; over three months 61	187	23
Reasoned position	Yes 501; no 12	513	24
Investigation completed before decision	Yes 306; legal ground 137; no 70	513	25
Conversation under investigation	Requirements met 490; not met 11	501	27
Prior to decision	Requirements met 460; not met 248	708	29-30
Action plan	Available 592; Legal ground 12; missing 120	724	34
Action plan describes effort	Yes 587; no 5	592	35
Three-month follow-up	Yes 355; no 118	473	36-37
24-hour evaluation	Yes 170; no 3	173	39
Response to emergency needs	Yes 8	8	39

Measurement	Outcome	Denomination	Page
Review by notification	Yes 85; not executed 79; result not disclosed 4	168	40

The subtotals overlap. No overall union of cases with at least one breach of the law is stated. Information from parents and contact with the child after the start are indicators, not independent counts of legal breaches. Sub-denominators and exclusions are in praksisundersoegelser-kompakt.json.

Independent methodological criticism: “Requirement met” is not always a documented interview actually conducted. Under § 48, the 460 include 74 instances in which the Appeals Board itself infers a reason for omission although it does not appear in the records. For follow-up, actions may replace documentation of a specific assessment in the measurement. The underlying responses must therefore be retained rather than merely repeating “65 per cent interview” or “75 per cent follow-up”. Appealed cases and cases considered following notifications have been excluded, so the barometer must not be presented as all child welfare cases or all children affected by errors.

Other historical survey figures

Report	Selection / Abstention	Outcome	Limitation	Original / locator
Flekjob, January 2006	145 convened: 100 municipal + 45 boards. 4 municipalities outside the theme; 141 examined = 96 municipal + 45 boards. Local government latest before 1 April 2005; unemployment benefit before 1 October 2004. The defendant is excluded.	Municipality 52 correct, 44 incorrect / 96. Name 42 correct, 1 incorrect, 2 cases of doubt / 45.	The decisions are before 2006; knowledge published in 2006. The criticism of 44 awards cannot be reformulated to 44 refusal of assistance. The two subpopulations are kept separate.	PUD-F06, printed p. 9, 14-19, 47-48 (PDF pp. 7, 12-17, 45-46).
Early onset of mental illness, December 2007	50 municipal awards. The appeal and the proceedings before the Board of Appeal have already been excluded. The rest of the detailed selection under control.	35 agreed, 15 disagreeing / 50 in award.	Favourable decisions; disagreement with the award is not a measure of people denied a legitimate pension. Formalities are not fully measured.	PUD-P07, summary and method, printed p. 58 (PDF p. 59).

Historical inventory, not yet fully controlled

Annex 2 of the National Audit Office provides the following additional original reports with legal review. The names here are checked in the reproduction of the National Audit, but counters, method and sorting must be checked in each Anchor Management Report before they can be included as verified series of investigations.

Report	Publication year of birth,	Case	Municipality r	Period of decision a	Status
Involvement of children and parents in voluntary action cases	2011	121	15	Latest before 1 February 2010	Original content outstanding; includes contact person and relief
Movement and repatriation of young people placed on the labour market	2011	81	16	1 January 2010- 1 March 2011	The entire 65-page original checked; 28 tables and 23 deduced example-ID. See? practice-relocation-help; emgive2011-full -tables -and -castle is for loeb.md
Contribution to the follow-up to the Children's Reform	2012	120	12	1 January 2011- 1 April 2012	Legal control in a welfare survey; original content is not available
Placed children and young people moving from foster family to other location	2014	57	20	1 January 2011- 1 November 2013	Original content not available

The same defined list contains four other welfare studies without a reported number of cases: municipality / region supervision 2009; case handling challenges 2010; municipality supervision 2012; cooperation

between foster families and municipalities 2014. They must not be counted as studies of zero cases. The list covers only studies focusing on case handling in the case of placement, not all of the Board of Appeal's practical studies.

The current public publication entry

The review of the public publication entry and searches gave 205 different publications pages and 321 PDF links. The same PDF may have several hostnames, and annexes / summaries may repeat the main report's cases. Therefore, the link references cannot be counted as 321 independent studies. The ordinary publication list contains mainly 2020-2026; it does not close 2006-2019. The controlled page register is found in the ast-publication-line.json; search observations in the ast-public-inventory-metadata a.json.

The AES study of remitted loss-of-earning-capacity cases and Udbetaling Danmark studies of reconsideration/appealed cases use different selection methods. The rule excluding cases already appealed from the historical municipal samples must not be transferred to these.

Relocation and return 2011: all tables, method and concrete citizen's programme

The November 2011 public original is fully read in memory: all 65 PDFs pages, 28 numbered tables including repeated table 8.1, Figure 2.1 and all case summaries. It is the original publication of the Ankestyrelsen in the public knowledge archive of the social educators. Read the original. SHA 256: 28ff7b6b0014e0e89fe2bedfca2d158cdbfd141df29ff6ffd642e7d3e3c3e58b.

The same 81 cases and overlapping 26 expert assessments are re-used. The 23 local example ID below is deduced across repeated mention and is not extra children. 11 of the cases describe the termination of placement; one of these is the transfer to the girlfriend's residence. Homecoming over the commune border and their own room can be continued. Return is not automatic reunification with parents and it is not the same as a remittal for reconsideration to a new decision by a review body.

Visual inspection: PDF 14 (Table 2.3), 16 (Figure 2.1), 18 (Table 3.1-3.2), 43 (Table 6.1). All other tables and the main text are text-read. Original counters / percentages shall be retained, even in the event of inconsistency. Percentage tables without a rough figure shall not be recalculated to integers. Locators are PDF pages; plain printed page numbers are PDFside minus 3, except the contents of the annex.

Basis, outcomes and known authority knowledge

Measure	Original number / percent / ve rsion	Unit, denominator, overlap and sample	PDF page
Order	February 2011	The Minister of Social Affairs's specific order; release November 2011	PDF 4
Local authorities / age	16; 12-17 years	Movement to own room / repatriation for municipal location / repatriation	PDF 5
Legal Committee	81 cases	Written documents, not all municipal cases	PDF 5
Family Affairs Sub-Committee	26/81	Gravity / clear problem; inadequately documented cases not selected	PDF 5
Consultation	4 Responses	Participation municipalities; not 4 repletions	PDF 4
Own operation	0 cases brought up	The Appeals Board’s express statement despite documented breaches of law; not redress	PDF 4
Legality	83% not adequate	Gross figures in Table 2.2; same 81	PDF 5
Children's conversation	57/81;70%	15 only this deficiency; the other 42 overlap with other regulatory deficiencies	PDF 6
Action plan audit	26/81;32%	Summary; legal error union later separated	PDF 6
No Action Plan	13/81;16%	No extra person sum	PDF 6
Ongoing contact	84%	Contact is not mandatory decision-making close to child conversation	PDF 6
Consent	23% moving cases; 91% consent among 15 +	Summary may have denominator / version conflict, be kept separate from table	PDF 6
Professional / statutory interview	24 valid; 28 actually held	Valid conversation is not necessarily capable of expert use; expert qualitative objectives separated	PDF 36-37 / 57
Figure 2.1	14 correct / 67 incorrect, essential / decisive 32 only incorrect	Visually controlled; no raw numeric segment labels. Not derived as a new count	PDF 16

Table 2.1-2.4: type of case, legality, causes of errors and information

Measure	Source count/%/ version	Unit, denominator, overlap and sample	PDF page
T 2.1 total relocation	50/62%	Of 81; subgroups 12 / 15%, 29 / 36%, 9 / 11%	PDF 12
T 2.1 own room inside / above the commune border; other above the border	12/29/9	38 returns of 50 relocations; 41 own room	PDF 12
T 2.1 return / total	31/38%;81/100%	Return is termination of placement, return is continued	PDF 12
T 2.2 legal	Move 10 / 20%; home 4 / 13%; total 14 / 17%	Names 50 / 31 / 81	PDF 13
T 2.2 illegal	Move 40 / 80%; home 27 / 87%; total 67 / 83%	Same denominators; total misunion	PDF 13
T 2.3 Child amalgamation rules	57 / 70%; sole cause 15	Of 81;53 not held 65%/sole 12;4 views missing 5%/sole 3	PDF 14
T 2.3 Action plan rules	42 / 51%; only 2	Of 81; 26 not revised 32% / only 0; 13 no 16% / only 2; 2 insufficient 2% / only 0; 1 further 1% / only 0	PDF 14
T 2.3 other rules	42 / 52%; only 1	1 not heard 1%/sole 0; 19 consent without committee 23%/sole 0; 22 no return-home period 27%/sole 1	PDF 14
T 2.3 total	67 actions for failure to act; 18 sole cause	Mistakes overlap. Consultation requirements only after 1.1.2011	PDF 14
T 2.4 no information missing	12/24%;5/16%;17/20%	Moving / return / total, denominators 50 / 31 / 81	PDF 15
T 2.4 Some minor information is missing	19/38%;13/42%;32/40%	Same columns / denominators	PDF 15
T 2.4 more / significant deficiencies	16/32%;13/42%;29/36%	Same	PDF 15
T 2.4 essential deficiencies	3/6%;0/0%;3/4%	Same	PDF 15
T 2.4 total	50/100%;31/100%;81/100 %	32 out of 67 incorrect with significant / crucial information gaps; do not graph new population	PDF 15-16

Table 3.1-3.5: age / sex, initiative and causes

Measure	Source count/%/version	Unit, denominator, overlap and sample	PDF page
T 3.1 own room / other / home / total	41/51%;9/11%;31/38%;81/100%	Same 81	PDF 18
T 3.2 12 years	0/0%;0/0%;0/0%;0/0%	Columns other / own / home / total; n 9 / 41 / 31 / 81	PDF 18
T 3.2 13 years	0/0%;0/0%;3/10%;3/4%	Same	PDF 18
T 3.2 14 years	2/22%;1/2%;5/16%;8/10%	Same	PDF 18
T 3.2 15 years	3/33%;1/2%;7/23%;11/14%	Same	PDF 18
T 3.2 16 years	2/22%;20/50%;8/26%;30/36%	Same; original percentages shall be retained	PDF 18
T 3.2 17 years	2/22%;19/46%;8/26%;29/36%	8 cases unknown date of decision accepted 17 years; not actual age variation	PDF 18
T 3.2 total	9/100%;41/100%;31/100%;81/100%	Same	PDF 18
T 3.3 boy / girl / total	39/48%;42/52%;81/100%	Case estimated; not number of parents	PDF 19
T 3.4 municipality	9/100%;41/100%;31/100%;81/100%	Columns: other/own/home/total. All at municipal initiative as a selection requirement; 20 municipality alone	PDF 19
T 3.4 young	5/56%;28/68%;15/48%;48/59%	Multiple answers allowed, overlap	PDF 19
T 3.4 holder of parental authority	2/22%;6/15%;14/45%;22/27%	Number of cases, not 22 unique parents	PDF 19
T 3.4 location	1/11%;5/12%;5/16%;11/14%	Same	PDF 19
T 3.4 others	1/11%;1/2%;0/0%;2/2%	Same	PDF 19
T 3.5 young does not want the place	56/44/0%	Columns other / own / home; n 9 / 41 / 31. Percentage without raw counters, no recalculation	PDF 20
T 3.5 planned development	22/37/0%	Same	PDF 20
T 3.5 objectives achieved	0/0/42%	Same	PDF 20
T 3.5 improvement	11/20/0%	Same	PDF 20
T 3.5 Application by parents	0/0/19%	Same	PDF 20
T 3.5 worsening	22/5/0%	Same	PDF 20
T 3.5 consent withdrawn 15 +	0/0/10%	Same	PDF 20
T 3.5 objectives not achieved	0/0/10%	Same	PDF 20
T 3.5 place closes	22/0/3%	Same	PDF 20
T 3.5 placement broken down	0/7/0%	Same	PDF 20
T 3.5 others	44/27/0%	Same; e.g. acute / no profit / autonomy	PDF 20

Table 3.6-3.9: places, young people, homes and support

Measure	Source count/%/version	Unit, denominator, overlap and sample	PDF page
T 3.6 institution / location	66/73/74/72%	Other / own / home / total; n 9 / 41 / 31 / 81. Only percentage cells despite title number / percent	PDF 21
T 3.6 college / college-like	11/15/6/11%	Same	PDF 21
T 3.6 care family / network	22/10/19/15%	Same	PDF 21
T 3.6 unanswered	0/2/0/1%	Total row 100/100/100/100%;n 9/41/31/81	PDF 21
Placement statistics 2010 reference	About 45% day / stay; about 40% family care	National 12- 17 population, not committee denomination	PDF 20-21
T 3.7 developmental disorders	4/44%;15/37%;8/26%;27/33%	Other / own / home / total; more answers possible	PDF 22
T 3.7 other difficulties	4/44%;11/27%;12/39%;27/33%	Same	PDF 22
T 3.7 leisure / network	2/22%;8/20%;7/23%;17/21%	Same	PDF 22
T 3.7 external reactivity	1/11%;11/27%;9/29%;21/26%	Same	PDF 22
T 3.7 inward reacting	1/11%;5/12%;1/3%;7/9%	Same	PDF 22
T 3.7 school	1/11%;16/39%;13/42%;30/37%	Same	PDF 22
T 3.7 abuse	1/11%;16/39%;4/13%;21/26%	Same	PDF 22
T 3.7 lack of family relations	1/11%;1/2%;0/0%;2/2%	Same	PDF 22
T 3.7 crime	0/0%;6/15%;5/16%;11/14%	Same	PDF 22
T 3.7 no difficulties	0/0%;2/5%;2/6%;4/5%	Same; not 4 legal cases perdefinition	PDF 22
T 3.8 home problems	No 13 / 42%; other 8 / 26%; conflict 4 / 13%; psychiatry 3 / 10%; abuse 3 / 10%; violence 2 / 6%; physical impairment 2 / 6%; neglect 1 / 3%; unexplained 1 / 3%	Of 31 homelessness cases, not number of unique parents	PDF 23
T 3.8 zero registrations	0 in 7 other problem classes	No care; parental death; serious illness/death; risk of sexual abuse; other crime; intellectual disability; poor physical health conditions	PDF 23
T 3.9 permanent contact person	0/0%;28/68%;13/42%;41/51%	Other / own / home / total; n 9 / 41 / 31 / 81; may overlap other forms of aid	PDF 24
T 3.9 day offers / training offers	0/0%;0/0%;4/13%;4/5%	Same	PDF 24
T 3.9 practical / pedagogical in home	0/0%;0/0%;3/10%;3/4%	Same	PDF 24
T 3.9 family / adolescent treatment	1/11%;0/0%;4/13%;5/6%	Same	PDF 24
T 3.9 relief	0/0%;0/0%;1/3%;1/1%	Same	PDF 24
T 3.9 internship	0/0%;1/2%;2/6%;3/4%	Same	PDF 24

Measure	Source count/%/version	Unit, denominator, overlap and sample	PDF page
T 3.9 other aid	0/0%;10/24%;5/16%;15/19%	Same	PDF 24
T 3.9 no other aid implemented	8/89%;6/15%;8/26%;22/27%	Can still have past support, does not mean 22 without any support	PDF 23-24

Table 4.1-4.3: Action plans for return home

Measure	Source count/%/version	Unit, denominator, overlap and sample	PDF page
T 4.1 revised before	10/32%	Of 31 homelands	PDF 27
T 4.1 not heard, should have been	13/42%	Same	PDF 27
T 4.1 revised after	5/16%	Same; subsequent audit does not automatically cure previous decision	PDF 27
T 4.1 no plan / total	3/10%;31/100%	Same	PDF 27
T 4.2 continuing high / some / rings / no / total	10/67%;4/27%;0/0%;1/7%;15/100%	Of 15 revised plans before / after mixed	PDF 29
T 4.3 adolescents / parents / none	13/87%;10/67%;1/7%	Of 15; young + parents overlap; not 23 people	PDF 29

Tables 4.4 to 4.6 and 5.1: moving action plans and child conversation

Measure	Original number / percent / verse ion	Unit, denominator, overlap and sample	PDF page
T 4.4 pre-audit / no / nejbur de / none / total	20/40%;12/24%;8/16%;10/20%;50/100%	Of 50 movements, 12 not audited without identified needs; 20 audited subcommittees	PDF 31
T 4.5 purpose high / some / rings / no / total	13/65%;6/30%;1/5%;0/0%;20/100%	Of 20 revised moving action plans	PDF 32
T 4.6 targets high / some / rings / no / total	14/70%;5/25%;0/0%;1/5%;20/100%	The same 20; poor objectives and objectives may be the same case	PDF 33
T 5.1 complied with / non / total	24/30%;57/70%;81/100 %	Of 81,53 not kept 65%; 4 positions missing 5%	PDF 36
Position of actual conversation	24/28;86%	28: not 24 other children other than 81	PDF 37
Historical change	1.1.1993; 1.1.2011; 16 years	Children's collective rule and new adult transition targets; not actual loss time	PDF 26 / 34

Table 5.2-5.3 and 6.1-6.2: involvement, return-home period and hearing

Measure	Source count/%/version	Unit, denominator, overlap and sample	PDF page
T 5.2 high/some/low/no/total	31/38%;37/46%;10/12%;3/4%;81/100%	Involvement outside child interview; not an independent criterion of lawfulness	PDF 38-39
T 5.3 high	14/58%;17/30%;31/38%	Child interview requirement met/not met/total;n 24/57/81	PDF 40
T 5.3 some	9/38%;28/49%;37/46%	Same	PDF 40
T 5.3 low	0/0%;10/18%;10/12%	Same	PDF 40
T 5.3 none	1/4%;2/4%;3/4%	Same	PDF 40
T 5.3 total	24/100%;57/100%;81/100%	Same 81, not a new cohort	PDF 40
T 6.1 period yes/no/total	9/27%;22/73%;31/100%	Source percentages differ from 9/31 and 22/31; raw counts retained	PDF 43
T 6.2 heard 2010	20/40%;15/48%;35/43%	Move/home/total;n 50/31/81	PDF 44
T 6.2 heard 2011	4/8%;0/0%;4/5%	6 moves in 2011;no returns home in 2011	PDF 43-44
T 6.2 not heard, should have been	2/4%;0/0%;2/2%	Of 6 relevant moves in 2011, 2 not heard	PDF 43-44
T 6.2 not heard,2010 irrelevant	24/48%;16/52%;40/49%	Historical measurement of breaches delimited; not 40 errors	PDF 44
T 6.2 total	50/100%;31/100%;81/100%	Same	PDF 44
Actual period without a decision on its duration	Several of 22, n unknown	Gradually phased out before decision or interval afterwards; not 22 immediate returns home	PDF 42-43

Table 7.1-7.3: form and consent

Measure	Source count/%/ version	Unit, denominator, overlap and sample	PDF page
T 7.1 written/note/consent/other/total	16/20%;35/43%;1/1%;29/36%;81/100%	Of 81; main text 46 gives other as 35%,table 36%	PDF 46-47
T 7.2 parental consent yes/no/total	31/62%;19/38%;50/100%	Of 50 moves;in 15 of 19, no holder of parental responsibility consented	PDF 47-48
T 7.3 consent of young people aged 15+ yes/no/total	43/91%;4/9%;47/100%	47 of 50 are 15+;in 3 of 4, neither young person nor any parent consented, and no referral to committee	PDF 48
Consent measurement method	Tacit agreement/positive attitude accepted as consent	No separate written declaration required; actual fully informed consent not independently measured	PDF 47
Appeal guidance	Few relevant cases, exact n not stated	Ankestyrelsen excludes young people's consent/requested return home from relevance; no figures can be reconstructed	PDF 49
Minimum action-plan follow-up	2 times a year	Historical description of duty; actual annual rate not calculated	PDF 51

Annex 1: complete sampling, attrition and repeated table 8.1

Measure	Source count/%/ version	Unit, denominator, overlap and sample	PDF page
Municipalities	16	Copenhagen, Høj-Taastrup, Ishøj, Roskilde, Kalundborg, Lolland, Bornholm, Odense, Nordfyn, Haderslev, Aabenraa, Horsens, Koldi ng, Herning, Aarhus, Viborg	PDF 60
Maximum take-off	Up to 10 prkommune; up to 5 own room and 5 home take-home	Returns fill in remaining places; not random national sample	PDF 60-61
Window	1.1.2010-1.3.2011	Allocation instruction also January 2010- February 2011; 6 decisions 2011,75 in 2010	PDF 61-62
Submitted / dropped / unsolicited	132/50/81	132 − 50 = 82, unexplained 1 case. Absence cases without a breakdown of numbers	PDF 61-62
Excluded	Alleged / treated in a social court /Ankestyrelsen	Also intellectual disabilities/physical impairments, return home at age 18,youth sanction/aftercare, children under 12,new placements, incorrect date/reason, moves outside the responsible municipality	PDF 61-62
T 8.1 repeated movement	50 / 62%; of which 12 / 15%, 29 / 36%, 9 / 11%	Repeat T 2.1, same 50; 38 returns	PDF 62
T 8.1 repeated return / total	31/38%;81/100%	Repeat T 2.1, no extra 81	PDF 62
Returned case-by-case assessment	Each case / measurement scheme for the municipality	Local authority knowledge in addition to public report; unsubstantiated legal consequences	PDF 60 Note / 63
Document base	All relevant files and records requested	Failure to submit plan / study may lead to a lack of information; assessment of documents	PDF 63
Children's advisory committee	26 / 81; second annual extended survey	Not by accident; gravity / well documented. First 2010; no addition	PDF 64-65
Knowledge	Consultation and dialogue meeting	4 consultation response PDF 4; no meeting date or case repair rate in the Annex	PDF 65

Decoupled summaries of cases: actual cessation, relocation and consequences

The information below is the report's reproductions of municipal files and expert assessments. The underlying individual acts have not been published in the report. The granting of aid, actual relocation, the person's statements and expert assessment shall be kept separate in each row. A new national sum for children or parents is not derived.

Local ID	Compact evidence / time chain	Limitation	PDFsider
038	17 year old boy returned to mother after about 3 years of placement; both wishes, the municipality assesses most goals achieved, contact person and revised plan with six target areas. Actually, Homecoming day unknown.	Positive action-plan example; no documented compensatory redress	27, 29
037	17-year-old girl urgently placed about 7 months after father's violence. Parents and girl want home, returned shortly after decision; plan 14 days after and contact / family treatment. No calendar date or subsequent safety result. PDF 52: Psychologist recommended continued placement until self-evident, place assessed possible repatriation; girl's wish changed in a few days. Cultural expertise involved and actually family care after. PDF 58 expert: sudden change of attitude should be investigated in the conversation.	Plan too late; actual reunion described	27, 28, 52, 58

Local ID	Compact evidence / time chain	Limitation	PDFsider
024	15-year-old girl returned home to her mother approximately 1,5 years after her first boarding school placement; psychiatric assessment after half a year, institution for the last half-year; plan not revised.	Return described; support / time unknown	28
068	14-year-old girl returned from short emergency stay to mother; cause unknown, family treatment, undated plan. Continued next page. PDF 30: plan describes school / family care, but Ankestyrelsen evaluate further efforts not specified.	Absence of progress	29, 30
007	15-year-old girl about 8 months placed because of mother's abuse / conflict. After half-year wants home; decided home after 2 months with security plan, joint action plan / child conversation and close follow-up. Actual calendar date unknown.	Real reunion described; not full proof of original illegal placement	30, 37, 39
081	15-year-old boy returned to parents after just over 10 months, school improved; revised plan without young / parents involvement.	Actual return home described; redress unknown	30
006	17-year-old girl moves to her own room after barely 3 months of emergency stay, mother depression. Contact person and continued psychologist, updated plan with six target areas.	Continued placement, non-return	31, 33
017	17-year-old boy boarding school since 2006; decided spring 2010 moved to own cabin 1.8.2010 with contact person. Plan 16.3.2010 relates to 2006 location, no current audit.	Continued placement; planned date of relocation	31
101	17-year-old girl own apartment with contact person; sparse purpose and lack of goals in revised plan. PDF 54: First emergency location April 2008, location terminated due to problems, home period and new institution June 2009; no psychological / psychiatric update since 2008.	Continued placement; later time outages unknown	33, 54
026	A 16-year-old boy moves from the same foster family after approximately 8 years to a residential institution. No interview before the decision/statement of views; yes only after presentation of the institution. PDF 46:no documented reason for the move other than the municipality’s termination of the foster-family arrangement.	Continued placement; consent after presentation is not decision-making conversation	37, 46
018	17-year-old girl placed since 2008; wants home, moves own room with 10 hours of contact weekly; status / network meetings and high involvement.	Continued placement; scope of support	39
153	14-year-old boy retired from outside residence to within the municipality; contract terminated due to circumstances in place, unclear reason for moving and poor youth involvement.	Continued placement, non-family reunion	39
073	17-year-old boy perennial placement, moving his own room summer 2010; conversations 2009 and status / farinterview show wish, no conversation before decision.	Continued placement; old conversations do not replace concrete consultation	40
118	Almost 15-year-old girl repeated placement, released April 2010 without conversation or opinion appears.	Actual month of release; loss time unknown	40
014	16-year-old boy Tourette / ADHD released after 2 years of placement, then post-school financially supported. Children's interview about 1 month before, other involvement is missing.	Home + new school described; date unknown	41
141	16-year-old boy returned to mother December 2010 after about 1 year stay; contact person. Plan says child conversation was held, no conversation ticket.	Actual return; lack of documentation	46
027	16-year-old boy returned summer 2010 after 1,5 years / two places; later does not want contact person; more undated plans without homecoming content.	Actual return; subsequent aid choices described	46

Local ID	Compact evidence / time chain	Limitation	PDFsider
008	17-year-old girl placed since 8 / 9 years moved from treatment home to her own room in a home-self project with a support person; mother has sole custody, both want documented. PDF 55: two	Continued placement; positive consent example	48, 55

Local ID	Compact evidence / time chain	Limitation	PDFsider
	previous suicide attempt, April 2006 treatment homes, last 2 years' exit; planned HF after relocation. Earlier and later mental processes are separated.		
062	17-year-old boy moves his own room November 2010; mother cannot attend but accepts later orientation, parental authority / consent and youth consent unabated.	Continued placement without documented all relevant consents	48, 49
136	17-year-old girl ADD after adolescent psychiatric discharge placed 2009 in foster family, post-school 2-3 months and back. Moves your own room after a non-functioning process; repeated suicide attempts also after a move, later massive support in your own home. Expert knowledge should be involved.	Specific serious consequence; causality not established	52
058	17 years old returned from supported own apartment to pregnant girlfriends' residence in the second municipality, do not want support for themselves / future child. Done 2007, planted 2008, own room 2009, drug experiments since 11 years / hashabuse until half a year before. Place continues to recommend support.	Termination of employment; not reunification with parents	53
108	16-year-old girl urgently placed according to his own statement about stepfather's sexual abuse, stepfather later convicted, mother rejects contact, weak father's new custody. Treated / psychologist, then own room at high school with bothtraining / advisor.	Continued placement; relevant specialised assistance	53, 56
103	17-year-old boy Tourette / OCD after 3 year-old institution moves their own room, self-desire and insufficient need recognition; support and continuous follow-up. Experts assess positive development and an appropriate independent framework.	Continued placement, positive actual support example	56

Documented errors and impact level

• The child expert assessment at PDF7-9 describes a missing current assessment and insufficient investigation of parental resources, weak continuity and insufficient support measures. The fact that the young person is not placed in a worse position may be because the previous placement did not meet the need either; it is not proof of adequate assistance.

• The treatment of the municipal council is required under § 79a (PDF 4) of the Historical Law on Legal Security. The report documents authority knowledge and responsibility for follow-up, but not actually case-by-case repair.

• PDF 54-58 the expert part has no raw count of appropriateness, support or quality of conversation beyond the 26 committee. Qualitative terms as a little over half / major part must not be recalculated into integers or added to 67 cases of error.

• Case 136 PDF 52 documents suicide attempts also after relocation and subsequent intensive support. This shows a serious consequence in a specific case, but not the isolated causal contribution of the municipality's assessment/support deficiencies.

• PDF 47 consent is accepted on the basis of positive setting. The published material does not document separately all the information, voluntary or legal persons' understanding behind each accepted consent.

Original deviations and non-harmonised objectives

• Summary PDF 6 says 23% of moving cases lack consent; Table 2.3 gives 19 / 81 = 23% and later the moving committee is 50. Keep both denominator statements; 19 / 50 is 38%, own calculation.

• Table 2.3 Action Plan 42% specified 51, while 42 / 81 rounded 52%; others 42 indicated 52%. The numerators and original percentages shall be retained.

• Table 3.2 16 years 30 / 81 indicated 36% and 20 / 41 indicated 50%; own rounding would be 37% and 49%. No quiet correction.

• T 6.1 PDF 43 original 27% / 73% for 9 / 22 of 31, own rounding 29% / 71%. No modification of original cells.

• T 2.3 PDF 14 consultation deficit 1, T 6.2 PDF 44 consultation deficit 2 among 6 relevant 2011 relocations. No hidden harmonisation.

• Case 153 PDF 39 refers to point 4.4.1, where in fact 006 / 017 stands, not 153. Cross-reference error retained.

• PDF 46 main text decisions otherform 35%, Table 7.1 PDF 47 says 29 / 81 and 36%. Original versions shall be retained.

• The appeal guidance measure at PDF49 equates consent/requested return home with no need to give the young person guidance. The report does not separately examine whether consent entails a wholly favourable finding in all support/conditions components.
• Submission flow 132−50=82 versus 81 examined (PDF61-62). Attrition is 50 cases that dropped out, not 50 cases excluded from the sample; the earlier compact registers' field n_udtaget_rapport must be clarified as attrition.

• Case 058 return is to pregnant girlfriend's apartment, while general case type description PDF 17 calls 31 returns to parents. Return means termination of employment, not always family reunion.

• Case numbers go up to 153 despite 81 measured; the number is local identification tracks from larger submitted / registered material, not targeted or citizen's national ID.

• Several case references point to the wrong section (026 → 5.1.5 on PDF 46,073 → 7.1.2 on PDF 53,108 → 7.1.3 on PDF 56). Own case ID chains are aligned on actual pages, not blind cross-references.

Lack of documents and concrete measures of investigation

• Ankestyrelsen: Explain flow 132 submitted − 50 deleted as against 81 measured, 1 versus 2 consultation gaps and the original's erroneous percentage cells; provide anonymous data basis / measurement forms with local case ID and exclusion grounds.
• The 16 municipalities: state the date of receipt of the feedback for each case, municipal council consideration under§79 a, actual reopening or new decision, support delivery and individual losses/compensation. The report documents 0 own-initiative cases, but not 0 municipal redress.

• Personal / Reunion Coupling: Unanonymously publishes IDcoupled with the original date of placement, actual termination / transfer date, destination and possible new location. 81 cases and 23 examples ID cannot be matched without a register to national unique children / parents.

• Case 136 suicide attempts and later massive support: individual original records and timeline required for precise causality, avoidable losses and liability. No duration or date of actual stabilisation has been published.

Priority responsibilities and requirements

The 67 decisions measured by the municipalities did not comply with the legislation examined. The evidence is the case-wise control, summarised in Tables 2.2-2.3, with 19 gaps in consent / committee, 57 infrequent children and 42 action plans among the overlapping errors. The rules protect both the young person's right to be heard and the basis for choosing an effective and comprehensive approach. The measures were specific relocation, cessation of placing and change of aid. Therefore, the municipality must be able to document what it did in each well-known case-related case after receiving the case-by-case assessment of the Appeal Board.

The most strongly documented first demand is establishment of the facts and consideration of each individual legal consequence: reopening or a new decision, specific support, actual destination and period of loss. Next are demands for documented follow-up by management and the municipal council and an explanation of the Appeals Board's express decision not to take up any of the cases on its own initiative. The original proves this decision; it proves neither subsequent municipal redress nor an absence of redress.

A precise claim for compensation or debt requires, in particular, original timeline and causality in cases where the need for aid was overlooked or the absence of consent / committee responsible. Case 136's serious self-harm is a specific element of investigation, not a generalised causality for 81 children. The months / years of the published examples indicate specific events; they must not be converted into total illegal placement times, since the legality of the original placement has not been investigated here.

The primary tracking is checked: all tables and each deduplicated example row have PDF locator; original URL / hash and full page checks are recorded in the accompanying JSON. No page in this original stands as unread. The rest are the exact underlying case / person / follow-up documents mentioned.

Inclusion 2011: full original tables and impact chains

All 107 pages have actually been read as RAM text, including all 31 numbered main tables,4 municipal-annex tables,3 figures and the complete measurement form. Figure pages 21/33/44 and tables 58/97/99/100 have been visually checked in RAM. Same cohort of 121 as in the earlier main figures;40 cases reviewed by child welfare specialists are nested and selectively chosen. No new cohort totals.

Table 2.1 · PDF17

Type	Correktor	Correct%	Uncorrected	% incorrect	IALTN	Total%
Relief	18	42	25	58	43	100
Contact person	8	24	25	76	33	100
Installation	20	44	25	56	45	100
Total	46	38	75	62	121	100

Table 2.2 · PDF19

Error types overlap; the 4-month BFU time limit is not included in the main correctness measure

Reason	N	% of 121	Of which sole cause
BFU deficiencies	33	27	7
Date of decision	8	7	3
BFU content	1	1	0
Plan deficiencies	29	24	12
Plan after decision	32	26	16
Plan content	1	1	0
Consent	29	24	6
Conversation / attitude	14	12	1
Information	19	16	0
Total sole cause	-	-	45

Table 2.3 · PDF20

Absence of information	N	%
None	68	56
Less	34	28
Essential	16	14
Decisive	3	2
Total	121	100

Table 3.1 · PDF24

BFU	N	%
Yes	78	64
No required	33	27
No, emergency.	10	9
Total	121	100

Table 3.2 · PDF25

Type	JAN	Yes%	No	No%	AkutN	Acute%	IALTN	Total%
Installation	24	53	12	27	9	20	45	100
Relief	31	72	11	26	1	2	43	100
Contact	23	70	10	30	0	0	33	100
Total	78	64	33	27	10	9	121	100

Table 3.3 · PDF28

ProsaPDF27: 70 sufficient + 5 only one of 2 + 3 nothing. Tabelja 75 thus includes 5 partial; BFUconsent omitted main correctness of amendment 2011.

Parents' BFUconsent	N	%
Yes	75	96
No	3	4
Total	78	100

Table 3.4 · PDF28

Only 16 over age 15 at the time of the survey

Young people's BFUconsent	N	% of 78
Yes	12	15
No	4	5
Not applicable	62	80
Total	78	100

Table 3.5 · PDF28

Form	Parents	Parents%	UngeN	Young%
Written	30	40	6	50
Oral	40	53	5	42
Other	5	7	1	8
Total	75	100	12	100

Table 3.6 · PDF30

Parental attitudes	N	%
Yes	63	81
No	15	19
Total	78	100

Table 3.7 · PDF30

Position of the child	N	%
Yes	23	29
No	55	71
Total	78	100

Table 3.8 · PDF31

Age	NonN	Not%	JAN	Yes%	IALTN	Total%
15-17	7	33	14	67	21	100
12-14	17	77	5	23	22	100
7-11	19	90	2	10	21	100
4-6	6	75	2	25	8	100
0-3	6	100	0	0	6	100
Total	55	71	23	29	78	100

Table 3.9 · PDF34

More extensive than necessary	N	%
Yes	0	0
No	78	100
Total	78	100

Table 3.10 · PDF35

Reasoned position	N	%
Yes	61	78
No	17	22
Total	78	100

Table 3.11 · PDF36

The title asks for implementation; the correctness criteria refer to the decision. No silent harmonization

BFU implementation	N	%
Yes	69	88
No	8	10
No, emergency.	1	2
Total	78	100

Table 3.12 · PDF39

Legal requirements but without total correctness; initial knowledge vs. implementation has different watches

BFUinden 4 m	N	%
Yes	37	47
No	41	53
No, emergency.	0	0
Total	78	100

Table 4.1 · PDF42

Action plan	N	%
Yes	85	70
No required	29	24
No acute	7	6
Total	121	100

Table 4.2 · PDF46

Expected duration UDELADT main correctness; 15 / 85 no extra to 75 without dedup

Expected duration	N	%
Yes	70	82
No	15	18
Total	85	100

Table 4.3 · PDF48

Pre-decision plan	N	%
Yes	47	55
No required	32	38
No acute	6	7
Total	85	100

Table 5.1 · PDF51

Discharge acidity	N	%
Yes	37	86
Customer of 2	3	7
None	3	7
Total	43	100

Table 5.2 · PDF51

None of the missing cases has substantiated § 56 decision

Contact person consent	N	%
Yes	21	64
Customer of 2	4	12
None	8	24
Total	33	100

Table 5.3 · PDF52

11/45 deficient parental consent. Prose on joint parental responsibility:16 cases/3 none/4 mother only/56% relevant uses a different selection from the total of 5 partial.

Installation thickness	N	%
Yes	34	76
Customer of 2	5	11
None	6	13
Total	45	100

Table 5.4 · PDF54

Indirect expression accepted; no original consent form checked here

Young people's placement rate	N	%
Yes	21	100
No	0	0
Total	21	100

Table 6.1 · PDF56

Age	Talk to me.	Conversation%	None	No%	IALTN	Total%
15-17	34	87	5	13	39	100
12-14	20	65	11	35	31	100
7-11	16	53	14	47	30	100
4-6	4	44	5	56	9	100
0-3	0	0	12	100	12	100
Total	74	61	47	39	121	100

Table 6.2 · PDF58

Age indicators 10 / 16 / 11 differ from T6.1 none-conversation 11 / 14 / 12; total 47 are similar. No guesswork

Age	Evaluate	Evaluation%	None	No%	IALTN	Total%
15-17	0	0	5	100	5	100
12-14	3	30	7	70	10	100
7-11	10	63	6	37	16	100
4-6	3	60	2	40	5	100
0-3	8	73	3	27	11	100
Total	24	51	23	49	47	100

Table 6.3 · PDF60

Position at conversation	N	%
Yes	50	68
No	23	31
Not applicable	1	1
Total	74	100

Table 6.4 · PDF60

Percentages summer 101 vedegenaddition; original 100 total kept

Position second	N	%
Yes	6	13
No	29	62
Not applicable	12	26
Total	47	100

Table 6.5 · PDF62

Type	Talk to me.	Conversation%	None	No%	IALTN	Total%
Installation	27	60	18	40	45	100
Relief	17	40	26	60	43	100
Contact	30	91	3	9	33	100
Total	74	61	47	39	121	100

Table 6.6 · PDF62

Age	AnbrN	Apr%	AflastN	Discharge%	Contact N	Contact%	IALTN	Total%
15-17	21	47	2	5	16	48	39	32
12-14	14	31	5	12	12	36	31	26
7-11	1	2	25	58	4	12	30	25
4-6	1	2	8	19	0	0	9	7
0-3	8	18	3	7	1	3	12	10
Total	45	100	43	100	33	100	121	100

Table 6.7 · PDF63

15 child involvement irrelevant; systematic involvement EXCLUDED from the headline error

Scope	BarnN	Child%	Parents	Parents%
High	40	38	77	64
Someone.	27	25	29	24
Rings	14	13	10	8
No	25	24	5	4
Total	106	100	121	100

Table 6.8 · PDF64

Multi-answer, non-cumulative union

Form of parental involvement	N
Ongoing conversations	113
Written	60
Telephone	48
BFU review	26
Plan review	15
Family Council	4
Network meetings	46
Notification	36

Form of parental involvement	N
Implementation	72
Other	7

Table 6.9 · PDF64

Multi-answer; 106 relevant from T6.7, original T6.9 no own Ntotal

Form of child-rearing	N
Ongoing conversations	66
Written	11
Telephone	10
BFU review	6
Plan review	6
Family Council	0
Network meetings	8
Notification	4
Implementation	12
Other	19

Table Annex 3.1 · PDF97

All 15 municipalities+total; not a representative municipal error rate

Municipality	BFUja	Acute No	No required	Total
Parsley leaves	7	0	1	8
Esbjerg	4	1	3	8
Frederikshavn	8	1	0	9
Glostrup	7	1	1	9
Horsens	4	1	3	8
Hvidover	3	0	6	9
HøjTaastrup	3	0	5	8
Hørsholm	7	0	2	9
Copenhagen	4	2	2	8
Køge	3	1	2	6
Medium speed	5	0	1	6
Oats	4	1	4	9
Roskilde	8	0	1	9
Sønderborg	6	1	1	8
Århus	5	1	1	7

Municipality	BFUja	Acute No	No required	Total
Total	78	10	33	121

Table Annex 3.2 · PDF98

Municipality	Planja	No required	Acute No	Total
Parsley leaves	7	1	0	8
Esbjerg	6	1	1	8
Frederikshavn	6	2	1	9
Glostrup	6	2	1	9
Horsens	6	2	0	8
Hvidover	7	1	1	9
HøjTaastrup	3	5	0	8
Hørsholm	6	3	0	9
Copenhagen	7	1	0	8
Køge	3	2	1	6
Medium speed	5	1	0	6
Oats	5	3	1	9
Roskilde	9	0	0	9
Sønderborg	3	4	1	8
Århus	6	1	0	7
Total	85	29	7	121

Table Annex 3.3 · PDF99

Municipality	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Parsley leaves	7	1	8
Esbjerg	3	5	8
Frederikshavn	4	5	9
Glostrup	1	8	9
Horsens	3	5	8
Hvidover	2	7	9
HøjTaastrup	1	7	8
Hørsholm	1	8	9
Copenhagen	2	6	8
Køge	3	3	6
Medium speed	2	4	6
Oats	3	6	9
Roskilde	5	4	9
Sønderborg	3	5	8
Århus	6	1	7
Total	46	75	121

Table Annex 3.4 · PDF100

Municipality	No deficiency	Less	Essential	Decisive	Total
Parsley leaves	7	0	1	0	8
Esbjerg	3	2	3	0	8
Frederikshavn	6	2	1	0	9
Glostrup	4	3	1	1	9
Horsens	4	3	1	0	8
Hvidover	7	1	1	0	9
HøjTaastrup	4	4	0	0	8
Hørsholm	5	2	2	0	9
Copenhagen	5	3	0	0	8
Køge	2	3	1	0	6
Medium speed	4	2	0	0	6
Oats	3	3	3	0	9
Roskilde	5	2	1	1	9
Sønderborg	3	3	1	1	8
Århus	6	1	0	0	7
Total	68	34	16	3	121

Table Figure 2.1 prosa · PDF21

Graf visually; no data count on columns. 32 conflicts with 44% of 75 = 33, not quiet.

Correctness / information	Original%	Original
Correct / No deficiencies	76	Not specified
Correct / smaller	24	Not specified
Incorrect / no deficiencies	44	32

Table Figure 3.1 prosa · PDF33

The graph visual set; 4 + 4 columns the exact number labels. Unknown cells not estimated from heights.

Resource hedge	Original value	Unit
Childhood	78	% of 78
Parental high	67	% of 78
Parents' rings / no	4	Naf 78
Childhood	2	Naf 78

Table Figure 4.1 prosa · PDF44

Graph visually seen; the last four prose values sum to 119 and the graph's no bar is visually below 10%,not 24; the low bar visually between 10-20. Original raw cells missing; no guessed correction.

Plan content	Original%
Intended high	74
Aim	22
Input high	58
The man in charge	35
Aggregate High	49
Collected Target Someone	34
Collect size rings	12
Total target No	24

Additional measurements

Locator	Indicator	N	Unit	Limitation
PDF5	Self-service without and fail decisions	2	cases	Actual decision referred to, not explicit reference
PDF5	Consultation	4	answer	
PDF7	Children's case experts	40	cases	Selectively well documented / gravity; subset 121
PDF21	Fully lit incorrect prose	32	cases	Prose 44% of 75=33; T2.3 total 68 minus 35 correct should give 33, retain the conflict visually
PDF44	Prose% plan content	49/34/12/24	%	Total 119%; figure 4.1 must be visually checked before correction; no basis for a guessed correction
PDF52	Joint parents' housing	16	cases	Subset 45; 3 nothing + 4 only mother; prosa 56% relevant
PDF79	Professional inadequacies	Not less than half	Coefficient of 40	No exact print; do not recalculate
PDF83	Local authorities selected	15	municipalities	Among 30 group 2010 in 3 year rotation; geo / size
PDF83	Request	9	cases	3 of each type, most recent before 1 February 2010; not probabilistic random selection despite the source's designation
PDF84	Submitted	135	cases	
PDF84	Dissorted	14	cases	Youth contract, continued placement, too old or mixed; no grounds
PDF83	Test omitted	Form / Concept / Complaint	control areas;	The source gives voluntary support measures as its reason; statutory duties do not lapse for that reason
PDF102	4 m-time measurement scheme reply 3	Not expired	code text	T3.12 response 3 is called acute, second label; both values 0 but the method is maintained
PDF105	Table of measurement	§ 58 (3) No 8	Reference	Form 4.17/4.18 incorrect reference; main-text legal basis section 52 subsection 3 no. 8, no silent correction
PDF106	Assistants registration	4.23/4.24	Table points	Asks about offers/actual participation but no published results table in this 107-page original; the 121 completed forms must be obtained

Concrete evidence chains

Local case ID	Locator	Proof / consistency
116	PDF25 / 29; PDF52; PDF65	Aged 17; the supplemented BFU from 2 years earlier is accepted as to content, but the young person's consent to the BFU is missing. The same case in two sections. The same 17-year-old, contact person: both parents agreed according to the case note; AS counts this as consent to the measure despite the young person's missing BFU consent. The same 17-year-old: the father's meeting participation omitted despite joint custody; he himself requests participation. Consent to support does not determine actual ongoing involvement.
134	PDF25-26 / 29; PDF37; PDF46-47	Aged 15; a BFU from 2 years earlier supplemented before placement, but the young person's consent to the BFU is missing. Diagnostic/family descriptions are accounts of the case, not independent original clinical evidence. The same 15-year-old:AS regards a BFU supplement on the same day as the placement decision as timely; the exact physical date is not stated. The same placed 15-year-old:AS assesses "throughout childhood" as a precise duration; not automatically a reunification plan or an actual 3 years of separation.
025	PDF26; PDF44; PDF61	Age 12, respite care based on a 2-year-old BFU for another intervention, no current supplement; BFU requirement not met. Same age 12 respite case: plan purpose/intervention assessed as good; this does not change the missing BFU. Same age 12: prior interview positive about respite care, consent track does not resolve the BFU deficiency.
091	PDF26; PDF45	2 month child placed; BFU before birth on family treatment not updated after birth before placement. The same 2-month child: the general objectives of the plan do not support concrete impact checks.
022	PDF29	Aged 15, contact person; no attempt to obtain consent to the BFU from the father with joint custody.
027	PDF31-32; PDF47	Aged 7,Down syndrome; no child interview/other expression of views. AS accepts a specifically reasoned exemption; this does not document a general exemption for children with disabilities. Duration in the original plan example:probably throughout childhood; a norm/plan is not an actual cessation date.
063	PDF31-32; PDF47	8 years, ADHD; child interview only after the respite-care decision, no alternative account of the child's views; AS accepts the local exemption assessment. Duration in the original plan example:12 months of respite care every other weekend; a standard/plan is not an actual cessation date.
076	PDF34	10 year ADHD; BFUhealth point says healthy / healthy despite medical treatment; content any degree, not separate illegality judgement.
131	PDF35; PDF81	Aged 8, contact person without a reasoned position in the BFU. The same 8-year-old: PPR report almost 4 years after referral; family treatment granted to the father never started. Residence previously PDF35 equally with each parent versus PDF81 mostly with the father; version discrepancy not harmonised.
034	PDF37	15 years, municipality known problems several years / notifications especially 2 years. BFUconsent 3 m before violence; physical placement 10 d post-episode; ASrejects emergency exception to missing BFU.
103	PDF37	16 years acute placed after sudden deterioration; ASaccept emergency exception to BFU decision. No automatic final legality of all other guarantees.
068	PDF39	Aged 9; concerns for approximately 7 years; moved municipality just over 1½ years earlier; home visit→child welfare assessment at the earliest 5 months.4-month deadline breached; not all 7 years in the same municipality.
030	PDF42	17 years of age, retired after 1 year of residence and no further education. Contact person without plan; actual date of entry / school period unknown.
098	PDF42	14 years of relief without anticipatory plan; the municipality known the family several years.
074	PDF42-43	Aged 15, placed as an emergency following the reported suicide attempt; not previously known. AS accepts the missing plan before the emergency decision; actual return/redress not stated.
010	PDF45	17 years two previous placements, now returned to father; contact plan without concrete effort. No actual date of return.
130	PDF46; PDF80-81	Aged 13,respite care, plan duration uncertain without further reasons. The same 13-year-old:professional assessment of timely/appropriate respite care, but plan duration uncertain according to PDF46. Professional approval does not remove a specific deficiency in safeguards.
084	PDF46	12 years of placement, duration depends on development without further evaluation; duration criteria omitted main error.

Local case ID	Locator	Proof / consistency
062	PDF47	Original schedule duration: 1-2 years; standard / plane is not actual hearing date.
097	PDF47	Original schedule duration: like 2 years or longer; standard / plan is not actual hearing date.
088	PDF47	Original plan duration: long-term review; standard / plan is not actual hearing date.
125	PDF47	Original schedule duration: one school year; standard / plan is not actual hearing date.
009	PDF48	17 year contact person, plan 1 ½ m after decision.
115	PDF49	6 years, respite care; plan on the decision date; AS: timely.
058	PDF49	17 years of contact, plan 1 m before decision; AStimely.
092	PDF49	Newborn physically placed as an emergency the day after birth, 8 weeks premature; plan 2 months after birth, emergency exception accepted by AS.
135	PDF49	17 years, emergency respite care after being thrown out; plan within 4 months, emergency exception accepted by AS.
083	PDF53; PDF77	Child aged 1½ years placed in care, preprinted form with both parents' consent; approved by AS, original consent not independently seen. Same 1½ years: need known from birth, later placed in care; child expert assesses a late response. Statements about parenting capacity require their original basis before independent application of the law to the facts.
001	PDF53	Age 15, placed outside the home, mother's consent but no documented consent from the father with joint parental responsibility.
008	PDF53	Age 16, placed in care, missing consent from the father holding joint parental responsibility. No actual/home date.
060	PDF54	17 years of existence, indirect joy transfer accepted by ASas intended consent; original journalism provided here.
080	PDF54; PDF78-79	Aged 17,wants to leave the parents after a suicide attempt; AS accepts the statements as consent to the purpose; independent examination of the originals is necessary. The same 17-year-old:previously placed→returned home to the father→placed again; course known by year, actual dates unknown. Sexual abuse appears as an allegation by the mother, not a verified fact.
086	PDF58-59	14 year contact person first informed by decision, no prior conversation / exemption / alternative attitude; 5 siblings not automatically 5 additional error victims.
093	PDF59	Aged 13,placement after approximately 8 years of respite care and many notifications; no prior child interview/statement of views/assessment of an exemption.
105	PDF60-61	12 years of contact, family known before birth; conversation before decision and concise request to person, ASinterview guarantee met.
120	PDF61	9 years of reloading 4 m; conversation about general well-being but not the child's attitude to concordant support.
075	PDF61; PDF65-66	9 years, new respite care every 4th weekend; no child interview/views/exemption examination. Same 9 years: no interview with the child at any time, parents informed only when a possible respite family found; decision time→delivery time unknown.
114	PDF61	5 years of disability without spoken language; local exemption accepted by AS. Not generalexemption for all disabilities.
123	PDF65	6 years, relaxation since 2 years → emplacement; anticipatory conversation / attitude; asemblemhigh.
048	PDF71	Aged 15, a contact person was actually provided 1 year after the decision; professional criticism of missing assessment and prevention. 1 year without granted support is specific; causation of criminality is a consultant's assessment, not counterfactually proved.
069	PDF72	Age 11, autism; specific exemption because of an unfamiliar adviser/the burden of an unpredictable situation professionally accepted; no general diagnosis-based exemption.
129	PDF72	14 years of Down syndrome, counsellor greetings home; concreteexemption accepted professionally.

Local case ID	Locator	Proof / consistency
113	PDF72	Aged 12,ADHD; municipality/parents' new interpretation is not a child interview before respite care; the child expert disagrees and wants direct involvement.
079	PDF76	Age 17, own approach→interview/psychologist→placement; child expert assesses good involvement, not an independent judgment on the outcome.
073	PDF81	Age 3, concern involving the eldest child 8 years earlier; family with 4 children, respite care inadequate according to a professional assessment. Not all 4 recorded in a unique error cohort; family records required.

Independent judicial review

Total correctness is a defined measuring instrument. The study omits the form of administrative law, justification and review guidance, as well as the four-month period, consent to the investigation itself, the expected duration of the plan and systematic inclusion as independent main criteria. The duties in force in the present case do not lapse in the opt-out procedure. The separate cells must therefore be retained and the lack of public cross-coding prevents addition to 75 cases of error.

The absence of valid consent constitutes a concrete departure from the conditions of the place of placement. Each of the 11 places of accommodation requires verification of consent, competent enforcement, effective implementation and continuation. A general presumption of the legality of the Authority cannot replace those evidence. At the same time, a case description of a parent problem must not be transformed into independently verified facts solely through repetition in legal and child-friendly sections.

One year without a granted contact person and almost four years waiting for assessment show specific periods in which support or the basis for decision-making was missing. The demand is actual delivery and individual redress, simultaneous assessment of loss and responsibility, and examination of the content of own-initiative decisions. The percentage of correct cases can neither measure these periods nor prove redress.

Checks and residues carried out

No unread page or numbered numerical matrix in the original. Three graphs' unlabelled data cells and internal conflicts in the original require raw tables; 121 original case records and completed forms, 14 exclusion-reason cells, linkage/union of people for cases already appealed, 2 original own-initiative decisions and actual support/redress/accountability have not been obtained.

The placement study 2006: all 32 tables, parental roles and specific separations

The study demonstrates concrete shortcomings in the basis for interventions in the family life of children and parents. Its 23 rated change outcomes out of 101 selected decisions are a control assessment, not a count of 23 actually native children. The published original has now been studied in full, all 63PDFs pages including method and questionnaires. All 32 numbered tables are included below. This is a deepening of the same 101case-cohort, which is already included in the report; it must not be added again.

Selection and cases not covered

21 municipalities were selected, one could not supply cases, and 20 were included. 125 received cases minus 24 outside the topic yielded 101. The sample consists of the most recent 5-8 relevant placement decisions per municipality before 20. April 2006, with a decision after 1. January 2006, under the methodology described. Cases already appealed are not included. In sibling cases, the oldest child is generally selected. The low number of compulsory cases therefore cannot be used as a national distribution. Answers to organisational questions vary between 10 and 20 municipalities.

The excluded appeal population must be examined separately. There is no public person-identity key showing overlap with other practice surveys, appeals, siblings or parents. Table 2.3 describes parental-responsibility roles; it does not give a count of unique affected adults. Offers to 12 mothers and 7 fathers in table 2.26 are 19 role instances with unknown overlap. Involvement, consent to assessment, consent to placement and actual reunification are different events.

All tables with original denominator

The tables reproduce factual cell values with their own short row labels. Percentages are referred to as percentages; blank or not explicitly printed cells are not changed to zero. The original case summaries are the reproduction of municipal documents by the control body. The citizens' original records are not publicly presented in this report.

Table 2.1 - Original PDF11

Form of settlement	Number
With consent	98
Without consent	3
Without parental consent, with young people's consent	0
Total	101

Table 2.2 - Original PDF12

Age	Boys	Girls	Total
0-3 years	2	2	4
4 to 6 years	4	1	5
7-11 years	7	5	12
12 to 14 years	20	12	32
15 to 17 years	21	26	47
Undisclosed	Not specifically printed	1	1
Total	54	47	101

The unlit row's boy cell is not filled in in the text reproduction. A calculated zero shall not be produced as a printed original cell.

Table 2.3 - Original PDF12

Parental authority	Number
Common	48
Mom alone.	46
Father alone	5
Others	2
Total	101

48 joint custody is not 48 unique parents. The report does not provide the identity key for deductibility.

Table 2.4 - original PDF13

Initiative / Contact	Number
Parents	46
School / SFO	26
Municipality	22
Others	22
Child / Young	19
Health services	14
Family / network	10
Police / Court	8
Daily offers	4

Several entrances may occur in the same case. Order 171 is not 171 cases. One case's entry is unknown. Of 46 parents' requests, 17 are only entry and 29 are combined; of 19 children's requests, 6 are alone and 13 are combined.

Table 2.5 - Original PDF13

Source of information	Number
Mom.	85
Child / Young	73
School	70
Dad.	50
Others	50
Psychologist	43
Physician	38
Network	22
Paediatrics	12
Health care provider	7

Several sources per case; 450 sources do not provide 450 people.

Table 2.6 - Original PDF14

Age	Missing information from the child;	Case	Printed percentage
0-3 years	4	4	100
4 to 6 years	4	5	80
7-11 years	4	12	33
12 to 17 years	15	79	19
Undisclosed	1	1	Not printed
Total	28	101	28

Table 2.7 - Original PDF14

Overall assessment	Number
Wouldn't change	78
Wanted to change	23
Total	101

This is the investigation’s counterfactual appeal assessment;23 does not document 23 implemented overturnings or returns home.

Table 2.8 - Original PDF14

Absence of information	Number
None	77
Less	6
More substantial	13
Decisive	5
Total	101

Table 2.9 - Original PDF15

Absence of information	Wouldn't change	Wanted to change	Total
None	70	7	77
Less	5	1	6
More substantial	3	10	13
Decisive	0	5	5
Total	78	23	101

The outcome assessment and the procedure assessment have different criteria. 78 unmodified outcomes are not 78 documented flawless cases.

Table 2.10 - Original PDF16

Investigation after 1.1.2006	Number	Percentage
Available	55	82
Deficiencies but required	12	18
Total	67	100

34 older assessments fall outside this denominator. One of the 12 missing assessments concerns emergency placement; legality must be assessed specifically against the conditions for the exception.

Table 2.11 - Original PDF16

Overall compliance of the survey	Number	Percentage
Very much	15	22
To some extent	33	49
Very small	6	9
No	1	1
Missing	12	18
Total	67	100

The text's 28% inadequate includes 19 / 67, including 12 missing studies.15 / 55 existing studies are 27,3%; the denominators may not be exchanged.

Table 2.12 - Original PDF16

Consent for Joint Authority investigation	Number	Percentage
Both	16	61
Mom only.	3	12
Only Dad.	1	4
None	1	4
Undisclosed	5	19
Total	26	100

10 / 26 has not documented the consent of both; the 5 undisclosed are not 5 proven refusals.

Table 2.13 - Original PDF17

Consent from young 15 + to study	Number	Percentage
Yes	16	60
No	0	0
Undisclosed	11	40
Total	27	100

11 unilluminated persons shall not be reclassified to 11 refusals. The broader summary of the text cannot replace the table cells.

Table 2.14 - original PDF17

Area of information	High / some percent	Rale / No%	Not applicable%	Printed total
Development	93	6	2	100
Family	90	11	0	100
School	74	20	7	100
Health	68	18	14	100
Recreation	70	25	5	100
Other factors	91	5	2	100

The footnote indicates 57 surveys after 1.1.2006, while Table 2.10 has 55. Row 101 / 101 / 101 / 100 / 100 / 98 shall be maintained; they shall not be normalised to 100 without explanation.

Table 2.15 - original PDF17

Specific features of young people	Number	Percentage
Very much	10	37
To some extent	2	7
Very small	4	15
No	11	41
Total	27	100

Table 2.16 - Original PDF18

Assessed need for sibling examination	Number	Percentage
Yes	17	49
No	14	40
Undisclosed	4	11
Total	35	100

20 out of 55 are not relevant to the sibling question.17 assessments are not 17 actually conducted studies or 17 siblings.

Table 2.17 - original PDF18

Involvement	Number of parents	Parents%	Child Number	Child percentage
Yes	41	75	42	76
No	10	18	9	17
Undisclosed	3	5	1	2
Not applicable	1	Not printed	3	4
Total	55	100	55	100

The irrelevance of children relates to two 0-year-olds and one undeclared age. Actor columns may overlap; they are not two separate case cohorts.

Table 2.18 - original PDF18

Involvement of other networks, relevant cases	Number	Percentage
Very much	20	45
To some extent	7	16
Very small	5	11
No	12	27
Total	44	100

Table 2.19 - Original PDF19

Reasoned opinion on aid	Number	Percentage
Very much	42	76
To some extent	8	15
Very small	2	4
No	3	5
Total	55	100

Table 2.20 - original PDF19

Four-month deadline	Number	Percentage
Accompanied	30	77
Not complied with	1	3
Undisclosed	8	20
Total	39	100

16 cases with a known need before 1.1.2006 are excluded from the deadline denominator. None of the 9 no/unspecified cases has an interim assessment; unspecified does not automatically mean a proven deadline overrun.

Table 2.21 - Original PDF20

Total requirements of the action plan	Number	Percentage
Very much	16	17
To some extent	50	52
Very small	16	17
No	5	5
Missing	8	8
Total	95	100

6 emergency / elderly schedules are outside; 87 plans are available; 66 / 95 is 69,5%; 66 / 87 is 75,9%.

Table 2.22 - Original PDF20

Plan requirements	Number of objectives	Objective percentage	Number of wagers	Rate of bet
Very much	72	83	63	72
To some extent	9	10	15	17
Very small	1	1	2	1
No	5	6	7	8
Total	87	100	87	100

The original presses 1% for 2 / 87 in the bet column; calculated is 2,3%. Both are kept apart.

Table 2.23 - original PDF20

Plan Area	High%	Some%	Low%	No%	Not applicable%	Total%
Development	34	39	8	17	2	100
Family	34	33	13	17	3	100
School	38	29	8	17	8	100
Health	28	24	2	29	17	100
Recreation	33	31	6	24	6	100
Other factors	11	11	1	47	30	100

N87 existing plans. Printed percentages cannot give exact unknown numbers.

Table 2.24 - original PDF21

Expected duration of the plan	Number	Percentage
Yes	71	82
No	16	18
Total	87	100

Table 2.25 - Original PDF21

Family support in the plan	Number	Percentage
Very much	44	51
To some extent	14	16
Very small	3	1
No	22	25
Not applicable	4	5
Total	87	100

The original prints 1% at 3 / 87, calculated 3,4%; printed category percentages sum 98.

Table 2.26 - Original PDF21

Tenders to be made separately Parental plan	Mother number	Mother%	Father number	Father%
Yes	12	14	7	8
No	29	33	18	21
Undisclosed	41	47	33	38
Not applicable	4	5	29	33
Total	87	100	87	100

The mother's row 86 contradicts printed total 87.12 mothers + 7 fathers are 19 bidders; not documented 19 different cases or families.

Table 2.27 - Original PDF22

Form of the decision	Number
Written decision	9
Journalnotate	65
Other	27
Total	101

The letter indicates 64 journal notes; Table 65. Two coercive actions shall have a written decision, one protocol.

Table 2.28 - Original PDF22

Reasons	Number
Very much	66
To some extent	12
Very small	7
No	10
Not applicable	6
Total	101

The brevity changes between 7 and 10 degrees and no. Table cells and opposites are preserved.

Table 2.29 - Original PDF22

Complaint guidance	Number
Very much	0
To some extent	0
Very small	0
No	2
Not applicable	99
Total	101

Of three cases of coercion, there is no guidance in two. The third is a decision of the Presidency which is not approved. No actual date of return is given for it for that reason alone.

Table 5.1 - original PDF47

Cases per. processor	Local authority under 40000	40000-59999	60000+	Total	Percentage
35-40	2	3	2	7	35
41-45	0	1	1	2	10
46-50	4	0	1	5	25
51-55	Not printed	Not printed	Not printed	Not printed	Not printed
56-60	0	1	1	2	10
61-65	0	2	1	3	15
Exceeding 65	1	0	0	1	5
Total	7	7	6	20	100

One over 65 is deleted from Figure 5.1 due to uncertain load statement. The explicit figure 26 / 0 / 19 / 17 / 38 cannot be safely connected to each column without visual control; no causal error rate is constructed.

Table 5.2 - Original PDF48

Number of work areas per worker	Municipalities	Percentage
1	8	40
2	5	25
3	5	25
Undisclosed	2	10
Total	20	100

Figures 5.2 and 5.3 do not give textual exact cell numbers. The description about two thirds versus one third is not an exact number of persons.

Table 5.3 - Original PDF50

Full-time posts	Less than 40000	40000-59999	60000+	Total
6-10	5	0	0	5
11-15	2	2	0	4
16-20	0	3	0	3
21-25	0	1	0	1
26-30	0	1	2	3
Exceeding 30	0	0	4	4
Total	7	7	6	20

Local authorities vary between 10 and 20 according to the question. The area of staff also includes other child, support and disability tasks.

Case-chains and the actual timelimits

The following own summaries maintain the original case codes so that repeated summaries do not turn into new people. The original report is the source of the statement made by the control body; the underlying municipal original documents are still necessary for self-examination.

Case a	Locator	Specific information on the control report	Meaning and delineation
3.4	PDF24 and 41	15-year-old girl placed 26.2.2006 and returned 31.3.2006; plan missing before decision; the investigation would amend the decision.	33 calendar days of actual placement. Return home is justified by dissatisfaction with the school; it is not documented as the result of a legal overturning.
5.19	PDF24-25	13-year-old girl; contact 28.12.2005, decision 26.1.2006, placement 1.2.2006 to carry out an assessment. The review body states that there was no basis for placement and does not accept the emergency justification.	Actual start is documented in the summary. The end, the return and the final responsibility are not disclosed.
4.8	PDF24 and 30	16-year-old girl; contact January 2006 and placement 13.3.2006 without necessary examination. The summary points out that two of three posts were vacant.	Evidence of capacity explanation and insufficient basis; no documented end date.
4.2	PDF25	13-year-old boy; study and plan after decision, with psychological material as insufficient substitute for overall assessment.	Subsequent document production does not in itself show legally original basis or restored family life.
4.6	PDF25-26	14-year-old girl; the mother's reluctant consent after the assessment does not cover the purpose.	Requirements for specific review of the content, voluntary nature and legal basis of consent; no end date.
2.8	PDF26	15-year-old boy in sister; no documented contact with or consent from the mother, although described as positive.	An assessed positive attitude is not documented consent.
0.2	PDF26 and 38	14-year-old girl with joint custody; father abroad has not been tried involved or asked.	The same case occurs in several places. Two children may not be counted.
5.22	PDF26-27 and 32	1-year-old boy, parents 17 and 20 years: mother consents to study 23.2.2006; father asks for help 13.3; acute placement 27.3 with mother's consent and father's previous aid wish treated as consent.	A request for help does not document consent to a particular placement. The different dates and consent objects must be kept separate.
5.18	PDF27 and 37-38	17-year-old girl refuses placement 14.3.2006 but the decision is treated as voluntary. The young person is not included in the study; the needs of younger family members have not been evaluated.	Concrete consent and involvement errors; younger family members are not extra investigated cases.
2.9	PDF27-28	Mother psychiatric inmate 5.4.2006 gives registered consent; 18.4 she does not remember. Father with joint authority has not agreed. The investigation and plan are missing.	13 days between entries have not been documented total separation time. The number of children is not determined by pluris.
1.1	PDF28	4-year-old boy; the municipality's assumption of custody has not been documented; plan is missing.	Actual custody must be documented before the municipality's assumption is used as a basis for action.
1.11	PDF29	15-year-old girl; study is missing, but the control body finds other information sufficient for the outcome.	Unchanged result cannot be rewritten as the absence of the investigation existed.
3.11	PDF29-30	The age of the summary 7 months and the 3 ½ years of the assessment have not been clarified.	The original's contradiction must be visible; it cannot be used for a secure age or person count.
3.8	PDF30-31	15-year-old girl; contact 7.3.2006 and acute placement 9.3 with family care.	The summary justifies specific acute exception; two days of process is not automatically illegal.

Case a	Locator	Specific information on the control report	Meaning and delineation
3.9	PDF31	12-year-old girl; police 9.3.2006, video interrogation 10.3 and acute placement; subsequent investigation is planned.	The initial trajectory provides no public end date or reunification information.
5.10	PDF31-32	11-year-old boy; acute placement at late evening and absent mother who later wishes to continue.	Consent and urgency must be attached to each time; the summary does not document the legality of the entire duration.
1.3	PDF33-34	16-year-old girl; relevant grandparents and sister are not adequately described in the family survey.	The network shortage may affect the alternative to placement; original alternative course and end date are required.
5.11	PDF34	16-year-old girl; school description only indicates the school type with no function, well-being and further education.	The title or institution name does not replace specific needs information.
3.6	PDF35	13-year-old boy; health section mentions allergy, but does not take a position on possible drug problems mentioned elsewhere.	The inconsistency of the source chain requires verification; the ruse suspicion is not independently verified.
0.1	PDF35	16-year-old girl; father died 2005 and information on mom's mental problems, but no sufficient information on friend environment.	Family information is summary statements; needs and network assessment must be based on original documents.
5.3	PDF36	16-year-old boy; school completion, local environment and housing opportunities are specifically included in the youth assessment.	This is the same age-restricted analysis, not an additional population.
5.14	PDF36-37 and 42	16-year-old boy; education, the local environment and housing are inadequately assessed; the plan only indicates an indefinite duration.	Unclear objectives and final perspectives may prolong the procedure; actual cessation date is not disclosed.
3.5	PDF37	16-year-old girl with a son and a half-brother named.	Maternity, child and siblings are different roles; they cannot be counted as three of the 101 without identity checks.
3.12	PDF37	14-year-old middle brother; oldest already placed and youngest at day school, with studies referred to.	The family context does not create three new sampled cases.
4.10	PDF37-38	15-year-old girl with 13-year-old brother; the need for a separate sibling study is specifically assessed.	A relevance assessment is not a general number of siblings or finished bets.
5.23	PDF38	A 17-year-old, the eldest of four, provides extensive care for siblings aged 7,3 and 1½ years. The oversight body calls for individual needs assessments.	One investigated case of old age; three mentioned siblings with possible unmet needs, without documented national delusion.
5.1	PDF32 and 39	12-year-old with 3-year-old sister; mother's consent to study has not been documented and grandmother cannot be the main caregiver.	Repeatations are gathered under the same case code.
1.5	PDF39	14-year-old boy; possible support of mother and grandmother has not been sufficiently investigated.	Requirements for clarification of less intrusive support, with concrete accessibility and the needs of the child.
5.4	PDF43	14-year-old girl previously housed in Greenland and returned in Denmark after cessation of care. The plan is imprecise on integration and family ties.	The actual return is mentioned, but the date and connection to the search is unknown.
1.12	PDF44	4-year-old boy; consent withdrawn and coercive decision 24.4.2006; older study continues to be assessed appropriately.	The review shall follow the change from consent to coercion; the date of selection of the original shall require a separate vote.
4.18	PDF44	The record in the coercion case lacks guidance on appeal rights.	Effective review is specifically concerned; effective redress, duration of action and subsequent correction are required.

Case a	Locator	Specific information on the control report	Meaning and delineation
5.21	PDF45	4-year-old girl acute on suspicion, with medical records without evidence of intrusion and age-threatening bruises. The inspection body asks for reasons; the Committee on Children's Rights does not approve the decision of the chairman.	The suspicion is not verified by being repeated. Non-approval shall be followed for effective termination / return; this end date is not disclosed.

Legal consequence, responsibility and concrete requirements

The strongest specific criticisms are a decision without a sufficient basis for placement, missing relevant consent and failure to approve an emergency decision. In case 5.22, the father’s request for help cannot, without documentation, be turned into consent to the specific separation. In case 5.18, an express refusal by a 17-year-old cannot be presented as consent. In case 5.19, the review body expressly states that a basis for placement is missing. Each point must be examined under the historical version of the law on the intervention date and the specific conditions for consent, assessment, emergency action and coercion; current Children’s Act provisions cannot be uncritically moved back to 2006.

The consequence of the action is the actual separation of the child and the loss of relevant parental involvement. Case 3.4 has a proven 33-day course and an established plan problem. The two facts are both documented in the summary, but the published source does not state that all 33 days were homeless or that the return was due to a violation. Comparison with private 37-day evasion in the report's chapter of responsibility must therefore show, respectively, the actual duration, the legal basis, the consent, the guilt, the actual review and the result of the judgment. The 40-day suspended prison of the private case is a real punishment in the specific case; it is not an automatic punishment for all municipal planning errors.

The specific chain of responsibility is the decision-maker, competent certification body, management and ex post control. The requested further course is the maintenance of simultaneous original records and consent documents, a separate decision on continued intervention, actual date of return / contact / support and a verifiable liability assessment. The report's reference to one own-initiative case under Article 47 does not give an additional 101- case code nor evidence of final return. The Committee's duty to follow up the practical study demonstrates a control route, but not its actual impact on these children.

Opposite and residual evidence of the original

Documented disputes include 55 against 57 studies, 64 against 65 journal notes, the exchange of 7 / 10 explanatory notes, a meeting column with a total of 86 and a total of 87, and percentage cells which do not match the printed numbers. There are also summaries of different ages or dates which require a vote with the original records. These concrete contradictions must not be concealed by adjusting the figures to a nice total.

All 32 numbered tables are now covered. The figures in figure 5.1 can be read as text, but their mapping to the bars has not been visually verified; figures 5.2/5.3 do not contain exact bar values in text. No values are invented from the height of the graph. The remaining substantive evidence consists particularly of the underlying 101 case files, the selection list with the 24 excluded cases and the cases already appealed, the final decision in the own-initiative case, municipal follow-up and citizens’ actual redress. These are precise additional demands for documents, not a reason to tone down the deficiencies already documented.

Appointment 2008: full original, all tables and actual meaning of consent

The full 73- page original is now text read, including all 39 main tables, all 5 municipal tables and the measurement scheme. PDF10 and 56 are also visually controlled in memory. This explains the same 143case-cohort in the historical series of the report; no 143 new cases are added. The cover indicates January 2008, the issue field February 2008. Both dates shall be retained.

The inspection body assesses 92 / 143 decisions improperly.22 cases lack relevant placement consent; 21 are listed as primary consent category and one in the primary category of non-placement basis. The control report shall not seek a hypothetical coercive power to replace a lack of voluntary consent. The known conditions must be followed to:

actual residence, termination, new valid decision and personal liability; the original does not give the overall restoration account.

Limitation and units

11 municipalities were asked for 15 cases each: 165 called minus 20 outside the theme and 2 not submitted = 143. Decisions should be after 1.1.2006 and the latest before 15.5.2007. Cases already complained are excluded; in the case of siblings only the oldest children.24 decision dates are undisclosed and age is set at 1.5.2007. Some summaries actually describe repatriation, while case 065 was explicitly never implemented.143 decisions are therefore not 143 documented new physical separations.

89 studies of substance are a subset of 90 available; one study concerns future parents and falls outside the then content examination.104 plans are the subset of the same cases. Parents' columns, siblings and source indications provide roles and sources; they cannot be summed up to unique persons.

All numerical tables and the exact figures of the graph

The row labels below are own short terms. Numbers and percentages are the values actually read, including the actual contradiction of the original. A code in the empty measurement scheme is a response category, not an observed number of citizens.

Table 2.1 - PDF9

Category: Form of decision	Number	Printed percentage
Optional	137	96
Forced	6	4
Forced with young people's consent	0	0
Total	143	100

Table 2.2 - PDF10

Age	Number of boys	Boys%	Number of girls	Girls%	Total number	Total%
0-3	4	5	7	11	11	7
4-6	5	5	3	5	8	6
7-11	13	17	5	8	18	13
12-14	29	37	21	32	50	35
15-17	27	35	29	45	56	39
Total	78	100	65	100	143	100

PDF10 actually visually set.4 with footnote 1 are 4 boys, not 41. One unborn child is included. Boy cells are buzzing 78. The printed 5% at 5 / 78 is retained even if calculated 6,4%.

Table 2.3 - PDF10

Category of custody	Number	Printed percentage
Common	52	36
Mom.	78	55
Dad.	12	8
Others	1	1
Total	143	100

Table 2.4 - PDF11

Initiative	Number	%	Only occasion number	Only cause%
Parents	46	32	16	11
Municipality	30	21	11	8
School / SFO	28	20	7	5
Health	23	16	6	4
Child / Young	17	12	4	3
Family / network	15	11	6	4
Police / Court	11	8	1	1
Daily offers	2	2	1	1
Others	56	39	20	14

Several entrances can occur in the same of 143 cases; 228 entrances are not 228 children.

Table 2.5 - PDF11

Category: source of information	Number	Printed percentage
Mom.	130	91
Child / Young	115	80
School	94	65
Dad.	65	45
Psychologist	62	44
Physician	53	37
Network	47	33
Daily offers	16	11
Health care	4	3
Others	96	68

Multi-answer. Several printed percentages are not normal rounding of number / 143; the values are kept as print.115 Child information gives 28 without, while Table 2.6 says 29.

Table 2.6 - PDF12

Age	Without child information	Age denominator	%
0-3	9	11	82
4-6	3	8	38
7-11	5	18	28
12-14	6	50	12
15-17	6	56	11
Total	29	143	20

Table 2.7 - PDF12

Category: total correctness	Number	Printed percentage
Correct	51	36
Not correct	92	64
Total	143	100

Table 2.8 - PDF13

Category: primary cause of error	Number	Printed percentage
No basis for placing	3	3
No voluntary basis / consent	21	23
Formal error	68	74
Total	92	100

Primary category, not all overlapping errors. PDF12 says 69 formal, while Table 13 and summary says 68.

Table 2.9 - PDF13

Category: lack of information	Number	Printed percentage
None	61	43
Less	43	30
Multiple / substantial	21	15
Decisive	18	12
Total	143	100

Table 2.10 - PDF14

Absence of information	Correct	Not correct	Total
None	35	26	61
Less	16	27	43
Multiple / substantial	0	21	21
Decisive	0	18	18
Total	51	92	143

Table 2.11 - PDF14

Category: Parents' accommodation consent	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	122	89
No	15	11
Total	137	100

Only 137 volunteers; 6 forced left out.

Table 2.12 - PDF14

Category: young 15 + placement consent	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	46	82
No	10	18
Total	56	100

12 only parents + 7 only young + 3 both = 22 cases without relevant consistance.21 primarycategory and 1 under no basis; not 22 + 21.

Table 2.13 - PDF15

Category of survey	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	90	63
Deficiencies but required	40	28
Deficiencies, deadline not expired	13	9
Total	143	100

Content is measured only in 89 of 90; one being-parent study falls outside the requirements of the time.

Table 2.14 - PDF16

Category: content of the study	Number	Printed percentage
High	19	21
Someone.	53	60
Rings	17	19
No	0	0
Total	89	100

The content assessment does not cover right.16 for the late without emergency, 7 for the late acute and 8 for the undisclosed among 89.

Table 2.15 - PDF16

Consent to BFU at single parent	Mother number	Mother%	Father number	Father%
Yes	31	72	7	78
No	2	5	1	11
Undisclosed	10	23	1	11
Total	43	100	9	100

Table 2.16 - PDF17

Category: BFUconsent common	Number	Printed percentage
Both	22	61
Mom only.	3	8
Only Dad.	0	0
None	2	6
Undisclosed	9	25
Total	36	100

Table 2.17 - PDF17

Category: Young people's BFU consent	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	13	42
No	6	19
Undisclosed	12	39
Total	31	100

Table 2.18 - PDF18

Theme	High / some%	Rated / No%	Total%	Denomination
Development	92	8	100	89
Family	90	10	100	89
School	90	10	100	81
Recreation	87	13	100	85
Health	74	26	100	89
Other factors	68	32	100	56

Table 2.19 - PDF18

Category: special conditions for young people	Number	Printed percentage
High	3	10
Someone.	10	32
Rings	9	29
No	9	29
Total	31	100

Table 2.20 - PDF18

Category of sleepers assessed	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	28	57
No	21	43
Total	49	100

40 of 89 not applicable; 49 cases are not 49 siblings.

Table 2.21 - PDF19

Category: Parental position	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	77	86
No	12	14
Total	89	100

Table 2.22 - PDF19

Category: position of children	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	56	63
No	23	26
Undisclosed	2	2
Not applicable / possible	8	9
Total	89	100

Footnote 1 before 8 is footnote, not 18. Four are 0-year-olds.

Table 2.23 - PDF19

Category: Family resources	Number	Printed percentage
High	24	27
Someone.	38	43
Rings	12	13
No	15	17
Total	89	100

Table 2.24 - PDF20

Category: Reasoned position	Number	Printed percentage
High	65	73
Someone.	15	17
Rings	3	3
No	6	7
Total	89	100

Table 2.25 - PDF20

Category: BFU four-month deadline	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	58	65
No	17	19
Undisclosed	14	16
Total	89	100

Table 2.26 - PDF20

Category: preliminary overshoot assessment	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	3	18
No	13	76
Undisclosed	1	6
Total	17	100

PDF20's prose indicates 14 without assessment; table says 13 no and 1 unlit; PDF43 says 13. No harmonisation to 14 proved no.

Table 2.27 - PDF21

Category of action plan	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	104	73
Deficiencies, should be available	26	18
Deficiencies due to acute	13	9
Total	143	100

Table 2.28 - PDF21

Category: plan before decision	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	34	33
No, should be available	41	39
No, due to acute	18	17
Undisclosed	11	11
Total	104	100

Summary 42 for late vs Table 41; unknown for the same primary coding.

Table 2.29 - PDF21

Category: Contents of the plan	Number	Printed percentage
High	4	4
Someone.	63	60
Rings	33	32
No	4	4
Total	104	100

The percentage of the municipality annex 3 / 61 / 32 / 4 differs from 4 / 60 / 32 / 4, although the number 4 / 63 / 33 / 4 is the same.

Table 2.30 - PDF22

Level	Number of objectives	Objective%	Number of wagers	Bet%
High	70	67	45	43
Someone.	28	27	49	47
Rings	2	2	4	4
No	4	4	6	6
Total	104	100	104	100

Table 2.31 - PDF22

Plan Area	High / some%	Rated / No%	Not applicable%	Total%
Development	83	17	-	100
Family	71	29	-	100
School	65	24	11	100
Recreation	69	26	5	100
Health	51	47	2	100
Other factors	23	30	47	100

104 plans; percentage cells are not exact integers.

Table 2.32 - PDF22

Category: expected duration	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	68	65
No	36	35
Total	104	100

Table 2.33 - PDF23

Category: family support	Number	Printed percentage
High	22	21
Someone.	30	29
Rings	14	13
No	38	37
Not applicable	0	0
Total	104	100

Table 2.34 - PDF23

Separate Parental Plan	Mother number	Mother%	Father number	Father%
Yes	8	7	4	3
No	87	84	45	44
Undisclosed	9	9	3	3
Not applicable	0	0	52	50
Total	104	100	104	100

8 + 4 are 12 roles with unknown family coupling. Printed 7% and 3% at 8 / 104 and 4 / 104 are retained.

Table 2.35 - PDF23

Category of child interview completed	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	95	66
No	48	34
Total	143	100

A completed interview is not in itself the correct time and content for the purposes of Case 021 / 163.

Table 2.36 - PDF24

Age	Yeah.	No.	Total	Printed yes%
0-3	1	10	11	10
4-6	5	3	8	63
7-11	8	10	18	44
12-14	34	16	50	68
15-17	47	9	56	84
Total	95	48	143	66

Table 2.37 - PDF24

Category: Form of decision	Number	Printed percentage
Written	19	13
Journalnotate	83	58
Configuration Note	11	8
Declaration of consent	24	17
Other	6	4
Total	143	100

Table 2.38 - PDF24

Category: written justification	Number	Printed percentage
High	16	84
Someone.	3	16
Rings	0	0
No	0	0
Total	19	100

Table 2.39 - PDF25

Category: coercive complaint guidance	Number	Printed percentage
High	3	50
Someone.	0	0
Rings	0	0
No	1	17
Not applicable	2	33
Total	6	100

Footnote 1 before 2 is not 12. PDF25 explains preliminary findings; form PDF73 does not link to non-approval. Physical cessation shall be demonstrated separately.

Table Annex 3.1 - PDF63

Municipality	Yes%	No%	Total%	Number
Copenhagen	30	70	100	10
Hvidover	42	58	100	12
Høj-Taastrup	36	64	100	11
Køge	36	64	100	14
Lolland	14	86	100	14
Medium speed	38	62	100	13
Haderslev	36	64	100	14
Sønderborg	57	43	100	14
Skanderborg	20	80	100	15
Århus	58	42	100	12
Drill-Dronninglund	21	79	100	14
Total percentage	36	64	100	-
Total	51	92	-	143

Table Annex 3.2 - PDF63

Municipality	No basis%	Consent%	Formula%	Total%	Number of errors
Copenhagen	0	29	71	100	7
Hvidover	14	43	43	100	7
Høj-Taastrup	0	29	71	100	7
Køge	0	44	56	100	9
Lolland	8	8	84	100	12
Medium speed	0	0	100	100	8
Haderslev	0	0	100	100	9
Sønderborg	0	50	50	100	6
Skanderborg	0	33	67	100	12
Århus	0	0	100	100	5
Drill-Dronninglund	9	18	73	100	11
Total percentage	3	23	74	100	-
Total	3	21	68	-	92

Table Annex 3.3 - PDF64

Municipality	No%	Less%	Significant%	Decisive%	Total%	Number
Copenhagen	40	30	10	20	100	10
Hvidover	42	33	8	17	100	12
Høj-Taastrup	55	9	18	18	100	11
Køge	43	43	0	14	100	14
Lolland	36	50	7	7	100	14
Medium speed	54	38	8	0	100	13
Haderslev	43	50	7	0	100	14
Sønderborg	43	14	14	29	100	14
Skanderborg	27	40	7	27	100	15
Århus	84	8	8	0	100	12
Drill slev -Dronninglu nd	71	29	0	0	100	14
Total percentage	49	32	8	11	100	-
Total	70	46	11	16	-	143

Main Table 2.9 / 2.10 says 61 / 43 / 21 / 18; this Annex 70 / 46 / 11 / 16. The same 143 cases; no extra 143 or harmonised misclassification.

Table Annex 3.4 - PDF64

Municipality	High%	Some%	Low%	Total%	Number of BFU
Copenhagen	0	43	57	100	7
Hvidover	0	80	20	100	5
Høj-Taastrup	17	83	0	100	6
Køge	0	100	0	100	7
Lolland	10	70	20	100	10
Medium speed	43	43	14	100	7
Haderslev	17	50	33	100	6
Sønderborg	22	56	22	100	10
Skanderborg	0	70	30	100	10
Århus	40	50	10	100	10
Drill-Dronninglund	55	36	9	100	11
Total percentage	21	60	19	100	-
Total	19	53	17	-	89

Sønderborg 22 / 56 / 22 does not match normal rounding of numbers with denominator 10. The original's percentage and the denominator are preserved.

Table Annex 3.5 - PDF65

Municipality	High%	Some%	Low%	No%	Total%	Number of plans
Copenhagen	10	50	40	0	100	10
Hvidover	0	67	33	0	100	6
Høj-Taastrup	0	50	50	0	100	4
Køge	0	75	25	0	100	8
Lolland	0	33	67	0	100	6
Medium speed	0	38	54	8	100	13
Haderslev	0	56	22	22	100	9
Sønderborg	0	80	20	0	100	10
Skanderborg	0	53	40	7	100	15
Århus	9	91	0	0	100	11
Drill slev -Dronninglu nd	8	75	17	0	100	12
Total percentage	3	61	32	4	100	-
Total	4	63	33	4	-	104

Table 1 - PDF56

Decommissioning quarter	Number
1st kvt. 2006	4
2nd kvt. 2006	6
3rd kvt. 2006	14
4th kvt. 2006	10
1st kvt. 2007	44
2nd kvt. 2007	41
Total known date	119
Unstated date	24
All decisions	143

All six column numbers and mapping actually visually controlled in RAM7.10.2026 Sum 119 plus 24 = 143.

Case chains, actual stay and loss of participation

These are own summaries of the statements made in the control report. The 38 separate case codes are counted once each in this list; they are not 38 additional cases on top of 143. Underlying medical records, health information and citizens' statements are not independently verified by their reproduction alone.

Case a	Locator	Information of the control report	Consistency and further requirements
159	PDF27	15-year-old deaf boy; dietary needs treated as placement, although the control body finds sufficient information and no basis for placement.	A need for support does not automatically provide legal authority for the further municipal decision-making competence that accompanies placement.
061	PDF27-28	13-year-old girl; actual permanent residence with the former respite-care family and a new placement decision without a supplementary assessment; the older assessment approximately three years old.	Permanent residence, authorisation and regulatory needs assessment shall be aligned; no precise end date.
072	PDF28 / 36	14-year-old boy about six years earlier placement, escape and actual repatriation, then new decision without plan.	The historic six-year period has not been proven for six years without legal basis; a new plan error does not automatically give rise to the legality of the historical period.
049	PDF28 / 45	13-year-old boy; municipality justifies lack of study with work pressure, plan is also missing.	Capacity explanation documents knowledge, not fulfilment of guarantees or emergency exception.
160	PDF28-29 / 32-33	11-year-old boy; no conversation before the decision, later orientation.	Subsequent information shall not give back the lost participation before the decision is taken.
128	PDF29 / 36 / 41 / 4 9	13-year-old boy; the municipality chooses not to involve father because of described mental illness and limited contact, no father's consent; the child is first spoken on the day of placement; siblings are not assessed.	The same case code repeated four places; one case, several concrete overlapping errors. Original health statements must be tested independently.
065	PDF30-32	15-year-old boy; parents choose meeting without him, no young consent, insufficient information and no investigation. The placement will not be launched.	Decision without substantiated basis, but no proven physical separation as a result of that decision.
041	PDF30 / 45-46	16-year-old with extensive intellectual disability; no consent test for young people, special plan papers without purpose, effort and objectives.	The consent of the mother does not automatically replace the required consent of the child; the lack of consent requires legal representation and verification of competence.

Case a	Locator	Information of the control report	Consistency and further requirements
027	PDF30	Three months old girl; parents face voluntary or forced placement and choose consent while they do not understand the necessity.	The inspection body considers that the agreement is inadequate. The threat of other interventions is not evidence of informed volunteering.
042	PDF31	15-year-old pregnant girl; joint custody, only mother's consent.	The rights of the father and young person must be treated on a concrete basis; the pregnancy must not be counted as an additional child already placed without proof.
022	PDF32	14-year-old girl and younger sister previously placed about six years earlier, returned the year before without expected usefulness, now new acute decision insufficiently reasoned.	Two children are mentioned, but only the oldest is selected. Exact previous duration, new physical residence and end date are unknown.
138	PDF34 / 40	15-year-old girl; decision on network placement before examination, which ends approximately two months later; local environment and school continuity insufficiently assessed.	Two months relate to subsequent investigation, not documented overall separation time. The original allegations of violence are summary statements.
030	PDF35	14-year-old girl; hospital report 9.1.2007, meeting 11.1 and emergency decision upon discharge 12.1.	Three days between knowledge and decision, concrete acute assessment; no end date or date of return.
112	PDF36 / 53	13-year-old boy, emergency placement without consent; later consent to assessment, but the emergency decision and reasons are not documented as communicated in writing.	Time limit 24 hours and information on the rights of the parties / lawyer fails on the assessment of the supervisory body. PDF53 refers to the boy as a girl in a sentence; co-code.
037	PDF37	7-year-old boy; specific health conditions and controls described.	Checkpoint on source content, not new error population.
154	PDF38	16-year-old boy; urine sample approximately two months earlier, but current health data from boy and mother are missing.	A previous test does not replace a specific overall health assessment.
137	PDF38	Almost 6 years old; the health section has only the designation unspecified.	The title of the form does not prove the content of the study.
039	PDF38	13-year-old girl; ethnicity and language specifically discussed.	The documented control point is the content assessment, not verified damage.
083	PDF38 / 41	Barely 16-year-old; possible debt and drug concern without original information from young / mother; no own position in study supplements.	Repeated concern is not self-verification.
150	PDF39 / 42	16-year-old girl; network / school / own wishes referred to, but crash risk and hedge unconsidered.	Different checkpoints in the same case; two younger siblings are not two extra cases examined.
163	PDF40 / 50	10-year-old boy; sibling assessment made, but conversation before decision is not about placement; later position is obtained.	A conversation may be registered and yet lacks the necessary topic and time.
111	PDF41	16-year-old girl; own housing request described, father with custody is in custody.	Parents' detention and the child's intervention may be simultaneous, but the report has no personal union with the custody register.
100	PDF42	13-year-old girl; worsened situation, but the supplement reuses old resource description without current network assessment.	Previous information is not automatically simultaneous or comprehensive for the new decision.
157	PDF43-44	14-year-old with ADHD; notification 29.5.2006, meeting 4.9, deadline 29.9, completed study 27.3.2007 without preliminary assessment.	302 calendar days from knowledge to completion, 179 days from four months to completion; unproven 302 days' placement.

Case a	Locator	Information of the control report	Consistency and further requirements
046	PDF44	16 years; knowledge 11.12.2006, consent 23.1.2007, preliminary assessment 4.4, end 6.5.2007.	146 calendar days from knowledge to completion. The original writes the deadline 11.4.2006, which is before knowledge; the calendars give 11.4.2007,25 days to end. The original date shall be kept in conflict.
132	PDF46	16-year-old; plan without purpose.	Evidence of lack of target basis; actual cessation unknown.
162	PDF46	13-year-old; the plan's positive future goals do not specify concrete intervention.	Abstract development is not a specific aid programme.
125	PDF46 / 53-54	11- year of compulsory schooling; plan without specific objectives, decision without decisive factual considerations and without decision with regard to father with common authority.	The supervisory body shall designate a decision in relation to both parents as a condition of validity; no effective date of termination.
008	PDF46-47	10-year-old; plan repeats general development objectives on several themes.	Recurrence does not provide precise efforts or a verifiable reconciliation objective.
062	PDF47	Plan indicates indefinite duration of stay.	No precise end perspective; actual days unknown.
047	PDF47	The plan shall indicate a long duration at least until the first year of life.	The inspection body considers it too imprecise; the child's actual end date is missing.
155	PDF49	16-year-old with autism and grief; diagnosis is used to avoid conversation.	An adapted interview with a support person must be investigated; a diagnosis is not on its own evidence that participation is impossible.
129	PDF49	13-year-old with OCD / anxiety; no conversation before decision and no concrete reasons.	Requirement for appropriate participation and specific reasons for an exception.
135	PDF50	4-year-old; no conversation or justification.	Age alone does not replace individual maturity assessment.
084	PDF50	5-year-old with partial paralysis; no conversation or justification.	Physical disability does not document the inability to participate.
021	PDF50	14-year-old; interview completed but not about the upcoming placement.	95 recorded conversations are not 95 properly conducted conversations.
088	PDF53	13-year-old girl urgently placed without documented decision copy / written justification.	The same 24-hour guarantee and access to a lawyer / access to documents must be subject to effective review.
078	PDF54	New born coercive; committee decision and complaint guidance not documented.	The absence of evidence in the course of the procedure requires the simultaneous supporting documents for competence and justification.

Legal Deviation and Liability

The 22 cases of consent shall, after verification by the inspection body, provide evidence of a lack of basis for the chosen form of voluntary decision. It cannot be repaired analytically by inventing a coercive decision that was not taken. In Case 027, the parents of a three-month-old child were faced with voluntary or compulsory placement while they did not understand the purpose; the supervisory body rejects the adequacy of the consent. In case 041, large-scale disability is used in a process without proven legal position on the young person's own rights. In case 125, the decision in relation to both parents has not been implemented. The actual deviations must be carried out in accordance with historical service law § 52 / 53 / 58, the rules on competence and the concrete guarantees reproduced by the original.

The importance of the evidence is that formal conditions here protect against physical separation on the wrong basis of decision. A lack of discussion may deprive the child of the opportunity to influence the decision; it may not be restored simply by information after the decision. The lack of support and imprecise end targets may affect the possibility of reunification. However, the source shall not document for each child the subsequent period of stay, new decision, return or appeal for responsibility.

The avenue of responsibility must therefore identify the original decision-maker, management's documented knowledge of workload, the specific power to stop or change the intervention and the municipal council's follow-up under Legal Protection and Administration in Social Matters Act § 79 a. The foreword's two own-initiative cases are a review action; they are neither two additional 143 cases nor two documented completed instances of redress. The demand is original consents and contemporaneous records, physical start/end, a reasoned review of continuation, actual support for child and parents and assessment of specific compensation/disciplinary/criminal responsibility.

Original conflicts and remaining necessary evidence

The main conflicts are 68 / 69 formal errors, 115 source data against 29 missing child data in 143 cases, main tables 61 / 43 / 21 / 18 against Annex 70 / 46 / 11 / 16 information categories, the summary 42 against Table 41 for late plans, different 3 / 61 against 4 / 60 percentage distribution of the same number of plans and 13 no + 1 not referred to as 14 without temporary evaluation. The original's Sønderborg percentages by mentioning 10 and more other percentage cells can also not be uncritically converted to secure integers. Case 046 s exempts 2006 lies before the described knowledge; the own calendars and the printed date are both visible.

All 73 pages and all 44 numbered tables are now covered textually, and the figure's six observed quarterly counts have been visually verified. The specific further evidence is the 143 original case files, 20 excluded cases, the separate outcomes of cases already appealed, the decisions in two own-initiative cases and the municipalities' individual redress with dates. The public tables contain no identity key that can close these person and causation links through further addition.

Municipal representation against the original control

Copenhagen's meeting item of 12.3.2008 describes all the municipality's placement decisions as correct while also stating that 70% have errors. The original municipality table states 3 correct and 7 incorrect out of 10; among the 7, 29% are categorised as lacking a voluntary basis. The municipality's further statement that no cases were handled incorrectly therefore cannot be used as the same legality conclusion as the original's. 7 assessments, 10 plans and 8 interviews document occurrence, not content, timeliness or valid consent. The sustainable criticism is this change of meaning in the presentation to the political body. The demand is that the municipal council receive the original legality assessment and the specific redress processes. The meeting item's expected improvements and statement of no financial consequences establish no individual reparation. [KK-SUD93/2008; PUD08-FULD, PDF63-65]

Placing practice 2009: the entire original tables, denominators and citizen's programme

In fact, all 94 physical aspects of the board's December report are textual, including the municipal tables and the methodological and regulatory annexes. The readable source is a public archive copy of the Office's own version. The page number is the same in the physical PDF and the printed report. It is the same 125 case reports as the previously limited PUD09 sample; tables and repeated case descriptions must not be added together as new citizens.

Main analysis: errors before the intervention and oversight without documented redress

The report documents deficiencies in the decision-making basis itself and the necessary participation of children and parents. In 11 of 121 placements registered as voluntary, the required consent is not documented. Case 097 describes an actual emergency placement without the father's consent, despite his joint parental responsibility. The Appeals Board expressly finds that there was no basis for a voluntary placement. That an urgent need may justify a later BFU does not resolve the deficiency in the chosen consent-based legal authority for placement. Case 135 describes a hospitalised mother whom the municipality's own record says does not understand the meeting, yet the municipality nevertheless decides on voluntary placement. Here the criticism concerns a necessary legal condition, not merely the letter's form. [PUD09, PDF 18-19 and 24]

The review report's 83 per cent must be relabelled neither as substantively approved placements nor as an unconditional national abduction rate. Ankestyrelsen states on PDF 12 that it assessed the basis for placement only in cases meeting the specific procedural requirements. For the other cases, the study therefore does not document that the substantive legal basis was present. The specific consent findings can be examined against the condition for legal authority; the remaining errors must be traced to each decision's validity, duration and actual consequences. The original also states that no case was taken up of the authority's own motion. This does not document that the recorded errors were corrected, families reunited or losses compensated. [PUD09, PDF 4, 12-14 and 90]

Time is real in a number of cases. A 14-year plan of action only comes seven months after placement (018). A 15-year-old Asperger course is waiting from the family approach in February 2008 until the beginning of December for finished BFU and the plan is drawn up after the placement (090). A two-year BFU takes six months from the notification of the new municipality (032). The report does not consider any justification for the particular circumstances of the 35 BFF programmes which exceed the four-month period. The delay concerns the child's access to a timely examined and planned assistance. The report gives no systematic subsequent record of actual improvement, family support or cessation. [PUD09, PDF 43-46 and 62-63]

Assistance to the family is a separate duty and denominator. T4.7 covers 130 holders of parental responsibility in 91 cases; 83 have not been offered a separate action plan. T4.6 instead measures the content of the same 91 child plans:31 do not describe support for the family, and three do so only to a limited extent. These figures cannot be added together as different families. The original connects family support with the possibility of return home and the parental role during placement. A described offer or plan is nevertheless not documentation of assistance actually received. [PUD09, PDF 59-61]

The possibility of review shall be weakened when a written decision, date, statement of reasons or complaint guidance is missing. The newborn in case 024 is placed from birth; the mother is orally informed of the right of appeal, but proper written advice has not been documented. A plan for the rest of the upbringing indicates a time perspective. It does not show an actual separation for 18 years and does not in itself test whether such separation is necessary and proportional. In case 139, the one-year re-examination period is also not an actual residence period. [PUD09, PDF 58 and 70-72]

Method, persons and voting

140 cases were requested and received from 14 municipalities selected from the year’s 30 municipalities in the three-year plan. After 15 exclusions, 125 are included. Decisions already appealed must not be selected. Municipalities were to send their ten most recent decisions before 1. January 2009. Where several children in the same family share the same date, only the oldest is assessed. The siblings mentioned therefore show more affected people than the principal cases assessed, but the report does not provide a deduplicated total for all siblings or parents. Missing submitted records are treated in the assessment as missing information in case processing. The underlying case records are not published here. [PUD09, PDF 4 and 73-77]

Total correctness is printed as 21 / 104 on PDF 13 and 20 / 105 in the cross table on PDF 17 and the commune table on PDF 91. It is an internal source conflict in the same 125 cases. On the other hand, the original note to PDF 14 explains why the BFU is missing in 44 cases, but is an overall error in 43: one emergency case was returned after two months before the deadline. The same case explains 34 failure to act, compared with 33 as a whole, as a cause of error. That explanation must not be used without documentation to harmonise the correctness conflict.

The summary of PDF 7 indicates 64 percent BFU to a large extent; the detailed T3.2 and the text of PDF 26-27 indicates 50 / 81 and 62 percent. T6.3 classifies two instructions that are not correct, while the running text says that the correctness of two cases could not be assessed. The final sentence of the method on PDF 81 in the action plan deadline wrongly calls the measurement object § 50 the study; PDF 61-62 / 80 and the tables are about action plan. These local differences are preserved and demarcated. None of them cancels out the other documented errors.

All 41 numbered tables follow below, including the four methodology tables and four municipality tables. Additional numerical blocks show selection and the original’s 2008 comparisons. Subgroups and causes overlap. Percentages are not converted back into guessed numbers of persons. In the case chains, information is described as the review report’s account; it is not the original record or an independent validation of diagnoses, allegations and family circumstances.

All tables in the original

T2.1 - Type of placement

PUD09, physical and printed page 11. Denominator/scope: 125.

Category	Planned locations number	Acute locations § 75 number	Total
Article 52 (3) No 8	95	26	121
Without consent § 58 (1)	4	0	4

Category	Planned locations number	Acute locations § 75 number	Total
Total	99	26	125

Acute and planned are the study categories. No urgent coercive action in this sample.

T2.2 - Overall assessment of decisions

PUD09, physical and printed page 13. Denominator/scope: 125.

Category	Number	Percentage
In accordance with rules and practices	21	17
Not in accordance with rules and practices	104	83
Total	125	100

Opposes T2.5 and Annex 3 T3.1, which prints 20 / 105. Both versions are preserved; no new case is inferred.

T2.3 - Causes of incorrect decisions

PUD09, physical and printed page 14. Denominator/scope: 104.

Reason	One of several reasons	Of which only reason
No § 50 survey	43	6
§ 50 investigation not completed after 4 months	35	12
No Action Plan	33	4
Action plan not completed before decision	31	6
§ 50 investigation not completed before decision	10	2
No child conversation and attitude not obtained	13	0
No consent to voluntary placement	11	1
§ 50 investigation does not comply with legal requirements	10	3
Action plan does not comply with legal requirements	8	1
Total	-	35

Causes overlap. One acute case with repatriation after 2 months is accepted without BFU / action plan; explains 43 against 44 in T3.1 and 33 against 34 in T4.1 35 only one deficiency, 69 more. 12 only four months; 92 / 125 = printed 74% without this criterion. The text also uses 105 for action; not harmonised.

T2.4 - Information base

PUD09, physical and printed page 16. Denominator/scope: 125.

Category	Number	Percentage
No information is missing	89	71
Some minor information is missing	16	13
Several and / or essential information missing	15	12
Decisive information missing	5	4
Total	125	100

The BFU and the action plan are not themselves treated as information for this measurement; therefore their absence does not automatically affect the information assessment.

T2.5 - Correctness and information base

PUD09, physical and printed page 17. Denominator/scope: 125.

Information	Legally correct yes	Legally correct no.	Total
No missing	18	71	89
A few minor deficiencies	2	14	16
Multiple / significant deficiencies	0	15	15
Decisive deficiencies	0	5	5
Total	20	105	125

20 / 105 versus 21 / 104 in T2.2 No missing information is not the same as legal placement.

T2.6 - Consent for placement

PUD09, physical and printed page 18. Denominator/scope: 121.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	110	91
No	11	9
Total	121	100

Only placements recorded as voluntary. Of 11, 3 lack the young people’s consent; in 1 case the mother cannot give informed consent; the remainder concern holders of parental responsibility. Consent to a child welfare assessment in T3.3 is a different decision and not an additional population of people.

T3.1 - BFU prepared

PUD09, physical and printed page 22. Denominator/scope: 125.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	81	65
No	44	35
Total	125	100

Older BFU for other support does not count if not supplemented for current placement. Acute exception explains the difference to T2.3

T3.2 - BFU total content

PUD09, physical and printed on page 26. Denominator/scope: 81.

Category	Number	Percentage
Very much	50	62
To some extent	18	22
Very small	3	4
No, do not meet requirements	10	12

Category	Number	Percentage
Total	81	100

The content assessment omits the four-month deadline and location before the decision. Summary PDF 7 writes 64%; table and PDF 26-27 writes 62% (50 / 81).

T3.3 - Consent to BFU from all relevant parties

PUD09, physical and printed, page 28. Denominator/scope: 81.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	70	86
No	11	14
Total	81	100

Historical Paragraph 50 (9) provided a separate way to investigate without consent. Consent for examination shall not replace consent to voluntary placement.

T3.4 - BFU: six themes

PUD09, physical and printed page 32. Denominator/scope: 81.

Theme	To a large or some extent	Small or small not	Irrelevant	Total
Development and behaviour	93	2	5	100
Family conditions	100	0	0	100
School conditions	83	5	12	100
Recreation and friendships	78	10	12	100
Health conditions	90	10	0	100
Other relevant factors	44	7	49	100

Percent, not exact integers. Themes are parallel assessments of the same 81 studies.

T3.5 - BFU: special conditions at the age of 15

PUD09, physical and printed, page 34. Denominator/scope: 28.

Category	Number	Percentage
Very much	8	29
To some extent	4	14
Very small	0	0
No	10	36
Irrelevant	6	21
Total	28	100

44 of 125 cases concern 15-17-year-olds, but only 28 of them have a child welfare assessment and are included here.

T3.6 - Assessment of examinations of other children

PUD09, physical and printed, page 36. Denominator/scope: 45.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	27	60
No	18	40
Total	45	100

36 of 81 BFU omitted as not applicable. Other children are defined wider than biological siblings. These are 45 selected cases, not 45 families plus all siblings.

T3.7 - BFU: Views of the holder of parental responsibility

PUD09, physical and printed, page 37. Denominator/scope: 81.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	73	90
No	8	10
Total	81	100

T3.8 - BFU: attitude of the child

PUD09, physical and printed, page 38. Denominator/scope: 69.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	60	87
No	9	13
Total	69	100

12 of 81 omitted from the source's assessment of lack of relevance / possibility. The calculation method differs from 2008. Case 107 is mentioned in several places, but is counted once as a course.

T3.9 - BFU: resources in family and environment

PUD09, physical and printed, page 39. Denominator/scope: 81.

Category	Number	Percentage
Very much	38	47
To some extent	32	39
Very small	4	5
No	7	9
Total	81	100

T3.10 - BFU: reasoned opinion

PUD09, physical and printed page 40. Denominator/scope: 81.

Category	Number	Percentage
Very much	72	89
To some extent	5	6

Category	Number	Percentage
Very small	1	1
No	3	4
Total	81	100

T3.11 - BFU completed within four months

PUD09, physical and printed, page 43. Denominator/scope: 81.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	43	53
No	35	43
Undisclosed	3	4
Total	81	100

Start by the Authority's knowledge of support needs; not by its later decision on investigation. None of 35 exceedances were found to be justified by special circumstances. Unknown start / end date in 3 cases.

T3.12 - BFU prior to decision in planned locations

PUD09, physical and printed page 45. Denominator/scope: 68.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	52	76
No	10	15
Undisclosed	6	9
Total	68	100

13 acute of 81 BFU omitted from this pre-decision measurement but is included in the four-month measurement.

T4.1 - Action plan prepared

PUD09, physical and printed, page 49. Denominator/scope: 125.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	91	73
No	34	27
Total	125	100

The acute case referred back after 2 months explains 33 deficiencies in overall assessment as against 34 here.

T4.2 - Action plan total content

PUD09, physical and printed, page 51. Denominator/scope: 91.

Category	Number	Percentage
Very much	30	33
To some extent	44	48

Category	Number	Percentage
Very small	9	10
No	8	9
Total	91	100

Timeliness is excluded from the content measure; it is included in the overall assessment of the decision. Eight insufficient plans lack at least 3 elements.

T4.3 - Action plan: purpose and necessary effort

PUD09, physical and printed, page 52. Denominator/scope: 91.

Category	Number of objectives	Objective percentage	Number of wagers	Rate of bet
Very much	74	81	59	65
To some extent	16	18	29	32
Very small	1	1	2	2
No	0	0	1	1
Total	91	100	91	100

Two assessments of the same plans, not 182 different plans.

T4.4 - Action plan: objectives and sub-objectives for six themes

PUD09, physical and printed, page 54. Denominator/scope: 91.

Theme	To a large or some extent	Small or small not	Not applicable	Total
Development and behaviour	84	16	0	100
Family conditions	86	14	0	100
School conditions	75	11	14	100
Recreation and friendships	69	20	11	100
Health conditions	78	22	0	100
Other relevant factors	28	19	53	100

Percentages; not exact integers or proof of actual delivery of bets.

T4.5 - Expected duration specified

PUD09, physical and printed, page 57. Denominator/scope: 91.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	73	80
No	18	20
Total	91	100

A specified duration is not a registered actual end date. PDF 58 accepts the remainder of upbringing as an indication in case 024; this does not try proportionality over 18 years.

T4.6 - Family support specified

PUD09, physical and printed, page 59. Denominator/scope: 91.

Category	Number	Percentage
Very much	37	41
To some extent	20	22
Very small	3	3
No	31	34
Total	91	100

The description of aid is not actually offering, participating or reuniting.

T4.7 - Holders of parental responsibility offered a separate action plan

PUD09, physical and printed page 60. Denominator/scope: 130.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	47	36
No	83	64
Total	130	100

130 holders of parental responsibility in 91 cases. Both are assessed where parental responsibility is joint. The 130 are not added to the children as a union of unique citizens.

T4.8 - Action plan before decision: intended locations

PUD09, physical and printed, page 62. Denominator/scope: 71.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	31	44
No	25	35
Undisclosed	15	21
Total	71	100

20 acute of 91 plans are included in the second measurement T4.9

T4.9 - Action plan within four months: acute volunteers

PUD09, physical and printed, page 62. Denominator/scope: 20.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	13	65
No	6	30
Undisclosed	1	5
Total	20	100

25 + 6 = 31 documented time gaps in the action plan in T2.3; unknown date groups are not automatically added.

T5.1 - Children's interview completed

PUD09, physical and printed, page 65. Denominator/scope: 125.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	86	69
No	24	19
Not applicable	15	12
Total	125	100

The relevance assessment of the source, not an independent review of disability adaptation.

T5.2 - Position obtained by other means without conversation

PUD09, physical and printed, page 65. Denominator/scope: 24.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	11	46
No	13	54
Total	24	100

Only the 24 without conversation in T5.1; the 15 not relevant are not included.86 + 11 = 97, printed 78% of 125.

T5.3 - Children's interview or position by age

PUD09, physical and printed, page 66. Denominator/scope: 125.

Age	Yes number	No number	Total	Percentage i the age group;
0-3 years	1	12	13	8
4 to 6 years	3	1	4	75
7-11 years	13	5	18	72
12 to 14 years	40	6	46	87
15 to 17 years	40	4	44	91
Total	97	28	125	-

12 out of 12 no for 0-3 years, 1 out of 5 no for 7-11 years and 2 out of 6 no for 12-14 years are not considered relevant. The column heading in the original says completed child conversation, but title / counters also include attitude in other ways. No exclusive share of the call shall be derived.

T6.1 - Form of decision

PUD09, physical and printed, page 69. Denominator/scope: 125.

Category	Number	Percentage
Written decision	33	27
Written journal note	60	48
Declaration of consent	9	7
Other form	23	18

Category	Number	Percentage
Total	125	100

Of 4 coercion cases, 2 written decisions, 1 forwarded protocol, 1 medical record entry without documented written notification.33/125=26, 4%; the original's 27% is retained.

T6.2 - Forced decision: Statement of reasons FVL § 22- 24

PUD09, physical and printed page 70. Denominator/scope: 4.

Category	Number
Consistency	3
Not in accordance	1
Total	4

Case 139 has grounds in the minutes note, but notification and adequate justification to the mother have not been documented.

T6.3 - Forced decision: Appeals notice

PUD09, physical and printed, page 71. Denominator/scope: 4.

Category	Number
Proper complaint guidance	2
Inappropriate complaint guidance	2
Total	4

The body text says it was not possible to assess in 2 cases; the table heading says not correct. Uncertainty about notification and established incorrect guidance are kept separate. Case 024: oral information does not satisfy the requirement for written guidance.

B1.T1.1 - Annex 1: Sex and age

PUD09, physical and printed, page 75. Denominator/scope: 125.

Sex	0-3 years	4 to 6 years	7-11 years	12 to 14 years	15 to 17 years	Total	Total percentage
Boy	6	2	10	18	24	60	48
Girl	7	2	8	28	20	65	52
Total	13	4	18	46	44	125	100

The same 125 cases.90 / 125 = printed 72% for 12-17 years. Not a new cohort.

B1.T1.2 - Annex 1: Parental responsibility

PUD09, physical and printed, page 75. Denominator/scope: 125.

Category	Number	Percentage
Common	51	41
Mother alone	53	42
The Father alone	13	10
Others	2	2

Category	Number	Percentage
Undisclosed	6	5
Total	125	100

Cases analysed by authority; not full census of parents.

B1.T1.3 - Annex 1: Reason for action

PUD09, physical and printed, page 76. Denominator/scope: 125.

Feature	Number	Percentage	Only occasion number	Only occasion %
Parental authority holder	51	41	22	18
School / Recreation Home / SFO	47	38	19	15
Initiative of the municipality	29	23	13	10
The child / child	20	16	3	2
Health care / health care	12	10	2	2
Family / network	8	6	1	1
Police / Court	6	5	1	1
Day institution	2	2	0	0
Others	23	19	5	4

Multiple reasons, percentages use 125, including sole reason. 23/125=18, 4%; the printed 19% is retained. Not the same percentage definition as ASAN10 T2.4.

B1.T1.4 - Annex 1: Origin of data

PUD09, physical and printed, page 77. Denominator/scope: 125.

Category	Number	Percentage
Mom.	108	86
The child / child	84	67
School / teachers	86	69
Dad.	56	45
Psychologists	50	40
Doctors	30	24
Network	27	22
Day institution / educator	16	13
Health care	8	6
Others	40	32

More sources of information. The author is not independent confirmation or verification of the accuracy of the statement. Others include the police and former commune of residence.

B3.T3.1 - Annex 3: Total correctness

PUD09, physical and printed, page 91. Denominator/scope: 125.

Municipality	Number (first detachment column)	No.	Total
Aabenra	2	8	10
Aalborg	4	5	9
Billund	0	9	9
Fredensborg	1	9	10
Heath site	3	6	9
Helsingør	3	6	9
Herning	3	4	7
Ikast-Brand	1	9	10
Kalundborg	0	10	10
Cold	0	8	8
Nyborg	0	9	9
Slaughter	2	5	7
Sorø	0	10	10
Tower	1	7	8
Total	20	105	125

The original header's first exit column is denoted Number. Summer 20 / 105, as T2.5; conflict with 21 / 104 in T2.2
The 7-10 cases of the municipalities are selected, not municipal full populations.

B3.T3.2 - Annex 3: Information base

PUD09, physical and printed, page 92. Denominator/scope: 125.

Municipality	No missing	A few smaller deficiencies	Multiple / substantial deficiencies	Decisive deficiencies
Aabenra	9	1	0	0
Aalborg	6	3	0	0
Billund	7	0	2	0
Fredensborg	6	3	1	0
Heath site	7	2	0	0
Helsingør	7	0	2	0
Herning	5	0	2	0
Ikast-Brand	7	3	0	0
Kalundborg	5	1	2	2
Cold	5	1	2	0
Nyborg	8	1	0	0

Municipality	No missing	A few smaller deficiencies	Multiple / substantial deficiencies	Decisive deficiencies
Slaughter	6	0	1	0
Sorø	6	0	2	2
Tower	5	1	1	1
Total	89	16	15	5

Same 4 national marginals as T2.4; no addition.

B3.T3.3 - Annex 3: BFU content

PUD09, physical and printed, page 93. Denominator/scope: 81.

Municipality	Very much	To some extent	Very small	No.	Total
Aabenra	8	0	0	0	8
Aalborg	4	4	0	1	9
Billund	3	2	0	0	5
Fredensborg	3	1	0	2	6
Heath site	5	2	0	0	7
Helsingør	2	0	0	1	3
Herning	5	1	0	0	6
Ikast-Brand	3	3	0	2	8
Kalundborg	4	0	0	0	4
Cold	2	0	1	2	5
Nyborg	1	3	1	1	6
Slaughter	4	0	0	1	5
Sorø	2	1	1	0	4
Tower	4	1	0	0	5
Total	50	18	3	10	81

Only studies which are available; local authorities are different from all cases.

B3.T3.4 - Annex 3: Action plan content

PUD09, physical and printed page 94. Denominator/scope: 91.

Municipality	Very much	To some extent	Very small	No.	Total
Aabenra	7	3	0	0	10
Aalborg	2	6	1	0	9
Billund	1	2	0	0	3
Fredensborg	2	5	1	0	8
Heath site	1	5	0	2	8
Helsingør	1	2	0	1	4

Municipality	Very much	To some extent	Very small	No.	Total
Herning	3	1	1	0	5
Ikast-Brand	6	2	1	0	9
Kalundborg	0	3	0	2	5
Cold	2	1	3	2	8
Nyborg	1	5	2	1	9
Slaughter	2	2	0	0	4
Sorø	1	3	0	0	4
Tower	1	4	0	0	5
Total	30	44	9	8	91

Only plans available. Repeat T4.2 at local level.

M1 - Selection and checking of the sample

PUD09, physical and printed, page 74. Denominator/scope: 125.

Relationship	Figures	Locator
Selected municipalities	14	PDF 73-74
Municipalities in the selection group of the year	30	PDF 74
Summarised per municipality	10	PDF 74
Received	140	PDF 74
Deleted earlier appeal	1	PDF 74 Note 1
Discontinued Youth Sense	1	PDF 74 Note 1
Departure	1	PDF 74 Note 1
Deleted Place Shift	1	PDF 74 Note 1
Deleted not placed	4	PDF 74 Note 1
Not deleted last 10	7	PDF 74 Note 1 and own diffusers
Total deleted	15	PDF 74
Medicinal	125	PDF 74
Local government own schedule per municipality	3 of 10	PDF 77
Own operation taken up	0 according to original	PDF 4

The most recent decisions before 1 January 2009; cases appealed omitted. In the case of several children on the same date in the family, only older children are assessed. The 7 is the individual diffusers 140 − 125 − 8; the source describes the residual group without printed 7. Not random samples from all national locations.

M2 - 2008 figures reproduced for comparison

PUD09, physical and printed page 7. Denominator/scope: parallel surveys with separate samples.

Measurement	2008%	2009%	Locator
Overall incorrect with different criteria	64	83	PDF 13

Measurement	2008%	2009%	Locator
Overall incorrect without customer-time error	64	74	PDF 14
BFU very much	21	62	PDF 27
BFU available	63	65	PDF 23
The BFU is missing where the old deadline did not expire	9	not the same demarcation;	PDF 23
Essential / essential information gaps	27	16	PDF 16
BFU young people to a large extent	10	29	PDF 34
BFU youth special conditions none	29	36	PDF 34
Other children assessed	57	60	PDF 36
Parents' attitude in BFU	86	90	PDF 37
Family / network relationship rings or none	30	14	PDF 39
Reasoned position	73	89	PDF 41
Action level high	4	33	PDF 51
Aim high degree	67	81	PDF 52
High Level of Action	43	65	PDF 52
Family ratio targets / sub-targets high / some	71	86	PDF 54
Health objectives / sub-targets high / some	78	78	PDF 54
Expected duration	65	80	PDF 57
High level of family support	21	41	PDF 59
Children's conversation	66	69	PDF 65

Reproductions of the 2008 results for comparison, not new 2008 cases. Only terminal errors removed give 92 / 125 = printed 74%, but do not normalise selection or other method differences. Summary PDF 7 64% BFU has a high degree of detail compared to 62%; retained as a conflict in the T3.2 note.

Case Chains: the same case is counted once

Case ode	Age	Findings and concrete consequences of the original	Time	Historical rule	Locator
018	14	Current post-school placement without new or supplementary BFU; action plan not until 7 months after decision / placement. Placing process carried out without current investigation and timely plan.	7 months to action plan; return unknown	§ 50, § 52 (2) and § 140	PUD09, PDF 15, 25, 62
031	14	Treatment placement of a girl described as having manic-depressive disorder; no child welfare assessment, action plan or documented child interview. The original describes the family as well-functioning. The child was placed without the three recorded safeguards. The diagnosis/family statement is the source's account, not independently verified.	Recommendatio n June; affixing November; no exact dates	§ 50, § 140 and § 48	PUD09, PDF 15, 23, 49, 67
097	10	Acute placement three days after the meeting; joint custody, father away and his consent missing. No BFU before or after. Ankestyrelsen find no grounds for voluntary placement. Child actually placed without the necessary consent to the chosen voluntary legal basis. The acute BFU exemption does not solve the lack of consent.	3 days meeting → placement; end date unknown	§ 52 (1) (3), § 53; acute exposure to BFU requires the following BFU	PUD09, PDF 18, 19, 24
033	17	Placed in an institution; no BFU / action plan, no documented conversation or own consent. No necessary consent condition for voluntary placement supported by evidence.	Not available	§ 52/53, § 50, § 140, § 48	PUD09, PDF 19
135	15	The municipality's journal describes that seriously ill hospitalized mother does not understand the meeting. The municipality nevertheless records voluntary placement; also BFU consent was wrongly based. Placing on a registered voluntary basis without meaningful parental consent; the investigation required a separate legal procedure.	Not available	Section 52 / 53 and separate section 50 (9)	PUD09, PDF 19, 29
045	16	Girl mentioned with ADHD; not documented child conversation, other position or consent before placement. The child's involvement and the necessary consent conditions have not been documented.	Not available	Section 48 and Section 52 / 53	PUD09, PDF 66, 67
032	2	New municipality receives notification in mid-December; BFU finished six months later. Plan has purpose / goal; family contact specified 2 hours a week first, then every other weekend. Aid needs examined with documented deadline overrun. Contact plan is planned scope, not proof of actual interaction.	6 months of unemployment → BF U	§ 50 (7); § 140 on Objective and Family Support	PUD09, PDF 43, 52, 54, 55, 56, 63
090	15	Asperger course: the mother seeks assistance in February 2008; the BFU is not completed until early December; the action plan is undated but prepared after placement. Delayed assessment and placement without a timely plan; new statutory targets do not document actual redress.	February → beginning of December · 10 months; approximate, not exact day number	§ 50 (7) and § 140 (1)	PUD09, PDF 43, 44, 52, 54, 55, 56, 63

Case ode	Age	Findings and concrete consequences of the original	Time	Historical rule	Locator
081	11	Preliminary assessment before the deadline, but no particular circumstances justify a failure to complete BFU. Action plan indicates family assistance. Preliminary paper was not considered sufficient to fulfil the obligation to complete the study; planned family support does not document delivery.	Not available	Article 50 (7)	PUD09, PDF 44, 60
079	13	Decision beginning of June after notification at the end of April; BFU only completed early July, no action plan. Health section omits relevant information. The child placed before finished BFU without an acute exception and without plan.	Last April → beginning of June → beginning of July; exact days not given	§ 52 (2), § 50 and § 140	PUD09, PDF 32, 46, 49, 66
067	9	Replaced January to mother in new municipality; replaced acute June with consent in former foster family. Action plan not complete within four months. Documented return followed by re-placement; return is not permanent reunification.	January return; June recovery; more than 4 months to plan	§ 140 emergency time limit	PUD09, PDF 50
002	17 years 10 months	Father with full custody dead; own residence. The municipality fails to take action because of short-term placement; this is not accepted. Subsidiarity to 18 years was used to avoid plan; the source states that short duration does not cancel the obligation.	Not available	§ 140 and historically eft erværnspla n	PUD09, PDF 35, 39, 50
063	14	Three siblings; no assessment of their survey needs. Mother did not offer separate action plan. Sibling protection and the family's own support plan omitted. Three siblings are referred to persons without independent assessment in the 125 cohort.	Not available	§ 50 (8) and § 140 (8)	PUD09, PDF 36, 61
013	14	Twin and younger sister. Twinning is investigated indirectly, but no proven position on younger sister. The school claims a desire to separate twins. Study needs of younger children not assessed. The school's statements do not even prove the need for separation.	Not available	Article 50 (8)	PUD09, PDF 36, 39, 41
069	15	BFU refers to sexual violations and ADHD; the action plan does not assess the need for specific action in the context of the violations. Registered knowledge of violations translated into placement, but no documented treatment / protection follow-up in the plan.	Not available	§ 140 Consistency with § 50	PUD09, PDF 33, 56, 57
113	11	The BFU health section does not comment, while the source's case-making refers to enuresis and encresis. Relevant health problem omitted from the assessment of support needs.	Not available	§ 50 health conditions	PUD09, PDF 32

Case ode	Age	Findings and concrete consequences of the original	Time	Historical rule	Locator
139	11	Forced placement with one-year retreatment is shown in the note; written notification and adequate justification to the mother are not documented. The mother's ability to know and attack the decision has not been proven.	1 year period for re-processing; not documented actual placing	§ 22-24 and written observations	PUD09, PDF 70, 71
024	newborn	Placed from birth without the mother's consent. Minutes/meeting provide oral information; correct written appeal guidance is not documented. The plan states the rest of childhood. A newborn separated; guidance on review is missing. A plan until age 18 and annual reconsideration are neither an established 18-year stay nor an independent proportionality assessment.	From birth; 1 year re-treatment; plan to 18 years; actual endpoints unknown	FVL § 25 and § 140	PUD09, PDF 58, 72
060	15	Previous return from foster family; new placement shortly after. Decision date not clear in the journal. Replacement without a traceable date of decision; return not permanently documented.	Shortly after return; exact dates unknown	Note and decision making	PUD09, PDF 69
126	8	Acute voluntary placement; BFU and schedule later, but decision / date not documented clearly. In fact, placing with a lack of documentation of the decision chain.	Not available	Note and decision making	PUD09, PDF 69, 70
107	11	The original classifies a girl with multiple disabilities who does not speak as unable to address her place of residence and accepts the absence of an interview/views. Included among the exceptions. The original does not document separate testing of supported communication here; its assessment is not an independent disability-accommodation review.	Not available	§ 48 and specific relevance assessment	PUD09, PDF 28, 38, 66
051	14	Plan only states that duration is assessed continuously; this is not accepted as expected duration. Child / family lack specific time perspective during placement.	Not available	Article 140 (6)	PUD09, PDF 58
121	14	Acute placement after the fourth mentioned suicide attempt; BFU completed 16 days after. The source accepts the timeliness of this very acute case; this is not a general exception for other cases.	16 days notice → BFU	Historically a rule exception to § 52 (2)	PUD09, PDF 46
050	11	Residential family with two younger siblings during mother's treatment; primarily information about mother's alcohol problems, significant child-specific conditions missing. Several children actually included in the family placement process, but only the oldest are assessed in the sample.	Provisional 6-month placement; actual cessation unknown	Basis of information and § 50	PUD09, PDF 17
038	14	Primarily police charges and contact-person contracts; other school/family circumstances missing. Placement on a decisively deficient basis according to the review report. Charges are not established crimes.	Not available	Basis of information and § 50	PUD09, PDF 17

Case ode	Age	Findings and concrete consequences of the original	Time	Historical rule	Locator
036	16	New notification January, own desired college placement September; no BFU. Placement without current statutory examination.	January → septte mber; no exact days	Articles 50 and 52 (2)	PUD09, PDF 23
082	9	Boy referred to by ADHD; notification February, voluntary placement September, no BFU. Placement without current investigation according to longer known needs.	February → September; no exact days	Articles 50 and 52 (2)	PUD09, PDF 23
030	14	Older BFU on support person; no new or supplementary when stowed. Previous support study does not substitute for study of current placement.	Not available	§ 50 Current investigation	PUD09, PDF 25
093	15	No documented mother / child BFU consent; custody is transferred during the study to father, including his consent documented. Change of authority not followed by documented legal investigation route.	Not available	Article 50 consent and paragraph 9	PUD09, PDF 29
080	12	Father with joint custody refuses consent; only mother gives BFU consent. The BFU should have followed the separate legal basis without consent; not just called consent-based.	Not available	Article 50 (9)	PUD09, PDF 29
116	8 months	Mother consents to BFU; the father's part in authority is discovered later, his consent and information is missing. The person / consent circle is deficient; the position of the child is described voluntarily after the institution stays.	Enlisted with mother at 5 months; placed after 2 months; no final date of discontinuation	Articles 50 and 9	PUD09, PDF 30
014	16	Action plan only indicates the need for offers without detailed purpose; PPR / psychiatric assessments are not incorporated. Progress without any specific objective of the aid; diagnosis is the source's statement.	Not available	§ 140 purpose and effort	PUD09, PDF 53
070	16	The BFU refers to charges and weapons incidents as other relevant facts. Example of sufficient publicity assessed; charge alone is not a proof of guilt.	Not available	§ 50 relevant facts	PUD09, PDF 33
102	14	Small family / friend networks discussed and considered to be unable to solve the difficulties. The source accepts the description; it is not a verification of all underlying network information.	Not available	§ 50 resources	PUD09, PDF 40
056	14	Acute voluntary placement in sister's foster family, action plan within four months; plan for 18 years. The source accepts the time; planned duration is not actually terminated.	Within 4 months to plan; plan to 18 years	§ 140 emergency time limit	PUD09, PDF 50, 58
085	17	Documented BFUconsent; pre-positioning and pre-decision examination. Positive example in several paragraphs, same case.	Mid-August implementation → beginning of December BFU; source estimates within 4 months	§ 50, § 52 and § 140	PUD09, PDF 28, 41, 45, 63

Case ode	Age	Findings and concrete consequences of the original	Time	Historical rule	Locator
134	12	Current complement to previous BFU is adequately assessed. Positive example of supplement, not an extra location case.	Not available	§ 50 Current investigation	PUD09, PDF 24
140	16	Supplement to previous BFU upon own request; action plan / consent before decision. The source assesses the decision correctly; repeated examples are the same.	About 1 week approaches → supplement	§ 50, § 52 / 53 and § 140	PUD09, PDF 15, 16, 24, 45

Documented errors, limits of evidence and specific requirements

The documented review findings include missing consent for the voluntary legal basis chosen, a missing or delayed current BFU, a missing or delayed action plan, omission of an interview with the child/the child's views, a missing separate family plan and deficient documentation of decisions and review. Each row above identifies the specific line of evidence. A final determination of invalidity, any persons responsible, criminal intent and loss in each case requires the underlying records; these are not established by the review classification alone. The strongest specific argument in the consent cases described is that the municipality carried out a placement registered as voluntary without the necessary condition, rather than merely committing an unspecified formal error. The demand is to retrieve the contemporaneous legal basis and any separate compulsory-placement decision, the complete chain of decisions and stays, and actual redress. For timing and planning errors, dates are required for knowledge, decision, implementation, completion, family support, physical return home and payment. The unresolved subsequent redress is a precise limit of the documentation. It must not be converted into an established number of children who remain separated, but the absence of these public outcomes cannot be used as evidence that the authorities corrected the errors either. Access to case records, the municipal council's consideration under section 79 a and documentation of individual follow-ups are the necessary next evidential links. No such request has been sent.

Parenting capacity assessments 2012: complete tables and evidential chains

All 20 pages of the publicly available Ankestyrelsen report have been read as text in RAM. Five pages with discrepancies in percentages, denominators and table sums have also been visually checked in RAM. All 22 printed tables are included. The municipalities' questionnaire responses,104 placement cases and ten professional assessments of parenting capacity assessments have different scopes. Footnote 5 confirms that the placement cases were reused from the study of Barnets Reform. The 104 cases are therefore not added as new children.

Sources and scope of control

H: Original, 20 pages. SHA256: 4673c5d1bed797fcf469ac189a784a40777777ced1ce3ff63be6fe5206ad02b8. All pages read.

Original parts	Actual Read Content
H1 -11, printed p.1-9	Version, questionnaire, all municipal number / percentage tables and complete committee notes.
H12 -20, printed p.10-18	All case / material / subject group / FKU / involvement / interpreter tables, all quality records and methodological notes.
Visual H5 / 9 / 13 / 14 / 18	Local number sum, percentage deviations, material and trade group contests, and external psychologist visually controlled in RAM.

Sample and population

Search	Limitation
Three studies	Municipal questionnaire concerning 2011, legal review of 104 placement cases from 12 municipalities after 1. January 2011, child welfare specialist quality review of ten parenting capacity assessments within the 104.
Overlap Child Reform	Footnote 5 H11 states that cases were primarily requested for follow-up on Barnets Reform and were reused here. 104 therefore does not automatically mean an additional 104 children on top of another reform cohort. No public case-ID linkage in this report.
Non-compliant municipalities	Pr. 2. August 2012: Hedensted, Vejle, Langeland, Kerteminde, Guldborgsund, Næstved, Slagelse, Holbæk, Hallsnæm, Hørsholm, Helsingør, Hillerød, Frederiksberg, Viborg and Rebild.
Calls and exclusions	12 municipalities asked for randomly selected accommodation cases and all relevant documents. The absence of significant acts is not assessed. Number of summoned, terminated, already indicted and affected unique persons not published here.

All published figures

25 reading tables with 142 rows. Repeals and subsets of the same cohort shall not be added together. N and response categories are retained from each original.

1.1: Parenting capacity assessments requested in 2011

Original H, PDF page 4. 82 municipalities gave numbers; 83 answered one or more questions. Counts assessments, not unique children/parents.

Search	Number
Number of surveys	816
Average per municipality	10
Minimum	0
Maximum Aalborg	77

1.2: Breakdown of numbers between municipalities

Original H, PDF page 5. 82 municipalities; 44 estimate the number. Copenhagen’s estimate covers six of eight local centres; one municipality covers only the family department, not the disability department.

Number of surveys	Municipalities
None	3
1-5	34
6-10	19
11-15	14
16-20	5
21-25	1
26-30	4
Exceeding 30	3
Total	82

1.3: Subsequent type of measure

Original H, PDF page 7. 772 studies from 72 out of 82 councillors. Only percent, not original category counters. Printed categories summer to 99.

Type	Printed percentage
Day provision / leisure home	1
Home support	10
Treatment of the family / child	22
Family visits	12
Relief	3
Permanent contact person	3
Placement with consent	28
Practical employer's offer / reimbursement	0
Other advice / treatment / support	3
Placement without consent § 58	17
Printed total	100

1.4: Knowledge of the Ministry's guidelines

Original H, PDF page 8. 78 municipalities responded; their own statements about knowledge, not an independent review of practice.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	73	94
No	5	6
Total	78	100

1.5: Requesting guidelines

Original H, PDF page 9. 72 of the 73 municipalities with enlightened knowledge.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Always	37	51
Often	25	35
Rare	8	11
Never	2	3
Total	72	100

1.6: Guidelines for preparation

Original H, PDF page 9. 69 of 73 municipalities with enlightened knowledge. Printed 22 / 69 = 29% not voting; 34 + 22 = 56 / 69. No correction of original cells.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Always	34	49

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Often	22	29
Rare	9	13
Never	4	6
Total	69	100

1.7: Own guidelines

Original H, PDF page 10. 78 municipalities; previous bread text says 28%, table says 27%.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	21	27
No	57	73
Total	78	100

1.2-P10: Authorised psychologist (printed table number 1.2)

Original H, PDF page 10. 79 municipalities; Bread text refers to Table 1.8, printed heading 1.2.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Always	68	86
Often	11	14
Rare	0	0
Never	0	0
Total	79	100

1.9: Internal or external psychologists

Original H, PDF page 11. 76 municipalities; the reasons given by the municipalities for objectivity / equity are their statements, not a concrete disability test.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Internal	25	33
External	51	67
Total	76	100

Smethod: Responses, estimates and other annual limits

Original H, PDF page 4. Answers per question vary. The 2800 / 14000 background has different units and overlaps; no annual national unique union is deduced.

Search	Number	Unit / demarcation
Answers	83	Municipality, June-July 2012
Printed response rate	85	Percentage, all municipalities contacted

Search	Number	Unit / demarcation
Number equivalent	82	Municipalities
Number of estimates	44	Municipalities
1 -15 studies	67	Municipalities
Mariners' fjord	35	Studies, estimates 2011
Copenhagen	45	Studies, estimates six out of eight local centres
Aalborg	77	Studies, accurate counting
Annual municipal placement decisions, background	2800	Circa, not cohort and not number of persons
Children / young people with support annual background	14000	Circa, can be placed at the same time
Places referred to in percentage bread text	46	Percentage, Table 28 + 17 = 45, no extra number row for population

1.10: Child welfare assessment before placement

Original H, PDF page 13. 104 applications for accommodation. A cited section 50 study was not submitted and coded as not available. Printed 13 / 104 = 11% deviates from 12,5%.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	86	83
No, should be available	13	11
No, emergency.	5	5
Total	104	100

1.11: Types of material about parents

Original H, PDF page 13. Several types of material per case; the table's percentages are close to N104, whereas the main text refers to 86 child welfare assessments. 260 represents overlap, not cases/persons.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Parenting capacity assessment	9	9
Specialist certificate	13	12
Opinion	69	66
Status	41	39
Journalnotate	90	86
Printing letter	11	10
General medical examination	2	2
Pensions Acts	2	2
Cash support files	2	2
Other	21	20
Total material deposits	260	Not printed

1.12: Professional groups providing information on parents' conditions

Original H, PDF page 14. Several subject groups per case; the denominator of the table is similar to N104, the percentage of the bread group differs. 299 may not be counted as employees or children.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Authorised psychologist	25	24
Legal officer	91	87
Family worker / adviser	42	40
Teacher	45	43
Health care provider	9	9
Nurse	1	1
Paediatrics	20	19
Medical practice	13	12
Specialist	25	24
Others	28	27
Total trade group occurrences	299	Not printed

1.13: All material for the placement decision

Original H, PDF page 15. Only the ten FKU cases, total file. The quality of the FKU itself is assessed separately.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	10	100
No	0	0
Total	10	100

1.14: The FKU uncovers the care capacity of specific children

Original H, PDF page 16. Ten FKU; two small studies may not necessarily be the same as other quality errors.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	6	60
To some extent	2	20
Very small	2	20
No	0	0
Total	10	100

1.15: Psychologist's access to relevant documents

Original H, PDF page 16. Ten FKU; in one omitted important piece of information on past violence against children, according to the report.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	9	90
To some extent	0	0
Very small	0	0
Not at all	1	10
Total	10	100

1.16: Consistency and validity

Original H, PDF page 17. Ten FKU, professional quality assessment. Not ten full decisions of law.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	7	70
To some extent	0	0
Very small	3	30
No	0	0
Total	10	100

1.37: FCU for current placement (printed number 1.37)

Original H, PDF page 17. Ten FKU; text refers to 1.17, printed 1.37.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	6	60
No	4	40
Total	10	100

1.18: Supplement to former FKU

Original H, PDF page 18. Only four former FKU. Two missing supplements are subset, not additional children.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Should be supplemented	2	50
Sufficiently topical without supplement	2	50
Total	4	100

1.19: Internal / external designers

Original H, PDF page 18. Three internal/seven external. Printed external percentages 20/30 differ from both 4/7 and 3/7; body text states four specialists, table three.

Professional group	Internal N	Internal%	External N	External%
Authorised psychologist	3	100	4	20
Specialist psychologist	0	0	3	30

Professional group	Internal N	Internal%	External N	External%
Legal officer	0	0	0	0
Others	0	0	0	0
Undisclosed	0	0	0	0
Total	3	100	7	100

1.20: Parents informed of purpose

Original H, PDF page 19. Ten FKU, not number of parents.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	8	80
To some extent	1	10
Very small	0	0
No	0	0
Undisclosed	1	10
Total	10	100

1.21: Review and possible comment

Original H, PDF page 19. Ten FCM; the same eight are assessed and noted. No number of parents; concrete invitation / deadline not published.

Response	Review N	% review	Note N	Note%
Yes	8	80	8	80
No	0	0	0	0
Undisclosed	2	20	2	20
Total	10	100	10	100

1.22: Interpreter

Original H, PDF page 20. Ten FKU; one case non-Danish-speaking parent and actual use of interpreters disclosed.

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	1	10
No	0	0
Not applicable	9	90
Total	10	100

Section: Documentation cut, source text

Original H, PDF page 14. 104 cases; 7 / 3 / 10 and material counter 9 are not necessarily the same measurement.

Search	Number	Printed percentage
FKU of 104	10	Not specified
FKU directly in child welfare assessment	7	Not specified
Additional FKU without directly documented § 50 coupling	3	Not specified
Table 1.11 FCU material	9	9

%: Separate percentage versions of the text

Original H, PDF page 13. Material bread text refers to 86 § 50 surveys, subject group bread text says the studies; matching integers to these percentage versions are not published. About ten percent has been rewritten from "every ten."

Relationship	Source%
Journals	94
Opinions	73
Statements of status	43
Specialist / Printing	10
Legal officer	98
Teacher	50
Family worker / adviser	47
Medical practice	12
Health care provider	9

Examples, time and citizens' consequences

The specific documentation shows placement decisions with missing child welfare assessments and FKUs with unexamined interaction, transfer from one child to another without supplementation, omitted relevant records and insufficient validity. These errors may affect the basis for separating the child from the parents and for choosing support, but the report does not provide the full assessment of legal authority/proportionality or subsequent cessation for every placement. Each decisive claim must therefore be traced from original case records through the specific legal rule to the result of the intervention; professional approval of the overall material is not alone evidence that the intervention was lawful. No actual return home, waiting time, compensation or employment-related sanction is documented here.

Own locator	PDF	Example type	Number / progress	Assessment
H16-E1	16	No source ID, own locator	FKU with good psychological tests, but without interaction observation or concrete child perspective	To a small extent, care coverage. Test results alone do not bear any specific relation / needs of the child.
H16-E2	16	No source ID, own locator	The FKU related to mother and another more treatment-consuming child; not supplemented for current child	Transfer between siblings without specific supplement; individual evidence deficiencies. It is not possible to identify overlap with two missing supplements.
H16-E3	16	No source ID, own locator	Psychologist did not have access to relevant documents; previous sentence for violence against children not included	Key information omitted from the survey according to source. Judgments / originals shall not be disclosed; no independent judicial review shall be carried out.

Own locator	PDF	Example type	Number / progress	Assessment
H17-E1	17	Group reference, no source ID	Three only to a small extent valid / coherent FKU	Lack of relation to economy / abuse, child's concrete needs and interaction. Not three new examples / people on top of ten.
H20-E1	20	No source ID, own locator	Coming mother; review tried, birth initiated prematurely	In fact, lack of review of the report described, not a documented waiver from the mother.
H20-E2	20	No source ID, own locator	Non-Danish-speaking parents, interpreter used	One case of interpretation within the same ten; language, quality, actual understanding and number of parents unknown.

Source deviations

Locator	Deviation
H6-7	Position in text 46%, table 28% + 17% = 45%; printed table percentages sum 99 against 100. Rounding cannot be found in unpublished integers.
H9	Table 1.6 has 22/69 printed as 29%, own division approximately 31,88%; category percentages 49+29+13+6=97. The text's 78% always/often differs from 56/69≈81,16%. Retain the counts and both statements.
H9-10	Own guidelines referred to 28%, Table 21 / 78 printed 27%; both retained.
H10	Authorized psychology table has printed 1.2, text 1.8; recycled number retained.
H4	Annex 1 with a municipal-count overview is mentioned, but is not included in the 20-page public original. A separate access route is being examined.
H13	Table 1.10 has 13 / 104 printed 11%, recalculation 12,5%; category percentages 83 + 11 + 5 = 99.
H13-14	Material table 1.11 contains 90 journal notes and 86%, compared with 94% in 86 studies. The table indicates 9FKU, footnote 7 says 7 directly + 3 further = 10. No secure individual vote.
H14-15	Trade group table 1.12 says cashier 91 / 87%, teacher 45 / 43%, family 42 / 40%, while bread text says 98 / 50 / 47%. Total occurrences 299, not unique professional population.
H17	Printed Table 1.37 against text 1.17; preserved as original version locators.
H18	External authorised psychologist 4 / 20% and specialist 3 / 30%, overall 7 / 100%; bread text says four specialists. Percentages do not match the 7-denominator; no exchange or percentage correction.
H19	The report accepts the possibility of comment partly on the basis of the submission to the meeting. No parents' comments on every case. Submission does not in itself document real, timely contrast.
H5, Table 1.2, Visually confirmed	The categories 3 + 34 + 19 + 14 + 5 + 1 + 4 + 3 summer to 83 municipalities, while the total and table note indicate 82. All cells have been visually confirmed. It is an original deviation, not a transfer error; no municipality is moved or deleted.

Other factual incisions

Locator	Precise information
H5	816 are commissioned studies from 82 municipalities, with 44 estimates. Psychological / interaction studies and implicit family treatment assessments may give additional assessments; not identical to the recorded 816 population.
H8-11	Guidelines of 21 June 2011 are, according to the original, not binding. Therefore, the absence of guidelines should not be counted as a breach of law alone.
H11-12	Legal review focuses material types and disciplines; ti-expert-review quality and adequacy. A quality problem is not in itself a published decision on invalid placement.
H12-13	According to the study, 13 placement cases should have had a 50-year study; five acute placement cases should be dealt with separately. The report does not subsequently publish § 50 preparation, repatriation or review of full material fitting.
H15 -18	Ankestyrelsen assess the parental material of a total of ten placement cases adequately, at the same time as three small valid FKU and two untimely without a supplement. The collection material assessment does not eliminate the documented actual FKU deficiencies.
H19-20	One course of early childbirth explains an attempted but not completed submission; unsolicited case coding / other subsequent meeting not documented.
H13 footnote 6	Guidance on the measurement form is given, but not attached; the original blank form and code / jump method cannot be checked here.
Annex track, tested October 7, 2026	H4 refers to the municipal table Annex 1, but the 20-page copy does not contain such a list. The Folketing's report copy of 18 pages omits the front page / colophon and has the same attachment; web metadata confirms 18 pages. It has not been certified fully text-controlled here.
Original register, tested 7 October 2026	SOU alm.del 2012-13 Annex 9 records report and transmission letter, document date 4 October 2012. No separate annex report was provided in the available registry view. This does not prove that the municipality inventory was never published.
Access to named annexes	Precise searches by report title + annex, 2012 + annex 1 + municipality, 2012 + annex report and 2012 + measurement form gave report copies / mention, no separate municipality summary or measurement plan guidance. The previous publication address of ASTM gave 404; two exact archive CDX tracks gave timeout respectively HTTP503. The FTregister gave in RAM HTTP403. No end to non-publication.
Registry responsibility and specific enquiry	Ankestyrelsen: provide the municipality-by-municipality annex 1 overview, original questionnaire with responses and estimated-value markers, measurement-form guidance/form and version/correction basis for tables 1.2,1.6,1.10,1.11,1.12 and 1.19, linked to the October 2012 report ISBN978-87-7811-192-0. Ministry/FT: accompanying annexes and original transmission register SOU 2012-13 annex 9. No request has been sent.

Historical Rule references

These are the rules and principles of the original. They are not counted as new investigations and are not automatically used as applicable 2026.

Reference	Locator	Defined content
Service Law § 50 and Guidelines 21 June 2011	H3 / H8 / H12	A child welfare assessment examines the child's/family's resources and difficulties. Guiding FKU principles: multiple methods, the specific child, parental strengths/weaknesses, no recommendation of a particular measure, thorough review with the parents.

Instrument and stage of execution

Blank fields, codes and illustrations are method information, not citizens' numbers. Actual correction, delivery and payment shall not be deduced solely from a follow-up decision.

Field	Locator	Meaning
Questionnaire	H4- 11	All municipalities asked June-July 2012 about 2011. Not everyone answers all questions; each table has its own denominator.
Legal Measurement	H11 footnote 5	Documents not in submitted acts are not assumed to have been drawn up. This is a method assumption; actual non-existence requires the municipality / file register.
Child qualified measurement	H12-20	TiFKU subset of 104. Quality of test / action basis, timeliness, care, validity and contrast; assessment section overlaps.
Personal dedup	H3 / H11	No local case IDs. 816 studies, 104 cases, 10FKU and municipality numbers are different units; cannot be a citizen's union.
Time / effect	H11-20	Decisions after 1 Jan 2011; no individual placement/return-home dates or redress/accountability series.

Concrete remains and evidence chain

All tables/pages of the main original have been fully checked. Named but not supplied annexes: the list of municipalities “annex 1” (H4) and the assessment-form instructions (H13 footnote 6). The specific access check below retains these as outstanding originals, without claiming non-publication. Also missing are 104 complete case files, 10 original FKUs, municipality/case links to BarnetsReform, the received/excluded/appealed flow, a register of records to test the assumption of absence, parents’ comments, current supplements, return-home dates/duration of intervention, responsibility and loss. Demand: an individual factual basis concerning the child and parents grounded in the records, an opportunity to contest the material, examination of the basis for every placement, a correct decision and documented cessation/redress where substantive legal authority is lacking. Nationwide demand for FKUs cannot be calculated from the estimated 816 as a rate of unique breaches of law.

The source chain is the original table or case summary → delimited error → the stated historical rule → the act or omission of the municipality → concrete significance for performance / testing → responsibility and requirement for act-based correct decision as well as documented effectiveness. Actual loss, guilt and personal union require the separate documents specified. The assessment by the Authority is not merely proof of its own correctness.

Specific access tracks for non-enclosed annexes

Tested URL	Result
Source tracks	Web can read the 18-page report copy; available main text / metadata, no independent attachment 1 file identified. Not full certificate of this parallel version.
Source tracks	Search records shall provide a report and a letter of transmission. Direct RAM HTTP403; web direct cache error.
Source tracks	HTTP404; no end to original publication.
Source tracks	Timeout, no record.
Source tracks	HTTP503, no record.

Family and network contact 2013: full numbers, children's statements and evidence chains

A plan of visits does not in itself demonstrate that the child's relationship is preserved. The fully reviewed study shows that family and sibling contact often depends on parents' contact, carers' agreements or the child's own efforts. A child misses half-siblings, which it hasn't seen since Christmas, but hasn't told an adult. Another doesn't know why a firm and cosy deal with Grandma has ended. The municipality's obligation to seek out the child's wishes cannot therefore be replaced by the right of the child or family to turn to themselves. [NET13-FUD, PDF23 / 69-72]

The local authorities' explanation that parents typically cancel must be kept separate from the documentation. The contact figures record frequency, not the reason for each rejection. Several interviewees tell that parents most often meet and only

are cancelled in case of illness or practical circumstances; some describe repeatedly other cancellations. The interview children cannot be connected to the 252 documents, and the difference is therefore a difference between source types, not proof that a particular municipality is lying in a particular case. [NET13-FUD, PDF6 / 33 / 54-55 / 65-66 / 79]

The child's wishes can be both more and less contact. The criticism is that the wishes must be examined in concrete terms, be real and be reflected in the explanatory statement of the decision. A reference to the best or professional method of the child is not in itself proof that this has happened. The concrete statements about the lack of sibling issues, insufficient early network coverage and experienced distortion of a child's conversation provide precise testing clues. They are not a finished invalidation or punishment. [NET13-FULD, PDF23 / 27 / 68 / 70-72]

Source control and delimitation

NET13-FULL. Ankestyrelsen, December 2013, ISBN 978- 87- 7811- 213-2. All 79 physical pages have been read, including both annexes. All 20 figures are reviewed; all sides with figures and ambiguous tables are also visually controlled in memory. No official original, full text or page images are stored locally. PDFside = printed page + 3. Original Public report copy of social educators. SHA256 c6df436a55861b36582f4c5b52ac8ab7ae1400c111df68bf86c73f46b3fb04ba. Known Annex of the Folketing - ID1316351 is metadata / mirror tracks, not an additional document or a separately read population.

There are 14 numbered original tables with 73 rows,20 figures with all explicitly published values,16 methodology cards and 24 description cards of our own. Bars without numerical labels have been checked, but their height has not been converted into invented exact cells. The 252 children, 9 interviewed children, 542 contact-group occurrences and the annual statistics' stocks/decisions each have their own denominator.

Method, exclusions and cohort bridge

Point	Actual delimitation	Physical PDFside
Selection of municipal units	98 municipalities; Ishøj / Vallensbæk joint gives 97 possible answers; 94 replies = printed 97%	78
Lack of general answers	Goldborgsund, Lyngby-Taarbæk, Brøndby	78
Review	252 cases from 86 municipalities; still located 0-14 years per 1Jan 2013, decision after 1Jan 2011 and before 1Jan 2013	48
Exclusion	Development inhibition / physical impairment only; types of placement other than the five specified; termination of placement; 15-17 years	48
Choice of proceedings	Latest three fulfilling decisions per municipality; called randomly in other sections, but method is temporal local quota	48
Unselected municipalities	The footnote says 9, but Esbjerg is mentioned twice among 9 names; unique 8.	48
Reference population	1080 target group in prose PDF48 / 73 / 74; footnote PDF74 indicates 1142 children / adolescents without a vote	74
Alleged representativeness	Printed 5% error margin without published weighting; different consent / placement distributions; no national error rate	74
Municipality interview	6 municipalities: Gladsaxe, Skanderborg, Aabenraa, Frederikshavn, Lolland, Odense; selection including network use	78
Case files for qualitative illustrations	6 municipalities asked for 3 acts each, one network; 18 are ordering, not documented definitively received	22
Child interview	9 children 10-14 years in ordinary foster family, 4 municipalities, August 2013, in a room without foster parents	60
Child Selection	Commune intermediary; written consent of the parental authority; able to handle interviews; possibility of networks in addition to parents	79
Passenger bridge	252 children / 9 interviewees not connected; no documented union 261; number of parents / siblings / disabled	49
Contact concept	Physical interaction; letter, email, telephone, social media omitted from the mapping, but mentioned in interviews	48
General time limits	Family group conferencing typically 2-3 weeks; child welfare assessment 4-month time limit mentioned; Aalborg 2-year project	21
No fallout check	No national or individual measurement of legal correctness/return home/compensation; contact over the most recent six months is the municipalities' file-based recording	48

All numbered original tables

Table 2.1: Participatory case-processing method

NET13-FULD, physical PDF11, printed 8. 93 responses; one “do not know” excluded from 94.

Category	Number of municipalities	Percentage
Uses	76	82
Do not use	17	18
Total	93	100

Table 2.2: Case-handling methods used

NET13-FULD, physical PDF12, printed 9. 76 municipalities, multiple responses. Licences in 75 municipalities/DUBU62 in September 2013 are different indicators, not proof of implementation.

Method	Number of municipalities	Percentage
ICS	60	79
Signs of Safety	14	18
Others	26	34
Number of equivalent	76	-

Table 4.1: Deviations between actual and planned interaction

NET13-FUD, Physical PDF32, printed 29. The general experience of the municipalities, not the 252s trial.

Frequency	Number of municipalities	Percentage
Always	0	0
Often	10	11
Sometimes	59	63
Rare	22	23
Never	1	1
Don’t know	2	2
Total	94	100

Table 4.2: Typical more or less contact

NET13-FULD, Physical PDF33, printed 30. 91 responses. Prosa PDF32 says 38% as planned; Table 37% is retained.

Category	Number of municipalities	Percentage
More	5	6
Less	52	57
As planned	34	37
Total	91	100

Table 5.1: Annual network applications

NET13-FULD, physical PDF35,printed 32. Reuse of the placement statistics’ year-end version; no new children beyond the annual series already counted.

Measure	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
All children placed at the end of the year	12801	12893	12681	12360	11800
Network outside the genus	424	473	409	385	364
Network within the genus	210	217	331	414	444
Total networks	634	690	740	799	808

Measure	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Percentage share	5,0	5,4	5,8	6,5	6,8

Table 5.2: Network location decisions 2008-12

NET13-FULD, Physical PDF40, printed 37. Decisions 2008-12, not deductible.

Age	Kinship foster families	New arrivals	Percentage
0-3	168	1839	9
4-6	96	908	11
7-11	235	2196	11
12-14	193	3698	5
15-17	201	6556	3
Total	893	15197	6

Table 5.3: More frequent network management supervision

NET13-FULD, Physico PDF41, printed 38. 93 responses.

Category	Number of municipalities	Percentage
Yes, the whole placement.	27	29
Yes only startup	4	4
No, same thing.	55	59
Don’t know	7	8
Total	93	100

Table 5.4: Specialised personnel

NET13-FUD, Physical PDF42, printed 39. 93 responses.

Category	Number of municipalities	Percentage
Yes	31	33
No	60	65
Don’t know	2	2
Total	93	100

Table 5.5: Planned use of network installation

NET13-FUD, Physical PDF43, printed 40. 94 replies; table continues PDF44.

Category	Number of municipalities	Percentage
More	58	62
Unchanged	32	34
Less	0	0

Category	Number of municipalities	Percentage
Not at all	0	0
Don’t know	4	4
Total	94	100

Table 6.1: Planned interaction

NET13-FUD, Physical PDF50, printed 47. 252 children, multiple responses; five contact groups sum 454. The title absence is the original error. Prosa PDF51 says 31% grandparents versus Table 30%.

Group	Number of children with planned absence [original title]	Percentage
Parental authority holders	237	94
Siblings	84	33
Grandparents	75	30
Other family	40	16
Network	18	7
None	4	2
Undisclosed	7	3
Number of children	252	-

Table 6.2: Actual contact last six months

NET13-FUD, Physical PDF50, printed 47. 252 children, multiple responses; five contact groups sum 542. No personalities for individual groups; 542 are children × group occurrences, no visits or unique relatives.

Group	Number of children with actual contact	Percentage
Parental authority holders	238	94
Siblings	106	42
Grandparents	96	38
Other family	71	28
Network	31	12
None	6	2
Number of children	252	-

Table 6.3: Difference in number of contact groups

NET13-FUD, Physical PDF52, printed 49. 252 children; the same number of groups do not show the same frequency of visits.

Category	Number of children	Percentage
Less groups than planned	17	7
More groups than planned	63	25
Same groups	169	67

Category	Number of children	Percentage
Not reported	3	1
Total	252	100

Table 6.4: Monitoring / supported interaction

NET13-FUD, Physical PDF56, printed 53. 252 children; support also includes counselling before / after contact. Total printed 152 (visually controlled), while 105 + 147 = 252. Protected as error, no tacit correction. No published list of persons for overlapping.

Response	Monitor number	Monitor %	Number supported	Percentage supported	Both types total	Both types Total percentage
Yes	26	10	79	31	105	42
No	226	90	173	69	147	58
Total	252	100	252	100	152	100

Table 6.5: Contact groups with monitored / supported interaction

NET13-FULD, Physical PDF57, printed 54. Multiple answers; denominators 26 and 79. Prosa says supported networks in one case, Table 0; monitored network 1. Not harmonised.

Group	Number monitored	Percentage monitored	Number supported	Percentage supported
Parental authority holders	26	100	75	95
Grandparents	1	4	11	14
Siblings	1	4	5	6
Other family members	1	4	2	3
Network	1	4	0	0
Total children	26	-	79	-

Figures: all explicit figures and the exact reading limits

Figure 2.1: Policy / management focus

NET13-FULD, Physical PDF10. 94 municipal units; columns without precise labels.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Children's policy describes	2/3	prosa
Written guidelines	approx. half	prosa

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 2.2: Fuse tools

NET13-FUD, Physical PDF15. 94; only explicitly prose PDF15-16. Unmarked tools never encoded; 6ICScommunes use SoS always / often and 9SoScommunes always / often PDF16.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
ICS always / often	60	%

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Network Cards / Genogram always / often	approx. 20	%
Network map / genogram sometimes	ca. 40	%
SoS always / often	12	%

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 2.3: Meetings

NET13-FULL, Physical PDF17. Municipal survey; prose PDF16 / 21.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Network meeting always / often	78	%
Family advice often	Approx. 5	%
Family advice rarely / never	ca. 70	%

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 3.1: Estimates of relevant resources

NET13-FUD, physical PDF25. Local government estimates; the last wording does not clearly indicate two separate exact counters.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Parents relevant in >75% of cases	40	municipalities
Grandparents in <25%	35	municipalities
Grandparents in 25-50%	35	municipalities
Other family / network i <25%	good 60	municipalities

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 4.1: Contact groups in the plan of visits

NET13-FULD, Physical PDF29. Municipality statements, prosa PDF28; other columns not labeled.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Parents always	more than 90	%
Parents often	8	%

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 4.2: Frequency of the schedule of visits

NET13-FUD, physical PDF32. Direct figurative labels. Prosa PDF31 wrongly refers to Figure 4.3.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Always	61	%
Often	35	%
Sometimes	4	%

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 5.1: Other network location hedging practices

NET13-FULL, physical PDF36. Direct figurative labels.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Yes	38	%
No	55	%
Don’t know	7	%

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 5.2: Person groups used as network care

NET13-FUD, physical PDF41. 94 municipalities; five frequency categories / four relationship groups; no exact cells.

No new exact data cells published in this figure; any cells already tabulated are not counted again.

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 6.1: Planned / actual contact groups

NET13-FUD, physical PDF51. Reuse T6.1 / 6.2; not extra population. Prose grandparents 31% versus Table 30% are maintained.

No new exact data cells published in this figure; any cells already tabulated are not counted again.

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 6.2: Actual frequency

NET13-FULD, physical PDF52. The figure's noteN542 child × group deposits; prosa calls it children. No conversion to unique children.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
2-5 times	up to half	prosa
1 time	20	% from summary PDF8
<1 time	around 20	% from summary PDF8
Not reported	10	% from summary PDF8

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 6.3: Frequency by contact group

NET13-FULD, physical PDF53. Distribution within each contact group, not all 252 child's registered individual distributions.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Parents 2-5 times	66	%
Other groups 2-5 times	15-20	% interval

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 6.3. a: Frequency after consent

NET13-FULD, physical PDF54. Disparities by consent, subN not published.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
With consent 2-5 times	42	%
Without consent 2-5 times	45	%

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 6.4: Planned versus actual frequency

NET13-FULD, physical PDF54. Figure note 542; prosa refers to planned visits. N454 planned vs 542 actually must not be harmonised.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
More	5	%
Less	13	%
No difference	65	%
Not reported	17	% from summary PDF7

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 6.5: Frequency deviation by contact group

NET13-FULD, physical PDF55. Contact-group instances; no reason for cancellation registered in the figure.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Parents less	25	%
Other smaller groups	2-6	% interval
The same exception network	60-67	% interval
Network progress	about half	prosa

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 6.6: Monitoring after consent

NET13-FULL, physical PDF58. Prosa PDF57; Herald N of the subgroup not published.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
With consent supervised	2	%
Without consent monitored	25	%

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure 6.7: Aid after consent

NET13-FULL, physical PDF59. No exact figure labels for each consent group.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
With / without consent supported	approximately one third	prosa

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure Annex 1.1: Gender

NET13-FULD, physical PDF74. 252 sample; prosa 1080 reference, footnote 1142. No recalculation of integers.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Sample boys	56	%
Sample girls	44	%
2012 boys	52	%
2012 girls	48	%

No interpolation of pillar heights.

FigurAnnex 1.2: Age

NET13-FULD, physical PDF75. 0-3 / 4 -6 / 7-11 / 12-14; two cohorts; no exact figurative labels.

No new exact data cells published in this figure; any cells already tabulated are not counted again.

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure Annex 1.3: Consent

NET13-FULL, physical PDF76. 252 versus 2012 reference. No population weighting published.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Sample with	64	%
Sampling without	36	%
2012 with	77	%
2012 without	23	%

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Figure Annex 1.4: Location

NET13-FUD, Physical PDF77. Other columns without exact labels; no interpolation.

Information	Published value	Unit of measurement / source
Sample General Care	58	%
2012 general care	44	%
Sample of the institution of the day	20	%
2012	25	%

No interpolation of pillar heights.

Concrete contact and information processes

Map	Documented statement and possible consistency	Concrete verification required	PDF page
K01	Copenhagen recognises insufficient early networking. After installation, the network may be more difficult to get involved.	Early investigations, searches and alternative support options in the specific case.	27
K02	The AS considers the risk of registering only those who are addressing themselves or of describing only relationships. Passive or less strong relatives may be omitted; relationships are not translated into support.	Outreach work and reasoned assessment of resources, not just a list of relationships.	23
B01	A child has been monitoring contact with mother for half an hour every four weeks and wants the representative's protection. Very limited time and dependence on adult support; the child's own desire must be preserved.	The specific decision, reasons for necessity and the child's own statements; not automatic illegal surveillance.	62
B02	A child says the mother's return report turned out not to hold. Uncertainty of return and subsequent teasing described by the child.	The decision / information course and original interview; the report does not test the mother's statement independently.	62
B03	A child wants shorter contact than two hours at the table. Load and lack of meaningful activity, not simple resentment of family contact.	The child's wishes, support and concrete activity / contact plan.	62,63
B04	A child will be troubled if the written schedule of visits is not there. Predictability has an independent effect on the child's everyday life.	Available plan and timely explanation of changes.	63
B05	A child describes three different homes on the same day and fears of saying something wrong. Load by shift and consideration of adult emotions.	The child's experience and specific transport / time courses, not diagnosis derived from interviews.	63,64
B06	A child wants to stay with mother, but says that the municipality has announced stay in the care family to the 9th grade. lived locked future and grief by farewell.	Original decision, review periods and reunification work; interviews are not a legal test.	64
B07	A child prefers the foster family, too, if her mother gets well. The relationship and desire of the child differ from that of other children.	Individual assessment; no general presumption of the same desire in all children.	64
B08	A child has lived 9 years in foster care after 3 first years with mother and has to choose an adult when purchasing a confirmation dress. Loyalty conflict between mother and foster mother; fear of making anyone sad.	Support for the child's own wishes without making the child responsible for adult conflict.	64,65
B09	A child would rather have 2 good hours with mother than 4 bad ones and is prepared to wait a year for longer contact. The child puts their own wish aside out of consideration for the mother's condition.	Support needs and actual contact; the opinion is not evidence of a year's actual waiting time.	65
B10	One child describes that mother's cancellations ended after the interview with case handler; others describe continued cancellations. Cancellations have different causes and processes; support can make difference.	Cancellation log and practical barriers; no overall cancellation guilt can be inferred from fewer visits.	65,66
B11	A child wants the family centre, but doubts whether it was the child or the parents' proximity. Being asked isn't the same as being able to see your influence.	Statement of reasons and response to the child's wishes.	66,67
B12	A child sees mother every two weeks against earlier monthly, changed a month before interview via mother. Contact was extended, but the child does not tell about his own direct conversation at the time of the change.	Talk and the child's real participation.	67

Map	Documented statement and possible consistency	Concrete verification required	PDF page
B13	A girl resumes contact with her father after more than 2 years and gains closer contact with his other family. The paternal side had previously been absent from a confirmation celebration with 62 invitees; her sister arrived 4 hours before the others.	Contact chain to the entire family page; the information does not show that the authority caused the previous breach.	67,69
B14	A child makes contact with mother changed from two to once monthly and from home to center; describes 5-6 movements in the year and at least 13 earlier. The child's desire for a different contact was followed.	Original wishes / decision; no additional person count of each move.	67,68
B15	A child has on several occasions wanted less intercourse, but says the municipality says the parents have to say yes. The desire remains ineffective; later hours lead to fatigue at homework.	Original grounds for jurisdiction / consent and concrete assessment; the report does not give rise to a declaration of invalidity.	68
B16	A child says that a cosy firm agreement with Grandma has ceased without the child knowing why. Contact can cease without understandable explanation for the child.	Contact plan, cause of discontinuation, child's wishes and support to maintain the relationship.	69
B17	A child experiences that Grandma no longer wants to have contact after moving to foster care. Experienced loss of relationship, even if a birthday present is sent.	Original contact trials and grandmother's statements; experience is not verified motive.	70
B18	A child sees little sister in the second foster family about every third Monday through the foster family agreement. Practical support actually provides sibling contact.	The continuity of the plan and the child's own wishes; no automatic municipal plan.	70
B19	A child has not seen half-siblings since Christmas, misses them and has not told the caretaker or foster mother it; little brother 1 year. Siblings can be weakened while missing remain unspoken.	Outreach child interview and concrete contact plan. Interview date August 2013 does not exactly give the last date of the visit.	70,71
B20	A child maintains contact with two friends from 3rd grade and organises visits independently; no one helps the child remember them. Preservation of the original network depends on the child’s own efforts.	Support for relations; no assumption that lack of plan is the same as no connection.	71
B21	A child tells about meeting months later about the foster family without knowing what it was; the second describes the fatigue of many interlocutors. Information and continuity may fail or strain.	Original information, intercom and customized help; episodes cannot be duplicated.	71
B22	One child experiences that the previous caseworker did not incorporate their wishes into the plan; another experiences an example of gardening assistance being changed to pots only and forwarded. Experienced disregard and distortion may weaken trust and the child’s ability to speak freely.	Original interview / journal / plan and receiving chain; the authority's reproduction cannot prove itself.	72

Legal significance, responsibility and requirements

The study discusses the Social Services Act rules then in force on systematic involvement (§47), child welfare assessment (§50), a support person (§68 b) and the child’s right to contact with family and network (§71). These are 2013 rules as reproduced in the report, not an assertion that the 2026 section number is unchanged. The joint report’s current rights analysis is used for present-day demands. [NET13-FULD, PDF4/14/19-20/22-23/28/33-34/56-57]

The sustainable evidential chain is: a child's contact can disappear without the child being asked or given an explanation; this is supported by specific interview statements and AS' own points for attention on active investigation; its significance is the risk of losing family connections and lacking influence, which is not resolved merely by having a plan; responsibility must be assigned to the authority that was required to investigate, give reasons, arrange and follow up; the demand is for production of original interviews with children, network maps, contact/cancellation logs, decisions and actual support, together with specific review and restoration of the affected relationships. The legal basis, necessity, causal sequence and any culpability in respect of each person must be determined on the specific records. The report does not provide personal identities or final outcomes concerning return home/compensation.

Documented source problems and residues

T6.4 contains a visually confirmed 152, where its own subcells 105 + 147 give 252. T6.1 calls its numerical heading planned absence. The grandparent figure is 30% in the table but 31% in prose; T4.2 is 37% against 38% in prose; supported networks are 0 in T6.5 against one instance in prose. The footnote's list of 9 municipalities repeats Esbjerg and gives only 8 distinct names. The reference population is 1080 in prose but 1142 in a footnote. All these values are retained separately. [NET13-FULD, PDF32-33/48/50-51/56-57/73-74]

A specific problem with the results is that the report uses the word children in frequency figures whose notes state 542 contact-group occurrences. This cannot be converted into the number of children with too little overall contact, completed visits, lost relationships or cancellations giving rise to liability. T6.3, however, actually gives 17 children with fewer contact groups than planned; it does not say why. The sample contains 36% placements without consent against a reference of 23% and 58% ordinary foster care against 44%; a standard margin of error of 5% does not remove this documented population shift. [NET13-FULD, PDF49-55/74-77]

The source work on the 79-page report is closed. The specific outstanding matters are identity links not publicly disclosed, original individual case records, reasons for cancellation, subsequent contact/reunification and actual compensation or support. These outstanding matters are necessary for stronger claims about individuals/culpability/redress; they do not weaken the already substantiated deficiencies in investigation and the children’s documented experiences.

Residential families 2014: full sub-reports, supervision and populations

All 37 + 53 + 11 + 7 = 108 original pages actually read in memory. All 40 numbered tables in Part 1 / 2 / 4; 61 reader blocks / 373 rows. Visual pages appear in the source register.

Coverage and demarcation

PF14K:80-90 municipal responses, 79 in the satisfaction figure; 97 response units. PF14P:374 of 834 questionnaires sent, 60 municipalities; former foster families excluded; one child per response. 11 interviewed families are among the 374. PF14N:95 of 97 response units, 10.542 approved/8.794 active/5.987 active full-time foster families at the end of October 2013. PF14S repeats the populations; part 3 with 57 legally examined moves is only summarised, and the main original remains a specific document still to be obtained.

374/834=44,84% response against the printed 62%.132/340=38,82% with fewer than 2 supervision visits,not 39% of 374 or all children in care.95 municipalities in the mapping against summary 93. All discrepancies are retained locally. Different survey/percentage/family/case denominators are not harmonised.

KM: Municipality method

PF14K PDF3 / 36-37; mentions 97; unitary municipality / interviews. End 2013; Organisational Reform 2014. No judicial review. Satisfaction 1-5 is recoded 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 + 5; PF14P other categories, no direct scale harmonisation.

Measurement	Figures	N / Limit
Issued	97	Ishøj / Vallensbæk overall
Answer per question	80-90	Figure 3.1 only 79
Main interview	3	Aarhus / Herning / Ishoy
Phone interview	1	Ikast-Brand
Written material	1	Roskilde
Preinterview	3	Holbæk / København / Slagelse

K2.1: Organisation

PF14K PDF9; denominator 90; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Same unit	59	66
Different units	26	29
External supplier	3	3
Other	2	2
Total	90	100

K2.2: Same person in the same unit

PF14K PDF10; denominator 59; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	8	14
No	51	86
Total	59	100

K2.3: Supplies guidelines on allocation of tasks

PF14K PDF11; denominator 81; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	26	32
No	55	68
Total	81	100

K2.4: Planned organisational changes 2014

PF14K PDF12; denominator 86; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	18	21
No	47	55
Unexplained	21	24
Total	86	100

K3.1: self-termination of foster families: change last year

PF14K PDF15; denominator 84; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Increase	2	2
Fall	0	0
Unchanged	82	98
Total	84	100

K3.2: Municipal termination: change last year

PF14K PDF15; denominator 84; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Increase	5	6
Fall	1	1
Unchanged	78	93
Total	84	100

K4.1: Remuneration model

PF14K PDF20; denominator 86; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Aarhus model	7	8
Other fixed	47	55
No fixed	32	37
Total	86	100

KF3.1: Cooperation climate

PF14K PDF13; mentions 79; unit percentage. PF14KPDF4 prosa 91% vs 43 + 47 = 90% and PDF13; rounding / version is retained.

Category	%	Family consultant%
Very pleased	13	43
Satisfied	42	47
Neither	38	9
Dissatisfied	8	1

KF3.2: Changed climate

PF14K PDF16; denominator 86; unit percentage. Figure: last 2 years; chapter introduction: last year.

Category	Percentage
Better	20
Worse	10
Unchanged	70

KF4.3: Management involvement

PF14K PDF23; mentions 88; unit percentage.

Category	Percentage
Never	1
Rare	11
Sometimes	24
Often	23
Always	41

KF4.4: Movements in involvement guidelines

PF14K PDF27; mentions 61; unit percentage. 70% of municipalities say guidelines; nfor 70% not explicitly stated. Guideline ≠ actual action.

Group	Percentage
Others	18
Other family / network	34
Professional network	75
Family Adviser	92
Biological parents	98
Child	98
Family of care	100

KG: All graphs without exact cell count

PF14K PDF8 / 10 / 19 / 29-30; denominator pr.fig; unit graph metadata. All graphs visually read. Stable widths are not replaced by detected precise cell values.

Figure	PDF	Rows	N	Printed prosa numbers
2.1	8	7	89	Remuneration 57 / 43; supervision 69 / 30 + 1 external; about 20% external supervision / course
2.2	10	7	88	No precise cell labels
4.1	19	11	not printed,	Approx. 40% interaction / relocation
4.2	19	11	not printed,	Approx. 40% interaction
5.1	29	8	82	79 ongoing/48 employment guidelines/44 network/33 group supervision
5.2	30	8	not printed,	80% running very high; 58% group high; 23% website high; 28% newsletter high

KE: All local time / resource examples

PF14K PDF6 / 21 / 23-26 / 32-34; denominator unknown; unit interview statements / secondary schemes. No individual journal-tested errors or exact actual date of release.

PDF	Example	Objective / status
6	Ishøj	24 hours phone

PDF	Example	Objective / status
21	Aarhus	2 years trial, permanent 2010; child 18 years forecast
23	Aarhus supervision	1 time / md first 6 md, possibly + 6 md
24	Herning supervision	every 6 weeks first 6 months; 4 levels
25	Roskilde network	12 families; start 2013; secondary reference
26	Ishøj Coherence	minimum first 3 md; municipal statements
26	Roskilde conversations	2 advisers; secondary reference
32	Ishøj match	several months; possible additional institution relocation
33	Herning targets	2 parts of the plan; monthly follow-up
34	Sweden project	1Jan 2013-2016; 4 years old
34	Standard of proceedings	20-25 versus 40-45
34	Upgrading	4 to 8 social workers + 3 health nurses + 3 psychologists
34	Expected savings	4.5 million over 4 years; unproven effect

PM: Residential family method

PF14P PDF4 / 42 / 49-50; mentions 374; unit families / interviews. Jan-mar 2014. Discovered foster families. Answers for children with the next birthday, not all children. Strategic interview selection; sound recordings. 62% visually verified PDF49.

Measurement	Figures	N / status
Issued	834	families in 60 municipalities with most active
Reply	374	834
Printed response rate	62	conflict;
Calculated response rate	44.8441	44.8441%; recalculation
Active full-time stock	5987	PF14N
Sample%	6.2	rounded 374 / 5987,
Focus groups	3	families already among 374
Families group 1	4	6 participants
Families group 2	4	6 participants
Families group 3	3	5 participants
Total families	11	not extra cohorts,
Total participants	17	not 17 families
Interview duration	2	hours
Prepared good / improvement points	3+3	last group

P2.1: Remuneration dealer

PF14P PDF12; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Legal officer	131	35
Family Adviser	153	41
External	3	1
Management	28	7
Others	59	16
Total	374	100

P3.1: Assignment of a family consultant

PF14P PDF16; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Local authority	321	86
External	13	3
None	40	11
Total	374	100

P3.2: Involvement

PF14P PDF17-18; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	165	44
Someone.	124	33
Rings	49	13
None	31	8
Don’t know	5	1
Total	374	100

P3.3: Hearing

PF14P PDF21; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	105	28
Someone.	156	42
Rings	72	19
None	21	6
Don’t know	20	5
Total	374	100

P3.4: Handleplanden

PF14P PDF24; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Full plan	180	48
Parts	22	6
Know if, not extradited	60	16
Almost no info	48	13
Do not know replan	64	17
Total	374	100

P3.5: Plan used

PF14P PDF24; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	128	34
Someone.	105	28
Rings	21	6
None	61	16
Not applicable	59	16
Total	374	100

P3.6: Hearing before movement

PF14P PDF25; denominator 36; unit survey responses. 36 of 374 have a move within the last 3 years; former families excluded. Not 57 cases examined against the records.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	19	53
No	13	36
Don’t know	4	11
Total	36	100

P3.7: Agreement on movement

PF14P PDF26; denominator 35; unit survey responses. One unspecified out of 36.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	21	60
No	14	40
Total	35	100

P3.8: Causes of movement

PF14P PDF26-27; denominator 36; unit survey responses. Multiple responses; cell percentages correspond to N35,not 36. The original prose’s 35 against the table’s 36 is retained. Not summable error events.

Category	Number	Percentage
♪ Baby better ♪	3	9
Child worse	17	49
Framework / terms of disagreement	7	20
Professional dissent	3	9
Bioparents' agreement	4	11
Private relations	3	9
Child leaving / wishes	6	17
Acute / temporary	5	14
Own termination	4	11
Other	3	9
Printed number of movements	36	-

P3.9: Personal supervision 2013

PF14P PDF28; denominator 340; unit survey responses. At least one year with the family.132/340=38.82% have fewer than 2 visits; survey statements not checked against case records.340 versus 374−43 under 1 year=331 in B2.4 is retained; raw data required.

Category	Number	Percentage
0 visits	40	12
1 visit	92	27
2 visits	126	37
More than 2	79	23
Vedikke	3	1
Total	340	100

P3.10: without a foster parent

PF14P PDF29; denominator 374; unit survey responses. Presence of 41% is not automatically unlawful; the rule says as far as possible, and original individual reasons are necessary.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	207	55
No	154	41
Vedikke	13	3
Total	374	100

P4.1: Supervision satisfaction among recipients

PF14P PDF31; denominator 302; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	152	50
Someone.	108	36
Rings	32	10
None	10	3
Total	302	100

P4.2: Supervision provider

PF14P PDF31; denominator 374; unit survey responses. Multiple responses.374−71=303 against satisfaction N302; one other response or exclusion requires raw data.

Category	Number	Percentage
Family Adviser	245	66
Legal officer	30	8
Psychologist	73	20
Others	41	11
None	71	19
Reply	374	-

P4.3: Supervision dissatisfaction

PF14P PDF34; denominator 148; unit survey responses. Multiple responses, total 160.

Category	Number	Percentage
No supervision	45	30
Too little	28	19
Unadapted	23	16
Quality	36	24
Others	28	19
Reply	148	-

P4.4: At least 2 course days last year

PF14P PDF39; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	261	70
No	110	29
Vedikke	3	1

Category	Number	Percentage
Total	374	100

P4.5: Course relevance

PF14P PDF40; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	133	36
Someone.	162	43
Rings	51	14
None	11	3
Vedikke	17	5
Total	374	100

P5.1: Form of approval

PF14P PDF43; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
General	278	74
Concrete Network	9	2
Concretely	29	8
Konkretkommunal	16	4
General	20	5
Vedikke	22	6
Total	374	100

P5.2: Number of foster children

PF14P PDF44; denominator 374; unit survey responses. Families≠children; over 3 is an open category. No exact union of individuals or national calculation of people affected by errors.

Category	Number	Percentage
1	190	51
2	132	35
3	43	11
Exceeding 3	9	2
Total	374	100

P5.3: Contracting Party

PF14P PDF45; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Nursing mother	211	56
Father of Nurses	41	11
Both	122	33
Total	374	100

P5.4: Employment matrix percentages

PF14P PDF45; mentions 347; unit percentage. Rounded cells, not raw numbers. Spouse only 347; PF14Nprosaandenominator / second distribution.

Primary part	The spouse	Spouse part-time	Full-time spouse	Total
None	14	7	40	60
Part-time	2	3	16	21
Full-time	4	1	13	19
Total	20	12	69	100

P5.5: Own children under 18

PF14P PDF47; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
0	214	57
1	92	25
2	42	11
3	23	6
4	3	1
Total	374	100

PB2.1: All consultant-conflict cells

PF14P PDF51; denominators Npr. row; unit percentage. Repeatagesigraphs 1.2 / 1.3 / 2.1 / 2.2 / 3.1 / 4.2 / 4.3; same responses, no additional population. Annex heading calls 3.2 / 3.3, but actual conflict figures; rounding is preserved.

Theme	Never%	Rare%	Some%	Frequently%	Always%	Total%	N
Remuneration	56	21	12	4	7	100	302
Remuneration	45	23	11	9	12	100	285
Council	48	28	15	4	5	100	306
Supervision	52	22	14	6	6	100	300
Education	52	21	16	6	4	100	307
Support child	45	24	17	7	8	100	307
Interview	45	27	15	6	7	100	306

Theme	Never%	Rare%	Some%	Frequently%	Always%	Total%	N
Communication bio	44	29	17	4	6	100	304
Information	33	28	19	10	10	100	308
Other	52	15	15	4	13	100	104

PB2.2: All authority-conflict cells

PF14P PDF52; denominators Npr. row; unit percentage. Repeatagesigraphs 1.2 / 1.3 / 2.1 / 2.2 / 3.1 / 4.2 / 4.3; same responses, no additional population. Annex heading calls 3.2 / 3.3, but actual conflict figures; rounding is preserved.

Theme	Never%	Rare%	Some%	Frequently%	Always%	Total%	N
Remuneration	46	23	17	6	7	100	363
Remuneration	38	22	16	10	14	100	340
Council	36	30	22	9	4	100	358
Supervision	47	21	16	7	9	100	352
Education	49	21	18	7	5	100	357
Support child	33	24	19	10	13	100	359
Interview	32	24	21	13	10	100	366
Communication bio	33	27	22	7	11	100	365
Information	20	31	21	14	13	100	360
Other	42	6	18	8	25	100	119

PB2.3: Age of selected foster child

PF14P PDF52; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
0-3	49	13
4-7	74	20
8-11	83	22
12-14	70	19
15-17	98	26
Total	374	100

PB2.4: Time with family

PF14P PDF53; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Less than 1 year	43	11
1-3 years	128	34

Category	Number	Percentage
4 to 9 years	119	32
10 plus	84	22
Total	374	100

PB2.5: Acute care

PF14P PDF53; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	56	15
No	308	82
Vedikke	10	3
Total	374	100

PB2.6: Previous placement

PF14P PDF53; denominator 374; unit survey responses.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	155	41
No	217	58
Vedikke	2	1
Total	374	100

PB2.7: Own children, repeated annexes

PF14P PDF53; denominator 374; unit survey responses. Same P5.5,no additional children/families.

Category	Number	Percentage
0	214	57
1	92	25
2	42	11
3	23	6
4	3	1
Total	374	100

PF1.1: Overall satisfaction

PF14P PDF5; mentions 365 / 297; unit percentage.

Category	% N365	Adviser% N297
Very common	22	46
Satisfied	46	40

Category	% N365	Adviser% N297
Less	18	9
Not	14	5

PF2.3: Latest fee negotiation

PF14P PDF11; not mentioned; unit percentage.

Period	Percentage
Less than 1 md	4
1 -6 md	11
6-12 md	20
Over 1 year	65

PF3.2: Contact frequency

PF14P PDF17; mentions 374 / 334; unit percentage. No contact prosa 9 family authority / 1 consultant; 0% rounding does not hide zero event.

Period	Authority%	Adviser%
Weekly	3	4
Monthly	26	28
Quarterly	35	44
Half-yearly	24	16
Rarely	10	8
None	2	0

PF3.3: Hearing on change of behaviour

PF14P PDF22; denominator 317; unit percentage. 57 irrelevant out of 374;34 families never heard. Not 34 deduplicated decisions.

Category	Percentage
Always	48
Often	16
Some	16
Rare	9
Never	11

PF4.1: Supervision type / satisfaction without cell labels

PF14P PDF32; denominator types overlap; unit graph metadata. Visually read; no invented exact segment values. A second figure at PDF36 repeats number 4.1 but shows conflict, is PB2.1/2.2.

Type	Nfrap4.2	Exact printed figure
Psychologist	73	68% high in prose
Others	41	-
Legal officer	30	-
Adviser	245	-
None	71	-

PF5.1: Family seniority

PF14P PDF44; mentions 374; unit percentage. PDF8 prosa 72% over 6 years versus 20 + 23 + 26 = 69%; non-harmonised.

Year	Percentage
Less than 1	3
1-5	28
6-10	20
11-15	23
Exceeding 15	26

PF5.2: Training background

PF14P PDF46; mentions 374; unit percentage.

Category	Primary%	Spouse%
Educational	30	9
Pedagogical experience	19	10
Teacher	5	4
Social adviser	1	1
Other	44	71
Not applicable	1	5

PE: Other figures and qualitative progress

PF14P PDF10-13/19/27/33-41/46; denominator unknown; unit survey/interview statements. Statements≠independent documentary evidence. No deduplicated accountability/redress register.

PDF	Measure	Value / status
10	Conflict / remuneration / negotiating party	9% consultant / 13% authority; N not disclosed
11	Repayment party	19% consultant / 28% authority; N not disclosed
13	Time limit for contracts	3 months or years; statements
19	Child known since	7.5 md; statements
27	Other conflict markings	approx. 60 / 16% of 374
33	Overvision interval	4 → 6 → desired 8 weeks; statements

PDF	Measure	Value / status
33	Child family	10 years; statements
34	Lack of freedom of supervision	Penalty fears; Current
35	Psychologist sends all minutes	Case handler; statement
37	Case material not delivered	statement; Current
38	Emergency situation without response	movement proposed; undocumented movement;
40	Course impact / no case manager	statement; Current
46	Adults 2 / 3	80%/13%; annex 2 mentioned but no numerical table there

NM: Method of mapping

PF14N PDF3-4/6-8; denominator 97; unit municipal responses/families. Some estimates; Ishøj/Vallensbæk joint response. Residential care includes respite, category respite alone. Not geographical residence. Not 10.542 children or authority errors.

Measure	Value
Commune worker	95
Possible	97
Missing	2
Duration of inventory	ultimooct 2013
General accepted%	77
Specific%	23
Active%	83
Client reloading	3300
Municipal days	17
Municipalities; municipal respite care	3
Municipalities / specific municipal	7

N1.1: All overall approval / activity cells

PF14N PDF5; mentions 10542; unit families.

Category	Approved	Active
Generelalm.days	5743	4491
General cargo	2326	1838
Generelalm.total	8069	6329
General Community.days	76	73
General Commune.	13	8
General Community.total	89	81
General total	8158	6410
Number of days worked	735	735

Category	Approved	Active
Concretal, etc.	704	704
Concretal, total	1439	1439
Konkretmunder.dags	15	15
Konkretmunder.aflass	1	1
Konkretmunder.total	16	16
Kinship care, residential	673	673
Network.cargo	256	256
Network.total	929	929
Concrete count	2384	2384
Total	10542	8794
This is it.	7242	5987

N1.2: General

PF14N PDF6; mentions 8069; unit families. Repeat N1.1 cells, same population.

Category	Number
Day	5743
Charges	2326
Total	8069
Active day	4491
Activaplast	1838

N1.3: General Municipality

PF14N PDF6-7; mentions 89; unit families. Repeat N1.1 cells, same population.

Category	Number
Day	76
Charges	13
Active day	73
Activaplast	8

N1.4: Concreteapproved

PF14N PDF8; denominator 2384; unit families. PDF8 prose 14 municipal/667 network versus tables 15/673. Both original versions are retained.

Category	Number
General	735
General cargo	704

Category	Number
Alm.total	1439
Local government days	15
Municipal cargo	1
Kinship care, residential	673
Network.cargo	256

N1.5: Top / bottom 5 municipalities

PF14N PDF10; mentions 10542; unit families. Approval municipalities, not necessaryresidence.

Top Municipality	Number	Bundkommune	Number
Copenhagen	641	Fanoe	0
Parsley leaves	362	Læsø	2
Aalborg	283	Glostrup	8
Esbjerg	249	Allerred	8
Corner	247	Hørsholm	10
Total	1782	Total	28

NF1.1: Cards all exact legend numbers

PF14N PDF9; mentions 98; unitary map municipalities. Visual reading; 98 map municipalities are not 97 response units. Individual communes of kunintervalcoloring, non exact number; no estimate cells.

Approvals	Municipalities
0-49	27
50-99	24
100-149	17
150-199	18
200 plus	10
No reporting	2

NP: Repeated surveillance summary

PF14N PDF10-11; denominator 374; unit percentage. The same PF14P survey population, not an additional population. The employment prose gives different percentages from PF14PP5.4N347; no harmonisation.

Measure	Primary%	Spouse%
No other employment	60	18
Part-time	20	11
Full-time	18	65
Early full time	76	84

Measure	Primary%	Spouse%
Other training	44	71
Educational	30	9
Pedagogical experience	19	10

SM: Summarytal and separately undelivered Part 3

PF14S PDF4-7; denominator mixed units; unit repeated cohorts/meta-document. The main original for part 3 is still not obtained; reading the 7-page summary in full does NOT close the part 3 methodology/subtable gap. No exact count of 22 errors out of 57 derived from 39% alone.

Measurement	Figures	N / status
Commune worker	80-90	sammePF14K
Families	374	sammePF14P
Focus groups / families	3/11	sammePF14P
Mapping municipalities	93	modPF14N95
Legal removal test	57	20 municipalities
Legally correct%	61	rounded 57; crude cell not here
Legal requirements not followed%	39	same 57; IKEsurveillance 39%
Foster-care contract ended on own initiative %	approx 40	same 57
Homes	omitted	relocation to another location;
Personnel cases concerning foster families	not obtained	kunbarnetsakt
Children's examination	cut	Not disclosed

SF1: Summary Characters 1.1 / 1.2 repeat

PF14S PDF4; denominators 79/365/297; unit percentage. Visual mapping checked; different response scales, no direct comparability. Same PF14K/P figures, no new people.

Category	KommuneSags% N79	KommuneKons% N79	Family Case% N365	% N297
Very common	13	43	22	46
Satisfied	42	47	46	40
Neither / less	38	9	18	9
Dissatisfied / not	8	1	14	5

Own evidence, rights and impact assessment

The supervision responses document a clear oversight signal:132 responses describe fewer than two visits in 2013. The strongest sustainable demand is to obtain the underlying supervision records, the child's own interview and reasons for any departures, and then establish what risk or unmet support need the missing visits caused. It is not sustainable to multiply 38,82% by the entire national population in care. The sample includes particular active families, one selected child and 340 specifically delimited responses; families whose arrangements had ended are excluded, and specific person linkage is missing.

The family's perception of a child's reactions is a contribution to proof which must be tested independently. It cannot automatically prove that contact with parents is harmful or that relationships should be restricted. When a municipality describes a general minimum of contact in the first three months, it is a concrete evidence of individual justification, proportionality and family preservation; the presentation of the report as a cooperative approach does not replace the trial. Similarly, an unheard foster family is relevant to the provision of information on a moving case, but it is not without the other acts a definitive invalidation judgment.

Case-handling changes, lack of delivery, sanction fears under supervision and lack of support may undermine both information and protection. The supporting evidence justifies the requirements of the simultaneous records, contact requests, lack of response and subsequent action. Movements proposed following an acute situation shall not be presented as a documented actual move. Similarly, administrative family breakdown must not be excused by a general cooperation narrative.

The overall strongest evidence chain is original survey response → journal / decision → concrete duty → failure → failure to act → child's proven consistency → authority knowledge → responsibility and repair. The current sources provide first-tier and clear control themes. They shall not provide a common register of persons, individual criminal assessment or proof of effective reunification. Raw data, full recordings, part 3 the main original and concrete results follow-up shall be provided for the precise additional claims. All four here identified readable originals are fully reviewed.

Three further original surveys:pension, activation and contact

Controlled October 7, 2026. Own factual tables. The populations are kept separate; there is no person delupling.

Early retirement after work efficiency method, July 2006

Registration	Figures and demarcation	Original Locator
Called / deleted / investigated	150 / 3 / **147**, 15 municipalities; awards only	PDF 37-38
Period of decision	New decisions **before 1 December 2005**. Published during the report period, but the decisions are before 2006.	PDF 38
Exclusion of the appeal	The appeal to and dealt with by social boards is excluded.	PDF 38
Total accuracy	113 correct / **34 not correct** / 147	Table 3.2.1, PDF 11
Basis for information	105 full; 12 individual deficiencies; 23 more deficiencies; 7 essential deficiencies / 147	Table 3.2.1, PDF 11
Among 34 not correct	30 inadequately lit; 4 fully lit, materially incorrect	PDF 5, 11
Lack of key information	Working test 20, medical information 15, function 14, second 3; **overlap**, 30	Table 3.2.2, PDF 12
No working test	85 / 147; 59 of these 85 were considered manifestly pointless, 26 not	Table 3.2.6-7, PDF 14
Non-testing of relevant measures after derogation	41 / 147; separate sub-population 78, of which 37 were apparent exceptions	Table 3.2.11-12, PDF 16-17
Resource Profile	146 produced, 1 not; 93 high, 34 some, 18 rings and 1 not adequate / 146	Table 3.3.1, PDF 17
Citizens' Dialogue on Resource Profile	92 high, 39 some, 12 rings, 3 none / 146	Table 3.3.2, PDF 18
Offer of meetings	99 yes, 6 no, 42 not available / 147	Table 3.3.3, PDF 18
three months	128 yes, 9 no, 10 not available / 147	Table 3.3.5, PDF 19

Source: Original report, 59 PDF pages, SHA-256 d3d171a0343078bbd5b7e917bf6473034109e6d426bed1c08d5004a54fcd2dad. The entire pension 2006 original has now been reviewed in practice -pension2006- full -tables -and -citizens-loeb.md / .json: all 59 pages, 20 number blocks with 108

rows and 23 historical summaries of decisions on matters of principle. The same 147 awards; no additional cases. The original's two conflicting category distributions and delimited time measures are retained; the union of persons and actual redress are separate data requirements.

Two sub-tables are not harmonised: Table 3.2.8 has categories 88 / 28 / 21 / 10, while cross table 3.3.10 has 88 / 29 / 21 / 9, both n 147. These versions are retained as a concrete internal counting difference; main outcomes 113 / 34 are common. The report repeals the category "in doubt" of the new measurement forms (PDF 38); therefore, later years' change of category must not be hidden in a common series of errors.

Company practice and wage subsidy, March 2014

Registration	Figures and demarcation	Original Locator
Called / deleted / investigated	116 / 5 / **111**, 12 municipalities	PDF 60
Period of decision	New decisions before **20 June 2013**; appropriations, 18-65 years; refusal excluded	PDF 59-61
Exclusion of the appeal	Appeals and forwarded excluded; locally modified reassembly cases could be included	Call letter PDF 75
Overall correct / ground for amendment or remittal	**64 / 47 / 111**	Table 3.1, PDF 22
Business practice	17 correct, 13 not / 30; private 14 / 8 of 22, public 3 / 5 of 8	Table 3.2, PDF 22
Wage subsidies	47 correct, 34 not / 81; private 18 / 25 of 43, public 29 / 9 of 38	Table 3.3, PDF 23
Basis for information	29 full, 39 minor deficiencies, 2 substantial, 41 essential / 111	Table 3.4, PDF 24
Significant information gaps	43 / 111; 4 of these also wrong on the basis of the facts	PDF 22
Limitation of wage subsidies	66 yes, 3 no, 11 does not appear / **80**; the single case of the Act of Integration excluded from this objective;	Table 3.11, PDF 30
Employees consulted	57 yes, 1 no, 16 not available / **74**; private companies without employees excluded;	Table 3.14, PDF 35
Public wage subsidy workplace: budgetary information in the documents	0 yes, 38 no / **38**	Table 3.21, PDF 44
Special previous recruitment requirements	Practice: 10 satisfied, 20 not available / 30. Wage subsidy: 43 met, 38 not available / 81	Table 3.25-26, PDF 50
Spouse / co-operative	3 fulfilled, 40 not available / **43** private wage subsidy cases;	Table 3.27, PDF 51

Source: Original report, 103 PDF pages, SHA-256 290a8104cf52c9521151b613c00aac2920e94c32d004fbab036fc241b50f9fd5.

The last two unpleasure targets did not in themselves affect the principal accuracy (PDF 51). Thus "64 correct 'is a conclusion within selected control criteria; it does not prove that all legal requirements were verified. No additional documents were obtained (PDF 61). Private / public figures refer to: **workplace**while the tried decision authority was the municipality. All 103 pages and numerical sub / commune tables of the trainee are now in fact reviewed in practice -internalization2014-full -original tables.md / .json: 40 data lags, 185 rows of numbers and 16 identified cases. The same 111 decisions; no new cohorts.

Social affairs, January 2016: State Administration

Registration	Figures and demarcation	Original Locator
Request / received and investigated	40 / **38** decisions on the merits after 1. May 2015, not appealed	PDF 3
Former control 2014	33 **already appealed and remitted** cases from 2012-2013; separate selected population	PDF 3, only historical information in this original
The child's perspective illuminated	36 sufficient / **2 insufficient** / 38	PDF 4-5
Reasons	**6 insufficient**, 1 partial / 38	PDF 4-6
Parental agreement	7 agree / 31 disagree / 38; both inadequately elucidated and all six inadequately justified in the disunity group	PDF 4
Continued handling of cases after suspension	Case **12 and 29**: temporary suspension was not followed by continuation of the proceedings until final decision;	PDF 26, printed page 24

Source: The original of the Appeal Board at the Social Teachers' Association, 32 pages, SHA-256 685486d225462b2bb1be4of2a61e072703a60ed88663d4a54fee70bd3f5bda62.

Precise version selection: The colophon calls the document "DRAFT" (PDF 2); the library catalogs it as the published 2016 report. An alternative final PDF has not been verified. The "six percent of 31" of the text in the explanatory statement does not correspond to its own six cases: its own division is 6 / 31 = 19,35%. Numbers are recorded as 6 / 38 and 6 / 31, the percentage error is corrected locally. The two lighting errors, six justification errors, one partial justification and two lack of follow-up procedures may overlap and may not be added to a number of children concerned. The duration and in fact the subsequent restoration of contact are not apparent from these checks.

Full supplementary check: Contact 2016: all 32 pages, all three figures and 20 local case IDs. The same 38 decisions, the UDKAST marking retained.. The known outstanding public table/annex material has been covered; actual redress and a union of persons do not follow automatically from decision counts.

Cases 2016: full tables, method and children's programme

The version of the publicly available 32-page version is fully text read in RAM, and all three figures as well as the erroneous percentage indication are visually checked in RAM. The Colophon's DRAFT selection is maintained. The module completes the already registered sample of 38 decisions; no new cohort is added.

Sources and scope of control

H: Original, 32 pages. SHA256: 685486d225462b2bb1be4of2a61e072703a60ed88663d4a54fee70bd3f5bda62. All pages read.

Original parts	Actual Read Content
H1-7, printed p.1-5	Version, complete scope of the request for cases, summary, all three figures and recommendations.
H8-16, printed p.6-14	The entire section on rules/the opportunity to contest the material/reasons.
H17 -26, printed p.15-24	All ages, decision groups and specific lighting / justification courses.
H27-32, printed p.25-30	The entire sub-arrangement / holiday / party consultation / agreement section and all repeat / new local case IDs.

Sample and population

Search	Limitation
Version	January 2016, ISBN 978-87-7811-314-6. The colophon PDF2 gives the title as »Samværssager - UDKAST«. The actual public version is retained, not an assumed final edition.
2015sample	40 unappealed decisions determined on the merits after 1. May 2015 requested; 38 received and measured. Appealed decisions excluded. No random-selection procedure or complete flow for the two not received is stated.
Previous investigation	33 appealed decisions from 2012-2013 already remitted for reconsideration were examined in 2014. An earlier population selected for errors, not an additional 33 in the current 38 cohort. The number of remittals for reconsideration is said to have doubled in 2012→2013, but absolute denominators are not stated.

All published figures

12 reading tables with 101 rows. Repeals and subsets of the same cohort shall not be added together. N and response categories are retained from each original.

2.1: Decision types, all graph cells

Original H, PDF page 5. 38 decisions; the categories are mutually separated in this figure, while the chapter on current / holiday / terms overlap.

Type	Number
Refusal / termination and other contact	1
Current and terms	1
Replacement	1
Suspension	2
Monitoring of the interaction	2
Conditions	2
Holidays	5
Current and Vacation	6
Ongoing interaction	9
Refusal / cancellation	9
Own sum	38

2.2: Lighting the child's perspective, all graph cells

Original H, PDF page 5. 38

Type	Yeah.	No.	Total
Refusal / termination and other contact	1	0	1
Current and terms	1	0	1
Replacement	1	0	1
Suspension	1	1	2
Monitoring of the interaction	2	0	2
Conditions	1	1	2

Type	Yeah.	No.	Total
Holidays	5	0	5
Current and Vacation	6	0	6
Ongoing interaction	9	0	9
Refusal / cancellation	9	0	9
Own sum	36	2	38

2.3: Justification of the child's perspective, all graph cells

Original H, PDF page 6. 38

Type	Yeah.	No.	Partial	Total
Refusal / termination and other contact	1	0	0	1
Current and terms	0	0	1	1
Replacement	1	0	0	1
Suspension	1	1	0	2
Monitoring of the interaction	2	0	0	2
Conditions	1	1	0	2
Holidays	5	0	0	5
Current and Vacation	4	2	0	6
Ongoing interaction	7	2	0	9
Refusal / cancellation	9	0	0	9
Own sum	31	6	1	38

S2: Overall lighting, justification and parental agreement

Original H, PDF page 4. 38. Printed 6 / 31 = 6% is a source deviation, not a correct calculation.

Cut	Number	N	Printed percentage
The child's perspective adequately elucidated	36	38	95
Insufficient lighting, disagreeing parents	2	31	6
Parents agree	7	38	18
Parents disagree	31	38	Not printed
Insufficient justification	6	38	16
The same six factors of disagreement	6	31	6
Additional partial justification	1	38	Not printed

S15: Refusal / termination of contact and age

Original H, PDF page 17. Ten cases, nine pure refusal / cancellation and one other contact. Six children are reported in the disagreements, not the total national population.

Cut	Number	N
Refusal / Revocation proceedings	10	38
Sufficiently illuminated / justified	10	10
Parental agreement	4	10
Parental disagreements	6	10
Absence children 0-2 years	2	6
Disunity children 3-5 years	1	6
Absence children 6-8 years	1	6
Disunity children 9-11 years old	2	6

S16: Ongoing interaction and absence of justification

Original H, PDF page 18. 16 courses, sub-decisions overlap with holidays / conditions. Figure 2.3 also codes one partial statement of reasons in combination proceedings.

Cut	Number	N
Ongoing	9	38
Current and Vacation	6	38
Current and terms	1	38
Total ongoing interaction	16	38
Adequate lighting of running part	16	16
Insufficient justification of the current part	4	16
of which expert assessment not involved / weighed	3	4

S17: Children in current cases

Original H, PDF page 19. 16 cases, 19 child cases, three cases involving two children. The group text "more than 12 years" is the original, although case 15 is 12 years.

Age / structure	Number
0-2 years	3
3 to 5 years	3
6 to 8 years	7
9 to 11 years	3
More than 12 years old, original formulation	3
Two children in the same case	3
Own sum of age groups	19

S19: Holidays and reasons

Original H, PDF page 21. Figure 2.1 shows five purely holiday cases; the four + six of the text can be read as the ten dispute cases, but not explicitly explained. Keep the local denominator.

Cut	Number	N
Vacancy cases	11	38
Adequate lighting	11	11
Parental agreement	1	11
Parental disagreements	10	11
Only holidays in bread text	4	10
Combination holidays in bread text	6	10
Insufficient holiday justification	2	11

S19A: Children in the ten holiday disputes

Original H, PDF page 21. ten cases / 11 child cases; overlap with 16 current cases is specifically present.

Age / structure	Number
0-2 years	1
6 to 8 years	4
9 to 11 years	2
12 years or more	4
Two children in the same case	1
Own age groups	11

S21: Conditions

Original H, PDF page 23. Three cases. Figure 2.2 shows two illuminated / one not, while H23 says only one illuminated. Not harmonised.

Cut	Number
Terms only	2
Current and terms	1
Total	3
Bread text says only one sufficiently illuminated	1
Bread text then insufficiently illuminated	1
Bread text then insufficiently substantiated	1

S23: Temporary and replacement relations

Original H, PDF page 25. Four temporary cases; the other two properly dealt with disputes have three children, not all four.

Cut	Number
Replacement, correct lighting / justification	1
Temporary meeting	4
Monitor	2
Suspension	2
Temporary correct lighting / justification	3
Agreement on Monitoring	1
Other two described properly dealt with disputes	2
Children 3-5 years of age in these two	1
Children 6-8 years of age in these two	1
Children 9-11 years of age in these two	1
Of which two children in the same case	1

S25: Sharing arrangements and other control findings

Original H, PDF page 27. Five divide-up cases within 16 consecutive; two excess holiday offers within 11 holidays. Agreement 8 may include partial agreement, 7 summary is complete, but precise coupling not published.

Cut	Number	N
Dividend proceedings	5	16
Desired limited previous regime	4	5
Determination of the sharing system	1	5
Conflicts of interest examined in three examples	3	5
Poor cooperation but not changed	2	3
Effects on children and changed	1	3
More holiday conversation than applied for	2	11
Agreement is included in the decision, H31	8	38
Agreement, summary H4	7	38

Examples, time and citizens' consequences

The strongest documented errors are insufficient lighting in cases 7 and 12, insufficient reasoning, the use of a holiday study which does not address holidays, party consultation shortcomings and the lack of further treatment following temporary suspension in cases 12 and 29. Child and parent may in the latter course be maintained in a contact procedure without the required final review. The original does not state how long those suspensions actually lasted or whether contact was restored. Case 23 provides about five months of contact absence prior to the decision, Case 25 provides an actual restart through parental statements. The decision to have a relationship is not proof of having a real relationship. Each of the 20 published local case IDs appears only once in the preliminary table; several children in the same case are specified specifically and repeated records are not added together.

Own locator	PDF	Example a	Number / progress	Assessment
32	17	Source ID	Child 11 years, multi-annual absence; termination	School and child experts' assessments and the child's wish are reproduced as a basis for decision.

Own locator	PDF	Example a	Number / progress	Assessment
				Original conversation / school acts not published; cause of multiannual absences not documented here.
9	18	Source ID	Child 10 years, two conversations; refusal of contact	The child's statements on sexual abuse and psychological evaluation are reproduced. This is documented source statements, not self-verification of the infringement.
31	19	Source ID	Children aged seven and 11; agreed 7/7 arrangement changed	Lack of parental cooperation and the concern of children are cited as a justification. The scope / effect of the new scheme is not apparent.
5	19	Kildecase ID, same also H24	Child five years; Friday-Sunday straight weeks, Wednesday-Thursday odd weeks; refusal of passport deposit	Part of the territory assessed reasoned, arbitrary part deficient: concrete justification for not requiring passport deposit deficiencies. Not two separate children / cases.
6	20	Source ID	Children six and eight years; refusal to grant a licence	The child's wish is expressed without weighing up the experts' doubts about the pressure of loyalty. Actual subsequent implementation not measured.
15	20	Source ID, continued H21	Child 12 years; spend every other weekend reduced to every fourth	The child's wish was based solely on the fact that an expert assessment of loyalty and absence of free speech was not included in the explanatory statement. Conversation note only sent for information prior to follow-up meeting; source criticises lack of clear possibility / deadlines for comments.
33	22	Source ID	Children 13 and 11 years of age; maintained three weeks of summer vacation	Perspectives only through parents; source estimates sufficiently illuminated. The children's independent attitude / actual effect not published.
30	22	Source ID	Holidays up to three nights; last one-week holidays four years earlier; H29 indicates six years, H30 five years; holiday placement influenced by the telephone information provided by the parent	Extent based on past relationship, institution and medical information. The age of the child is not given in the example; the parent does not consult the parties before the decision.
20	22	Kildecase ID, continued H23	Children eight years wanted a maximum of three overnight stays; set seven summer days, next year 14 days; Christmas shared by 28 December	Expert assessment of the child's limited understanding of consequences not weighed in the explanatory statement; holiday requests 2 + 1 week are given by parent.
37	23	Source ID	Child seven years; fixed holiday with reference to child-expert examination	The study did not relate to holidays. The reference does not therefore bear the specific holiday certificate used.
34	23	Kildecase ID, continued H24	Conditions for urine testing at the doctor / drug center, agreed about ten months earlier, maintained	Parental information on well-being and the possibility of requiring a sample upon request; actual test execution not disclosed.
7	24	Source ID	Child seven years old, allergy / asthma, dot test horse / dog / cat / dust mites; refusal of animal contact conditions	Conflicting fact of protection in contact; no further medical opinion obtained. In fact, illness after intercourse is parental enlightenment, not causally medically verified here.
29	25	Kildecase ID, continued H26	Child four years; relationship suspended	The information of the parent on mental breakdown and the child's condition is reproduced; the parent is not commented on. The source does not establish any further proceedings / final decision following the interim measure.
Own locator	**PDF**	**Example a**	**Number / progress**	**Assessment**
12	25	Kildecase ID, continued H26	Child five years; remaining in contact suspended despite lack	Alleged violence and the institution’s assessment relied upon; observed contact could illuminate the child’s

Own locator	PDF	Example a	Number / progress	Assessment
				perspective. Ankestyrelsen The Court of Justice of the European Communities has held that there is insufficient information and no further action / final decision. The exact length of the period is not available. Children's garden opinion given weight without party consultation.
11	27	Source ID	Child four years; 7 / 7 system maintained despite expert advice against continued poor cooperation	The central government's estimates of well-being and a short time after the termination of cohabitation are reproduced; the importance of conflict is used differently in the cases described.
8	28	Source ID	Children two and six years; separation from court settlements about seven months earlier maintained	The state administration is likely to be dissatisfied with change, despite poor communication. Original institutional / judicial conciliation acts are not included in the report.
3	28	Kildecase ID, continued H29	Child one year; previous shifts every second / third day in the 14-day roll, changed to Friday-Monday straight and Thursday-Friday odd weeks	The childminder's descriptions of well-being are reproduced. The lawyer's development/attachment assessment is a statement by an authority, not a separately produced expert assessment.
2	29	Kildecase ID, continued H30	Child six years; applied 23-26 and 24-27 December, fixed 29-December-1 January and 23-27 December	The report assesses more / more holiday interaction than desired. No actual date of implementation measured.
25	30	Source ID	Children nine years; spend every other weekend / holidays 2011-August 2014; applied vacation 2015, set 2015 and onwards	Parents provide stable restart immediately after the meeting. This is source-informed actual restart, unverified relationship records or precise restart date.
23	31	Kildecase ID, continued H32	Child 13 years; weekend Friday -Sunday and holiday set without escalation after about five months of interruption	Unclear as to the extent is the decision or reproduction of agreement; disagreement on escalation. Five months' absence has been disclosed, actual performance after the decision has not been documented.

Source deviations

Locator	Deviation
H4, printed s.2	The original indicates six inadequately justified by 31 disputes as six percent. 6 / 31 is about 19,35%; both printed percent and own control is retained. On the other hand, two insufficiently elucidated by 31 is about 6,45%.
H2	The Colophon's DRAFT selection; no other version based.
H19, printed p.17	The age group is formulated "more than 12 years," while Case 15 states 12 years. No tacit rewrite to ≥ 12.
H21, printed p.19	11 leave cases and one agreement; then text four pure plus six combination cases, against the five pure plus six combinations of the figure. Possible differences not explicitly; both retained.
H23-24, printed p.21-22	Bread text says only one of three arbitrary cases sufficiently elucidated; later it describes one lack of information and one lack of justification. Figure 2.2 shows together two illuminated arbitrage cases.
H22 / H29 / H30	The same case 30 is referred to without age at H22, as six years old at H29 and five years old at H30. Not divided into two children or two cases.
H4 / H31	The seven cases of unity of the summary face eight decisions with agreement in the agreement section. The latter also refers in part to agreement. Both counters are preserved without secure individual harmonisation.
H25-26	Temporary limitation of information requirements is generally justified by a later final decision, but cases 12 and 29 have no further consideration, according to the report. Consequently, the specific condition of the statement of reasons was not fulfilled in the two stages.

Other factual incisions

Locator	Precise information
H7, printed p.5	The State administration must justify why a child-expert assessment is not important, indicate the relevant age and distinguish the decision from the write-down of the parental agreement. The recommendations of the report are not documented subsequent changes.
H10-12, printed p.8-10	No fixed age limit for inclusion; about seven years is only indicative age of conversation. For under three years, information from parents, health care and institutions can be used. Note must justify concrete immaturity or alleged influence; children must not feel responsible for the decision.
H3	The state administration asked. Ankestyrelsen Participation on the sidelines in a justification project in 2016. Actual implementation, amended decisions and impact have not been documented here.
H26, printed p.24	Cases 12 and 29 are both described as suspension, but Statsforvaltningen did not proceed further, so the interim decision would not be followed by a final one. This is a specific failure to continue processing; actual subsequent reopening or restoration of contact is not documented.
H27-30	The weight of the conflict level in sharing arrangements varies in the five cases examined. Recommendation to clarify practice is not a documented change in practice.
H29-30	Two out of 11 holiday cases have more holiday experience than applied for. The report highlights the presence of the parent's own contact, not publicly required contact beyond the wish.
H30-31	Failures to hear the parties are discussed without an aggregate numerical count. Specific ID30,12,15 are reused; not three new cases in addition to those already referenced.
H31 - 32	An agreement may replace a decision by an instrument of access; specific parts of the decision must be identified, in particular by a mixed agreement / disagreement.

Historical Rule references

These are the rules and principles of the original. They are not counted as new investigations and are not automatically used as applicable 2026.

Reference	Locator	Defined content
Parental Responsibility Act § 4-5,19,21,32,34	H8-12, printed p.6-10	The child's best, own voice by age / maturity, contact with both parents and, specifically, the child's relationship. The child's perspective must always be elucidated; counselling and conflict mediation through disagreement with specific exceptions.
The official principle	H12, printed p.10	The decision basis shall be adequate and information reliable, including from other authorities. Qualified assessment of evidence is required.
Administrative Law § 19; FOB1987 p.91	H13, printed p.11	Party hearing is a guarantee. Family law information and the views of the counterparty may require further involvement; the minimum rules of the law do not replace concrete contractual arrangements.
Administrative Act § 24; FOB1988 p.276	H14 -16, printed p.12-14	Individual account of the facts and estimates. Irritable fact, conflicting expertise and derogation shall be identified and justified. The presumption of conflict in the event of termination requires concrete factual basis.
Parties' consultations	H14, printed p.12	Reasonable deadline for reply, clear information on the possibility of comments before decision. Following a meeting, requests for further comments should, as a general rule, be granted by deadline.

Instrument and stage of execution

Blank fields, codes and illustrations are method information, not citizens' numbers. Actual correction, delivery and payment shall not be deduced solely from a follow-up decision.

Field	Locator	Meaning
Measuring points	H3	Method of illumination, sufficient information and sufficient justification; no published completed instrument / local distribution.

Field	Locator	Meaning
Local case numbers	H17-32	Numbers identify examples within the report; repeated mention of the same number is the same case, not new person.
Number of children	H19 / H21 / H25	19 cases in 16 current cases, 11 in ten dissimilar cases, three in two described correct temporary disputes. The population overlaps.
The originator of information	H17-32	Parents' statements, expert assessments and institutional statements are reproduced separately. Original conversation / journal / institutional files have not been provided; the report's approval is not an independent verification of the whole fact.
Actual contact	H26 / H30 / H32	Suspension without further processing, resumption reported by the source and five months of absence are found; no complete implementation/redress series.

Concrete remains and evidence chain

All identified public pages, figures and case summaries in this version have been fully checked. Not published here: all 38 complete case files, precise dates of intervention/cessation/restart, the full union of children/parents, subsequent amendment, contact actually carried out, loss and responsible persons, the operative outcome of the two decisions not received and the later final version of UDKAST. Demand: full establishment of the facts from the case records and an opportunity to contest the material, an individually reasoned decision, continued and rapid final consideration of temporary interventions, and documentation of actual redress and any loss. Hypotheses about longer absence of contact, the cause of absence and specific culpability require evidence of timing and complete case files.

The source chain is the original table or case summary → delimited error → the stated historical rule → the act or omission of the municipality → concrete significance for performance / testing → responsibility and requirement for act-based correct decision as well as documented effectiveness. Actual loss, guilt and personal union require the separate documents specified. The assessment by the Authority is not merely proof of its own correctness.

Business practice and wage subsidy 2014: full original tables and citizens' programme

All 103 original pages are actually read in RAM. This complements the same 111case-law in practice-pension2006-training2014- cooperation2016.md; no new 111 cases are added. **32 numbered original tables,**, explicit figure data, municipal annexes and 16 different case codes have been retained.

Main analysis and control limit

The study documents 47 decisions that would be amended or remitted on appeal. This is a review assessment, rather than 47 documented amending decisions. Municipal grants could rely on deficient forms even where a signature was present. Each missing item of information must be linked to the rule, who knew it, the actual placement/employment and the individual’s or ordinarily employed worker’s specific loss. [PPR14-FULD,PDF22-26/30-46]

The 64 decisions assessed as correct overall are delimited by an explicit methodological choice: a missing job plan, prior unemployment and special employer requirements did not necessarily affect the main correctness assessment. Pay/employment conditions, distortion of competition, aid intensity and assessment under the Public Administration Act lay outside the review’s focus. The assessment form’s formal fields on PDF86 document an instrument, not that these requirements were fully examined or the results published. These exclusions do not release the municipality from specific duties. [PPR14-FULD, PDF10-11/50-57/59/86]

Method, selection and knowledge

Grants before 20. June 2013,18-65 years old; refusals excluded. Most recent cases from 12 municipalities, not a probability-based national person rate. Requested 116(32 work placements/84 wage subsidies),5 excluded, 111 retained. Already appealed and forwarded cases excluded; cases amended in local reconsideration could be included. Renewed offers for the same individual required records from the first grant. Records submitted by municipalities were assumed complete; no supplementary documents obtained. [PPR14-FULD, PDF59-61/75]

Case-wise measurement forms had to be sent to the municipality and the report was politically considered. A letter of call indicates the shredding of submitted copies after reporting; it is not proof that the municipality's own original documents have been shredded. The municipalities' general difficulty rate of 10 / 1 / 1 stands independently alongside 47 cases. Planned

dialogue in the first quarter of 2014 and reporting does not document individual repair. [PPR14-FUD, PDF9 / 59-61 / 76 / 81-83]

Figures by original table and sub-population

1.1: Total accuracy by tender

PPR14-FULD, PDF6, printed page 4. Denominator: 111. Repeats the same cohort as T3.1-3.3.

Category	Business practice	Wage subsidies	Number
Yes	17	47	64
No, amendment/remittal	13	34	47
Total	30	81	111

3.1: Overall accuracy

PPR14-FULD, PDF22, printed page 20. Names: 111.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	64	58
No, would be amended/remitted	47	42
Total	111	100

3.2: Rightiness, enterprise practice

PPR14-FULD, PDF22, printed page 20. Denominator: 30. Workplace type; the decision-making authority is the municipality.

Category	Private enterprise	Public enterprise	Number
Yes	14	3	17
No	8	5	13
Total	22	8	30

3.3: Rality, wage subsidy

PPR14-FUD, PDF23, printed on page 21. Names: 81.

Category	Private enterprise	Public enterprise	Number
Yes	18	29	47
No	25	9	34
Total	43	38	81

3.4: Information base

PPR14-FULD, PDF24, printed on page 22. Names: 111. 43 significant / crucial; of which 4 also materially incorrect. Not 43 extra to 47.

Category	Number	Percentage
No missing	29	26

Category	Number	Percentage
A few minor deficiencies	39	35
Multiple / significant deficiencies	2	2
Decisive deficiencies	41	37
Total	111	100

3.5: Information other than forms, practice

PPR14-FUD, PDF25, printed on page 23. Denomination: 30.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	3	10
No	27	90
Total	30	100

3.6: Information other than forms, wage subsidy

PPR14-FUD, PDF25, printed on page 23. Names: 81.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	9	11
No	72	89
Total	81	100

3.7: Information on additional employment assessment

PPR14-FULD, PDF26, printed on page 24. Names: 81. More answers; 88 registrations, not 88 cases. Budget 2 is the answer of the municipalities; T3.21 finds zero budget acts.

Type of information	Number	Percentage
Forms	78	96
SKAT	0	0
Business documentation, private	4	5
Budget, public	2	2
Other	4	5

3.8: Staff count last 3 (4) months, internship

PPR14-FULD, PDF28,printed page 26. Denominator:30. One of 13 lacking information is a sole proprietorship and correct overall; 12 incorrect.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	17	57
No	13	43

Category	Number	Percentage
Total	30	100

3.9: Number of employees last 3 (4) months, wage subsidy

PPR14-FUD, PDF28, printed on page 26. Denomination: 80. An integration law case omitted; 3 out of 16 total correct.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	64	80
No	16	20
Total	80	100

3.10: Maximum number of supported internships

PPR14-FUD, PDF29, printed on page 27. Denomination: 30.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	19	63
No	0	0
Not reported	11	37
Total	30	100

3.11: Maximum number of wage subsidies supported

PPR14-FULD, PDF30, printed page 28. Denominator: 80. Integration Act case excluded.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	66	82
No	3	4
Not reported	11	14
Total	80	100

3.12: Written expression, fairness, practice

PPR14-FULD, PDF32,printed page 30. Denominator:30. 17=3 sole proprietorships+1 other overall correct+13 incorrect; subgroups are the same 17.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	13	43
No	17	57
Total	30	100

3.13: Written statement, fairness, wage subsidy

PPR14-FULD, PDF32,printed page 30. Denominator:80. Prose PDF27 says 24 deficiencies, table/prose PDF32 says 25. Retain the difference. 7 of 25 sole proprietorships; 18 others.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	55	69
No	25	31
Total	80	100

3.14: Employee representatives consulted

PPR14-FULD, PDF35, printed on page 33. Names: 74. Seven private companies with no employees left out.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	57	77
No	1	1
Not reported	16	22
Total	74	100

3.15: Positive employees

PPR14-FUD, PDF36, printed on page 34. Names: 74. The same 74; not a new consultation population.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	57	77
No	1	1
Not reported	16	22
Total	74	100

3.16: Agreement on additional employment

PPR14-FUD, PDF36, printed on page 34. Names: 74.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	55	74
No	0	0
Not reported	19	26
Total	74	100

3.17: Written declaration before wage subsidy

PPR14-FULD, PDF37, printed page 35. Denominator: 81. 61 includes 7 sole traders, employer only;54 both.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	61	75
No	20	25
Total	81	100

3.18: Number of employees previous 12 months, private

PPR14-FULD, PDF39,printed page 37. Denominator:43. Seven sole proprietorships among 27; deficiencies may be kept outside headline correctness where there is agreement.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	16	37
No	27	63
Total	43	100

3.19: Job available on departure / dismissal last 3 months

PPR14-FULD, PDF40, printed page 38. Denominator: 43. A further 2 dismissals with a corresponding position unresolved are mentioned in prose; do not add them as new cases.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	2	5
No	32	74
Not reported	9	21
Total	43	100

3.20: Job centre tested additional employment, sole proprietorship

PPR14-FULD, PDF41, printed on page 39. Names: 7.

Category	Number	Percentage
High degree	0	0
Some degree	0	0
Low degree	7	100
Not reported	0	0
Total	7	100

3.21: Budget information in public matters

PPR14-FUD, PDF44, printed on page 42. Names: 38. T3.7 s 2 alleged budgetary acquisitions are not provided.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	0	0
No	38	100
Total	38	100

3.22: Work-sharing arrangement, private wage subsidy

PPR14-FULD, PDF46, printed page 44. Denominator:43. The original assesses 1 of 2 as an incorrect form response in a sole proprietorship, the other case 68 incorrect. 10 deficiencies do not change the main outcome.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	2	5
No	31	72
Not reported	10	23
Total	43	100

3.23: P-number deviated, internship

PPR14-FUD, PDF47, printed on page 45. Denomination: 30.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	2	7
No	19	63
Not reported	9	30
Total	30	100

3.24: P-number deducted, wage subsidy

PPR14-FUD, PDF47, printed on page 45. Names: 81. The PDF48-49 language mentions 3 to some extent + 2 not being met, while the table only 4 deviations. Stay without a new case union.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	4	5
No	60	74
Not reported	17	21
Total	81	100

3.25: Not the same last employer, internship

PPR14-FULD, PDF50, printed page 48. Denomination: 30.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	10	33
No	0	0
Not reported	20	67
Total	30	100

3.26: Not the same last employer, wage subsidy

PPR14-FULD, PDF50, printed page 48. Names: 81.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	43	53
No	0	0

Category	Number	Percentage
Not reported	38	47
Total	81	100

3.27: Non-spouse / partner / co-worker activities

PPR14-FUD, PDF51, printed on page 49. Denomination: 43. Lack of information does not in itself affect the principal accuracy of the information.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	3	7
No	0	0
Not reported	40	93
Total	43	100

3.28: Purpose of enterprise practice

PPR14-FUD, PDF55, printed on page 53. Denomination: 30.

Category	Number	Percentage
High degree	23	77
Some degree	6	20
Low degree	1	3
No	0	0
Total	30	100

3.29: Aim wage subsidy

PPR14-FUD, PDF55, printed on page 53. Names: 81.

Category	Number	Percentage
High degree	72	89
Some degree	8	10
Low degree	0	0
No	1	1
Total	81	100

B2.1: Total accuracy per municipality

PPR14-FUD, PDF65, printed page 63. Names: 111.

Municipality	Yeah.	No, would be amended/remitted	Total
Copenhagen	10	6	16
Gladsaxe	9	3	12
Ishøj	4	4	8

Municipality	Yeah.	No, would be amended/remitted	Total
Gribskov	4	4	8
Kalundborg	3	4	7
Nordfyn	4	4	8
Aabenra	5	3	8
Fredericia	4	3	7
Vejle	5	4	9
Randers	10	2	12
Disc	2	6	8
Rebild	4	4	8
Total	64	47	111

B2.2: Information base per municipality

PPR14-FULD, PDF66, printed on page 64. Names: 111. Blank printed field is reproduced as blank, not authoritatively 0. The note's 4 materially incorrect without significant defects are the remaining 4 of the 8 materially incorrect, but the T3.4 describes 4 with overlap. The two groups must not be confused.

Municipality	No missing	A few smaller	Multiple / substantial	Decisive	Total
Copenhagen	4	6	blank	6	16
Gladsaxe	4	5	1	2	12
Ishøj	2	2	blank	4	8
Gribskov	1	3	blank	4	8
Kalundborg	3	blank	blank	4	7
Nordfyn	3	2	blank	3	8
Aabenra	2	4	blank	2	8
Fredericia	2	3	blank	2	7
Vejle	1	4	1	3	9
Randers	4	7	blank	1	12
Disc	1	1	blank	6	8
Rebild	2	2	blank	4	8
Total	29	39	2	41	111

F1.1: Overall result, printed figure and accompanying prose

PPR14-FULD, PDF4, printed page 2. Denominator: 111. Not 47 actual overturnings on appeal. 4 of 8 grounds for amendment also involve significant deficiencies in the factual basis, included in T3.4's 43.

Category	Number in prosaPDF4-5	Percentage in Figure
Conformity	64	58
Ground for remittal alone	39	35

Category	Number in prosaPDF4-5	Percentage in Figure
Explanation of amendment	8	7

F3.1: Target group internship, visually printed percentages

PPR14-FUD, PDF53, printed on page 51. Denomination: 30. No reversing integer's; prose 3 sickness benefit / 1 permanent.

Target group	Percentage
Daily subsistence allowance	53
Cash benefits alone unemployment	10
Cash assistance, not solely unemployment	17
Sickness benefit	10
Variable limitation	3
Not reported	7

F3.2: Targeted wage subsidy, visually printed percentages

PPR14-FULD, PDF54, printed on page 52. Names: 81. Prose each of the last three 1 person.

Target group	Percentage
Daily subsistence allowance	69
Cash benefits alone unemployment	22
Cash assistance, not solely unemployment	6
Revalident	1
Pre-time Sensiticians	1
Self-employed persons	1

BF1: Age / sex, visually printed column number

PPR14-FUD, PDF62, printed on page 60. Names: 111. 53 men / 58 women; prose 48% / 52%.

Age	Male	Women
Less than 30	14	14
30-39	13	16
40-49	6	16
50-59	18	12
60+	2	0

BF2: Country, explicit quarterly transmission points

PPR14-FULD, PDF63, printed page 61. Names: shown separately in the rows. Figure PDF64 flour meters without exact point labels; no interpolation. Land figures do not mispopulate.

Benefits and offers	2008Q2	2013Q2
Cash benefits, traineeships	18363	43202
Cash benefits, wage subsidies	3435	9532
Daily allowance, internship	2409	17062
Daily subsistence allowance, wage subsidy	8345	14621

M1: Municipal response

PPR14-FULD, PDF9, printed page 7. Denominator: 12. None of the 3 free municipality trials exempts the reasonableness/additional employment requirements.

Measurement	Number	Denomination
No general difficulties encountered	10	12
Observed difficulties	1	12
No general answer	1	12
Remarks	5	12
Proposal	5	12
Free municipalities	3	12

M2: Request and retained sample

PPR14-FULD, PDF60, printed on page 58. Names: 111.

Measurement	Number
Intended internship	32
Wage subsidy called up	84
Total called	116
Deleted	5
Placed internship	30
Salary allowance paid	81
Total kept	111

M3: Other explicit sub-measurements

PPR14-FUD, PDF34, printed on page 32. Names: shown separately in the rows. Job schedule requirements have only 77% printed, raw not published. Approximately 2 / 3 unemployment / planned shares not converted into numbers.

Measurement	Number	Denomination	PDF
Practice over 13 weeks	2	30	34
Of which consultation / declaration illuminated	1	2	34
Of which unilluminated	1	2	34
Person undergoing vocational rehabilitation, insufficient documentation of additional employment	1	81	45
Pre-time sensitiser, same	1	81	45

Measurement	Number	Denomination	PDF
Job plan requirements	77	percentage of 111	56
Practical men	12	30	62
Trainee women	18	30	62
Men's wage subsidies	41	81	63
Wage subsidies women	40	81	63

Concrete course: same outcome, no personal add-on

Case a	Original Locate or	Specific information provided by the source	Meaning and requirements
5	PDF29	Folkeskole, originally 27.2.13, extended 27.5.13; 70 employees / 3 trainees February; Declaration 9.4.13.	AS accepts the available basis despite the lack of 3 month history; declaration does not self-control of all actors' employees.
43	PDF30	Daily offers: internship 22.4.13, wage subsidy 21.5.13; 29 employees, 4 wage grants + 4 internships.	Asfinder reasonably not met, also at 29 ordinary not more than 5 supported.
103	PDF30-31	Sole proprietorship, wage subsidy 1.6.13; already 1 work-placement participant with no cessation information.	Asfinds no basis for another supported position.
111	PDF31	Public enterprise, internship 13.5.13 → wage subsidy 11.6.13; 5 / 6 / 6 employees, May 2 wage subsidy + 1 internship.	Previous termination not documented; teams of unemployed several years, possible repeated displacement requires primary acts.
48	PDF32-33	Public-sector work placement 19.6.13; employer's signature missing, employee's indication is available.	Asamen right; concrete criterion weight, not full formal acquittal.
66	PDF33	The sickness benefit is awarded to the trade union 17.6-30.8.13; signed without duly completed justification.	Signature does not replace specified agreement.
80	PDF37-38	Office assistant wage subsidy 12.11.12-10.5.13 and 17.6-13.12.13; neither old nor new form documents required consultation / agreement.	All relevant BAB68 requirements missing according to AS; the assumption of extension is the reviewer's assessment, not actual uninterrupted work.
105	PDF38	Pupils 18.6-15.12.13, signature without completed consultation points.	AS finds award unlawful; no documented subsequent redress.
57	PDF40	Painsvend 18.6-13.12.13; corresponding ordinary position available for voluntary departure only 3 months.	AS finds the additional-employment requirement not met; a specific safeguard against displacement, not evidence of a particular dismissed person's loss.
102	PDF40-41	Office assistant 10.6-31.12.13; ordinary employee dismissed 1.6.13 alleged misconduct.	Ascan not exclude similar position; the municipality had to investigate, misstatements not independently confirmed.
42	PDF44	Public office assistant 7.6-31.10.13, signature without agreement on additional employment.	The municipality should not grant the foundation.
68	PDF46	Service staff 20.6-15.9.13; form indicating work distribution.	The municipality had to examine the factual basis before an award; no final independent investigation of the employer produced.
101	PDF48	Public-school work placement 19.6-19.7.13; alternative workplace delimitation without explanation/agreement.	The municipality was supposed to investigate the actual department and get a statement.
71	PDF48-49	Insurance company, alternative delimitation without description but agreement declared.	Asgathered properly despite documented lack of clarification; unfamiliar character.
11	PDF49	Hospital archives 11.3-16.6.13, extended 17.6-16.12.13; 41 / 43 / 44 employees.	Asstis second delimitation and accepts principal accuracy, but the municipality had to clarify it. The number of departments is not automatically true.
47	PDF56	58 years, grant 12.6.13 offers 13.6-11.12.13; actual resignation 30.9.13 and acquisition of shop 8.10.13; cooperation agreement 10.6.13.	Lack of purpose / experience and additional employment; actual resignation has not been proven legal repair.

Documented deviations, local source differences and residues

The documented criticisms are insufficient fact-finding, missing ratios/hearing/agreement, known obstacles without necessary investigation, insufficient examination of sole proprietorships and unexamined public budgets. 2 municipal statements that a budget was obtained are not 2 budgets produced; T3.21 shows 0/38 in the records. The specific departure from employment in case 47 is likewise not a remittal-for-reconsideration or compensation date.

The source's local counting differences are retained: PDF27's 24 deficiencies in written declarations against T3.13's 25; PDF48-49's 3+2 alternative delimitations against T3.24's 4; the B2.2 note has 4 substantively incorrect cases without significant deficiencies; T3.4 has 4 substantively incorrect cases with significant deficiencies. These 4+4 constitute the 8 substantively incorrect cases and are not a source conflict. None of these differences is replaced with a guessed harmonised figure. Blank fields in the municipality table are reproduced as blank. Repeated tables/figures concern the same cohort.

- In fact, employees / unemployed persons' CPRunion were not published; past / other municipal interventions may overlap.
- The report does not include individual key acts, actual job paths, wage / benefit changes, losses, political implementation and post-control.
- Figure PDF64 intermediate years have no exact labels; graph curve reading would be estimated.
- A single scale for contract / formal response is not published as a result table; blank instrument response is not 0.

The strongest demand is individual examination of each documented statutory requirement, linkage of records between the municipality and workplace, actual time lost and financial consequences, responsibility for known breaches and relevant redress. Suspicion of further displacement in case 111 or citizens affected by errors outside the sample requires primary records; no national multiplication from 47/111.

Remittal, reconsideration and a broken connection: three original investigations

Controlled 7.10.2026. Figures in this module are not new citizens apart from the complaints series when the population has already dealt with complaints. All locators are physical PDFs page. No uncritical sum for the same cause of error.

AES loss of earning capacity:85 remitted appeal cases, published March 2023

Main report 39 pp.: https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732391690173418/Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-af-sager-om-tab-af-erhvervsevne-der-hjemvises-grundet-oplysningsgrundlaget.pdf. SHA256 c06dfc00ffcb8899fe475ebf6fe6929d8ac0bdd60bf0a385db1321367e361482. Annex 28 pp. with cover August 2022: https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732390377664441/Bilag-hjemviste-sager-om-tab-af-erhvervsevne-grundet-oplysningsgrundlag.pdf. SHA256 3752c68bb0fe96dac32dc0d25991107676ff549bec92f72cc9baa00847729f5d.

AS selected the 85 most recent AES decisions from 145 cases remitted in 2021 because of the evidential basis; reopening cases excluded. Annex p. 3; main report pp. 4-5. The original denominator for all 2021 complaints is internally contradictory:2132 on p. 4 and 2312 on p. 5.202 remittals/145 remittals concerning information are stated on p. 4. The 85-case sample is already part of the 145-case remittal population. Not 85 additional errors for the annual series.

Measurement; categories follow specified order	Counters	Denomination	Annex locator
Méngradation yes / no	17/68	85	4.1, p 19
E-loss refusal / award	22/63	85	4.2, p 19
E-loss deduction yes / no	32/53	85	4.3, p. 19
Complaints company / citizen, overlap	53/41	85	4.4, p 19
Complaints about information / cause / deduction / loss limitation / time / higher / lower / unjustified / other, overlap	13/13/26/0/0/25/11/4/3	85	4.5, p 20
Reassessment option yes / no	59/26	85	4.6, p. 20

Measurement; categories follow specified order	Counters	Denomination	Annex locator
Obstacle: re-assessment decision / both parties / both	17/7/2	26	4.7, p 20
Several sub-decisions yes / no	16/69	85	4.8, p. 21
Absence of information relates to all / only some sub-decisions	10/6	16	4.9, p 21
First AES-e-loss decision yes / no	54/31	85	4.10, p. 21
Former AS-e-loss decision yes / no	11/74	85	4.11, p. 21
Previous AS case sufficiently informed yes / no	9/2	11	4.12, p. 22
Previous AS decision addressed current theme yes / no	3/8	11	4.13, p. 22
Employment before injury to unskilled / skilled / academic / self-employed / education / flexible / other	42/27/8/1/6/0/1	85	4.14, p 22
Under the AES decision, sick / raskouden job / job / unemployment benefit / wage / flex / rehabilitation / senior pension / early retirement / other	33/3/22/4/1/4/4/0/9/ 5	85	4.15, p. 23
Disease reporting part-time / full-time	0/33	33	4.16, p. 23
Work part-time / full-time	8/14	22	4.17, p. 23
Jobs same / same, etc. / New job same place / New place New job / New place same job / second industry	4/4/2/5/3/4	22	4.18, p. 24
Main reason for remittal: entitlement/illness/pay/work/permanent impairment/recognition/uncertainty about causation/other	2/40/9/11/2/1/14/6	85	4.19, p. 24
AS could not assess the deduction / income before / revenue after / ability / spare / cause / other	34/7/6/3/10/24/1	85	4.20, p. 25
Wrong law: Deductions / part-time / self-employed / § 17 vs 17 a / other	1/0/0/0/0/1	2	4.21, p. 25
Additional information requested yes / no	19/66	85	4.22, p. 25
Requesting company / citizen / employer	17/2/0	19	4.23, p. 26
Request before recognition / before mén / before e-loss / in complaint / after complaint before transmission / after complaint / other	0/0/1/16/1/0/1	19	4.24, p. 26
AES obtained yes / partial / no	1/1/17	19	4.25, p. 26
Should be obtained prior to recognition / mén / past eloss / current eloss / post-complaint delivery / not known	2/1/6/69/4/3	85	4.26, p 27
AES medical consultant yes / no	2/83	85	4.27, p. 27
AS Medical Adviser yes / no	21/64	85	4.28, p. 27
Absence before / after damage	20/65	85	4.29, p. 28
The AS evaluates excusable past information gap yes / no	3/82	85	4.30, p. 28
AS does not make up for itself: pre-large / altered character / cannot / other	45/1/33/6	85	4.31, p. 28

The contents of all 31 annex tables have been checked. The main report additionally: medical information 58/85, p. 5; occupational information 16/85, p. 6; reassessment 19/85, of which 5 without additional information and 14 still insufficiently investigated, p. 7/27. In 82/85, information was missing that AS considered should have been obtained earlier; 3 had new information, p. 29. Several appellants/issues in dispute overlap. AS's assessment of excusability is a specific administrative assessment, not a criminal-law decision on an employee's culpability. Actual compensation following remittal for reconsideration and total waiting time are not published for this cohort.

Payout Denmark: maternity delay-revaluations, May 2022

Main report 49 pp: https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732233286942377/Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-af-udbetaling-danmarks-genvurdering-af-afg%C3%B8relser-om-frister-p%C3%A5-barselsdagpengeomr%C3%A5det.pdf. SHA256 a622752ec2970f8158b398bb344396fcf4132a1eddb88cbe6acfbd22bdd9ee38. Annex 27 pp: https://www.ast.dk/Media/638736685835992667/Udbetaling-Danmarks-genvurdering-af-afg%C3%B8relser-om-frister-p%C3%A5-barselsdagpengeomr%C3%A5det-Bilagsrapport.pdf. SHA256 882e05ebab3e6422df7f2b155811a6e24d57765732970cb85a4d65159a05b81c.

35 requested as a pool,30 examined;3 of the wrong type replaced from the pool. Most recent before 1.8.2021. Only original refusals amended on reconsideration with a favourable finding without forwarding to AS; as a rule without new information, with a few cases containing unused new information allowed. COVID§ 26 a-b excluded. Substantive matters examined, ordinary party consultation/appeal guidance not examined. Annexes 4-6.

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Worker's period of reimbursement / pregnancy / employee / self-employed	9/3/17/1	30	Head 6, Annex 5
Background 2020: Complaint-treated maternity cases	791	all the complaints referred to above;	head 5; UKK key figure 2020T2.3 secondary quoted
Background 2020: finding in favour on reconsideration	10%	791	same; raw counter not specified

The report does not give a complete numerator for 30 original errors versus 30 reconsideration errors. It states itself that not all 30 sequences are reproduced, main report 7. Therefore, neither 79 favourable findings from 10% rounding nor 30 unlawful original decisions from the selection criterion are inferred. Necessary request: AS's30 analysis forms and UDK2020T2.3 raw numerator/version date; case ID, appealed decision, reconsideration, favourable finding, amended award period, actual payment date and time taken. All 30 public code references and all 76 pages have now been checked in praksis-UDK2022-fuld-metode-og-30-sagsforloeb.md/.json; no additional 30 cases are added.

Interruption of interaction / contact, January 2020

Original 55 s: https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732272956796950/Ankestyrelsens-unders%C3%B8gelse-af-afbrydelse-af -samv% C3% A6r- and -kontakt.pdf. SHA256 b5a5f0addf6d114cd8e7d6aa9e841288b454ac2ce2f9f0cda861ac408dff9203.

Year	Consultation / Contact Complaint r, heleAS	All BUU complaints	Selected sample before exclusions	Locator
2016	151	1227	109	T2.1, p 15; T6.1, p 48
2017	193	1334	129	same
2018	235	1517	146	same
Sum	579	4078	384	derived amounts of separate annual statements;

384 sample cases−17 wrong type=367 appeal cases reviewed; 17 excluded=10 supervised contact+3 controlled contact+4 both. 367 cases contain 382 decisions; 15 cases under both§71 subsections 3 and 4,p. 48. The report examines characteristics, **not** a new legality review,p. 8. Four group interviews/four municipalities. The legal sample is already included in 579 AS appeals; all BUU appeals also include these appeals.

Visually read annex graphs, pp. 53-54:2016 upheld 73%, period amended 15%, other amendment 1%, annulled 12%;2017=86/5/without a printed label/9%;2018=83/8/1/8%. Subsection 3=80/10/1/10%, subsection 4=86/7/0/8%. Raw outcome counts and final year/section denominators are not specified in the graphs; percentages must not be rounded back into exact cases. The note to figure 2 uses 367 appeal cases even though the sections contain 382 decisions; the population must not be silently harmonised. All 55 pages,17 original tables/figures and 15 specific interview leads have now been checked in praksis-samvaer2020-fulde-originaltal-og-kontaktforloeb.md/.json. Periods and relationships are found there with

demarcation. In fact, subsequent contact / reunion is not part of the data set. Justification figure 2.2 omits repealed decisions and covers 331 out of 367 cases.

AES 2023: all original tables and nine citizens' programmes

39 pages of the main report and 28 pages of annexes have been read. The 31 annex tables in the previous PAES23 module were already checked; this fuller control also retains all printed percentages, four main tables, the nine individual trajectories and time intervals. **No new 85 cases population**.

Main analysis: known lack of information before refusal and deduction

The review documents 82 of 85 remitted cases in which, in Ankestyrelsen's assessment, AES should have obtained information earlier. In 19 cases AES reconsidered; five without new information and 14 still insufficiently investigated. The citizen was thus put through yet another decision and appeal while the question of compensation remained unresolved. This is a specific chain of responsibility from a known information deficiency to unnecessary waiting time. [PAES23-FULD,HovedPDF7/24-29;Bilag4.30,PDF28]

Statements by the employer and municipality cannot replace the missing primary evidence. Example 4 shows a refusal following an uninvestigated conflict over overtime and work accommodations. Example 2 shows a deduction based on municipal information about old hip pain disputed by the individual’s union; AS required further medical documentation. Historical § 12 required the occupational injury authority to discharge the burden of proving that documented loss of earning capacity was, on the balance of probabilities, due to something other than the occupational injury. The strongest demand is full source examination before compensation is reduced, a prompt lawful new decision and specific examination of the loss from delay. [PAES23-FULD, HovedPDF14-17/21-23; BilagPDF17]

Remittal is a review outcome, not documentation of compensation paid. The time intervals below stop at remittal because the next decision and actual payment are not provided. Three cases had relevant new information that, in AS’s assessment, AES could not have known; this changes only the specific assessment of responsibility in those three cases. [PAES23-FULD,HovedPDF29-30]

Method and demarcation

The sample consists of 85 most recently decided AES cases among 145 remittals for reconsideration due to deficiencies in the factual basis in 2021. All these 85 are already appeal cases in the annual series; they cannot be added as 85 extra cases. Reopening cases are excluded. Five cases read in a pilot informed the form, not a new cohort of errors. Activations of the instrument are not shown in the annex; instrument options are not actual results. [PAES23-FULD, HovedPDF4-5; BilagPDF3-13]

Source internal differences remain: 2132 Total complaints on main PDF4 and 2312 on PDF5. The main PDF9 refers to 30 complaint credits, B4.5 shows 26; 34 iB4.20 is another dimension, namely the deduction ATab could assess. The 73 actualcase deficiencies of the prosaic consist of 69 before the decision and 4 after / before the decision; not 73 before the decision. Main PDF31 s 18 not obtained should be read together with B4.25 s 1 yes / 1 partial / 17 no.

Original tables: same 85 cases cohort

B4.1

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF19. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes	20,0%	17
No	80,0%	68
Total	100,0%	85

B4.2

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF19. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Refusal of e-loss	25,9%	22
Qualified e-loss	74,1%	63
Total	100,0%	85

B4.3

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF19. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes	37,6%	32
No	62,4%	53
Total	100,0%	85

B4.4

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF19. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Insurance company	62,4%	53
Citizen / Party representative	48,2%	41
Total	100,0%	85

B4.5

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF20. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Insufficient information	15,3%	13
Causal context	15,3%	13
Deductions	30,6%	26
Duty to mitigate loss	0,0%	0
Time of award	0,0%	0
The e-loss must be higher	29,4%	25
E-loss must be lower	12,9%	11
Unsubstantiated complaint	4,7%	4
Other	3,5%	3

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Total	100,0%	85

B4.6

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF20. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes	69,4%	59
No	30,6%	26
Total	100,0%	85

B4.7

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF20. N = 26. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Reconsideration decision	65,4%	17
Both parties have complained:	26,9%	7
Both	7,7%	2
Total	100,0%	26

B4.8

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF21. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes (please specify)	18,8%	16
No	81,2%	69
Total	100,0%	85

B4.9

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF21. N = 16. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes	62,5%	10
No - indicate the sub-decisions to which they relate	37,5%	6
Total	100,0%	16

B4.10

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF21. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes	63,5%	54
No	36,5%	31
Total	100,0%	85

B4.11

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF21. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yeah, how many?	12,9%	11
No	87,1%	74
Total	100,0%	85

B4.12

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF22. N = 11. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes (elaborate if necessary)	81,8%	9
No (elaborate if necessary)	18,2%	2
Total	100,0%	11

B4.13

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF22. N = 11. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes - elaborate what we have said and when	27,3%	3
No	72,7%	8
Total	100,0%	11

B4.14

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF22. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Unskilled	49,4%	42
Qualified	31,8%	27

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Academic education	9,4%	8
Self-employed	1,2%	1
Training	7,1%	6
Flex jobs	0,0%	0
Other	1,2%	1
Total	100,0%	85

B4.15

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF23. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
(full-time as well as part-time)	38,8%	33
Rough reported but not in work	3,5%	3
Back to work (quick report)	25,9%	22
Unemployment benefit	4,7%	4
Remuneration	1,2%	1
Flex jobs	4,7%	4
Rehabilitation	4,7%	4
Senior pension	0,0%	0
Early retirement pension	10,6%	9
Other	5,9%	5
Total	100,0%	85

B4.16

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF23. N = 33. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Part-time	0,0%	0
Full-time	100,0%	33
Total	100,0%	33

B4.17

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF23. N = 22. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Part-time	36,4%	8

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Full-time	63,6%	14
Total	100,0%	22

B4.18

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF24. N = 22. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
1. Same Workplace and Work	18,2%	4
2. Same workplace and same work with spare- regards 18,2% 4 3. Same job with new work	9,1%	2
4. New Workplace with New Jobs	22,7%	5
5. New workplace with the same tasks	13,6%	3
6. Other industry with other tasks	18,2%	4
Total	100,0%	22

B4.19

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF24. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Misapplication of the law due to lack of information	2,4%	2
Pre-existing / competing diseases - specify which disease	47,1%	40
Specific pay conditions - specify which and specify whether it relates to pre-employment and / or post-work injuries 10,6% 9 Specific working conditions - specify which	12,9%	11
No information, as the error is in ménet - specify what the error is	2,4%	2
No information, as the error is in recognition,	1,2%	1
Doubts about causality - specify in the free text field what the doubt relates to 16,5% 14 Other - specify in the free text field what was missing	7,1%	6
Total	100,0%	85

B4.20

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF25. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
We could not assess deductions	40,0%	34
We could not estimate the income prior to the damage	8,2%	7
We couldn't assess the income after the damage.	7,1%	6
We were unable to assess the profitability prior to the damage.	3,5%	3

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
We could not assess the need for adjustments/functional limitations	11,8%	10
We could not assess the causal link	28,2%	24
Other	1,2%	1
Total	100,0%	85

B4.21

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF25. N = 2. Same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Added to the wrong fact	50,0%	1
Deductions	0,0%	0
Part-time	0,0%	0
Self-employed persons	0,0%	0
§ 17 a instead of § 17 or vice versa	0,0%	0
Other	50,0%	1
Total	100,0%	2

B4.22

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF25. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes	22,4%	19
No	77,6%	66
Total	100,0%	85

B4.23

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF26. N = 19. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Insurance company	89,5%	17
Injury	10,5%	2
Worker	0,0%	0
Total	100,0%	19

B4.24

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF26. N = 19. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Before the decision on recognition	0,0%	0
Before taking a decision on the matter	0,0%	0
Before the decision on the alleged e-loss	5,3%	1
The complaint	84,2%	16
After the complaint but before transmission to AST	5,3%	1
Following the complaint	0,0%	0
Second time - specify when	5,3%	1
Total	100,0%	19

B4.25

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF26. N = 19. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes	5,3%	1
Partially obtained - state what AES states as justification for not obtaining file 5,3% 1 No	89,5%	17
Total	100,0%	19

B4.26

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF27. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Prior to recognition	2,4%	2
Prior to long-term success	1,2%	1
Prior to one of the previous decisions on loss of earning capacity	7,1%	6
Prior to the current decision	81,2%	69
After the complaint but before the shipment	4,7%	4
AES could not know that the information had to be obtained	3,5%	3
Total	100,0%	85

B4.27

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF27. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes	2,4%	2
No	97,6%	83
Total	100,0%	85

B4.28

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF27. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes	24,7%	21
No	75,3%	64
Total	100,0%	85

B4.29

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF28. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Relations prior to the accident at work / occupational disease, 23,5% 20	76,5%	65
Total	100,0%	85

B4.30

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF28. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Yes	3,5%	3
No	96,5%	82
Total	100,0%	85

B4.31

PAES23-FULD, BilagPDF28. N = 85. The same 85 cohorts as previously PAES23; 4.4 / 4.5 multiple responses. Printed percentages shall be retained.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Excessive (to be retrieved from too many sites)	52,9%	45
The case changes character - specify how	1,2%	1
Information that the AST cannot obtain, such as a specialist's certificate	38,8%	33

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Other	7,1%	6
Total	100,0%	85

H0.1

PAES23-FULD, HeadPDF10. N = 85. Repeated original main table; no more cases. ProsaH0.1 calling 2.1.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
We could not assess deductions	40,0%	34
We could not estimate the income prior to the damage	8,2%	7
We couldn't assess the income after the damage.	7,1%	6
We were unable to assess the profitability prior to the damage.	3,5%	3
We could not assess the need for adjustments/functional limitations	11,8%	10
We could not assess the causal link	28,2%	24
Other	1,2%	1
Total	100,0%	85

H0.2

PAES23-FULD, HeadPDF20. N = 85. Repeated original main table; no more cases. ProsaH0.1 calling 2.1.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
(full-time as well as part-time)	38,8%	33
Rough reported but not in work	3,5%	3
Back to work (quick report)	25,9%	22
Unemployment benefit	4,7%	4
Remuneration	1,2%	1
Flex jobs	4,7%	4
Rehabilitation	4,7%	4
Senior pension	0,0%	0
Early retirement pension	10,6%	9
Other	5,9%	5
Total	100,0%	85

H3.1

PAES23-FULD, HeadPDF25. N = 85. Repeated original main table; no more cases. ProsaH0.1 calling 2.1.

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Prior to recognition	2,4%	2
Prior to long-term success	1,2%	1

Category	Percentage	Number of cases
Prior to one of the previous decisions on loss of earning capacity	7,1%	6
Prior to the current decision	81,2%	69
After the complaint but before the shipment	4,7%	4
AES could not know that the information had to be obtained	3,5%	3
Total	100,0%	85

H4.1

PAES23-FULD, HeadPDF35. N = 19. Reasoned refusal of information is not sufficient factual evidence.

Reasons / information	Number
Reasons	11
No statement of reasons	3
Information obtained	1
No possibility of re-assessment	4
Total	19

Citizens' courses and estimated time intervals

Days are their own calendar difference between the explicitly printed dates. They are not national appeals and do not include waiting time after remittal for reconsideration.

Examplest	Main original	Progress	Meaning of proof
1	PDF12-14	Trainee pedagogue, recognition 16.11.2015/permanent impairment 8%; request to reopen 21.9.2017. Working hours 37→20 hours+17 on benefits, later 30 hours. AES 1.7.2020 loss of earning capacity 15%, reassessment 14.9.2020 calculates 5% and refuses. AS 27.4.2021 remits for reconsideration. The former employer could not respond after transfer to the municipality; AES did not seek further information.	AES changed substantive compensation on an incompletely investigated occupational/medical basis. Time to remittal does not end the period of loss.
2	PDF16-17	Forklift driver struck on 16.5.2017 by 10-15 kg; recognition on 29.10.2018 permanent impairment 10%; 15.4.2019 temporary 30%without deduction. Dismissed November 2018.21.7.2020 total loss 60%/half deduction/30%occupational injury based on municipal hip history. Union challenges deterioration/no earlier sick leave.15.2.2021 remittal requires a specialist and full medical records from 2014 onwards.	Municipal repetition of disease is not sufficient proof of deduction. The burden of proof must be lifted independently.
3	PDF18-19	Welder fell 3 m on 31.8.2017, on sick leave the following week; disability pension four years later.4 specialist medical reports.13.3.2020 AES permanent injury 12%(10 back+addition for finger), AS21.12.2020 the same 12%.18.3.2021 loss of earning capacity 60%,1/3 of symptoms attributed to psychological/cognitive factors without total loss established. The company considers earnings of 250.000 kroner/35% loss.27.8.2021 remittal requires a psychiatric report/full medical records.	The company's amount and municipal PTSDomtal are statements, not evidence of non-work-related cause. No actual final 35% discharge.

Examples t	Main original	Progress	Meaning of proof
4	PDF21-23	Operator, crush injury 10.4.2019, recognition 21.4.2020 permanent impairment 5%; two weeks' sick leave.37 hours afterwards, more before. Citizen: no heavy work/no overtime; employer: no adjustments/fewer orders.3.8.2020 loss 30%,29.10.2020 reconsidered refusal (<15%) after recalculation. Citizen disputes a statement from an administrative employee and refers to the operations manager/colleagues' overtime.10.11.2021 remittal.	AEScould before the refusal had investigated conflicting facts and cross-heard. Employers' statements were used without the actual objections being verified.
5	PDF26-27	Unskilled worker, forearm fracture 28.9.2018.10.9.2020 recognition/permanent impairment 15%; specialist on 27.5.2020 reports return to work for 3 months, dismissed half a year later; municipality reports new sick leave a year later.16.2.2021 loss 60%, arm usable for 1-2 hours with severe pain. Insurer claims full-time work is possible, AS requires psychological records.	The source's different time statements about work / illness are preserved. Psychological treatment does not automatically prove other cause than work injury; the source recognises possible contributions.
6	PDF27-29	Driver,21.8.2019 recognised aggravated back condition/permanent impairment 10%−half=5%. Rehabilitation appendix not attached.17.4.2020 refusal,18.12.2020 reconsideration 40%13-31.12.2019 and 15%from 1.1.2020 with¼deduction for memory/concentration. AS24.9.2021 remits loss of earning capacity/annual pay.	The absence of underlying municipal records was visible; the general practitioner’s record alone before reassessment did not resolve the underlying problem.
7	PDF29-30	Fitter with finger injury,19.10.2020 permanent impairment<5%/loss-of-earning-capacity claim refused;AES14.12.2020 forwards after 10 months of income. AS receives information about a resource programme from 19.10.2020.7.10.2021 remittal concerning permanent impairment/loss.	AS assesses new information and no AES investigation error. The delimitation is specific:3/85,not a general defence for 82 documented deficiencies.
8	PDF33-34	Electrician’s shoulder 11.6.2018,30.10.2019 permanent injury 12%,AS30.4.2020 permanent injury 15%.31.1.2020 refusal,24.8.2020 reconsideration states both 30% and 40%.17.9.2020 new 40% decision without statutory authority. The company requests employment agreement/earnings/asthma information; AES does not obtain it, the employer has not replied. AS5.11.2021 remits.	Lack of response is not a positive proof of decision-making. Even revalued amounts were unsolved and burdened retrial.
9	PDF38-39	Warehouse worker struck by ladder,25.7.2019 permanent impairment 10%−half=5%;medical adviser consulted only about impairment.10.10.2019 loss 50%,20.10.2020 again 50%,no deduction for continuing depression. Insurer appeals. AS medical adviser finds basis incomplete;remittal date not stated.	AS specifically assesses that continuing depression required investigation in 2020. An assumption of a transient condition in 2019 does not prove the cause of illness or justify a deduction in 2020.

Example	Start	End	Days	Limitation
1	2020-07-01	2021-04-27	300	First 2020 decision→remittal
1	2020-09-14	2021-04-27	225	Refusal after reconsideration→remittal
1	2017-09-21	2021-04-27	1314	Request→remittal; not the processing time of one appeal case
2	2020-07-21	2021-02-15	209	Deduction decision→remittal for reconsideration
3	2021-03-18	2021-08-27	162	Compensation decision→remittal for reconsideration
4	2020-08-03	2021-11-10	464	Award→remittal for reconsideration
4	2020-10-29	2021-11-10	377	Refusal→remittal for reconsideration
6	2020-04-17	2021-09-24	525	Refusal→remittal for reconsideration

Example	Start	End	Days	Limitation
6	2020-12-18	2021-09-24	280	Reconsideration→remittal for reconsideration
7	2020-10-19	2021-10-07	353	AES decision→remittal for reconsideration
7	2020-12-14	2021-10-07	297	Forwarding→remittal for reconsideration
8	2020-09-17	2021-11-05	414	New 40% decision→remittal for reconsideration

Remaining and liability

Documented criticisms are insufficient information, untreated concrete factual conflicts, deduction without the necessary evidence and further delay after inadequate re-evaluation. Suspicion of the intention of a particular employee, the amount of the final compensation or consequential damage requires primary documents and the pay-out record. Former municipal or medical reproductions are no longer independent sources.

- Full CPR-based union with other complaint series not published.
- Final decision/payment/compensation and total time after remittal not recorded as outcomes.
- 2132 in main PDF4 versus 2312 in PDF5; appeal exclusion 30 in PDF9 versus 26 in B4.5. No guess selected. Main 31:18 not obtained includes 1 partial; annex 4.25 distinguishes 1 yes/1 partial/17 no.

Date of birth 2022: full method and 30 case codes

All 49 pages of the main report and 27 pages of the annex report are read. The study publishes qualitative courses and brief references to 30 case codes, but **no full quantitative accuracy matrix**. All public code references and explicit population data are reproduced below. It is the same 30 cases as earlier PUDK22; not new 30 complaints.

Main analysis: the Authority's own information is disregarded before refusal

Payment Denmark could refuse a timely application because the new alert was used without the previous alert which the Authority itself had requested to be replaced. Easy refund deleted the previous notification by correction. In Case 32, the Authority confirmed the timeliness and on the same day refused to exceed the time limit. The concrete chain of responsibility is therefore the authority's prior knowledge and instruction → loss of initial notification → lack of record involvement → incorrect refusal → necessary complaint. [PUDK22-FUD, HeadPDF14-19 / 25-26]

A successful complaint does not necessarily remove the actual burden. Case 28 shows only partial redress in practice, with even the reconsideration remaining incorrect in AS' assessment. Case 33 granted relief on the deadline, but the citizen/employer process then ended in refusal because of medical documentation. Case 34 took 135 calendar days from refusal to relief, while the employer was asked for documentation that was not used in the grounds for granting relief. Actual payment and its date are a separate evidential requirement. [PUDK22-FULD,HovedPDF31/33-35/42-43]

The review also criticises decisions granting more than AS considers lawful. These assessments are retained with their specific reasons; they cannot be rewritten as evidence that a particular citizen actually suffered a loss or had to repay. AS' assessment of case 34 is based on an unclear telephone note, and the original complaint and Nemrefusion documentation must be examined before the note is used as evidence of the truth of the telephone conversation. [PUDK22-FULD,HovedPDF32-35]

Method: reassembly case and concrete passenger bridge

35 cases submitted, 30 examined; three outside the time-limit issue were replaced within the same pool. The most recent decisions were dated 1. August 2021 or earlier. Only cases with a local finding in the party's favour, which were therefore not forwarded to AS; these are precisely a population that ordinary AS appeal statistics do not count as appeals considered. Nine employer reimbursements, three pregnancy-related sickness absences, 17 employees and one self-employed person. Employer cases may concern both the employee's parental leave and the company's finances; one case code is not a precise person count. [PUDK22-FULD, BilagPDF4-6]

The criterion was change without new knowledge. The Annex's footnote clarifies that some cases still have new information that UDKikke used. COVID § 26 a / bvar was omitted, and the hearing and complaint guidance were not formally tested. This opt-out limits the number measurement, not the duties of the authority. The pilot's five cases are method work, not five additional control cases. BilagPDF7-21 is an instrument with hidden activations, not a table of all 30 results. [PUDK22-FUD, HeadPDF7; BilagPDF4-7]

All express population data

Kohorte

PUDK22-FULD, H6 / B4-6.

Population	Number
Submitted	35
Completed	30
Replace	3
Worker 8 weeks	9
Pregnancy absence 5 weeks	3
Employees 8 weeks	17
Self-employed 8 weeks	1
Pilot	5

Background

PUDK22-FULD, H5.

Year	Appeals	Reconsideration rate
2020	791	10% rounded,

All published case code references

Short references do not give a full file or a new person's population. Category and accuracy are ASassessments with the specified locator basis.

Case	Group	Main PDF	Documented case history	Original Decision	Reconsideration
3	Employer reimbursement 8 weeks	17-18/24/27-28	2.4.2020 first notification 24.1-6.2; 5.4 employee confirmation; 3.5 awaiting registration of the father; 6.5 guidance to submit a new notification; 18.5 and 13.7 periods extended to 19.1-19.2. Refusal deadline 15.4. Reassessment grants the whole period and calls it a dispensation.	Cannot be determined: changed period, lack of practice	Not applicable; individual exemption without legal basis is criticised
4	Employees 8 weeks	42	Insufficient guidance, correct equalisation.	Wrong	Correct
5	Employees 8 weeks	37-38/44-45	Father of a4-month-old child who underwent heart surgery 8-19.1.2021; 19.1 phone contact without a deadline, same day 13-page notification with deadline on page 7=5.3.30.3 reminder, 31.3 application; 7.4 refusal; the appeal describes surgery, municipal notification/personal circumstances. 3.5 favourable finding on incorrect grounds for rectifying the substantive position, should have been an exemption under§26 subsection 6.	Wrong, lack of assessment of the cause of temptation	Right outcome; incorrect justification

Case	Group	Main PDF	Documented case history	Original Decision	Reconsideration
6	Employer reimbursement 8 weeks	28	Wanted leave first declared unpaid; no ASPrpractices to maintain original notification.	Uncorrected	Unable to settle
7	Self-employed 8 weeks	48-49	Father takes 2 weeks of paternity+1 week of parental leave 15.7-2.8.2019. Telephone guidance twice,draft created 26.6,no time limit stated;signs 20.12.2019. Refusal ignores two file notes. Telephone finding in favour/substantive equalisation.	Wrong	Correct real compensation; date of payment not disclosed
9	Employees 8 weeks	41-42	Newborn twins. Paid leave 18-31.1.2020(file 20-31.1),unpaid 1-14.2.27.1 telephone;5.2 letter with deadline 27.3;28.5 application;3.7 finding in favour.	AS assesses as correct	Asvalue incorrect real equalisation
10	Employer reimbursement 8 weeks	19-21/27	2.2.2020 notification; 25.3 reimbursement 13.11-31.12.2019; 9.6 application 1.1-31.5; 18.6 a new application required; 24.6 assistance; 26.6 new application 1.1-30.4; 29.6 refusal with time limit 25.6; 30.6 finding in the party's favour. The original 9.6 application was timely.	Wrong	Correct outcome; incorrect grounds for restoring the actual position
11	Pregnancy related absence 5 weeks	31-32/34-35	Telephone 23.2.2021 without guidance on time limit;absence 15.3-7.6 due date,21.4 reporting;deadline 19.4;granted for 21.4-11.5. Finding in favour for 15.3-20.4. Decision states 20.4 as notification date;UDK confirms 21.4 is correct.	Wrong	Correct outcome, unclear real equalisation / derogation and lack of home reference
12	Employer reimbursement 8 weeks	24-25/27-28	Three periods, partial/full return to work; new reporting changes periods. Initially results in refusal and finding in favour for all periods; no documented basis for timeliness in all periods.	Unable to settle	Unable to settle
13	Employees 8 weeks	39-40	Two children, remaining leave for both.6.7.2020 timely application for 28.5-26.6 with child 1;refusal on eligibility conditions and requires new notification with child 2.11.1.2021 employer notifies/13.1 mother applies;new refusal on time limit;appeal upheld.	Wrong	Correct; UDK should have asked about child 2 already in the original case
14	Employees 8 weeks	39	Deadline not exceeded, but refusal; reconsideration finds a timely application.	Wrong	Correct
15	Employer reimbursement 8 weeks	24	Ground for finding in favour absent from reconsideration; depends on file note.	Not separately aligned in this short reference	Not separately aligned in this short reference
16	Employees 8 weeks	40-41	Pregnancy-related illness 1.7.2019,pay ends 25.8,new entitlement to pay 25.10,birth 29.11.28.8 letter with deadline 20.10;application 5.11 for 26.8-24.10. Finding in favour calculates deadline from later birth.	AS assesses as correct	Ascertaining incorrect rule / deadline
17	Employees 8 weeks	38-39/45	Mother's absence 1.4.2020, birth 26.4, correct deadline 21.6.15.6 two enquiries, employer missing;18.6 notification/letter,22.6 application 1.4.2020-12.3.2021. Refusal calculates incorrect deadline 27.5 from 1.4.21.6 documentation of borger.dk error;13.7 relief granted.	Wrong	Right outcome; unclear / incorrect basis of derogation
18	Employees 8 weeks	42	Early contact is found in the call history, not recorded in the case file. Guidance on the deadline therefore cannot be documented; UDK accepts the citizen's account and provides actual redress.	Not separately aligned in this short reference	Not separately aligned in this short reference
19	Employees 8 weeks	41	Rectification of the substantive position on reconsideration, where AS considers the conditions unmet.	AS assesses as correct	AS assesses as incorrect

Case	Group	Main PDF	Documented case history	Original Decision	Reconsideration
20	Employees 8 weeks	45-46	Leave 1.7-6.10.2020,paid holiday 7-20.10,unpaid 21.10-9.11.28.9 email to HR.4.1.2021 employer notification/letter with premature deadline 16.12.2020,application 4.1 and refusal,telephone finding in favour for good faith. AS had to obtain further information available beforehand.	Cannot be determined: no fixed practice	Unable to settle; benevolent reasons for derogation assessed by AS
21	Employees 8 weeks	13/38	Refers to § 21 subsection 7 point 3 on reconsideration; AS considers the provision inapplicable.	Uncorrected	Incorrect use of exemption
22	Employees 8 weeks	39	Time limit not exceeded, but refusal; finding in favour on timely application.	Wrong	Correct
24	Employees 8 weeks	37-38	The father documents employer contact and wages paid/later withdrawn. Rectification of the substantive position versus sufficient written guidance; AS considers an exemption under § 21 subsection 7 point 1.	A lack of a uniform approach described a	Right outcome; second reason necessary
25	Employees 8 weeks	13/38	Proper derogation use after AS.	Uncorrected	Proper derogation use
26	Employees 8 weeks	13/38	Proper derogation use after AS.	Uncorrected	Proper derogation use
27	Employees 8 weeks	39/45	One day of leave 7.9.2020, employer 3.11 with letter deadline 2.11. Extra one-week deadline 9.11, application 12.11.13.1.2021 finding in the party's favour by telephone, the note alleges a one-day overrun. Actually 3 days after 9.11.	AS assesses as correct	AS assesses as incorrect; retrievability of the oral decision is questioned
28	Employees 8 weeks	42-43	Leave 30.9-31.12.2020, often one leave day each week.8.6 plan communicated and acknowledged, no guidance on a new application. Letter deadline 25.11;3.12 application/refusal for 30.9-3.12, awarded 7-31.12. On reconsideration awarded from 14.10 with deadline 9.12;not the entire preceding period.	Wrong	Wrong: only partial real compensation, actual remaining loss time
30	Employer reimbursement 8 weeks	22-24/27	Seriously ill child 15.6-8.7.2020 and paternity leave 8-21.7. Party consultation 6.8 says to do nothing if in agreement; the deadline 15.9 was not given. Reminder 28.9 in prose versus 1.10 in the case record; unanswered. 20.10 both grant and refusal/conflicting notifications. 10.11 favourable finding on reconsideration.	Improper, inadequate guidance	Correct real equalisation
31	Employer reimbursement 8 weeks	25	Refusal even though the employer was informed that the application had been made in time.	Concordance Time Error described	Not separately aligned in this short reference
32	Employer reimbursement 8 weeks	18-19/25-26	21.7.2020 application for 2.3-29.6; 20.8 holiday error; 17.9 guidance to submit a new report after holiday and confirm timeliness. Same-day refusal 28.4-29.6; later favourable finding 28.4-22.6, no parental leave remaining for the rest 23-29.6. New period in the case record 27.4, in prose 28.4.	Improper refusal of time	Proper assessment of time off; other maternity rights not tested
33	Pregnancy related absence 5 weeks	30-31/34	On sick leave from 10.3.2020, municipal notification three days later; 25.5UDK informed of pregnancy-related absence.2 2.7 application for 2.6-3.7 refused with deadline 7.7.12.10 complaint upheld regarding timely municipal notification; subsequent refusal due to missing medical documentation.	Wrong	Correct finding in favour on time limit; actual reimbursement still refused on another ground
34	Pregnancy related absence 5 weeks	32-35	17.12.2019 telephone about rates;31.1/24.2.2020 applications for 18.11-31.12.2019;24.3 refusal. Appeal next day,Nemrefusion document arrives in late May and is forwarded 19.6(states created 9.12.2019).6.8 finding in favour based on old guidance note, not collected document.	AS assesses as correct	Asvaluing real equalitywrong; 135 evaluation, document unnecessary

Case	Group	Main PDF	Documented case history	Original Decision	Reconsideration
35	Employer reimbursement 8 weeks	21-22/24	Leave; two; employee; children:26.8-8.9.2019 and 9.9.2019-15.3.2020.27.2 new notification required,3.3 and 20.4 application;7.5 refusal/repayment decision, deadline set at 2.2 based on 8.12.2019. Correct deadline 10.5.2020.17.8 note granting relief. Note prints 29.02.19 in a 2020 period.	Wrong	Correct

Time accounting up to finding in favour

Own calendar differences; date of payment does not automatically follow.

Case	Start	End	Days	Meaning
10	2020-06-29	2020-06-30	1	Refusal→finding in favour, not payment date
30	2020-10-20	2020-11-10	21	Conflicting decisions→note on finding in favour
35	2020-05-07	2020-08-17	102	Refusal+repayment→note on finding in favour
33	2020-05-25	2020-10-12	140	UDK prior knowledge→finding in favour on time limit, not payment
34	2020-03-24	2020-08-06	135	Refusal→finding in favour
34	2020-06-19	2020-08-06	48	Document received→finding in favour
5	2021-04-07	2021-05-03	26	Refusal→finding in favour

Documented errors, hypotheses and residues

Documented criticisms include omitted prior knowledge, incorrect calculation of time limits, inadequate guidance, incomplete real compensation, unclear reasons and decisions that cannot be recovered. Payment Denmark indicated that no decisions were automatic; Asset signatures / notes were used. It does not in itself prove that a case manager had read through the well-known documents. [PUDK22-FULD, HeadquarterPDF14 / 45]

The strongest requirements are the reconstruction of the original report and file, the verification of what information became known when, full real compensation where the error of authority affected the action of the citizen, correct justifications and actual economic recovery. Suspicion of intent, systematic concealment or a certain total economic loss requires additional primary proof.

• No publicly compiled table with exact number of correct / incorrect original and re-evaluated decisions; the 30 codes cannot all be classified from short references.

• Finding in favour on time limit does not always mean actual benefit: case 33 was subsequently refused on medical-documentation grounds.

• Exact payments, amounts, redress dates and a CPR-based union with annual statistics are missing.

• Case 30:reminder dated 28.9 in prose versus 1.10 in the record; case 32:new period starts 27.4 in the record versus 28.4 in prose; case 35:the record prints 29.02.19 in a 2020 course; case 9:pay starts 18.1 versus 20.1 in the record. Evidence versions retained.

Disrupted contact: all original numbers and documented interviews in 2020;

All 55 pages are read and all 17 original tables / figures are checked visually in memory. The tables reproduce the printed data cells with their boundaries. The Kohorten is the former PSAM20 cohort; it does not add 367 new complaints to the statistics.

Main analysis: breach of contact, lack of evidence and time

The survey shows both extensive breaks in contact and significant selection in their explanation. Figure 2.2 describes only 331 upheld or amended cases; annulled decisions are excluded. The published proportions of reasons therefore cannot be used as statistics of reasons for all 367 appeal cases examined. The derived excluded count is 36,calculated as 367−331. The report has not conducted a fresh lawfulness assessment. [PSAM20-FULD, PDF8/16/48-49]

The statements made by the authorities require independent control. Lawyers describe everything from convicted assaults to a loose, unannounced and unsubstantiated accusation. Others describe the most intrusive measures first, information afterwards, and party consultation without full information for parents. It proves documented practical statements and concrete investigation requirements; it does not automatically prove that each of 88 paragraph 4 decisions was legal, illegal or based on actual abuses. [PSAM20-FULD, PDF35 / 37- 38 / 41-42]

The time accounts shall follow the actual relationship. Two children had not seen their father for several years, according to a caseworker; Ankestyrelsen set a further period of two years at the latest. Another statement refers to six months of lack of contact before the formal interruption. The periods laid down in the figures must not be called actual time for reunification. For young children, the authorities themselves describe that the relationship can only be preserved through contact. The necessary chain of responsibility is therefore the first actual breach → decision and proof → each extension → complaint outcome → actual resumption → proven relationship loss and restoration. The last terms are not available in this dataset. [PSAM20-FULD, PDF26 / 30-31 / 36]

Method, separation and bridge

579 nationally decided AS complaint cases from 2016-18 form the selection population.384 sample cases became 367 after 17 exclusions.367 cases contain 382 decision occurrences under specific statutory provisions, because 15 cases involve both provisions.294 subsection 3+88 subsection 4=382; this represents neither 382 children nor 382 independent families. Contact less than once a month is treated as interruption even though contact may continue. [PSAM20-FULD,PDF7/13/24/34/48-49]

The interviews cover 14 employees in four municipalities selected by experience, variation in legal basis and geography. Managers selected the employees; quotations were sent to them for comment. Statements do not replace case records, and municipalities' explanations for the increase in complaints are assessments, not causal evidence. Each person's repetition across years, siblings and relationships cannot be publicly reconciled. [PSAM20-FULD,PDF49-51]

All original data cells

Figure 1.1

PSAM20-FULD, PDF9. 294+88=382 decision instances in 367 cases, 15 involving both provisions. The same figures as T3.1/4.1,not an addition.

Category	2016	2017	2018
§ 71 (3)	89	94	111
§ 71 (4)	19	32	37

Table 2.1

PSAM20-FULD, PDF15. SammeAScase may include several relationships and decisions; public total, not only the sample.

Category	2016 number	2016 pct	2017 number	2017 pct	2018 number	2018%
Consultation / Contact Complaints	151	12%	193	14%	235	15%
All-BUUURESIDENTS	1227	100%	1334	100%	1517	100%

Figure 2.2

PSAM20-FULD, PDF16. KUN331 confirmed / amended cases; repealed omitted. Several justifications per case; not listed annual denominators.

Category	2016	2017	2018
Attacks	17%	30%	26%
Protection against negative contact	57%	64%	72%
Lack of insight into the child's needs	47%	26%	57%
Having a relationship makes the child feel unsafe	48%	44%	50%
Risk of abduction	3%	5%	0%
The child does not want to have a relationship / contact	43%	39%	31%
Behaviour of the partner	49%	47%	41%
Other	23%	32%	33%

Figure 2.3

PSAM20-FULD, PDF23. 367 cases; annual breakdown of final denominators after 17 dispositions not indicated.

Category	2016	2017	2018
Interview	76%	61%	64%
Contact	8%	9%	10%
Both	16%	30%	26%

Table 3.1

PSAM20-FULD,PDF24. The original note calls 294/88 complaint cases; methodology and total show decision occurrences under specific statutory provisions,15 dual cases. No union of individuals.

Category	2016 number	2016 pct	2017 number	2017 pct	2018 number	2018%	Total
§ 71 (3)	89	82%	94	75%	111	75%	294
All decisions	108	100%	126	100%	148	100%	382

Table 4.1

PSAM20-FULD, PDF34. The original note calls 294/88 appeal cases; methodology and total show provision-specific decision entries, 15 double cases. No union of people.

Category	2016 number	2016 pct	2017 number	2017 pct	2018 number	2018%	Total
§ 71 (4)	19	18%	32	25%	37	25%	88
All decisions	108	100%	126	100%	148	100%	382

Figure 3.1

PSAM20-FULD,PDF27. 294 subsection 3 entries, including § 71 subsection 2 read with subsection 3; the same 15 double cases.

Category	2016	2017	2018
Interview	78%	63%	68%
Contact	9%	7%	9%
Both	13%	30%	23%

Figure 3.2

PSAM20-FULD, PDF29. 294 paragraph 3. Interview / contact may have different periods; no raw number of period observations. Prosa says 2016 both 8% and 1%; the graph marks 1% as 2018. 2016 / 17 rounding sums 101%.

Category	2016	2017	2018
1 -6 months	31%	34%	41%
7-12 months	48%	46%	43%
13-24 months	14%	14%	15%
25 months +	8%	7%	1%

Figure 4.1

PSAM20-FULD, PDF37. 88 subsection 4 decision instances; 15 dual cases as above.

Category	2016	2017	2018
Interview	68%	53%	51%
Contact	0%	13%	11%
Both	32%	34%	38%

Figure 4.2

PSAM20-FULD, PDF39. 88 paragraph 4. Periods may be different for contact / interaction. Fixed period, not recorded actual time for reunification.

Category	2016	2017	2018
1 -6 months	76%	30%	51%
7-12 months	16%	51%	41%
13-24 months	8%	7%	8%
25 months +	0%	12%	0%

Figure 5.1

PSAM20-FULD, PDF44. 367 cases; more relationships per case. The last graphic label of the original appears 99% at short column, not addressed to 9% without raw data. The height of the graph is not used as exact numbers.

Category	2016	2017	2018
Mom.	70%	69%	63%
Dad.	53%	57%	53%

Category	2016	2017	2018
Siblings	7%	5%	5%
Grandparents	8%	17%	11%
Former foster family	0%	0%	1%
Other network	7%	10%	99% [printed]

Figure 5.2

PSAM20-FULD, PDF45. Note provides 367 complaints; paragraph columns may not easily use a deduced person population. More relationships per case.

Relationship	Paragraph 3	Paragraph 4
Mom.	70%	58%
Dad.	47%	80%
Siblings	6%	6%
Grandparents	14%	6%
Former foster family	0%	0%
Other network	10%	8%

Figure 5.3

PSAM20-FULD, PDF46. Relationship denominators 245 / 199 / 20 / 44 / 1 explicitly published. Overlapping relationships and complainants; not 509 unique persons and not 509 new complaints.

Disrupted relation	Mom's complaining.	Father complains	Child complaints	Original number Decisions with the relationship;
Mom.	96%	42%	3%	245
Dad.	61%	90%	3%	199
Siblings	95%	70%	5%	20
Grandparents	86%	48%	7%	44
Former foster family	0%	0%	100%	1

Table 6.1

PSAM20-FULD, PDF48. 95% confidence / 5% uncertainty indicated before 17 dispositions. Registration may also include adult responsibility control; § 71 piece not routinely registered before the investigation.

Category	2016	2017	2018	Total
ASComplaints	151	193	235	579
Selected sample	109	129	146	384

Annex Figure 1

PSAM20-FULD, PDF53. Note 367 cases; raw counters and year-split denominators not published. 2016Change country is visually 1%, earlier extract 0% wrong. Unmarked 2017 category is not derived as exact 0. The change is the rate of access PDF52.

Year	Stated	Changed period	Other amended	Repealed
2016	73%	15%	1%	12%
2017	86%	5%	[no printed label]	9%
2018	83%	8%	1%	8%

Annex Figure 2

PSAM20-FULD, PDF54. Note 367 cases, paragraph division contains 382 cases. Both sums 101% rounded; no exact counters are reconstructed.

Destination	Stated	Changed period	Other amended	Repealed
Paragraph 3	80%	10%	1%	10%
Paragraph 4	86%	7%	0%	8%

Annex Figure 3

PSAM20-FULD, PDF55. Note 367 cases; precise counters not specified; not all locations nationally.

Year	Anonymised yes	No.
2016	8%	92%
2017	9%	91%
2018	9%	91%

Kohortbro

PSAM20-FULD, PDF48. Partial quantities / overlap, not summery as new control cohorts. End-year denominators not given.

Population	Number
Pre-sorting sample	384
Monitor out	10
Controlled contact out	3
Both controlled forms out	4
Total deleted	17
Completed	367
Decision occurrences	382
Cases involving both provisions	15
Paragraph 3 entries	294
Paragraph 4 entries	88

Population	Number
Figure 2.2 included	331
Figure 2.2 omitted [367 − 331, own calculation]	36

Interview and explicit additional figures

PSAM20-FULD, PDF5 / 17 / 45 / 49-51. Local interview figures and background; not national error targets. Employees elected by their own leaders; quotes sent to them in consultation.

Measurement	Figures
Interview municipalities	4
Interviews with staff	14
Case handlers	5
Lawyers	5
Specialist coordinators	4
Municipality criterion: complaints	>10 in 2016-18
Interview selection by municipality	1-2
Interview selection professional coordinators per municipality	Up to 2
Interview selection lawyers per municipality	1-2
Local increase in BUU recommendations, legal officer’s statement	63% over 5 years
Mom complains 2018 sidebar	74%
ASK increase 2016-18	84
Amendment of the ASM	12% → 15%, 3 percentage points

All concrete interview tracks with evidence definition

Track	PDF	Own paraphrase of statements	Meaning of proof and necessary checks
Int 01	21	The case manager reports on past relationships / negotiations rather than several formal decisions after legal upgrading.	Documented self-description of practice, not full case control. Requires initial agreements / competence / concrete consent for legal review.
Int 02	25	A child's relationship with mother was reduced from monthly to every three months, according to the opinion of the case worker, due to prolonged reactions.	Three months of interval is not three months of complete contact. The child's record, description and decision not published; no independently established infringement.
Int 03	26	Trade coordinator describes girl with anxiety / crying after mother's presence and refers to mother as mentally ill.	Authority statements; no medical original diagnosis checked. Both the child's reaction and causal explanation require primary proof.
Int 04	26	The trade coordinator describes interruption although the child had not already seen mother for 6 months, in order to remove uncertainty about attendance.	In fact, the absence of meetings prior to the formal decision following statements; no date / explanation for each extension of the default .6 months is not further counted in an unknown decision period.
Int 05	30-31	Lawyers describe 6 months of repetitive interruptions, with possible transition to 1 year, shorter periods of documentation failure and young children, where the relationship can only be maintained through contact.	The practice described by the Authority shows even the loss of relationships of time. No measured actual cumulative separation; requires first break, each extension and actual restoration.
Int 06	31-32	Lawyer describes young people who want a normal foster family life, although there is no strong concrete justification in health / development and parents do not harm the child.	The statement documents a problem of legal reasoning, not that all such interventions were unlawful. The child's wishes must be examined together with the actual condition for legal authority and proportionality.
Int 07	32-33	The child's various statements to parents, foster families and carers are called possible loyalty conflict.	Initial statements and interview terms are not reproduced; official interpretation must not automatically replace the child's own explanation.
Int 08	35	Legal indicates ranges from final judgment against the relevant person to loose accusation from mother against father / grandfather without substantiation or notification.	Necessary separation of judgment, charge, notification, suspicion and proof. Not all 88 paragraph 4 decisions actually document abuse.
Int 09	36	Case handler describes two children without contact with father for several years; AS set the last interruption period to 2 years.	Two children in one statement, no published case ID or delupply bridge to 367.2 years is a last-specified period, not the entire actual separation. Repair not enlightened.
Int 10	37-38	Lawyer describes acute placement + anonymization + interrupted contact / contact before full information, then dialogue with police / orphanage / parents.	A cumulative chain of interventions and missing information at the starting point appear as statements about practice. Original chairperson decision and all subsidiarity assessments required.
Int 11	38	Legal describes the hearing of the parties at the same time as parents are initially supposed to be given limited information for the purposes of notification.	Specific risk of an ineffective opportunity to challenge the material; the legal basis for each restriction of information must be documented, not assumed lawful from the quotation.
Int 12	38-39	The case manager describes mother's Messenger behavior and the requirement of a teacher in contact; another describes monitoring as practically impossible.	The first is the condition of control and accusation, not necessarily full termination of contact. Access / contact instructions and actual messages are required for testing.
Int 13	40	Legal officer describes 3-4 months before the requested child welfare assessment in an urgent unfamiliar case; the contact period follows.	Planned information period has not been documented actual implementation time, nor automatically legal deadline.
Int 14	41-42	Employees describe action only on presumption and continued presumption following waiver; report refers to 63-16 / 42- 18.	Absence of charges proves neither abuse nor automatic abuse. The Authority shall provide a concrete basis for the current presumption and for each continued action; general belief in children is not original proof.

Track	PDF	Own paraphrase of statements	Meaning of proof and necessary checks
Int 15	43/46	One relation to former foster family is interrupted; the child 12 + complained. Siblings / grandparents / foster parents are not included in the report's scheme.	The relationship blindness of the complaining population; one relation is not one new family independent of the cohort. No Union of direct / indirect affected.

Documented source deviations and real residues

2016 in Annex Figure 1 has a printed 1% share changed; earlier 0% was wrong and is corrected here. 2017 has not printed a label for the same category; an exact zero value is not derived from the missing label. In Figure 5.1, 2018Second Network stands 99% on a short column; the printed label is maintained and requires correction sheet or raw data. Figure 3.2 shows 25 months share 1% in 2018, while prosaPDF29 repeats 2016. No hidden harmonisations are introduced.

The necessary documents are analysis forms with annual distribution after 17 dispositions, precise counters, initial action decisions and the simultaneous evidence behind the interviews. In addition, there are dates for actual resumption of contact and concrete support measures. A confirmation outage is recorded as ASoutage and cannot only document the truth of all initial statements of authority.

5. Employment, Supplies and Pensions

Checked on 7. October 2026. The historical headline figures below are entry points to the newer full modules. The 2015 study of assessment of young people has now actually been read across all 86 pages, with 34 data blocks, 162 numerical rows and 20 identified case sequences; the 2015 sickness-benefit reassessment study across all 133 pages, with 25 data blocks, 186 numerical rows and 24 identified sequences. These are the same 102 and 125 decisions as below. Conflicting original denominators are retained; review assessments are not in themselves actual reopening or payment. See praksis-ungevisitation2015-fulde-tabeller-og-borgerforloeb.md and praksis-sygedagpengerevurdering2015-fulde-tabeller-og-borgerforloeb.md.

Report	n / kom munes	Correct headu falls	Wrong headu falls	Selection and exclusion	Original and locator
Sick day ge, review 2015	125/13	86	39	130 according to adjusted criteria; 5 out. First 123: 38 out, after change of criterion only 14 out; 21 supplementary is requested. Appeal and forwarded excluded; municipal revaluations allowed	report, printed 32-34,70-73,117-124
Young people under 30, visitation 2015	102/12	85	17	120 requested, 112 received, 10 out. First request after 1 January 2014; referral before 1 June 2014. Appeal on the basis of benefit excluded; municipal change allowed	report, printed 3-4; Annex 1 and letter of invitation 74- 75
Early Childhood 2015	78/10	62	16	80 received, 2 final 49 awards and 29 refusals. Communications with numerous refusals on this basis were selected on 1 October 2013- 1 April 2014. Appeal and forwarded excluded; municipal change allowed	report, printed 2-3,46-47,54-55
Fåtimerfleksej ob 2016	130/13	88	42	Only awards; all 130 received. Actual decisions 11 May 2013- 16 June 2015. Local authorities selected according to relevant case volume, size / geography. Appeal and forwarded excluded; municipal change allowed	report, printed 2-4,62-66,72-76
Pension without rehabili teringteam 2019	100/10	96	4	36 refusal, 44 obvious awards, 20 terminal awards. Not indicted Ankestyrelsen. Separate questionnaire 97 / 98 municipalities. Main report and methodological annexes now fully checked: 41 + 27 pages; see practice -pensions without 2019 -full -tables -and -citizens f orloeb.md	report, physical PDF6-9 and footnote 1

Registered error types

Measurement	Counter / relevant denominator	Locator
Sickness benefit 2015: essential medical information missing	26 / 125; current medical information missing in 22 / 26	printed 32-34,
Sickness benefit 2015: search / review not complied with	15/125	printed 56
Sickness benefit 2015: follow-up not complied with	10/125	printed 57
Sickness benefit 2015: § 7a assessment later than two weeks before cessation	29/125	printed 58
Sickness benefit 2015: § 7 a citizen involvement late; completely missing	23/125;26/125	printed 58
Young 2015: material information missing	10/102	printed 25
Young 2015: motivation / professionalism / social conditions / health not involved	9/102;9/102;12/102;14/102	printed 28-30,
Young 2015: first conversation for late; total conversation illegal	25/102;52/102	printed 31-32,
Young 2015: first stage missing / second stage not registered	42 / 102; 70 / 102. The general legality of the second stage has not been tested; individual exemption may occur.	printed 33- 34; UNGE15-FULL PDF35-36
Pension 2015: material case information missing in awards	16/49	printed 13
Pension 2015: preparatory plan / medical assessment / team statement insufficient	8/49;3/44;5/47	printed 24,28,33
Fleks 2016: material case information missing	36/130	printed 29
Fleks 2016: wrong target group flekjob / fåtimerflekjob	37/130;51/130	printed 70-71 municipal tables
Fleks 2016: Development potential not assessed by the municipality	88/130	printed 39
Fleks 2016: plan / team justification insufficient	7/130;9/130	printed 50-57,
Pension 2019: Young people's award delayed after the 18th anniversary	6/14	physical PDF9
Pension 2019: terminal medical consultant improperly involved	1/20	physical PDF9

The figures in each error group may overlap. A correct main outcome does not mean the absence of all procedural errors either. The 2019 pension study includes two refusals that should have been remitted and two awards using the wrong exemption provision; the total of 4 is a sum of adverse study assessments with different legal consequences. The report documents one young person who received a pension almost four years after their 18th birthday. It may be used as a specific observation of delay, rather than a national average waiting time.

Specific remaining checks

Pension 2015 is now fully checked in PEN15F: all 65 physical pages and all tables/annexes, with visual checking of the ambiguous cells. “Wishes” 49 yes+2 no/N49 is an actual discrepancy in the original; the 44 in the medical review has been reconciled as 49 minus four obvious § 12 cases minus case 78 on the existing basis. T1.3=36/5/8 contradicts T3.4=37/4/8 for the same 49 plans; both are retained. The previous image/medical-denominator problem has therefore been specifically resolved. See the full module’s precise case and time chains. Pension 2019 has now been fully examined with its separate methodology annex: all 41+27 pages, 13 numerical blocks and 98 rows in praksis-pensionuden2019-fulde-tabeller-og-borgerforloeb.md/.json. The five surveys discussed here were subsequently completed in the separate modules on reassessment 2015, youth classification 2015, pension 2015, few hours 2016 and pension without team submission 2019. This closes the known outstanding subtable/annex material; it does not certify a complete national inventory or actual individual redress.

Pension 2015: all tables, medical certificates, selection and citizen's programme

PEN15F includes an actual RAM reading of all 65 physical pages including all annexes. Eight pages of ambiguous numbers, all municipal cells and demographigraphs are also visually controlled; no public original stored locally. Physical PDF page is printed page number + 2. The same 78 cases as the main series, not 78 new; 14 specific case numbers that are only deduced within the original.

Main findings and concrete significance of the demarcation

All 16 hypothetical changes / remittals for reconsideration concern **awards;**, not proven wrongful refusal. All 29 refusals on the present basis were judged materially correct by the Board, while the same refusal group had three flawed plans, three incorrect complaint guides and 25 only partially correct complaint guides. The correct figure cannot therefore be rewritten into 29 error-free proceedings. The 16 awards were criticised for insufficient information; this does not prove that citizens actually had an opportunity to improve, that they were not ill or that a pension was actually deprived.

Ten municipalities were selected because they had the most refusals on the existing basis in the 4th quarter of 2013/1st quarter of 2014, ensuring enough cases that had not been appealed. 80 were submitted, two were excluded under the criteria, 78 were analysed, 49 awards and 29 refusals (PDF48-49/55-57). **Cases appealed and forwarded were excluded; cases reconsidered and amended without forwarding could be included** (PDF56). This is not a national random-sample error rate, and refusals already appealed are absent from the sample.

The request states that subsequent collection of records cannot be expected (PDF55). The methodology annex documents actual subsequent collection of forgotten records from nine of ten municipalities (PDF49). Both statements are retained: the published assessments follow completion of the records, while the number of affected cases and before/after changes are not reported. The request’s expected reporting in quarter 4 of 2014 is kept separate from the actual consultation on 20 February 2015 and public report in April 2015.

The review of plans is expressly a **purely formal check of whether information already available has been included**, not a full independent examination of the truth of each piece of information. Where information was elsewhere, the agency assumed that the team knew the complete material (PDF6/25-26). This assumption cannot replace documentation of actual presentation, receipt and consideration. The reasons for the team's recommendation were not examined under chapter 6 of the Administrative Procedure Act, because the agency treated it as a procedural step; the 29 refusals did not receive this examination of the reasons for the recommendation at all (PDF9/35/42). This must not be concealed by the overarching term review of legality.

The assessment form’s questions on hearing the parties, 5.4,and citizen involvement/team participation, 2.4.2/2.8,have no complete public results table (PDF59/61/65). A question in the form does not prove a count of safeguards met. The report’s legal references to executive orders of June/December 2014 must be version-checked against decisions from October 2013-April 2014 before making specific legal demands; a later account alone does not make later rules apply retrospectively.

All numbered tables and exact published demographics

Repeatations of the same judgment are for the purposes of voting, but are not included as additional cases. Unlabelled columns have not been found in integer cells. Printed figures / percentages are retained even where they cannot be matched mathematically.

T1.1 - Overall accuracy, both decision types (PDF5)

Rating	Attribute Number	Attribute%	Refusal Number	Refusal%	Total	Total%
Right	33	67	29	100	62	80
Amendment/remittal	16	33	0	0	16	20
Total	49	100	29	100	78	100

T1.2 - Both types of case (PDF5)

Information	Attribute Number	Attribute%	Refusal Number	Refusal%
No missing	27	55	29	100
Minor deficiencies	6	12	0	0
Essential deficiencies	16	33	0	0
Total	49	100	29	100

T1.3 - Plan; the summary version differs from T3.4 (PDF7)

Rating	Attribute Number	Attribute%	Refusal Number	Refusal%
Very much	36	74	23	80
To some extent	5	10	3	10
No	8	16	3	10
Total	49	100	29	100

T1.4 - LE265; same as T3.6 (PDF8)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	36	82
To some extent	5	11
No	3	7
Total	44	100

T1.5 - Team Statement; same as T3.11 (PDF8)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	35	74
To some extent	7	15
No	5	11
Total	47	100

T3.1 - Accuracy of award (PDF14)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Right	33	67
Amendment/remittal	16	33
Total	49	100

T3.2 - Information in awards (PDF15)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
No missing	27	55
Minor deficiencies	6	12
Essential deficiencies	16	33
Total	49	100

T3.3 - Assessment of law by the municipality (PDF17)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	28	57
To some extent	5	10
No	16	33
Total	49	100

T3.4 - Plan; main chapter version (PDF26)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	37	76
To some extent	4	8
No	8	16
Total	49	100

T3.5 - The eight content stages of the plan; wishes 49 + 2 contradicts N49 (PDF27)

Search	Yeah.	No.	Printed N
Employment / training	49	0	49
Personal resources / family / network	48	1	49
Employment / social barriers	48	1	49
Wants for the future	49	2	49
Health	43	6	49
The impact of health on jobs / education	45	4	49
Absence History	48	1	49
The municipality's offer to date	47	2	49

T3.6 - LE265; 44 of 49 tested (PDF30)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	36	82
To some extent	5	11
No	3	7
Total	44	100

T3.7 - The four levels of contents of the physician (PDF30)

Search	Yeah.	No.	N
Relevant health	40	4	44
Specific considerations	41	3	44
Citizens' perspective	42	2	44
Other factors	41	3	44

T3.8 - Simplified assessment; 20 positive registrations in 19 cases (PDF33)

Rule	Yeah.	No.	N
§ 12	17	32	49
§ 13	3	46	49

T3.9 - Paragraph 12 without LEA265; should the certificate have been obtained? (PDF33)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	0	0
No	4	100
Total	4	100

T3.10 - Paragraph 12 with LÆ265; was the certificate necessary? (PDF34)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	9	69
No	4	31
Total	13	100

T3.11 - Team Statement (PDF35)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	35	74
To some extent	7	15
No	5	11
Total	47	100

T3.12 - Two parts of reasoning; the same five negative (PDF35)

Search	Yeah.	No.	N
Variable / substantial reduction	42	5	47
No self-support despite support	42	5	47

T4.1 - Refusal on the available basis (PDF39)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Right	29	100
Amendment/remittal	0	0
Total	29	100

T4.2 - Refusal information (PDF39)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
No missing	29	100
Minor deficiencies	0	0
Essential deficiencies	0	0
Total	29	100

T4.3 - Rejection assessment (PDF40)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	29	100
To some extent	0	0
No	0	0
Total	29	100

T4.4 - Rejection plan (PDF42)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	23	80
To some extent	3	10
No	3	10
Total	29	100

T4.5 - Refusal content of the plan (PDF43)

Search	Yeah.	No.	N
Employment / training	28	1	29
Personal resources / family / network	28	1	29
Employment / social barriers	28	1	29
Wants for the future	29	0	29
Health	26	3	29
The impact of health on jobs / education	28	1	29
Absence History	27	2	29
The municipality's offer to date	28	1	29

T4.6 - Form of the decision, refusal alone (PDF44)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Written decision	29	100
Journalnotate	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	29	100

T4.7 - Reason for refusal only (PDF44)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	21	72
To some extent	8	28
No	0	0
Total	29	100

T4.8 - Complaint guidance; printed 87% maintained (PDF44)

Rating	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	1	3
To some extent	25	87
No	3	10
Total	29	100

Annex 3 / T1 - All municipalities; same 78 decisions (PDF53)

Municipality	Right	Amendment/remittal	N
Copenhagen	5	2	7
Helsingør	7	1	8
Holbæk	6	2	8
Slaughter	6	2	8
Medium speed	7	1	8
Odense	6	2	8
Vejle	7	0	7
Randers	7	1	8
Aarhus	7	1	8
Aalborg	4	4	8
Total	62	16	78

Annex 3 / T2 - Information for all municipalities (PDF53)

Municipality	No missing	Minor deficiencies	Essential deficiencies	N
Copenhagen	5	0	2	7
Helsingør	6	1	1	8
Holbæk	6	0	2	8
Slaughter	6	0	2	8
Medium speed	6	1	1	8
Odense	6	0	2	8
Vejle	6	1	0	7
Randers	6	1	1	8
Aarhus	6	1	1	8
Aalborg	3	1	4	8
Total	56	6	16	78

Annex 1 / graphs 1-3 - Demography; three unlabelled graphs, exact accompanying figures only (PDF50-51)

Published information	Figures	Limitation
Male	45	78 cases; 58%
Women	33	78 cases; 42%
Refusal 40 +	73	Printed percentage; boundary 40 in text, 40 + on axis
Refusal under 30	0	No one gives up on the text.
Refusal 30-39	27	Printed percentage
Award under 40	12	Printed percentage
Award 40 +	88	Printed percentage
Authorization 50-59	37	Printed percentage
Attributes	52	Printed percentage; no unique integer cell can be derived from 49
Awarded women	48	Printed percentage
Rejectors	two thirds,	Prose of the original, not exact integer cell
Refusal women	one third	Prose of the original

SUP1 - Selection, acts and knowledge (PDF3 / 48-49 / 55-57)

Search	Number / date	Meaning
Municipalities	10	Local authorities with most available base refusal 4th quarter 2013 / 1st quarter 2014
Requested and received	80	50 awards + 30 refusals
Deleted	2	Criteria not met; one from each decision type
Analyzed	78	49 awards + 29 refusals
Municipalities with missing acts	9	After retrieval from all nine, the number of cases concerned not published
Period of decision	1 October 2013-1 April 2014	Latest decisions first
Time limit for submission	30 June 2014	Call letter
Expected reporting	4st quarter 2014	Plan
Actual consultation for municipalities	20 February 2015	Preliminary report and individual measurement forms

Voting and the specific deviations of the original

T1.3 has 36 / 5 / 8, while T3.4 has 37 / 4 / 8 for the same 49 planes; both versions are visually seen. The 41 accepted / eight deficient are similar, but the degree distribution is different. The T3.5 wisher- row has 49 yes + 2 no with printN49; it is visually verified and preserved without tacit correction. T4.8 presses 25 / 29 as 87%; own fraction is 86,21%, and ordinary integer rounding would be 86. The original 87 is preserved as a number deviation, not as an additional citizen.

The LÆ265denominator 44 has been fully settled: 49 minus four obvious § 12 cases minus Case 78 on the basis of the case (PDF7 / 29-30). The previous possible gap 49 − 4 − 44 is thus explained by one specific exception case and is not a currently missing figure. 17 § 12 and 3 § 13 provide 20 positive registrations in 19 different cases due to one double count, explicitly indicated in T3.8. T3.12 s twice five negative are the same five team justifications.

The demographies PDF50-51 have been viewed visually, but column cells are not printed with exact values. Prosaen 52% men / 48% women among 49 awards cannot be translated into unique integers by regular rounding. The published 45 men / 33 women and 78 in total are preserved; they do not solve all type / age tables. A national personal connection and a register of actual loss of benefits have not been published in this study.

Specific case, health and family codes

The reproduction by the competent authority of a medical opinion shall be marked as reproduction; the full original of the medical opinion has not been published here. This is particularly true of the conclusions where the board replaces a professional forecast / risk statement with an opportunity for further clarification. The cases should be read as below, not as automatically verified medical truths.

Case mold	Physical PDF Page	The reproduction process of the original	Deviation, consistency and requirements for evidence
54	15-16	47-year-old woman, substance abuse since 16, drug-free since 2008, pain, neck/knee conditions and carpal tunnel operations. One month of work assessment in a kitchen, 2-2½ hours daily, exhaustion after 1-1½ hours.	AS: tasks did not meet the needs of the spare; further clarification. Possible higher workability is a management ending, not documented actual improvement.
44	16-17/27-28	38-year-old mother alone with five children; PTSD, anxiety and chronic pain. Trauma rehabilitation centre states chronic condition, exhausted options, risk from even the slightest treatment/assessment/clarification.	AS requires psychiatric special examination and more functional / ancillary description. The recommendation of the Management Board does not have a published independent clinical justification which clarifies the Centre's specific deterioration risk. Demand original statement, risk assessment, concrete necessity / proportionality and actual help for mother / children. Five children, not five new housing cases.
78	17-18/30	47-year-old man with anxiety / depression since youth, suspected schizophrenia 1998, diagnosed 2012, recent work 2001, effectively without stable psychiatric treatment 1998-2013. Depot medicine March 2013, accommodation; two psychiatrist disagreements, health coordinator indicates chronology and lack of opportunity.	AS: insufficient assessment, a resource programme proposed. A documented disagreement over treatment is not independent evidence of a realistic, sound prospect of development. Case 78 is precisely the fifth omitted LÆ265 assessment; no additional denominator gap.
20	19-21	55-year-old machine worker with 30 years of work, heart condition in 1995,severe shoulder injury in 2012. Cardiologist on 17 May 2013 states POSSIBLE improvement with treatment. Team 8 August; refusal 21 November 2013. Psychiatrist on 4 September says no mental illness/indication for treatment. Assessment 16 September-4 October and work placement 4 November-16 December, eight absences out of 14,30-45 minutes on the other days. Team 20 February 2014: pension; coordinator: no further medical measures.	The AS uses previously possible treatment and the motivation interpretation of the internship to criticise the award. Non-cooperation is the statement of the internship, not independently verified intent, and pain / medicine / IT deficiency should not be rewritten into it. The statement of the grounds for refusal 21 November on the lack of employment initiatives is the subject of the report's already dated September / October courses and on-going November practice. Require original decision / action list to clarify the discrepancy.
6	21-22/31	46-year-old mother had cared for her brain-injured son since he was five months old, round-the-clock assistance; brief employment when son aged 3-4. Son placed outside the home at age 15 in summer 2010, mother on sick leave from 5 August 2010. Resource programme in summer 2013, private psychology/psychiatry October 2013-January 2014, discontinued following deterioration. Clinic on 29 January 2014 describes risk from further measures.	Pension accepted. READ 265 from 24 May 2013 not updated; AS bases accuracy on other acts. The reported deterioration during the course and the clinic's risk assessment must be shown as real citizen consistency; full original clinic act is missing for independent causality / compensation testing. The son is actually described, but the original does not test the legality of the placement or the time of return.
72	22-24	18-year-old woman with significant intellectual impairment; STU and foster family, day-to-day needs. Neuropsychology 21 December 2013 at 17 years 10 months / IQ52, several levels of development are reproduced. The municipality starts retirement proceedings one month before the age of 18 and grants from the age of 18.	AS accepts obvious futility by reclarification; actual date of effect not bank date. Development ages are the reproduced professional description, not an independent basis for depriving legal capacity.
22	24-25/33	37-year-old male, lung cancer December 2013 with back metastases and terminal same month, COPD / abuse. Life-prolonging chemo and pain cover.	Pension and lenient plan accepted; life-long treatment is not documented work development. No precise terminal date / pension / payment date for day count.

Case mold	Physical PDF Page	The reproduction process of the original	Deviation, consistency and requirements for evidence
12	28/30-31	52-year-old male, accidents at work 2002 / 2004, schizophrenia diagnosis March 2012, treatment stabilized; municipal team 28 August 2013, start of the retirement case subsequently cancelled. New psychiatric status, new team January 28, 2014 without updated plan / LE265.	AS criticises both the basis and the timeliness. Five months between meetings document pre-term, not automatically five months of unlawful refusal or non-performance. CTfinding with evidence of previous blood clots should be explicitly reproduced without described damage; do not sharpen to proven brain damage.
47	29/31	46-year-old male in the nursing center with help for all everyday tasks except hygiene, alcohol-related cirrhosis, MISTANKE about alcohol dementia. Cognitive information is missing from plan / LE265 but according to AS is found in other documents.	Pension accepted following an assessment of materiality. The suspicion must remain a suspicion. Assumed team knowledge based on other documents is not proved actual review without meeting/presentation material.
31	36	17-year-old man with Down syndrome, special school / STU, significant support / communication needs; pension from 18 years without team. The municipality recognises general practice of direct pension boards in obvious cases and later indicates correction.	Safeguard rule breached; AS considers the specific deficiency to have no effect on the outcome. The municipality's reported correction of its routine is not a fully dated follow-up verification account. No published count of other individuals affected by the acknowledged practice.
48	36-38	59-year-old male, cancer surgery 2009,14 cm oesophagus / one third stomach / rib removed and lung punctured; later declared healthy. Flekbob, terminated two years later; team rejection but municipality awarded pension without re-submission.	AS: significant information gap and retransmission errors. Declared healthy after cancer treatment does not prove discontinued functional impairment after surgery. The doctor's statement that few hours of flex job cannot be ruled out is not proof of actually sustainable self-support.
1	40	63-year-old woman, teacher 1969-2012, disability pension, pain and two non-operable aneurysms. Represents as non-desirable job offers.	AS accepts refusal on the available basis. It is an assessment of the available material, not independent medical evidence that offers are sound or realistic.
34	40-41	29-year-old father with three children, special child with father; financial pressure and foreclosure. Chronic pain after a traffic accident, antidepressants, dyslexia / bullying; electrical training is lacking about half a year, dismissed after illness. Trainees as driver / janitor / warehouse.	AS accepts refusal and examination of resource trajectories; team reproduces motivation. Physical training, centre for functional disorders and extended mentors are plan proposals, not actually delivered effect; three specifically mentioned children in one family.
58	41	44-year self-employed hairdresser with work since 1996 and parallel 18 hours postjob until fall February 2010. Flekjob since May 2012, pension application May 2013.	AS accepts refusal because deterioration is not documented. Absence of documented deterioration is not self-sufficient proof of sufficient effective capacity to work; full functional / flekscobakter necessary for concrete verification.

Case 44's five children, case 6's one son with a disability and case 34's three children are nine specific children described in three parental courses. This counts descriptions in three distinct local cases, not a person-deduplicated national nine-child total; only case 6 describes actual placement of the son. Cases 72/31 also concern the young people themselves in the transition to age 18,and case 72 mentions a foster family. They must not be added to the placement statistics as two new placements.

Case	Start information	Final disclosure	Own resources calendar days	What time actually measures
12	28 August 2013	28 January 2014	153	Two team meetings; no known illegality space
20	21 November 2013	20 February 2014	91	Refusal → team setting, not pension / bank date
6	24 May 2013	29 January 2014	250	LEV265 → later clinical evaluation
6	5 August 2010	29 January 2014	1273	Disease reporting → Clinical evaluation; not every day proven authority-induced damage

These ranges overlap with other descriptions in the same case. None of them may be used automatically as days without a pension, illegal placement or a failure to pay a bank. The clinical course October 2013- January 2014 does not have exact start / end dates; it is described in the published months, not as invented 90 days. Between the two

team meetings in case 12 went 153 days; a refusal / cancellation date and actual subsequent payment must be submitted to try financial intervention time.

Local authorities' knowledge, responsibilities and priority pleas

Copenhagen's political treatment 17 September 2015 describes seven local cases, five accepted and two criticised awards; the board maintained the criticism after the municipality's comments. The production indicates 62 / 78 as 79% and 16 / 78 as 21%, while the original T1.1 presses 80 / 20; both version rows must be retained. It promises quality initiatives implemented in Q3 2015 and early correction of complaint guidance. Decision without reconciliation and expected quality improvement proves knowledge / plan, not actually improved citizen outcomes or fully completed restoration.

Documented errors: the 16 substantive criticisms of the factual basis, deficiencies concerning plans/certificates/teams/appeal guidance with their precise denominators, failure to resubmit case 48, an acknowledged unlawful routine of no team submission in case 31’s municipality, and the visually verified numerical discrepancies. **Suspicions requiring primary evidence:** an unsound new assessment despite a risk of deterioration in case 44/6, an incorrect account of absent intervention in case 20, further citizens affected by the acknowledged routine, and specific non-payment/individual criminal liability. These hypotheses must not be counted as adjudicated crimes.

Strongest demands in order of priority: produce the original medical/employment/team material and examine whether each inference actually follows from it; require sound clarification supported by specific reasons and avoidance of health-damaging measures where the primary prognosis shows a risk and necessity is not documented; require a lawful, timely decision specifically addressing all support and income-maintenance options; require dated, correct effect/payment and consideration of documented loss. For each case, the authority's knowledge, act/omission, legal departure and consequence must be linked to the original record. Public attribution of responsibility must be distinguished from actual redress; a percentage for substantive correctness cannot determine the question of Convention duties towards the citizen and the children.

Pension 2006: all results tables, citizens' programmes and authorities knowledge

PEN06F is a full RAM reading of all 59 physical pages, including the rules, principles and measurement tables. Eight pages of dense / tabular error-proof original numbers are also visually controlled. Physical and printed page numbers are the same on the main text. No official original is stored locally. It is the same 147 awards as the previous main series, not 147 new cases; 15 numbered cases, one unnumbered terminal citizen case and 23 historical summary of principles are kept separate.

Time, selection and concrete limitation of accuracy

Fifteen municipalities were asked for ten awards each; 150 called, three out on theme, 147 were analysed. The most recent decisions were taken before 1 December 2005. **This has been public knowledge published July 2006 on decisions before the main period of the report;**, not a number of new 2006 decisions. (PDF38); this wording must not be treated in the same way as the exclusion of any subsequent investigation of complaints already submitted.

The municipalities were Copenhagen, Odense, Aarhus, Aalborg, Greve, Nykøbing Falster, Helsingør, Køge, Roskilde, Næstved, Esbjerg, Horsens, Holbæk, Slagelse and Svendborg. The original does not publish a fully distributed local results sheet. The 15 municipal names and the desired ten per municipality must not be used to invent where the three abandoned were.

The investigation shall cover only awards, not refusals. Thus, the 34 criticised awards are not 34 documented illegallyrefused pensions.30 had significant / decisive information gaps, four sufficient information but materially incorrect outcomes. The Board could not change specific decisions of its own motion in this practice control (PDF7). It provides individual feedback but does not provide an actual correction / payment series.

The break in measurement in 2006 is expressly documented: the “in doubt” category is removed, and inadequate factual bases are moved to the overall incorrect/would be amended or remitted for reconsideration category (PDF9/38). Without consistent coding, an increasing error rate after this break cannot alone be interpreted as more decisions actually containing errors. Conversely, older doubtful cases must not be concealed as lawful cases in historical comparison.

All original tables and additional control figures

Each figure follows the denominator of the original; multiple crosses, subpopulations and column percentages are marked separately. All percentage deviations have been retained. Table number 3.3.10 is the original's own number, although it stands between 3.2.9 and 3.2.11.

T3.1.1 - Gender and main diagnosis; dash maintained (PDF10)

Diagnosis	Women	Women%	Male	Male%	Total	Total%
Medical	12	17	17	22	29	20
Reumatology	14	20	3	4	17	12
Orthopaedic	6	9	5	6	11	7
Neurological	11	16	21	27	32	22
Psychological	18	26	21	27	39	27
Social	-	-	1	1	1	1
Mixed	8	12	10	13	18	12
Total	69	47	78	53	147	100

T3.2.1 - Timeliness of case information; original percentage deviations maintained (PDF11)

Missing	Right	Real%	Wrong	Wrong%	Total	Total%
None	101	69	4	3	105	71
Single	12	8	0	0	12	7
More	0	0	23	16	23	17
Decisive	0	0	7	5	7	5
Total	113	77	34	23	147	100

T3.2.2 - Missing information types; multi-cross (PDF12)

Type	Several deficiencies	Decisive deficiencies	Total
Medical	11	4	15
Working test	15	5	20
Function	12	2	14
Other	3	0	3

T3.2.3 - Rightness after diagnosis; same 147 (PDF12)

Diagnosis	Right	Real%	Wrong	Wrong%	Total	Total%
Medical	25	86	4	14	29	100
Reumatology	9	53	8	47	17	100
Orthopaedic	8	73	3	27	11	100
Neurological	25	78	7	22	32	100
Psychological	32	82	7	18	39	100
Social	0	0	1	100	1	100
Mixed	14	78	4	22	18	100
Total	113	77	34	23	147	100

T3.2.4 - Documented permanent and substantially reduced working capacity (PDF13)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	92	63
To some extent	23	16
Very small	24	16
No	8	5
Total	147	100

T3.2.5 - Documentation against accuracy;% denominators vary by column (PDF13)

Grade	Right	Real%	Wrong	Wrong%	Total	Total%
Very much	92	81	0	0	92	63
To some extent	19	17	4	12	23	16
Very small	1	1	23	68	24	16
No	1	2	7	21	8	5
Total	113	100	34	100	147	100

T3.2.6 - Documented Working Test (PDF14)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	62	42
No	85	58
Total	147	100

T3.2.7 - No test; apparently no improvement option (PDF14)

Response	Number	Printed share of all 147
Yes	59	40
No	26	18
Total	85	58

T3.2.8 - Focus on development; version 1 (PDF15)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	88	60
To some extent	28	19
Very small	21	14
No	10	7
Total	147	100

T3.2.9 - Insufficient development focus; manifestly pointless? (PDF15)

Response	Number	Printed share of all 147
Yes	15	10
No	44	30
Total	59	40

T3.3.10 - Focus on accuracy; original number and version 2 (PDF16)

Grade	Right	Real%	Wrong	Wrong%	Total	Total%
Very much	88	78	0	0	88	60
To some extent	25	22	4	12	29	20
Very small	0	0	21	62	21	14
No	0	0	9	26	9	6
Total	113	100	34	100	147	100

T3.2.11 - All relevant measures tested (PDF16)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	69	47
To some extent	27	18
Very small	17	12
No	30	20
Not applicable	4	3
Total	147	100

T3.2.12 - Insufficient documentation of measures; pointless? (PDF17)

Response	Number	Printed share of all 147
Yes	37	25
No	41	28
Total	78	53

T3.3.1 - Validating resource profile; one without profile omitted (PDF17)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	93	64
To some extent	34	23
Very small	18	12
No	1	1
Total	146	100

T3.3.2 - Citizen dialog; same 146 profiles (PDF18)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	92	63
To some extent	39	27
Very small	12	8
No	3	2
Total	146	100

T3.3.3 - Offers for meetings with decision-makers (PDF18)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	99	67
No	6	4
Undisclosed	42	29
Total	147	100

T3.3.4 - Attendance; only 99 with offers (PDF19)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	9	9
No	36	36
Undisclosed	54	55
Total	99	100

T3.3.5 - Determined within three months of the start of the retirement (PDF19)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	128	87
No	9	6
Undisclosed	10	7
Total	147	100

T3.3.6 - Home is shown in the decision (PDF20)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	131	89
To some extent	13	9
Very small	0	0
No	3	2
Total	147	100

TSUP1 - Additional published control numbers (PDF5 / 14 / 19-20 / 30 / 32 / 35-38)

Search	Figures	Limitation
Adequate information, but materially incorrect	4	Included among 34
Multiple / essential deficiencies	30	Included among 34; 15 + 20 + 14 + 3 type cells overlaps
Individual adapted work test	52	Among 62 with testing; published alternative for other 10 not fully distributed
Cases dealt with	0	The findings of the Management Board in selected awards
Unnecessary measures found	0	The same concrete definition
Written decisions	143	97% of 147
Other form	4	3% of 147
Clear / intelligible	143	Same 147
Pretty clear.	2	Same 147
Unintelligible	2	Same 147
Profile and result same	147	Only awards; not automatic quality certificate
Future control decided	1	Case 003, unlawful control assessed
Deficient profiles	19	Same 18 + 1 in T3.3.1; all misjudged
Over three months	9	Notification / justification of extension not provided
No Profile	1	Terminal 64 year; concrete award accepted
Municipalities	15	ten cases requested from each
Called	150	Three out on theme: 147
Previous reform practice studies mentioned	6	Three pensions 2003 / 2004 / 2006, reval 2003, merud 2004, flex 2005; not six new 2006 cohorts

Deviations and limits of proof which the original's conclusions do not resolve

T3.2.8 has 88 / 28 / 21 / 10, while T3.3.10 has 88 / 29 / 21 / 9 for the same 147. Both versions are actually visually controlled and preserved; the change between someone's degree and no can not be corrected by guessing. The T3.2.1 assembly lines press 12 as 7% and 23 as 17%, although the specified denominators 147 give 8,16% and 15,65% .30 information gaps / 147 is 20,41%, while the summary / text refers to 21%. T3.2.5 presses one true case without documentation as 2% of 113; own fraction is 0,88%. These figures are source deviations, not further mishit citizens.

The summary at PDF4 states 27% lacking documentation of all relevant measures, while T3.2.12 has 41/147 and 28%; the own fraction of 27,89% supports the table’s rounding. The 59 pointless work trials in T3.2.7 and 37 pointless work trials in T3.2.12 involve different conditional questions and may overlap; not 96 people. The diagnosis percentages in 3.1.1 use the sex columns’ 69/78 as denominators in the type rows, while the total row’s 47/53 indicates the distribution of the full 147. The original’s footnote must be read against the cells, rather than as one uniform percentage population.

The original says that only nine of 99 offered a meeting attended; 54 are unspecified. There are therefore nine documented attendances, 36 known non-attendances and 54 unknown, not 90 documented refusals or instances of lack of interest. The agency’s own statement of limited interest cannot be established for the 54 without actual attendance evidence (PDF35).42 unspecified meeting offers are likewise not 42 documented lawful offers. Nine time-limit breaches have unspecified written extension notices, and ten have unspecified timeliness (PDF35); neither nine nor ten is a count of days without a pension.

The fact that the board did not find overtreatment / unnecessary measures applies to the selected, most recent, non-named awards. It does not document the absence of such errors in all refusals, complaints already made or the overall long-standing process of the citizen. The formal profile control is an overall assessment without separate verification of each profile element (PDF33); the original recognises that continuous citizen involvement was difficult to control (PDF34).

Concrete citizens' programme and consequences of the original

Local gsnummer no	Physical PDF Page	Publication	Evidence, concrete meaning and necessity requirements
011	22	37-year-old woman, a teacher retrained through vocational rehabilitation, depression/personality disorder and a mentally ill 15-year-old son.	AS considers less psychologically demanding work not excluded. It is a possible job ending, not documented actual support; one son and mother are concrete family contexts.
050	22-23	22-year-old male with brain damage, balance, fatigue, major speech-motor difficulties and complexity problems; stable / slow work test.	AS: lack of evidence that flekjob is unmanageable. Attendance / stability does not prove sufficient pay / work ability without performance, support and actual job base.
040	24-25	59-year-old clerk after a blood clot, reduced energy / initiative and defined cognitive problems. Short internship in new business interrupted; she was strongly emotionally influenced.	AS probably accepts the pension and calls the test appropriate. The emotional consequence is reproduced; precise duration / cause / subsequent support not provided.
042	25	47-year-old machine worker after small blood clots in the brain / brain stem, fatigue and oversight problems. A few hours on the past business could not be completed.	AS accepts adaptation and consideration. The employer's error / energy assessment is labelled as statements, not a free-standing diagnosis.
170	26	Women's tailor / housekeeper, Denmark from 1990, traffic accident 2003, chronic pain, dizziness / knee problems; pension only on a medical basis.	The AS requires work tests. The health / functional / risk basis must be verified before a specific new load; the absence of a test alone does not prove a sound improvement.
003	26-27/30	25-year-old woman after a stroke at the age of 5, learning problems, discontinued education; five short jobs and four traineeships. Neuropsychologist recommends pension with follow-up for home / home. Four-month clarification, 50% absence.	AS considers interests / hand functions insufficiently tested; only decided pension control is assessed illegally. Repeatations are one matter. Interest in the workshop / housing plan is not actually established support / housing.
030	27	54- year-old cleaning assistant after 22 years of work, severe osteoarthritis / pain. New clarification in the arcade with cleaning, interrupted after one day.	AS: the test did not respond precisely to cleaning-related pain. The concrete inappropriate task is documented criticism, not just administrative formality.
060	27-28	48-year-old health care provider with pain / migraine and referred to the trend of somatization, revalidated manual teacher two years earlier, with no job. The packaging / assembly test of the revalværket site concluded an prohibitive physical barrier.	AS: training / creative ability and possible deterioration not illuminated. Continuing training two years before is not in itself proof of the present capacity to work; the trend of sexist must not be tightened up to the absence of disease.
010	28-29	18-year-old man with Down syndrome and constant motor restlessness, assistance with all functions.	AS accepts pointless new clarification. No known bank date, no documented inclusion in the example.
172	29	51-year-old social / health assistant, severe lung disease with spread to the brain and extremely low function.	AS accepts special circumstances. The original does not provide precise action / payment dates.
029	30	37-year-old goldsmith with renal failure, imminent dialysis / transplantation, flex job abandoned.	AS says future resumption could be considered. It is a proposal, not an actual control decision or known retirement withdrawal.
058	33	20-year-old woman with delayed development, bothtraining and three-month baking practice. Psychologist's statement and positive practical statements are mentioned. The report assigns father support for addiction / weakness.	The description of the father’s influence is the authority’s causal interpretation, not independently verified evidence. Require the original psychologist/work-placement record before a family relationship is used for attitude adjustment or denial of a right.
065	33	52 years of age after stable work, depression, respiratory symptoms, sensory disturbances and possible small blood clots. Psychiatric specialist suggests possible alcohol-related brain damage.	The AS requires neurology / lung bases. Possible brain damage must not be rewritten as verified cause of injury; original statements are necessary.

Local gsnummer no	Physical PDF Page	Publication	Evidence, concrete meaning and necessity requirements
018	33	32-year old self-employed, schizophrenic diagnosis after one meeting, long-term therapist contact.	AS:one-sided factual basis, missing therapist assessment. Repetition of the medical narrative without contemporaneous treatment records cannot verify the conclusion about functioning.
089	34	60-year-old woman with stable / varied work history and new physical / mental genes.	AS: comprehensive profile, but concrete efforts in relation to resources not explained. Future improvement outcomes unknown.
No published number	32	64-year-old terminal citizen with oesophagus narrowing, no profile.	AS: formal guarantee deficiency with no concrete result. This is not proof that all profile errors are irrelevant; must not be assigned an invented case number.

Case 011 describes one mother and one 15-year-old son, case 058one father of a 20-year-old woman. These parent / child relationships cannot be deduced nationally. Boottraining in 058 has not been documented forced placement or separation from the hazard. In fact, neither case 003's possible home nor a future work function has been proven to be achieved. The original's main direct citizens' consequences are briefly interrupted unsuitable cleaning clarification, repeated job / internship breaks, emotional stress and health risks, with precise source levels for each.

All 23 historical summary of principles; separate knowledge chain

These courses concerning decisions on matters of principle are historical, from 2003-2005,and cannot be counted as 23 new cases from 2006. They were read in the published original's summaries, not presented as a full reading of the original records of those decisions. They show, among other things, already known invalidity due to profile/meeting/delegation-of-authority errors and the requirement for all relevant information rather than a later profile summary alone.

Principle	Physical PDF page	Own summary and concrete meaning
P-22-03	47	Young office graduates; AS does not accept the start of pension until relevant options are studied.
P-04-04	47	No profile; actually remittal for reconsideration back in historical cases.
P-7-04	47	58-year-old woman, refusal on the available basis; weakened concret- job requirements indicated.
P-8-04	47-48	Deficient profile concerning previous flex job/cessation; remittal for reconsideration.
P-11-04	48	65 years after 23 years of work until February 2002; AS considers testing to continue.
P-14-04	48-49	65- year weakened woman, end of October 2003 supports start; planned three-week introduction could not be implemented, remittal for reconsideration back.
P -15 -04	49	45-year existence of basic refusal; planned new internship has not actually been delivered.
P-21-04	49-50	Invalid: insufficient guidance, lack of a citizens' meeting, lack of previous fleksjobinformation; medical consultant exceeds the function of pension law assessment.
P-28-04	50	55-year-old male; flekjob / treatment justifies refusal according to AS.
P-29-04	50	Deviation from setting allowed; indication of the status of the setting required as good practice.
P-30-04	50	Failure to provide for meetings with decision-makers results in concrete nullity.
P-33-04	51	60-year-old man resident Norway, Norwegian pension; Danish refusal based on written profile / leisure resources.
P-35-04	51	Checks shall not be allowed on the basis of chronic pain syndrome alone.
P-36-04	51	The function of the profile's authority cannot be delegated; deficiency with nullity.
P-8-05	51-52	33-year-old wants pension since 1993, mental function problems and reproduced rejection of treatment; AS accepts refusal.

Principle	Physical PDF page	Own summary and concrete meaning
P-9-05	52	42-year-old woman, methadone since 1993, discontinued abuse; no attempt of actual self-support, AS accepts refusal.
P -12 -05	52-53	31 years after whips' silence, flexisitation April 2003; most recent clarification did not address competences / interests or previously documented limitations.
P-18-05	53	Healthy significantly aggravated after flekjob; AS requires specially adapted sample, actual help / result not specified.
P-19-05	53	The municipality AND board built on incomplete profile summaries; all relevant original facts had to be investigated.
P-20-05	54	Sporadic employment for 38 years; demand for clarification.
P-26-05	54	Control by May 2000 at the latest; right to the middle pension from 1 September 2000; ability to work about 2 / 3 reduced. Retroactive right, unknown bank date.
P-28-05	54	53years of short employment over 30 years; AS accepts refusal on the reproduced basis.
N-2-04	54	Specific work functions can be described as jobs or job activities.

P-26-05 is a specific historical redress track: a missed review due no later than May 2000 resulted in entitlement to the intermediate pension from 1 September 2000. A retroactive entitlement is not evidence of the day the money was actually paid. A precise complaint/redress duration cannot be calculated because the original review deadline, complaint date, AS decision and bank entry have not all been published here. The case is kept outside the report's new decisions for 2006-2025.

Documented errors, hypotheses and liability requirements

Documented errors: the negative sub-assessments, 19 defective profiles, 15 insufficient / undocumented dialogue, six missing meeting offers, nine exceedances of the three-month deadline, the illegal control in 003 and concrete unsuitable work tests in 030; their overlap shall be maintained. Undisclosed facts are separate, not proof of compliance with the obligation. **Hypotheses:** additional undisclosed guarantee / payment errors, harmful non-sample overclarification and individual criminal infringement. They require independent original documents and must not be counted as convicted acts.

Priorities:(1) documented duration, function and risk shall be tested in simultaneous primary acts before an administrative statement of possible improvement is used for further burdensome actions; (2) the municipal public-law information, dialogue and meeting guarantees shall be tested, including dates; (3) require legal decision, correct effect / payment and concrete treatment of loss / repair; (4) require the management's dated follow-up to individual feedback. The historic section 21 of the Pension Act starts with a formal transition to pension treatment, not automatically with the first sick leave. The entire pre-transition run must be measured separately so that technical compliance with time limits does not conceal the actual waiting time of the citizen.

The original's P-19-05 specifies that both municipality and board must address all relevant information, not only a summary in the profile. This rule is a direct document-verification standard for the report's criticism: where medical, family and work-placement information is reproduced, the authority's inference must not be given greater evidential weight than the original basis actually supports. The State's responsibility for protection and effective redress is a separate element; the original's lack of access to own-initiative alteration is not evidence of individual criminal immunity.

Flekjob 2006: full original control, all tables and citizens' programme

F06F. All 72 original pages of the readable Copenhagen annex version are actually reviewed in memory, including all 11 results tables, method, law extracts, practice summaries and blank measurement form. No official original is stored. PDF14 / 15 / 48 / 52 is visually controlled; in particular, the error-drawn table 3.3 is corrected to the image. The figures are the same 96 municipal and 45 Board decisions as previous main statement; this is an extension of documentation, not 141 additional errors.

What the verification covered and excluded

145 decisions are convened: 100 municipal and 45 committee decisions. Four municipal cases fall outside the theme, so 96 + 45 = 141 are investigated. 30 municipalities participate: five large with five cases and 25 others with three. The municipalities are Kø benhavn, Frederiksberg, Odense, Århus, Ålborg, Frederikssund, Helsingør, Køge, Gladsakser, Hvidovre, Ishøj, Allerød, Faru m, Greve, Helsinginge, Jægerprør, Ølkre, Næstved, Horsens, Kolding, Randers, Slagelse, Fredericia, Silkeborg, Fred erikshavn, Nakskov, Ikast, Struer, Hobro. A full municipal cell table of accuracy is not published for 96 cases. The five large are named in the method; not 30 municipal percentages are constructed.

Selection is of the most recent decisions before 1 April 2005, unemployment-benefit cases before 1 October 2004. Results were published in 2006, but the decisions precede the reporting period; they are counted as knowledge published in 2006 with their actual decision years. Decisions already appealed were not to be submitted, including board decisions already appealed to Ankestyrelsen. The total number of excluded appealed decisions is not published. The 45 board decisions are therefore not proof that the whole appeal population was examined.

PDF9 expressly states that the practice survey cannot amend lower-authority decisions on its own initiative, subject to a special rule in the child welfare area. PDF45-47 describes specific feedback and forward-looking guidance, but no complete register linkage to new decisions, jobs, pensions or compensation. A hypothetical assessment of invalidity in 44 municipal cases does not document actual restoration of 44 citizens' rights.

All 11 original result tables

Table 3.1, PDF13: Overall material assessment

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	52	54
No	44	46
Total	96	100

Table 3.2, PDF13: Flexible jobs rather than ordinary work

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	52	54
No	44	46
Total	96	100

Table 3.3, PDF14: Documented permanent and significant restriction

Category	Number	Percentage
None at all	7	7
Low degree	25	26
Some degree	39	41
High degree	25	26
Total	96	100

Table 3.4, PDF14: Relevant offers tested

Category	Number	Percentage
None at all	11	11
Low degree	23	24
Some degree	45	47
High degree	17	18
Total	96	100

Table 3.8, PDF16: Local action under unemployment benefit

Category	Number	Percentage
None at all	4	12
Low degree	1	3
Some degree	23	68
High degree	6	18
Total	34	100

Table 3.9, PDF17: Focus on resource development

Category	Number	Percentage
None at all	11	11
Low degree	21	22
Some degree	45	47
High degree	19	20
Total	96	100

Table 3.10, PDF17: Citizens' involvement

Category	Number	Percentage
None at all	6	6
Low degree	11	11
Some degree	36	38
High degree	43	45
Total	96	100

Table 3.11, PDF18: Sufficient case information

Category	Number	Percentage
None at all	5	5
Low degree	25	26
Some degree	41	43
High degree	25	26
Total	96	100

Table 3.5, PDF15: Work retention compared to other cases

Group	No number /%	Low number /%	Some number /%	High number /%	N /%
Maintenance	9/41	7/32	3/14	3/14	22/100
Non-retention	2/3	16/22	42/57	14/19	74/100
Total	11	23	45	17	96/100

Table 3.6, PDF15: Same area of work in other workplaces

Category	Number	Percentage
None	1	10
Rings	6	60
Someone.	3	30
High	0	0
Total	10	100

Table 3.7, PDF16: Causes of unemployment; more answers per case

Reason	Number	Percentage
Lack of suitable jobs	25	74
Work test / rehabilitation	4	12
Second reason	11	32

Table 3.4 p 17 contains three futile tests. The three highest degrees of retention in Table 3.5 are precisely these three. They are not added to the table. Table 3.7 has 40 causality registrations in 34 cases, explicitly multiple replies. Table 3.8 percentages sum 101 by rounding; the figures give 34. Both sub-groups 22 and 74 are contained in 96; ten in earlier fields are part of 74.

Additional exact figures and their denominators

PDF46: Call and deduction

Category	Number	Limitation
Decisions called for	145	100 municipality + 45 boards
Local authorities outside the theme	4	Dismissed 100, not 96
Local authorities included	96	The same 96 in all main tables
Decisions included	45	Complaint decisions; local authority background not extra
Assessment decisions	141	96 + 45; Undocumented personal union
Municipalities	30	Five large with 5 cases; 25 others with 3
Name	15	Derived by 45 with 3 per board; no row of municipalities per case public

PDF14: Working test and retention

Category	Number	Limitation
Appreciably pointless tests	3	Part to 17 high; not extra
Previous Workplace	22	23% of 96
Same area of work second place	10	10% of 96
New area second place	64	Rest of 96
Insufficient test retention	16	73% of 22
Insufficient testing other	18	25% of 74

PDF17: Resource Profile

Category	Number	Limitation
Prepared	83	86% of 96
Not prepared	13	14%; older appropriations without new requirements
Submitted citizen	74	77% of 96
Not presented	8	8% of 96
Submission does not appear.	14	15% of 96
Completely incomplete profile	1	Case 88; expressly invalid; overlap with 44

PDF41-44: Name outage and control

Category	Number	Limitation
Stated Refusal Visitation	33	Own outturn of the members
State-owned wage subsidy share	1	Case 16
Stated persons rather than pensions	1	Case 29
Stated refusal of own business	1	Case 26
Modified refusal of flex job	1	The same case 8 as the board is in doubt about
Remitted for reconsideration	8	Same 45, no extra 8
Overall correct decision of the Board	42	93% of 45; not 42 legal municipal cases
Wrong decision of the Board	1	Case 22, lack of resource profile
Doubt	2	Case 8 / Case 10, practice and testing
The board criticised a legal deficiency on the municipality's part	6	ID1,2,13,39,21,34; overlap with remittal for reconsideration
Missing/deficient profile underlying remittal for reconsideration	6	ID2,21,33,34,39,43
Absence of the Board's opinion	4	ID7,16,17,18; same 45

PDF9-10: Historical background outside the period

Category	Number	Limitation
Expectation for flekjob 2004	23000	Expectation; non-observed citizens 2006
About 40000 searched 2004	40000	Approximate background; not error population
About 8000 unemployed 2004	8000	20% approximate background

13 missing resource profiles must not be made into 13 infringements: the original links them to appropriations before the entry into force of the work efficiency method on 1 January 2003. On the other hand, one completely incomplete profile is explicitly invalid. Two-thirds of the right other hearing and one inadequate is published as a prose alone; an exact integer table for the remaining group does not exist. The eight missing references and 14 unknown appear as independent control categories, not 22 automatically void cases. Justification shall be explicitly assessed by means of authorisations; unknown decision-making acts may not be reclassified as verified written legality.

All published local citizens' references

Number series	Local ID	Physically PDFsid a	Own paraphrase and meaning of proof
municipality	18	22	38 years of age, low level of intellectual function; the board assesses testing adequately.
municipality	83	23	42 years of age, sclerosis; flexible jobs in previous office work; similar ID in Annex 2.
municipality	1	23/26-27/49	41 years in main text, 42 years in Annex 2; back / whiplash, one introduction course and narrow electrical testing. The board is calling for information; not proof of fervour.
municipality	56	24/50	Approximately 50 years in main text, 51 years in Annex 2; psychologically low talent versus earlier extensive agricultural work. The Authority's assumption of employability is an assessment, not an independent new function measurement.
municipality	52	26	51 years of age, psychiatric course; testing found administrative work rather than human work.
municipality	32	27/50	47 years, osteoarthritis; no other workplace / work area tested.
municipality	47	28	54 years, brain surgery autumn 2003 with spastic paralysis; fleksjob February 2005, the board considers further measures pointless. ID47 is not in Annex 2's six correct restraining cases; no renumbering is carried out.
municipality	92	28-29/49	Age 49, muscle disorder and fatigue; reassignment at the workplace from the turn of 2003/04. The agency requests a trial at another workplace;same ID in annex 2.
municipality	4	33/52	53 years of age, knee / back pain. Flekjob 1 July 2004, interview 19 July 2004, deteriorated hospital message 6 April 2005. The main text calls follow-up a great deal; Annex 3 some degree. Hospital fatigue is described, but its own medical documentation is not published.
municipality	9	34-35/52	53 years of age, pain; fleksjob 1 September 2004, internship november-December 2004, retired 20 May 2005: 261 calendar days. Only the start of the case, not the pension award or the post-payment.
municipality	88	36/56	40 years, back; completely inconclusive profile and no follow-up. The municipality's own lack of follow-up is indicated; no subsequent repair is documented.
municipality	21	48	Proper retention; age 25; reported health conditions: sclerosis. No public date for restoration.
municipality	38	48	Proper retention; age 57; reported health conditions: fibromyalgia. No public date for restoration.
municipality	60	48	Proper retention; age 61; reported health conditions: cerebral haemorrhage. No public date for restoration.
municipality	83	48	Proper retention; age 42; reported health conditions: sclerosis. No public date for restoration.
municipality	89	48	Proper retention; age 43; reported health conditions: back injury. No public date for restoration.
municipality	96	48	Proper retention; age 49; reported health conditions: parkinsonism. No public date for restoration.
municipality	6	48-49	Deficient retention; age 60; reported health conditions: osteoarthritis / fibromyalgia. No public date for restoration.
municipality	16	48-49	Deficient retention; age 49; reported health conditions: depression. No public date for restoration.
municipality	22	48-49	Deficient retention; age 59; reported health conditions: back pain. No public date for restoration.

Number series	Local ID	Physically PDFsid a	Own paraphrase and meaning of proof
municipality	26	48-49	Deficient retention; age 55; reported health conditions: back pain. No public date for restoration.
municipality	33	48-49	Deficient retention; age 53; reported health conditions: fibromyalgia. No public date for restoration.
municipality	41	48-49	Absence of retention; age 49; reported health conditions: voice injury. No public date for restoration.
municipality	42	48-49	Deficient retention; age 54; reported health conditions: blood clot. No public date for restoration.
municipality	49	48-49	Deficient retention; age 37; reported health conditions: crisis / tinnitus. No public date for restoration.
municipality	54	48-49	Deficient retention; age 36; reported health conditions: whiplash / encephalitis. No public date for restoration.
municipality	61	48-49	Deficient retention; age 47; reported health conditions: arm paralysis / overload. No public date for restoration.
municipality	62	48-49	Deficient retention; age 55; reported health conditions: back / neck pain. No public date for restoration.
municipality	68	48-49	Deficient retention; age 50; reported health conditions: arm / shoulder / neck / back pain. No public date for restoration.
municipality	69	48-49	Deficient retention; age 55; reported health conditions: rheumatism / pain syndrome. No public date for restoration.
municipality	80	48-49	Deficient retention; age 53; reported health conditions: osteoarthritis / discus degeneration. No public date for restoration.
municipality	81	48-49	Deficient retention; age 55; reported health conditions: debriefing. No public date for restoration.
municipality	92	48-49	Deficient retention; age 49; reported health conditions: muscle disease. No public date for restoration.
municipality	1	49-50	Deficient past area according to Annex 2; age 42; reported health conditions: back / whiplash. No public date for restoration.
municipality	19	49-50	Deficient past area by Annex 2; age 37; reported health conditions: depression. No public date for restoration.
municipality	29	49-50	Deficient past area by Annex 2; age 41; reported health conditions: depression. No public date for restoration.
municipality	30	49-50	Deficient past area by Annex 2; age 48; reported health conditions: whiplash. No public date for restoration.
municipality	32	49-50	Deficient past area by Annex 2; age 47; reported health conditions: osteoarthritis / shoulder. No public date for restoration.
municipality	56	49-50	Deficient past area by Annex 2; age 51; reported health conditions: low talent. No public date for restoration.
municipality	65	49-50	Deficient past area by Annex 2; age 47; reported health conditions: depression. No public date for restoration.
municipality	74	49-50	Deficient past area by Annex 2; age 51; reported health conditions: back pain. No public date for restoration.

Number series	Local ID	Physically PDFsid a	Own paraphrase and meaning of proof
municipality	76	49-50	Deficient past area by Annex 2; age 44; reported health conditions: alcohol problems. No public date for restoration.
municipality	86	49-50	Deficient past area according to Annex 2; age 44; reported health conditions: back / past abuse. No public date for restoration.
municipality	19,20,50,59,82,95	51-52	Annex 3 follow-up: High. IDs are retained as local references, not additional citizens.
municipality	4,5,9,10,14,15,24,25,28,31,34,36,40,43,67,70,73,77,85,91,93,98,99	52-56	Annex 3 follow-up: someone. IDs are retained as local references, not additional citizens.
municipality	14	56	Annex 3 follow-up: Rings. IDs are retained as local references, not additional citizens.
municipality	55,64,88,97	56	Annex 3 follow-up: None. IDs are retained as local references, not additional citizens.
municipality	19	51	Annex 3; age 37; Flekjob 22 September 2004; unemployment 1 November 2004; depression and lack of expected employment.
municipality	20	51	Annex 3; age 30; Flekjob June 2004; job 1 July 2005; back / mental / social conditions and difficult family life. The board calls the grant without basis, but the follow-up is high.
municipality	50	51	Annex 3; age 36; Depression / personality structure; one month's sick leave before job 23 May 2005.
municipality	59	51	Annex 3; age 33; Unemployment 1 November 2004; 35 sought jobs; internship January 2005 for 20 hours / week interrupted, as citizen could not cope with the tasks.
municipality	82	52	Annex 3; age 36; Flekjob 23 August 2004; unemployment 1 September 2004; internship 1 September-29 November 2004; course 17 January-11 March 2005; psychologist 21 January 2005; hospital March 2005. Pain, anxiety, compulsive disorder and connective tissue disorder.
municipality	95	52	Annex 3; age 54; Flekjob / unemployment 20 September 2004; pain elbow / hand / shoulder.
municipality	4	52	Annex 3; age 53; Unemployment 1 July 2004; admissions made job search difficult. SammeID as the main text.
municipality	5	52	Annex 3; age 50; Unemployment 17 July 2003; follow-up October / November 2003 and February 2004; job club March 2004; migraine / fibromyalgia, pension in talk.
municipality	9	52	Annex 3; age 53; Unemployment 1 September 2004; internship November-December 2004; 20 May 2005 start pension case. Originally 25 hours / week reduced to 20 in December.
municipality	10	52	Annex 3; age 40; Unemployment 1 January 2005; periodic depression / paranoid personality structure; hospitalisation interrupted follow-up.
municipality	14	53/56	Annex 3; age 32; mental problems / low skill; contact to an internship only after 5 months; coincidence in two categories.
municipality	15	53	Annex 3; age 30; Unemployment 30 August 2004; psychiatric illness; unpaid driver training February 2005 ended after 2 days; citizen asked himself to seek March 2005.
municipality	24	53	Annex 3; age 50; Flekjob 29 May 2002; unemployment 1 June 2002; back surgery January 2003; course 1 September-28 November 2003; reference 10 December 2003; internship 7 June-15 September 2004.

Number series	Local ID	Physically PDFsid a	Own paraphrase and meaning of proof
municipality	25	53	Annex 3; age 44; Flekjob 13 November 2002; unemployment 1 December 2002; internship 17 January-30 April 2003; unemployment 1 August 2003; project first January 2005. Chronic pain.
municipality	28	53	Annex 3; age 47; Unemployment 10 March 2003; follow-up November 2003; job 1 June 2005 for 15 hours / week; psoriatic arthritis and arthritis.
municipality	31	53	Annex 3; age 47; Visitation 1 September 2002; internship 18 December 2003-14 January 2004; job 15 January 2004 in 16,5 hours / week; terminated 14 September 2004 until end October; unemployment 1 November 2004.
municipality	34	54	Annex 3; age 50; Visitation 22 September 2004; unemployment 1 October 2004; clarification result 30 June 2005; knee / abdomen / back / psychiatric condition.
municipality	36	54	Annex 3; age 41; Visitation 20 September 2001; job 22 October 2001 to 2004; unemployment 13 September 2004; pension application 10 November 2004. Bronchitis, nerve / back conditions, diabetes / blood pressure.
municipality	40	54	Annex 3; age 54; unemployment 1 August 2004; worsening shoulder/neck/nerve conditions; no pension decision date.
municipality	43	54	Annex 3; age 57; unemployment June 2004; nervous disorders, assessment for depression/dementia; origin Turkey according to the original.
municipality	67	54	Annex 3; age 52; unemployment 15 September 2004; unsuccessful vocational rehabilitation as a construction technician; caretaker work in spring 2005 could not be managed because of painting tasks; heart/leg/knee conditions.
municipality	70	54	Annex 3; age 41; Visitation 25 June 2003; follow-up February 2004; proposal back centre; pain, no later start date.
municipality	73	55	Annex 3; age 40; Unemployment 1 October 2004; interviews 19 October / 8 November 2004; job search workshop 18 May 2005 after the unusual press! 8; hearing reduction / migraine, ancestry Bosnia.
municipality	77	55	Annex 3; age 42; Unemployment July 2004; job negotiation September 2004; neuroinfection, no actual date of employment.
municipality	85	55	Annex 3; age 56; Visitation 1 September 2004; unemployment 1 October 2004; training interrupted by illness / shielding; vision, depression, shoulder / social conditions.
municipality	91	55	Annex 3; age 57; Visitation May / June 2004; labour market centre, concrete action not shown; retirement case May 2005; osteoarthritis / Scheuermann.
municipality	93	55	Annex 3; age 26; Visitation / unemployment 1 October 2004; internship 22 November 2004-20 February 2005 and 1 April-30 June 2005; possible brain damage, epilepsy, back / muscle wind.
municipality	98	55	Annex 3; age 50; Unemployment 1 January 2004; job 20 May 2005; congenital spastic disorder / brain injury / two discus operations.
municipality	99	56	Annex 3; age 25; Unemployment 1 May 2004; job 16 June 2004; unemployment again 5 July 2004; internship 18 October-12 November 2004; foot surgery February 2005, continued on sick leave July 2005. Personality disorder.
municipality	55	56	Annex 3; age 49; Unemployment February 2004; specialist requested February 2005; internship April-May 2005; no documented 6-month follow-up.
municipality	64	56	Annex 3; age 44; Unemployment 31 May 2004; job 31 May 2005; fatigue / unexplained symptoms; no 6-month follow-up.
municipality	88	56	Annex 3; age 40; Unemployment 1 September 2004; agreed truck card; the municipality does not provide any follow-up.
municipality	97	56	Annex 3; age 57; Unemployment 1 November 2004; heart disease; 6 months just passed without documented follow-up.

Number series	Local ID	Physically PDFsid a	Own paraphrase and meaning of proof
municipality	28	53	Visited 10 March 2003, first follow-up November 2003, job 1 June 2005: 814 d for recruitment. Placed under some degree, but own phrase says little. Job date is not a repair of the whole legality error.
municipality	14	53/56	32 years of age, mental problems / low level of skills; first contact at an internship after 5 months, place cannot employ. SammeID and history both below and below; not two people.
municipality	5	52	50 years, fibromyalgia / migraine; the original writes 23 hours a day. Unrealistic timing is retained as source error, not rewritten to assumed 2-3 hours.
municipality	64	56	Unemployment 31 May 2004 → job 31 May 2005: 365 d. The board finds authorisation incorrect and no documented 6 months follow-up; no full repair registered.
municipality	98	55	Unemployment 1 January 2004 → job 20 May 2005: 505 d. Congenital spastic disorder / brain damage and back surgery; the board assesses the license correctly and follow up some degree.
municipality	50	51	Visitation 1 October 2004 → job 23 May 2005: 234 d. Depression; positive follow-up assessment is not causative evidence.
name	16,29,26,8	41-42	The four separate outcome descriptions are repeated under local name ID; the number ID of the municipality case is a second number series.
name	2,21,33,34,39, 43,45,10	42	The eight remittals for reconsideration; ID39 both profile and hearing the parties, ID45 a private company wrote the profile without municipal dialogue with the citizen.
name	22,8,10	42	The Board's Board's Board's assessment: ID22 incorrect, ID8 / 10 in doubt; same 45.
name	1,2,13,39,21,3 4	43	Referral to the Court: follow-up, justification, speed and late retirement; ID34 work-injury proceedings were extended. The report writes Section 19 of the Law on the Consultation of the Parties; correctly FVL § 19 står PDF42.
name	7,16,17,18	44	The Management Board identifies four missing panel statements on profile / justification.

There are 67 different published municipal IDs and 18 different board IDs in this register. The two number series must not be linked by numbers alone. Annex 3 has 34 description entries, but 33 different local IDs, because 14 is repeated. No CPR-based union or children/spouses per process is published. Diagnostic references are source statements, not new medical documentation and not a measure of all disabled people among the 96.

Original conflicts affecting counting or consistency

Original site	Concrete conflict and proper handling
PDF28 versus 48	Positive restraint ID47 missing in Annex 2's six correct ID; no documented IDbro.
PDF15 versus 49-50	Table 3.6 has seven none / rings and three none; Annex 2 classifies all ten in the missing / deficient section. All figures and references are retained without making 10 to 7.
PDF33 versus 52	ID4 high versus no follow-up.
PDF53 versus 56	ID14 repeated as some and rings; 34 entries in Annex 3 but 33 different ID.
PDF53	The ID28 is below someone, but phrase says little.
PDF23 / 26 versus 49	ID1 age 41 versus 42; ID56 approx. 50 versus 51.
PDF52	ID5 is given 23 hours a day; no guess of correction.
PDF43 versus 42	The party consultation reference is called § 19 of the Act on Legal Protection and Administration in Social Matters; FVL§ 19 is the rule in the remittal description.

Strongest sustainable criticism and demands

Conclusion: the report documents significant errors in the basis for employment and income-support decisions, but a limited and internally contradictory picture of subsequent assistance to citizens. **Authority's statement and original evidence:**44/96 do not comply with rules/practice; PDF46 excludes appealed cases; PDF9 excludes alterations made by the authority itself; PDF53/56 repeats ID14 under two degrees of follow-up. **Deficiency:** review findings are not linked to an actual new decision, payment of arrears or redress. **Rule and action:** the duty to establish the facts and sections 69-70 then in force required specific documentation and relevant individual work trials; section 4 of the Legal Safeguards Act and section 7 of the Capacity for Work Executive Order required citizen involvement. **Departure and significance:**an inadequate profile or one on which the citizen has not been heard makes the authority's narrative about capacity for work unsuitable as a reliable basis. This also applies to claims about work that can be performed and illness that can be overcome; they are not proved merely by repeating the assessment. **Consequence:**ID9 has a documented 261-day period from assessment as eligible for flexible employment to the start of a pension case, ID28 an 814-day period to employment. These times are bounded intervals in case trajectories, not automatically the same duration of an unlawful loss of income. **Responsibility:**the municipality's fact-finding, dialogue with the citizen and follow-up, and the board's review, must be documented separately. **Specific demand:**link the identified cases to corrective decisions, benefit payments, actual employment/pension, loss and assessment of responsibility; at the same time, provide original assessments and an explanation of the ID/classification conflicts. No employee is documented as unpunished or punished by these tables.

Documented errors include 44 main assessments, the expressly invalid profile, eight profiles not submitted, one board decision with a missing profile and identified grounds for remittal/reprimand. They overlap and must not be added together. Suspicions requiring primary records are erroneous narratives about citizens, deterioration in health caused by work trials, continuing loss of benefits and individual employee responsibility. Missing documents are case/person links, original employment/medical records, the entire complaint population and subsequent redress. All figures above have been traced to the stated original page; time intervals are our own calendar calculations from two published dates.

Early retirement and mental illness 2007: full tables, families and evidence training;

PP07F. All 86 public original pages have actually been read in memory. All 23 numbered results are reproduced, including the four registry tables; blank instrument, annexes to the law and six historical principles have been read separately. PDF14 / 18 / 21 / 61 is visually controlled on the crucial column and number problems. No official original is stored. The 50 cases in the tables are the same 50 in the report's previous main account, not an extra 50.

The Committee and the express control limit

The study was conducted in June-October 2007 and concerns awards in 2006 to Danish citizens aged 18-49 with specified, municipally reported affective, neurotic or stress-related diagnoses. The register population is 980; 50 are selected by sex, age and diagnosis. The eight under 30 are deliberately overrepresented compared with 42/980(approximately 4%) in the register. The raw 15/50=30% therefore cannot be extrapolated as 294 of 980 actually unlawful pensions. Refusals, people without Danish citizenship, other diagnoses and older pensioners are not covered.

PDF59 excludes cases appealed to/considered by a board. The number of excluded appeal cases is not published. The agency assumes that all records have been received and states that no further records will be obtained. PDF7/60 says the practice study does not itself amend decisions. Less focus on the work-capacity method is declared at PDF57. PDF26/47/57 says the records and timeframe are insufficient for a proper study of effectiveness and waiting time, even though table 2.19 gives appropriateness categories. A positive assessment of an interim objective is therefore not a full document review of all offers' effects or the individual's loss.

23 municipalities named PDF63: Albertslund, Ballerup, Billund, Bornholm, Brøndby, Ebeltoft / Syddjurs, Fredericia, Frederi ksværk, Faaborg, Gladsaxe, Greve, Herning, Horsens, Hvidovre, Højoverver, Høj-Tåstrup, Copenhagen, Lolland, Odense, Ringsted, Str uer, Vejen, Egedal / Ølkhel, Aabenraa. There has been no publication of a complete 50-case municipal distribution of accuracy; no figures are constructed per municipality.

All 23 result tables with the original delimitation

Table 2.1, PDF12: Absence just before award

Category	Number	Percentage
Self-employed persons	0	0
Cash benefits	26	52
Sickness benefit	17	34
Unemployment benefit	0	0
Flex jobs	2	4
Other	2	4
Unknown	3	6
Total	50	100

Table 2.2, PDF13: Local diagnosis reported

Category	Number	Percentage
Periodical depression 061	13	26
Chronic foresight 062	2	4
Other infection 063	3	6
phobic anxiety 064	5	10
Anxiety without specification 065	7	14
Post-traumatic 067	14	28
Reaction Life Change 068	2	4
Load Reaction 069	2	4
Somatoform 070	2	4
Total	50	100

Table 2.3, PDF14: Type of offer and number per person; dash is printed dash

Tenders	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	Persons
Training / re validation		8	2	-	-	-	-	-	10
Enabling		7	4	-	1	1	-	-	13
Working test		17	7	-	1	-	-	-	25
Job training		6	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Flex jobs		2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
No offers	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
Other		4	3	1	-	-	-	1	11

Table 2.4, PDF15: Diagnosis and working test

Diagnosis	N	Working time	Percentage
Periodical depression 061	13	9	69
Chronic foresight 062	2	0	0
Other infection 063	3	1	33
phobic anxiety 064	5	3	60
Anxiety without specification 065	7	2	29
Post-traumatic 067	14	7	50
Reaction Life Change 068	2	1	50
Load Reaction 069	2	1	50
Somatoform 070	2	1	50
Total	50	25	50

Table 2.5, PDF16: Number of job-oriented offers per person

Tenders	Persons
0	9
1	15
2	12
3	5
4	3
5	4
6	1
8	1
Total	50

Table 2.6, PDF16: Latest offers; prosa says 4 job training, Table 3

Tenders	Number
Training / Rehabilitation	2
Enabling	8
Working test	20
Job training	3
Flex jobs	2
None	9
Other	6
Total	50

Table 2.7, PDF17: Time from end of last offer to retirement

Discipline	1-3 md	4-6 md	7-12 md	More than 12 months	Unknown	N
Sickness benefit	6	1	4	0	6	17
Cash benefits	1	1	4	7	13	26
Flex jobs / others	0	1	1	0	2	4
Unknown	1	0	0	0	2	3
Total	8	3	9	7	23	50

Table 2.8, PDF18: Study / treatment; multiple responses, printed total 111

Tenders	Number
Neuropsychological	0
Functional test	2
Medicines	39
Psychologist	20
Psychiatric disorders	29
Psychosocial	8
Functional training	0
Other	15
Printed total	111
Own sum of cells	113

Table 2.9, PDF18: Number of treatment types per person

Tenders	Persons
0	2
1	9
2	20
3	14
4	5
Total	50

Table 2.10, PDF19: Overall accuracy

Category	Number	Percentage
Correct	35	70
Would be amended/remitted for reconsideration	15	30
Total	50	100

Table 2.11, PDF20: Information and overall accuracy

Absence of information	Correct	Wrong	N
None	22	3	25
Less	13	1	14
Essential	0	9	9
Decisive	0	2	2
Total	35	15	50

Table 2.12, PDF20: Primary lack of information; only one response accepted in result

Deficiency	Number
Diagnostic basis	5
Management	3
Duration	0
Working test	1
Function description	0
Other	2
Total	11

Table 2.13, PDF21: Age and accuracy; original error rates maintained

Age	Correct N	Correct%	Wrong N	Wrong%	N	Total%
Less than 30	5	63	3	37	8	100
30-40	13	72	5	18	18	100
40-49	17	74	7	16	24	100
Total	35	70	15	30	50	100

Table 2.14,PDF22: Documented substantial permanent reduction in work capacity

Category	Number
High	22
Someone.	13
Rings	10
No	5
Total	50

Table 2.15, PDF22: Diagnosis documentation and treatment relevance

Category	Diagnosis	Management
High	28	26
Someone.	14	15
Rings	2	4
No	6	5
Total	50	50

Table 2.16, PDF23: All relevant measures tested

Category	Number
High	20
Someone.	17
Rings	10
No	3
Total	50

Table 2.17, PDF24: Health reasons for no work test

Category	Number
High	9
Someone.	7
Rings	4
No	5
Total	25

Table 2.18, PDF24: Citizen Dialogue and Adequate Profile

Category	Dialog	Profile
High	33	35
Someone.	12	9
Rings	2	6
No	3	0
Total	50	50

Table 2.19, PDF25: Appropriate overall trajectory

Category	Number
High	25
Someone.	15
Rings	7
No	3
Total	50

Table 5.1, PDF61: Register population and selected; age summers 979

Variable	Population	Percentage	Selected
Male	311	32	16
Women	669	68	34
18-29 years	42	4	8
30 to 39 years	304	31	15
40-49 years	633	65	27
Periodical depression 061	254	26	13
Chronic foresight 062	35	4	2
Other infection 063	46	5	3
phobic anxiety 064	101	10	5
Anxiety without specification 065	146	15	7
Post-traumatic 067	284	29	14
Reaction Life Change 068	41	4	2
Load Reaction 069	35	4	2
Somatoform 070	38	4	2
Printed total	980	100	50

Table 5.2, PDF62: Deficit in 980 population; rounded percentages

Category	One month before%	One year earlier%	three years before%
Self-employment	4	6	26
Sickness benefit	32	29	16
Rehabilitation	5	5	6
Cash benefits	46	44	35
Flex jobs	2	4	3
Unemployment benefit	10	8	9
Other	0	2	4
Printed sum	100	100	100

Table 5.3, PDF62: Civil status in 980 population

Category	Percentage
Not married	47
Married / registered partner	53
Total	100

Table 5.4, PDF63: Training in 980 population; sum 99 by rounding

Education	Percentage
None	19
Reason	25
High school	10
Vocational training	21
Short / Medium Higher	20
Long higher	1
Other	3
Printed sum	100

Offer and diagnostic groups overlap the same 50; T2.3 summarises 76 person records across types, not 76 people. T2.8 is multiple responses and contains the documented total sum conflict. T2.7 s 23 unknown are lack of time, not 0 months. The seven over 12 months all had cash benefits; range 17-84 months each contain an extra value. Seven-year period after the last offer documents a condition of maintenance / delivery, but not seven-year established illegality or cause of health follow-up. The 53% married person in the register cannot be converted into a precise number of affected spouses among those who have failed 50, and 34 women cannot be converted into 34 mothers.

T5.2 actually has the sum of cells 99 / 98 / 99 as opposed to printed 100 / 100 / 100; rounded percentages are not converted into exact person cells. T5.4 sums 99 by rounding. T2.12 has only one registered primary deficiency per case after note; the second category includes a case with both diagnosis and treatment deficiency. The glossy instrument, on the other hand, likes to say several crosss.11 primary causes are not a complete numerator of all information errors.

All additional concrete statements

Original site	Target number	Number 1	Number 2	Names / limits of evidence
PDF11	Female / Male	34	16	Same 50
PDF12	Degree of disability five years ago	82	18	Percentage of dependants / self-dependants; non-persons
PDF13-14	Bidiagnoses yes / no	36	14	Same 50
PDF13-14	Other significant profile ratios	13	Not available	Profile registration; later management assessment 19 is second target
PDF17-18	Contact job consultant yes / no / unknown	16/11/23	Not available	Same 50
PDF17-18	More than 12 months on offer	7	Not available	All cash benefits; range 17-84 md; 23 unknown
PDF19-20	Hypothetical material changes / remittals for reconsideration	4	11	15 broken down by type of information; not actual change
PDF23	Other conditions reduce function	19	Not available	Assessment by the Board; not 13 profile field
PDF26	Psychiatric consultants	2	25	Every 25 cases; no own patient investigation documented
PDF30	Accepted diagnoses	16/5/4/3/3/1/1/1/1	Not available	Personality / PTSD / psychosis / somatoform / ang / somatic + reactive depression / depression / chronic mood / without medical records; N35
PDF30 / 35	Imported from third countries	12	Not available	Subgroup of 35, all selected Danish nationals
PDF36	Incorrect with / without adequate diagnostic documentation	8	7	Seven = 5 with certain supporting documents + 2 clearly insufficient; overlap with 11 remittal for reconsideration
PDF36	Diagnosis among the eight	1/2/1/2/1/1	Not available	PTSD / personality / depression + somatization / somatoform / bipolar / anxiety; N8
PDF50-51	Verification / reopening provided for	0	Not available	All 50; the board does not consider the obligation to check in accepted 35
PDF51	Possible improvement despite acceptance	2	Not available	ID17 / 18; young age alone does not justify control
PDF52	Local diagnosis significantly same	15	Not available	May be the same bee diagnosis, not necessarily the same main diagnosis
PDF54-55	Municipal diagnosis in the 15 wrong	5/3/3/1/1/1/1	Not available	PTSD / depression / phobic / other infection / anxiety / life change / somatoform; N15
PDF58	Increase 1998-2005	300	Not available	Percent historical background, not legality rate 2006-25

All 25 published local case ID

ID	Age	Original PDFside	Own paraphrase and meaning of the evidence
17	Not available	30/51	PDF30 says no medical annexes for diagnosis were submitted, but extensive case-record summaries; PDF51,the same ID, describes a33-year-old with a clear personality diagnosis. Both statements retained.
8	49	32	Nurses; head / back trauma, depression / panic; stress from management jobs according to production; the board accepts pension.
11	32	32-33	Treatment 6-7 years in medical records and more than 10 years overall; hospital from end 1999 to 2006; suicidal impulses are mentioned. Diagnosis weight personality / depression changes; not independent evidence of disease-induced loss.
12	45	33-34	Former leader; abuse from 17 years, lost rehabilitation; record of alcohol pattern and treatment missing. The board accepts border cases.
3	28	37-38	Socio-phobia, specialist doctor November 2005 does not assess any significant improvement next year; citizen rejects pharmaceutical form. Management consultant points to age and opportunity for treatment / job. No new patient study / actual treatment effect in public.
7	42	38	Driver, two robbery-related assaults; specialist in March 2005 proposes a fresh assessment, general practitioner in January 2006 points to clarification of authority/insurance cases. The agency lacks treatment/work-trial information; the 10-year duration mentioned is the consultant's experience, not an actual time measurement of the case.
10	46	38-39	Female from Serbia, arrived 31 years; pain / depression; rheumatoid acts missing, consultant indicates possible improvement; no documented actual improvement.
19	47	39	No ordinary employment since 1985; three-week work trial with 9 sick days; anxiety, pain, possible schizotypal disorder; the agency states treatment is possible, but a borderline case.
20	45	39-40	Disciplinary studies, four months of group therapy; the management consultant says intensive treatment should be given long ago, but indicates possible non-participation. The latter is undocumented opportunity in summary, not established citizen rejection.
24	46	40	Secretary, two accidents / whiplash; no work test / psychiatric special examination. The diagnosis label in case is given 068 while the same PTSD category in the register is 067. Prognosis is assessed badly, but the board requires more testing.
36	29	40-41	Women want education; psychiatric / psychological courses over several years. Consultant says too easily abandoned and that time makes the condition more difficult to change. No dated solution / effect.
41	45	41	Nurse / case manager, without work since 1997; anxiety prevents leaving home, health barrier to work testing. The consultant refers to rejected hospitalization / alternative intensive treatment; original rejection and medical files are missing.
1	44	42-43	On medical grounds, May 2005; about 11 weeks of testing, less than 10 hours / week; concentration / memory. The mother's boundary psychosis statements and the psychologist's later assessment are different sources. Lack of diagnostic information does not mean agility.
2	36	43	Mother of 2 children living at home with major problems; dyslexic, grade 3.-4. level, physical pain. The employment centre assesses no work function, the agency consultant assumes a possible personality disorder and calls for psychiatry/work trials. The children are expressly reported family impact, not two additional error entries.
6	33	43-44	The warehouse expects return; testing ½ -1 hour / day, district psychology. The board provides possible correct pension, but documentation unclear. Case code 063 for phobic anxiety does not fit register category 064.

ID	Age	Original PDFside	Own paraphrase and meaning of the evidence
33	34	44	Institution for homeless, psychiatric care and home care / support; medical consultant cannot judge diagnosis / treatment / abuse safely. Missing current medical certificate.
43	29	44-45	Single parent, whiplash; psychologist recommends tranquility for children / everyday life. Number of children not published; cannot be calculated by majority rule. The board finds sparse medical records.
44	34	45	Psychiatric status certificate describes PTSDafter custody and permanent inability to work. Management consultant lacks the basis, explicitly does not mean no disease. No date or independent certificate of causality for prison consequences.
48	48	45	Accounting; two-month settlement; medical consultant changes PTSDtil adjustment response and does not assess lasting. No patient examination in the control documented.
18	30	51	Mother of a child of 1 year; anxiety, medicine, conversations, admissions. The board accepts duration despite possible improvement with maturation; young age alone does not justify control. The child's diagnosis is not derived from the sentence design.
14	Not available	53-54	Local PTSD reporting; status March 2006 refers to hallucinations, psychosis / antipsychotics; management consultant finds more severe psychotic disease.
35	Not available	54	Postcontrasting, somatoform / PTSD; management consultant reclassifies neurologic symptom complex as somatoform. It is the consultant's assessment, not a verified modification of original objective findings.
37	Not available	54	Many specialist diagnoses; consultant collects as severe PTSD.
39	Not available	54	Hallucinations / compulsion; status severe depression with psychotic symptoms; consultant cannot rule out actual psychosis. Possibility is not safe diagnosis.
50	Not available	54	Consultant finds indication for severe chronic PTSD; not a new patient course.

Case 2 expressly has two children living at home;Case 18 a mother of a one-year-old child. This gives at least three directly described children in two local cases. Case 43 mentions children without a precise number and single parenthood. A complete child/parent/disability union is not published. These children are family members affected in the descriptions;they do not document three new unlawful decisions or three children placed outside the home. Reported health conditions and medical consultants' conclusions are marked as source statements, not as new objective study results.

Six historical principles, separate from the sample

Decision of principle	PDF page	Progress and limit of evidence
P22-04	66-68	47 years, 1994 without work, 1999 two suicide attempts. Original denotes municipal decision 17 July 2003 but Board confirmation 11 December 2002 before the municipality; date order not corrected by guess.
P19-04	68-69	21 years, cancer January 2003, chemo February / June 2003; refusal because during treatment. Death after the appeal before the decision; pension retrospectively from the month following the municipality's decision. Dated life / payment chain not published. Historical regelillustration 2004, not extra 50-person.
P35-04	69-72	44 years, chronic pain; 37 hours / week study 2000 and 3-4 hours / day 2001; reassessment after 3 years denied, no disqualification. Former historical case, not an extra 50.
P8-05	72-74	33 years, application since 1993; specialist March 2003 describes severe social response and fear of drug abuse. The municipality of November 2003 refused, the board gave the pension, the board deprived the right; validity assessments of the treatment option must be tested against original grounds.
P9-05	74-77	42 years, methadone since 1993; 12 week clarification 2003, only 1-3 hours / day; the board joins the refusal and requires municipal assistance. In fact, subsequent help not shown.
P13-06	77-78	48 years old, tortureliver; municipal rehabilitation since 1 November 1993, pain centre January 2004, specialist doctor September 2004, application November 2004. The municipality / board's refusal is changed to pension 2006 after re-obtaining documents back in 1993. The plea of legal basis and re-information is traced; no exact application → payment time.

The six principles cannot be added to 50 as new cases in 2007. P13-06 is included as relevant legal knowledge in 2006; the previous records are legal background. In P19-04, the pension entitlement was only restored after the death of the citizen. A retroactive decision is not the same thing as actually helping while the citizen lived. In P13-06 the file chain back to 1993 was obtained prior to the amendment of the Board's refusal; it is a documented illustration that renewed primary evidence can break a repeated authority narrative.

Original conflicts and precise corrections

Original site	Concrete discrepancy
PDF14 / 15	Prose 7 of 10 depressions worked against Table 9 of 13. Not the same denominator; original change unexplained.
PDF16	Prose 4 job training against Table 3; 50 of the table is tuned.
PDF17 / 18	Prose 27 psychiatric therapy against Table 29; printed total 111 counter-cell sum 113. Number type table 2.9 weighted 111 does not support a choice between the two.
PDF21	30-40: 5 / 18 wrong = 27,78%, printed 18%; 40-49: 17 / 24 = 70,83%, printed 74%; 7 / 24 = 29,17%, printed 16%. Printed percentages are retained next to own fractions.
PDF21 / 61	T2.13 age 8 / 18 / 24 modT5.1 selected 8 / 15 / 27; 40 appearing in two printteT2.13 interval marks, no individual voting publicly.
PDF61	Age of population 42 + 304 + 633 = 979 disprinted 980; diagnosis / sex cells summer 980.
PDF30 / 51	Case 17 without a diagnostic annex versus a later clear personality diagnosis; no linkage to the originals.
PDF30	All 35 are said psychiatric documented, but one case 17 without medical records is described in the same place.
PDF20-21 / 83	Result note: only one answer about lack of information; blank instrument says more crosses. Full misunion cannot be deduced from the primary causation N11.
PDF40 / 43	Case 24PTSD068 and Case 6 phobic 063 do not match the register's 067 / 064 labels.
PDF67	Historical P22-04 date of 11 December 2002 is prior to the date of the municipality 17 July 2003; no estimated time of appeal on those dates.

Criticism, consistency and requirements

Conclusion: the study documents both inadequate municipal fact-finding and a review that cannot support firm conclusions about all citizens' actual treatment options or redress. **Authority's statement:**15 awards would be altered/remitted; 35 are accepted; treatment effectiveness and waiting time cannot be adequately examined. **Original evidence:**T2.10-12, PDF26/47/57/59 and the individual citizens' cases above. **Deficiency:**original medical/employment records have not been published; statements about possible improvement and participation cannot be reclassified as established medical fact. **Relevant rule:**sections 16-20 of the Pensions Act then in force required documented, specific capacity for work, the citizen's own view and clarification of relevant measures; section 21 required a decision no later than three months after formal transition, with a reasoned notification in the event of an exception. **Act/omission and departure:**missing case records or necessary psychiatric information make a firm statement about entitlement to income support inadequately substantiated; replacing the original course of events with summary diagnoses does not change the duty. **Effect on the outcome:**11 of 15 relate to hypothetical remittal, four to substantive disagreement; PDF43/45 shows citizens and family circumstances in which further information could change the basis. **Consequence:**at least three children are mentioned directly, the seven known lengthy cases last 17-84 months after the most recent measure, and the 23 unknown intervals conceal further possible periods of intervention/waiting time. None of these is documented as the same number of unlawful deprivations of income. **Responsibility:**the municipality's fact-finding, treatment offers and political follow-up must be examined against specific contemporaneous records; the agency's and consultant's assessment bases are separate matters for scrutiny. **Specific demand:**publish case-linked scope, duration and remedial action; obtain the records underlying prognoses and medical classifications; examine the identified citizens' cases specifically in relation to income support, treatment, loss and responsibility.

Documented review errors are 15 overall correctness findings, 11 significant/decisive deficiencies in the factual basis and 5 instances of little/no dialogue with the citizen; they overlap. Documented source errors are the conflicts concerning tables, ages, diagnostic codes and chronological order. Suspicions requiring further evidence are an incorrect medical narrative, missing actual assistance, health harm from waiting/testing and individual employee responsibility. Missing documents are the complete contemporaneous records, linkage to original treatment, appeals, later redress and loss. The strongest sustainable arguments concern the duty to establish the facts, specific reasons and dialogue with the citizen, followed by actual access to subsistence support/treatment and effective review. All decisive factual claims are linked to a physical original page above; counting alone creates no conclusion on responsibility.

Penalties 2015: full original numbers, actual dependencies and control chains

SAN15F is a full reading of all 116 physical pages of the main report and all its annexes, together with the separate one-page corrigendum. The originals were read directly in memory and not saved locally. 18 numerical pages were also visually checked. The locators are physical PDF pages; the main text’s printed page numbers are three lower. These are the same 99 cases as in the historical series, not 99 new cases. 29 example rows below contain 31 distinct local case numbers; repeated mentions are counted once within the original, and the numbers must not be linked to numbers in other reports without independent evidence identifying the persons.

What the study shows and what it fails to try

The strongest proven finding is 25 sanctions, which, according to the Board of Directors, would be amended or remitted by complaint, 26 pending cases and significant separate procedural deficiencies in the same population. The second error concerns the municipality's failure to sanction case 18. It must not be converted into another illegal deduction. The 47 cases in question relate to Sections 35 and 36 of the Act, not to a published complete review of all legal aspects.

Ten municipalities were selected by high/low sanction rates from October 2012 to September 2013. 120 cases were requested, four in each of three categories from each municipality;99 were included. Not all municipalities had the requested number in the categories. This does not document that the difference of 21 represents 21 discarded unlawful decisions. The original methodology does not further detail the actual receipt/exclusion accounting.

Cases already appealed and forwarded were excluded.(PDF98 / 113). The original complaint population must therefore be assessed separately and cannot be found by multiplying 25 / 99 up to all sanctions. Decisions and events should be after 1 January 2014; submission deadline 24 September 2014. An expectation of reporting in the first quarter of 2015 is a plan, not a restoration date.

The study did not examine whether eligibility interviews were held/their deadlines, coordinating caseworker/mentor duties or the validity of education orders (PDF5). This has specific significance: its own review of precedent decisions 87-14/N-2-07/N-7-06 describes how an invalid offer due to a missing mandatory plan/order may also invalidate the subsequent sanction (PDF93-95). Omission of a prior review of legal authority may thus conceal errors decisive for the deduction from subsistence benefits. The general description of practice studies as legality reviews (PDF112) does not expand the specific scope of examination.

The questionnaire also includes reasonable consultation time 6.3 and complaint guidance 6.7 (PDF109-111), but the original does not publish a full distribution of results for these two indents. Questions in a table are not published results. The Board evaluates only the files submitted and sends individual assessment forms to the municipalities (PDF99 / 116); actual corrections / post payments have not been published as a single series.

All original tables and figures with their delimitation

Numerical repetitions are part of this to make voting possible. They're reproductions of the same cases. A graph without printed figures is reproduced with the numbers of the accompanying text; column heights are not used to invent exact new cells. The percentage columns shall retain the rounded off of the original.

T4.1 - Visitation category (PDF37)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	91	92
No	1	1
Cannot be assessed	7	7
Total	99	100

T4.2 - Citizens' grounds for absence; more answers per case (PDF43)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Forgot	2	2
No call received	1	1
Sick	9	9
Child ill	0	0
Job interview	1	1
Other offers	0	0
Not answer	51	52
Other	39	39
Total printed	103	100

T4.3 - The municipality's reasonable assessment; 95 sanctions alone (PDF43)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	62	65
No	17	18
Cannot be assessed	16	17
Total	95	100

T4.4 - Four independent guidance requirements; parentheses are printed percentages (PDF47)

Requirements	Yeah.	No.	Undisclosed	N
Written	82 (83)	4 (4)	13 (13)	99 (100)
Co-administration	81 (82)	5 (5)	13 (13)	99 (100)
Consequence	81 (82)	5 (5)	13 (13)	99 (100)
How to Restore Help	79 (80)	7 (7)	13 (13)	99 (100)

T5.1 - Justification; 95 sanctions alone (PDF58)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	47	49
No	48	51
Total	95	100

T5.2 - Adequate case information (PDF61)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	68	69
No	31	31
Total	99	100

T6.1 - Notice of absence of the place of offer (PDF62)

Response	Number	Printed percentage
Telephone	1	1
Written	73	74
Other way	3	3
Not reported	22	22
Total	99	100

Annex 1 / T1 - § 36 isolated; all municipal cells (PDF67)

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Undisclosed	N
Copenhagen 101	10	1	1	12
Medium speed 410	1	2	1	4
Glostrup 161	8	0	0	8
Slaughter 330	8	3	1	12
Nyborg 450	0	6	5	11
Herning 657	11	1	0	12
Furesø 190	4	0	1	5
Faaborg-Midtfyn 430	5	2	4	11
South Djurs 706	9	0	3	12
Corner 860	5	4	3	12
Total	61	19	19	99

Annex 1 / T2 - Overall guidance; maintain the deviation from the main text (PDF68)

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Undisclosed	N
Copenhagen 101	12	0	0	12
Medium speed 410	2	1	1	4
Glostrup 161	5	0	3	8
Slaughter 330	8	3	1	12
Nyborg 450	6	4	1	11
Herning 657	8	3	1	12
Furesø 190	3	0	2	5
Faaborg-Midtfyn 430	8	1	2	11
South Djurs 706	6	3	3	12
Corner 860	10	1	1	12
Total	68	16	15	99

Annex 1 / T3 - Overall accuracy; all municipal cells (PDF69)

Municipality	Right	Amendment/ remittal for reconsideration	Wrong none sanction;	Undisclosed	N
Copenhagen 101	10	1	0	1	12
Medium speed 410	0	3	0	1	4
Glostrup 161	5	0	0	3	8
Slaughter 330	7	3	0	2	12
Nyborg 450	0	7	0	4	11
Herning 657	8	3	0	1	12
Furesø 190	2	0	0	3	5
Faaborg-Midtfyn 430	5	2	0	4	11
South Djurs 706	5	3	0	4	12
Corner 860	5	3	1	3	12
Total	47	25	1	26	99

Annex 7 / T1 - Final distribution of cases; repetition of the same municipalities (PDF115)

Municipality	Number
Copenhagen 101	12
Medium speed 410	4
Glostrup 161	8
Slaughter 330	12
Nyborg 450	11
Herning 657	12
Furesø 190	5
Faaborg-Midtfyn 430	11
South Djurs 706	12
Corner 860	12
Total	99

Annex 7 / T2 - Year of birth and sex; non national family (PDF116)

Year of birth	Male	Women	Total
1949-1960	2	1	3
1961-1970	6	3	9
1971-1980	20	3	23
1981-1990	19	11	30
1991-1996	30	4	34
Total	77	22	99

F2.1 - Overall accuracy; repeated in F4.6 and Annex 1 / T3 (PDF7)

Response	Number
Right	47
Amendment / remittal for reconsideration by appeal	25
Wrong decision on no sanction	1
Undisclosed	26
N	99

F2.2 - Paragraph 36 isolated; repeat in F4.2 and Annex 1 / T1 (PDF8)

Response	Number
Yes	61
No	19
Undisclosed	19
N	99

F2.3 - Guide to recovery of aid; same link as T4.4 (PDF10)

Response	Number
Yes	79
No	7
Undisclosed	13
N	99

F2.4 - Personal contact; repeat in F4.4 (PDF11)

Response	Number
Yes	19
No	10
Undisclosed	2
N activity rate	31

F4.1 - Visited groups; numbers defined in the text (PDF38)

Group	Less than 30	30+	Total
Job-ready	4	26	30
Training Parate	38	0	38
Activity Parate	16	15	31
Total	58	41	99

F4.2 - § 36 isolated; graph without printed column number (PDF42)

Response	Number of accompanying persons
Yes	61
No	19
Undisclosed	19
N	99

F4.4 - Personal contact; graph without printed column number (PDF50)

Response	Number of accompanying persons
Yes	19
No	10
Undisclosed	2
N	31

F4.5 - General guidance; main text PDF54 contradicts Annex 1 / T2 (PDF55)

Response	Number of accompanying persons
Yes	66
No	17
Undisclosed	16
N	99

F4.6 - Overall accuracy; recurrence of F2.1 (PDF56)

Response	Number of accompanying persons
Right	47
Amendment/remittal	25
Improper no sanction	1
Undisclosed	26
N	99

F5.1 - Three stages of consultation; deadlines have the second denominator (PDF58)

Test	Yeah.	No.	Undisclosed	N
Consultation made	83	11	5	99
All days of default	63	23	13	99
Time-limit decision	72	11	12	95

SUP1 - Call and interim / penalty (PDF5 / 8 / 46 / 97- 101 / 115)

Search	Number or time limit	Meaning
Municipalities	10	Selected by high / low penalty shares October 2012- September 2013
Cases per municipality requested	12	Four in each of three assessment categories
Total demand	120	Finally 99; deficiency in categories, undocumented 21 rejected illegal cases
Penalised	95	Justification and due process
No sanction	4	Three correct, one AS thinks wrong
19 incorrect § 36	19	11 no consultation + 4 wrong rule + 3 reasonable reason + 1 wrong number of days
Time limit for submission	24 September 2014	Recent decisions before the date of the call for competition
Start of the rule / event	1 January 2014	Both decision and sanctioned post-reform event
Expected municipal reporting	1st quarter 2015	Plan, not actual repair
Distribution of municipalities	12/4/8/12/11/12/5/11/12/12	Summer 99, same Annex 7 / T1

SUP2 - Local government's described workflows; overlap possible (PDF64-65 / 114)

Practice	Number	Evidence value
Internal guidelines	10	Submitted by the municipalities
Detailed Annexes	6	Not six extra case samples
Signature considered as consultation	1	Signature does not prove any concrete proof of defence
Home visits if necessary	1	Self-described routine, not actually contact in all cases
Meeting before sanction	1	Self-described routine
Electronic transversal operation	1	Daily at municipal centres, monthly at external and language schools, daily / weekly at job centres
Supplementary organisational questions	2	Guidelines and receipt of information from the service facility

Deviations, overlap and non-recovery order

Main text PDF54 indicates 66 correct, 17 deficient and 16 undisclosed overall instructions. The original table PDF68 in the municipality annex indicates 68 / 16 / 15. Both sums are 99; the deviation is visually verified and both versions are preserved. The recital 29 of October 2015 merely amends the withdrawal of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs from the political debate because the recommendation has no economic consequences. It doesn't correct this number deviation. A statement of the financial consequences of the nomination is not an estimate of the financial losses of the citizens.

T4.2 has 103 response records in 99 cases because several grounds for absence could be registered. The text PDF42 refers to 38 cases with other reasons, while the table has 39 registrations in Others. 39 unique citizens or a new overall error population cannot be deduced from this. No response 51 is neither 51 documented absences without reasonable reason nor 51 documented healthy citizens.

T5.1 has 95 as its denominator; T5.2 has 99. Hearing the parties concerning all days has 99, whereas a decision after expiry of the time limit has 95, because the four without a sanction are excluded from the latter. The summary's 76 written notifications of absence can be reconciled as 73 written+3 other electronic/email/attendance slips in T6.1; this is a grouping, not 76 additional cases. The 31 insufficiently investigated cases, 48 deficient statements of reasons, 23 deficient hearings concerning all days and 25 hypothetical amendments/remittals for reconsideration may overlap. They must not be added together as 127 distinct citizens affected by errors.

The largest known negative sub-group is 48 deficient reasons among 95 sanctions. For a Union of at least one of these documented negative sub-assessments, a minimum of 48 and a maximum of 99 runs may only be indicated in the overall sample before a cross-table / identification is available. It is a mathematical limit to the course of proceedings, not a number of persons, criminal proceedings or fully invalid decisions. The 26 pending cases have not been declared legal.

Citizens, children, parents, health and time

The examples below are own summaries of published reproductions. Information from medical records, doctors and citizens is labelled according to their actual source; the underlying full original record is not provided in the report. Local numbers provide deduplication within this original, not cross-government identification. The course of three children in case 57 is specific family context; placement, actual separation and repair time are not documented in this example.

Local number	Physical PDF Page	Publication	Meaning of proof and specific delineation
79	38-39	26-year-old woman: ADHD / depression, alcohol, economy for recommended medication and lack of excess for treatment is mentioned.	AS: should be a party to activities. Training readiness shall not be based on undocumented treatment / resources. Original medical files and actually subsequent help have not been published.
11	39/50-51	19-year-old man with Asperger, isolation, about 18 computer hours a day, lives with parents. Five days off in five-month offers; Mom couldn't get him to go.	AS accepts the contact link. This does not prove that aid was sufficient or every other level of lawfulness met.

Local number	Physical PDF Page	Publication	Meaning of proof and specific delineation
15	40	25-year-old man with HG / HF, SU June 2014, wanted educational training and rejected the SOSU track.	AS accepts obvious readiness for education; this is the agency's assessment on the records submitted.
42	40	60-year-old woman with care / care work, the municipality considered her ready for work.	Accepted search; no independent review of all levels of sanctions in the example.
39	40	30-year-old man, dyslexic, lack of years of education, help since 2006, anxiety / abuse and mentor mentioned.	AS accepts activity Parate Visitation; registered mentor is not documented enough actual help.
50	41	Job-ready category without sufficient documents.	The basis for the eligibility assessment could not be checked.
51	41	Depression since 2010, severe overweight / absence; job-ready without medical record.	Lack of medical basis for checking, undocumented ranting.
72	41	The municipality had stated, 2,5 months before the sentence, that health had to be investigated.	Relevant material was missing during the investigation. The course documents previously recognised information needs; no precise dates for daily calculation.
38	44/52/61	39-year-old man with ADHD, anxiety / depression and alcohol; lived with mother for economic reasons. Ten days absence in May 2014, penalty for nine. Offers February-May, ten hours per week / two days, mentor; June details on antabus and medicines.	AS: medical basis and contact insufficient. Relevant June information could not be disregarded without investigation; a mentor/home contact should have been attempted. Three mentions are one case; no arrears-payment date.
75	44-45	23-year-old man with isolation, skizoid drag / test information, could not call for help; absence in July.	AS: Penalties do not promote availability. The municipality subsequently stated that the decision had been amended. The statement is evidence of notified change, unverified bank payment or restoration date.
46	45	35-year-old male with social anxiety, absence in May, medical information in June 2014.	Proper non-sanction according to AS; not to be counted as illegal deduction.
18	45-46	26-year-old male with august- / septembre absence, SU from 1 October 2014; the municipality failed to sanction.	AS considers that the municipality should have sanctioned. This error is a different category from the illegal deprivation of the citizen's support; it is not a 26th proven wrong sanction.
22,24	46	Absence from conversation attributed to section 36.	AS: wrong sanction clause, § 37 was relevant. Two different local numbers.
54,80	46/59	Failure to report sick leave referred to Section 36; 80 also defective statement of reasons.	AS: Paragraph 39 was relevant. The same 80 goes on again; it does not add up to more citizens.
16	46	Deductions for too many days.	AS underestimates the number of days; the correct / excess number is not published here.
9	47/59	Guidance accepted, but the reasons for the decision did not explain the reason and the assessment of the citizen.	A correct guidance link does not prove correct overall decision.
90	47-48	45-year-old man, bid 23 June 2014; journal 20 June, signature 24 June; absence 23 and 26 June, penalty for two days.	AS: guidance came too late for June 23. The municipality was aware to pay back one day. Intent / recognition is not a bank receipt.
94	48	22-year-old man, offer 7 July 2014, job plan 8 July; former guide 4 April and later consultation 11 July.	Lack of simultaneous guidance; neither previous general guidance nor subsequent consultation replaces the management.
62	48	Guidance did not indicate how the right to help is recovered.	A description of efficacy without guidance is insufficient.
66	49	25-year-old male received general text with three alternative effects.	The citizen could not know the consequence of his incident; sanction without clear guidance.

Local number	Physical PDF Page	Publication	Meaning of proof and specific delineation
57	51	36-year-old man, stay after family reunification, wife and three children, six years of school; six days of absence at a Danish course, lost school's telephone number and language difficulties. Stress is mentioned.	AS accepts contact. Three specifically mentioned children in one family; not a national children's number, and no original medical act has been presented.
59	51-52	28-year-old male, refugee; eight amputated toes after foreign imprisonment, pain and psychiatric referral. Nine days of absence, two days a week as well as Danish lessons.	AS accepts contact. The decision of the Danish authority must be examined separately; foreign torture / injury must not be counted as eight Danish government offences.
43	53	39-year-old male, osteoarthritis, mentor, parental authority; medical disease 25 June-16 July 2014 and record of worsening in activity.	Letter without response was followed by sanction; AS requires further contact, including parents. 21 past calendar days / 22 days including both dates are only the interval in the reported sick leave, not known illegality or medically verified cause of injury.
10	53	18-year-old man with severe ADD in a § 107 residential facility; one day of absence.	Only letter, no personal contact via the accommodation; AS: Contact options not exhausted.
49	53-54	41st-year-old male, six-month offer, 22 days off.	Only letter, no personal contact before deduction; number of absences has not been proven 22 illegal deduction days.
83	54	26-year-old man, stress/depression, seven-month measure, five days of absence. Call requested only a signature.	Contact without examination of the cause of absence did not satisfy Article 35 (5).
74	59	Deductions for 12 August 2014.	The justification did not explain the specific cause and assessment; one decided sanction day, bank outturn unknown.
85	59	Deductions for 4 June 2014.	Lack of response was equated with illegal absence without concrete justification; bank outturn unknown.
35	61	The citizen said on the phone that he had actually met the two contentious July / August days. The municipality asked him to contact the site of the bid and sanctioned without his own clarification.	AS: The authority had to investigate the attendance error itself. The list of the invitation to tender cannot only make contentious absences true; the two actual absences have not been proven in the published chain.

Knowledge, public political treatment and the strongest demands

Copenhagen's political presentation and decision 12 November 2015 documents the receipt / processing of the findings. The municipality's own sample had 12 cases, ten true, one change / remittal for reconsideration and one unresolved. The presentation says that the failed citizen had immediately passed on to training and that therefore there had been no actual consequence or further treatment. The evidence of subsequent education does not in itself demonstrate that a previous improper deduction of the income had been paid back. The production also indicates that the recommendations were already implemented; that is the municipality's status statement, not a published post-check of each payment.

The national political table indicates 47 / 25 / 26 and in a footnote omits the one wrongly omitted penalty. That demarcation may be used for the adverse sanctions of citizens, but the original's full 47 / 25 / 1 / 26 must continue to be shown. The decision to take note of the report is not a documented decision on the restoration of each individual citizen.

Documented errors: the negative partial assessments in the tables, the specifically reproduced deficiencies concerning invalidity/contact/the factual basis, and the original’s numerical discrepancy of 66/17/16 against 68/16/15. **Hypotheses that require more evidence:** further unlawful sanctions in unresolved cases, omitted plan/order errors, specific payment loss and missing back payment, and individual intentional/grossly negligent disregard. None may be counted as proved solely from the sample percentage.

Priorities of pleas and claims: First, try the prior offer / training order and each condition of sanction, not only the summary accuracy figure. Secondly, resume and correct the actual errors, present original absenteeism lists and citizens' objections, and pay back proven unjustified deductions with

specific consideration of interest/compensation under the applicable basis. Finally, require a dated account of redress from the erroneous decision through municipal knowledge/complaint/remittal to actual correct bank payment. The authority's duty to gather information and conduct a specific hearing of the parties follows section 10 of the Legal Safeguards Act, section 19/sections 22-24 of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Active Social Policy Act's special safeguards in the historical version reproduced in the original; current rules must not be applied retrospectively without version verification.

The state's responsibility under the Convention does not depend on a particular caseworker being punished. Documented unlawful deprivation of subsistence must be investigated as a real impact on the individual's means of existence and family life; the duration and seriousness of the loss must be linked to specific record/payment dates. The original provides no basis for calculating a national sum of months without subsistence. The missing bank/reparation data are specifically missing evidence of consequences, not an argument for explaining away the documented errors.

Sanction surveys 2015-2017:actual samples and exclusions

Control 7 October 2026. Own compact fact records following original reports. The outcome is the review of sample cases by the Board of Appeal; they are neither actually made up of complaints nor evidence of criminal liability. Unsubstantiated legality is distinct from a well-established error of assessment. No person deducting is available.

Publication / deg Ear period	Input, fractionation and actual n	Right / wrong / not evaluable	Limitation and original locator
September 2015 / 2014	120 requested; 99 investigated in 10 municipalities: 95 sanctions and 4 decisions not to sanction. Full reception / separation distribution has not been documented here.	47 / 26 / 26. The 26 wrong ones are **25 decisions on penalties and one; decision not to: Penalties**.	§ 36; municipalities selected by high / low previous penalties. Cases complained of and forwarded were excluded; cases of locally modified reassembly were possible. PDF 5-11, 69, 112-115. Original 2015.
June 2016 / 1st January-31 October 2015	Objective 130; Call 13 × (8 + 3) plus all § 40 a cases; 175 received, 44 deleted, **131 tested**.	**34 / 70 / 27**. Control sum below.	Selected from the use of § 40a, length of complaint and geography. Objected cases excluded. PDF 5-10, 33, 35-37, 42-44, 56, 75-78, 136. Original 2016.
March 2017 / 1st January-4 May 2016	Objective 130; 150 requested; 136 received; 31 deleted; **105 tested**, the same 10 municipalities as 2015.	**62 / 21 / 22**. The 21 would be changed; the 22 could not be judged sufficiently.	Article 36. Objected cases excluded. 28 job-ready, 46 training and 31 activity-parate. PDF 4-10 and methodological annexes; source letter PDF 91. Original 2017.

2016 autonomous subpopulations:

Destination	n	Right	Wrong, would amended	Not evaluable	PDF Page
§ 37	78	31	24	23	33
Paragraph 39 (7)	4	0	4	0	35-37, 42
§ 39, point 8	29	3	22	4	43-44
§ 40a	20	0	20	0	56
Control sum	**131**	**34**	**70**	**27**	Own addition of express integers

Selected separate error targets with their own denominators:

Report	Measurement	Counter / denominator	Locator
2015	Misapplication of Paragraph 36 in isolation	19 / 99; 61 correct, 19 not evaluable	PDF 8-9
2015	Insufficient justification	48 / 95 Penalties	PDF 58

Report	Measurement	Counter / denominator	Locator
2015	Insufficient information	31 / 99	PDF 61
2015	Counselling incorrect / not evaluable	7 / 99 and 13 / 99	PDF 47
2016	§ 39, point 8: guidance inadequate / not assessable	6 / 29 and 14 / 29	PDF 44
2016	§ 40 a: reasonable reason not evaluable	8 / 20	PDF 62
2017	Counselling incorrect / not evaluable	11 / 105 and 1 / 105	PDF 7-10
2017	Activity Parate: Personal contact insufficient / not assessable	18 / 31 and 1 / 31	PDF 7-10
2017	Absence of justification	67 / 105	PDF 37, printed page 34
2017	Complaint guidance correctly / partially deficient / insufficient	5 / 105; 99 / 105; 1 / 105	PDF 40, printed page 37

Documentation change in 2017: Initially, 107 cases were relevant. Further material was requested in 87; 86 produced additional documents, with two cases then excluded. In 44 of the remaining 84, the documents changed the assessment. These 44 are a documentation-process measure, not a further 44 unlawful sanctions. The two earlier studies and 2017 must therefore not be presented as a trend series with a constant methodology.

Mistakes can overlap. The denominators shown must be preserved. The n of the three main populations can be summed as a maximum of 335 **sample measurements;**; there is no documented cross-border citizen deluxation. The same municipality is not the same citizen and different publication years are not proof of different people. Full review of all sub-tables in 2016 and 2017 has not yet been completed.

Source control: PDF number 116 / 142 / 98. SHA-256 of source bytes under control: 2015 e12704095eab24d1934818ec84913aa70a542219eb390aba6eef60a103435575; 2016 bcc87b8cda029245502462c861aff2f4e5c058722416e6d4c204362bef821951. The source bytes are not stored in the project.

Penalties 2016: all original result matrices and citizens' programmes

All 142 original pages have been read in RAM. All 28 numbered main tables, both municipality annex tables and the seven results figures have been addressed. This is the same 131-case cohort as in the historical overview; the tables and examples add no new cases. The “percentage” column reproduces the original’s rounded percentage, not a new calculation. The 47 local example numbers are deduplicated below.

Kohort Bridge and Documentation Terms

175 received minus 44 excluded =131 assessed. There is no public numerical breakdown of the individual grounds for exclusion. The plan was 130, the request 13×(8+3) plus all § 40 a cases. The distribution is 78 under § 37,4 under § 39, no. 7,29 under § 39, no. 8 and 20 under § 40 a. Appealed cases are expressly excluded in the case-request letter PDF136. The most recent decisions before 1 November 2015 were selected; this is not a documented random national sample. The municipalities were selected partly on the basis of sanction use and appeals. Nine of 13 municipalities participated in dialogue on 25 May 2016. The records submitted were the sole basis for assessment, and missing papers could change the outcome. Neither the number of repayments nor actual time without assistance is published.

All 28 main tables

Table 2.1: Timely written guidance for conversation

SAN16F, PDF15. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	65	83

Result	Number	Printed percentage
No	5	6
Cannot be assessed	8	10
Total	78	100

Table 2.2: Citizens had reasonable grounds under Paragraph 13 (7)

SAN16F PDF18. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	2	3
No	50	64
Insufficient information	26	33
Total	78	100

Table 2.3: The municipality's documented assessment for other reasonable reasons

SAN16F PDF21. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	4	5
No	74	95
Total	78	100

Table 2.4: Subsequent assessment by the Board of Appeal in the 74 without documented assessment

SAN16F PDF22. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Other reasonable reasons	1	1
No other reasonable reasons	35	47
Already reasonable grounds under Paragraph 13 (7)	2	3
Insufficient information	36	49
Total	74	100

Table 2.5: The municipality's documented assessment of whether the sanction promotes availability

SAN16F PDF24. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	7	9
No	71	91
Total	78	100

Table 2.6: Subsequent assessment by the Board of Appeal in the 71 without documented assessment

SAN16F, PDF25. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Will promote availability	36	51
Will not promote availability	1	1
Already reasonable grounds under Paragraph 13 (7)	2	3
Cannot be assessed	32	45
Total	71	100

Table 2.7: Actual personal contact before decision

SAN16F, PDF27. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	53	68
No	25	32
Cannot be assessed	0	0
Total	78	100

Table 2.8: Number of sanctioned days calculated correctly

SAN16F PDF31. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	45	58
No	5	6
Cannot be assessed	28	36
Total	78	100

Table 3.1: § 39 (7): Sufficient guidance

SAN16F PDF36. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	0	0
No	4	100
Not available	0	0
Total	4	100

Table 3.2: § 39 (7): Clear and precise job search agreement

SAN16F, PDF38. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	4	100
No	0	0
Cannot be assessed	0	0
Total	4	100

Table 3.3: Paragraph 39 (7): non-compliance with the agreement

SAN16F PDF39. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	4	100
No	0	0
Cannot be assessed	0	0
Total	4	100

Table 3.4: Paragraph 39 (7): Citizens had reasonable grounds

SAN16F, PDF40. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	0	0
No	4	100
Insufficient information	0	0
Total	4	100

Table 3.5: § 39 (7): amount of the sanction calculated correctly

SAN16F, PDF41. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	0	0
No	0	0
Cannot be assessed	4	100
Total	4	100

Table 3.6: § 39 (8): Sufficient guidance

SAN16F, PDF44. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	9	31
No	6	21
Not available	14	48

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Total	29	100

Table 3.7: § 39 (8): time limit for registration

SAN16F PDF46. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	13	45
No	1	3
Not available	15	52
Total	29	100

Table 3.8: § 39, No 8: Job search activities not registered by the deadline

SAN16F PDF48. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	5	17
No	22	76
Cannot be assessed	2	7
Total	29	100

Table 3.9: Paragraph 39 (8): Citizens had reasonable grounds

SAN16F, PDF50. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	0	0
No	28	97
Insufficient information	1	3
Total	29	100

Table 3.10: § 39 (8): amount of the penalty calculated correctly

SAN16F PDF52. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	13	45
No	1	3
Cannot be assessed	15	52
Total	29	100

Table 4.1: § 40 a: time and quality of guidance

SAN16F, PDF57. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes, most recent call letter	3	15
Yes, previous call letter	1	5
Yes, other previous letter	3	15
No guidance	4	20
Lack of guidance	0	0
For late guidance	3	15
Cannot be assessed	6	30
Total	20	100

Table 4.2: Previous provisions on penalties; several responses possible

SAN16F PDF59. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
None	10	50
§ 36	7	35
§ 37	5	25
§ 38	0	0
§ 39	0	0
§ 41	1	5
Other	0	0
Total; case denominator	20	100

Table 4.3: Repeated sanctioned omissions within the relevant period

SAN16F PDF60. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	7	35
No	7	35
Cannot be assessed	6	30
Total	20	100

Table 4.4: § 40a: Citizens had reasonable grounds

SAN16F PDF62. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	0	0

Result	Number	Printed percentage
No	12	60
Insufficient information	8	40
Total	20	100

Table 4.5: Penalised offences documented a lack of will

SAN16F, PDF64. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	5	25
No	15	75
Cannot be assessed	0	0
Total	20	100

Table 4.6: Daily tender fulfilled the conditions

SAN16F, PDF66. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	19	95
No	1	5
Not available	0	0
Total	20	100

Table 4.7: Decision provides assistance only for days of attendance

SAN16F, PDF67. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	20	100
No	0	0
Total	20	100

Table 4.8: Decision gives date of effect

SAN16F, PDF67. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	20	100
No	0	0
Total	20	100

Table 4.9: Decision specifies the length of the period of imprisonment

SAN16F PDF68. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	19	95
No	1	5
Total	20	100

Table 4.10: Proportionality between offences and increased penalties

SAN16F, PDF70. The rows keep the table's own question and denominator.

Result	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	4	20
No	16	80
Cannot be assessed	0	0
Total	20	100

Both municipal annex tables with common row -N

SAN16F, PDF81-82. The findings and case information are different columns for the same cases.

Municipality	Right	Wrong	Not evaluable	N	Sufficient enlightened	Insufficient enlightened
Esbjerg	3	1	5	9	4	5
Fax	1	14	5	20	5	15
Haderslev	4	5	2	11	7	4
Heath site	0	3	0	3	1	2
Corner	0	8	2	10	3	7
Holstebro	1	1	2	4	1	3
Jammerbug	1	1	0	2	2	0
Copenhagen	14	8	3	25	20	5
Odense	0	3	1	4	0	4
Odsherd	4	4	0	8	4	4
Randers	4	9	2	15	11	4
Rødover	2	8	1	11	6	5
Sorø	0	5	4	9	2	7
Total	34	70	27	131	66	65

All figure cells and supplementary sub-totals

Figure / measurement	Category	Number of animals declared	Printed percentage	N / Limit
1.1, PDF6	Right / Wrong / Not evaluable	34 /70 /27	26 /53 /21	131; number from main distribution
2.1, PDF14	Psychiatric / physical disorder	not printed,	46 /44	78; several causes possible
2.1, PDF14	Abuse / homelessness	not printed,	28 /13	78; several causes possible
2.1, PDF14	Language barrier / other	not printed,	3 /46	78; no disability-personunion
2.2, PDF28	Contact, cause noted / not recorded	46 /7	87 /13	53 with contact
2.3, PDF28	Without contact, options exhausted / not exhausted / unknown	9 /14 /2	36 /56 /8	25 without contact
Annex Figure 2, PDF79	§ 37: men / women	not printed,	60 /40	78
Annex Figure 2, PDF79	§ 39, No 7: Men / Women	4 /0	100 /0	4
Annex Figure 2, PDF79	§ 39, No 8: Men / Women	not printed,	69 /31	29
Annex Figure 2, PDF79	§ 40 a: men / women	not printed,	65 /35	20
PDF78, gender prosa	Men / Women	84 /47	64 /36	131 case-by-case cases, not cross-border personal union
PDF19, subgroup	No contact / response not noted / other information gaps	14 /7 /5	not printed,	26 not adequately informed on reasonable grounds
PDF24	Local availability assessment accepted / not evaluable	3 /4	not printed,	7 with documented municipal assessment
PDF28	Total contact guarantee fulfilled	55	71	46 + 9 of 78; not the same as 53 with contact
PDF40, § 39, No 7	Party hearing answered without reasonable reason / unanswered	1 /3	not printed,	4
PDF63, § 40a	Party hearing answered without reasonable reason / unanswered	4 /8	not printed,	12 assessed for no reasonable reason
PDF65 / 70	No previous penalty / only one	10 /4	not printed,	Subgroups in both will / proportionality; not 20 new errors

Annex Figures 1 and 3: age, sex and all destination columns

SAN16F, PDF79-80. The sex cells are percentages; the rules are number. Age-N is calculated only as the sum of the four printed numbers. No gender count is derived from rounded percentages.

Age	§ 37	Paragraph 39 (7)	§ 39, No 8	§ 40a	Male, percent.	Women, per cent	Own age -N
18-20	4	0	0	5	33	67	9
21-25	11	0	4	5	65	35	20
26-30	9	0	1	4	50	50	14
31-35	13	1	5	1	75	25	20
36-40	15	0	2	1	56	44	18

Age	§ 37	Paragraph 39 (7)	§ 39, No 8	§ 40a	Male, percent.	Women, per cent	Own age -N
41-50	19	3	10	3	71	29	35
51-60	6	0	6	1	77	23	13
Exceeding 60	1	0	1	0	50	50	2

Specific measurement blindness and source deviations

Calculation errors have been omitted from principal accuracy. The PDF30-31,40-41 and 51-52 expressly state that the correct penalty time / amount is not a prerequisite for the "correct 'of the main measure. The separate 5 / 78 time calculation errors and 1 / 29 amount errors must therefore be shown. They cannot simply be added to 70 wrong; the cross table is missing. Similarly, 74 / 78 decisions are inadequately justified with regard to other factors and 71 / 78 without a documented assessment of availability. The 34 main cases are thus not 34 cases without legal error.

The review assumes several circumstances without complete original documentation. PDF38 gives significance to an unanswered hearing of the parties in relation to missing job applications. PDF43 assumes a job-search agreement in all 29 § 39,no. 8 cases without having requested the agreement in all of them. PDF64 relies on the municipal assessment of willingness even without specific reasons. These measurement assumptions are not independent evidence of each individual fact.

Multiple responses: T4.2 has 10+7+5+0+0+1+0=23 occurrences of statutory provisions for 20 cases; the original permits multiple responses. This is not an arithmetic error or 23 people. Figure 2.1 likewise does not sum to 100%,because reasons overlap.

Bug references: PDF25 refers to T2.6 for the three accepted municipal assessments and T2.7 for 36 subsequent assessments; the latter table actually measures contact. The figures and their actual questions are maintained. The PDF79 claims male majority across ages, but figure 1 shows only 33% men among 18-20 years of age. Case 91 should be reported 38 years on PDF25 and 36 years on PDF30. Case 96 has different statement periods and 10 decisions / 11 periods respectively; without the original act, the difference must be left open. The call letter PDF137 uses the word "refund" in a section on feedback and report consultation; it is not evidence of an actual payment.

A measurement form is not outcome data. PDF100-134 contains blank questions, including questions about the 3-month implementation deadline and the effect of sanctions on attendance. No completed national distribution of outcomes is published for all these fields. The options' code numbers must not be counted as cases. PDF138-141 contains blank submission lists, not additional decisions.

Dependent local case procedures

The 47 local case numbers below appear as examples in the same 131cohort. Repeated mention is collected; numbers are not publicly linked to unique CPR numbers. The actual statement of the source is therefore identified control summaries, not an independent rereading of the underlying citizens' records.

Local number	PDF	Documentary progress of the control summary	Meaning and time limits
32	16/19	Lack of guidance; the municipality accepted disease as a reasonable reason, but sanctioned the next day.	Two mention of the same case; no post-payment or end date published.
46	16	Inaccurate guidance without proper return to help.	Unlawful condition for sanctioning according to the study;actual amount/duration unknown.
67	16	The municipality gave guidance on the disappearance, subsequently correctly on deduction, but only after the absence.	Subsequent guidance does not repair the prior condition.
64	17	The municipality moved the meeting to the coffee shop without new timely instructions; the citizen asked for calls.	The municipality-changed agreement did not bear the sanction.
87	17	Telefonic meeting agreed for the next day; the presentation of the letter before the meeting was not documented.	Undocumented written prior guidance.
25	19	Likely to have overslept.	Example of a lack of due cause; not in itself proven unlawful sanction.

Local number	PDF	Documentary progress of the control summary	Meaning and time limits
31	19	Lived to forget the meeting.	Only one element of the overall test.
114	20	Diabetes / eating disorder; citizen and father enlightened vomiting, previous admissions known.	Sickness reasonable reason; doubts had to be examined medically before penalty.
12	20	Following traffic accidents and mental problems; contact after approximately 14 days.	Medical psychiatric information was missing; 14 days is contact interval, unverified loss time.
102	20	21-year-old with social anxiety, psychiatric diagnostic assessment and a contact person for four years in aftercare.	The municipality's lack of health information; four years is a history of support, not an illegal withdrawal from benefits.
131	22-23	45 years of age with serious health / addiction problems; where the absence was explained three days later.	Other reasonable grounds were exempted; the municipality could not sanction.
91	25/30	Homeless with mental information and mail address in mother; repeated contact attempts.	The source indicates 38 years in one mention and 36 years in another; the same number is counted once.
37	25	22-year-old with eating disorder, but explained absence with oblivion / oversleep.	Example of the Authority's on-site assessment, not self-proven damage.
26	26	45- year of alcohol abuse reported abstinence with tremors / malaise.	Health information is insufficient to assess the effectiveness of sanctions.
51	26	44-year-old mother emotionally influenced by forced removal; party consultation response reduced to standard note.	No concrete representation of the answer; parental loss and financial intervention meet in the same course, but the number / dates of the child are unknown.
72	29	36-year-old asked for calls; one attempt, decision four days later; mentor known.	Contact options not exhausted.
99	29	26-year-old with special schooling/STU and difficulties with structure lived with mother;decision 14 days later without contact.	The residence contact should be tried; 14 days is the time for the decision.
152	29	34-year-old wrote that the phone was dead and offered attendance; the municipality refused visits without an appointment.	The municipality failed to make any real contact.
163	29-30	59-year-old in methadone treatment; the municipality knew the place of extradition, but gave up after one missed call.	Not exhausted contact; time without help unknown.
50	30	60-year-old with back / alcohol problems; contact tried through residential, residential and telephone.	Example of exhausted possibilities; no independent illegality proven here.
69	30	20-year-old with a loaded upbringing; repeated calls and contact at the address.	The same definition as Case 50.
135	31	Failed to attend on 7 October 2015; deduction only from party consultation on 13 October.	Six-day calculation difference, but this has not been documented further citizen load.
118	32	It was 17 September; the municipality announced self-employment / new application after 31 October.	The municipality could not terminate the case on this basis; actual implementation could not be published.
175	37	Unclear guidance letter on job search and consequences.	Absence of a residence condition for § 39 (7)
109	38/41	Job search agreement one job per week; decision indicated three daily rates without any amount.	Agreement documented; calculation not verifiable.
174	38	Agreement on two posts found and at least two weekly applications.	Only the contract criterion documented.
173	42	1.995 kr mentioned for October-December with no clarity about total amount or monthly deduction.	No safe loss sum can be calculated from the formulation.
94	45	Guidance on registration and reduction of benefits.	Example of correct guidance; other indents separately.

Local number	PDF	Documentary progress of the control summary	Meaning and time limits
140	45/51	Guidance on registration and daily rates; citizen explained missing computer.	Repeat case number, no extra person.
76	45	Guidance on availability assessment, but without precise consequences for aid.	Insufficient guidance.
10	45-46/49/5 1	The municipality referred to counselling papers without accompanying them; the citizen actually informed the job search.	Missing original documentation must not be turned into certain proof of the content of the guidance.
11	47/49	Deadline every 30 days; joblog 27 august-28 September, registration 30 September.	Specific deadline and registration, not a public payment date.
35	47/49	Registration agreement at least two jobs per week; citizen was entering.	Obligation to register and actual job search must be separated.
56	47/51	No documented time limit for registration; unclear representation of party consultation results.	Both temptation and lack of information; one case with multiple errors.
20	47	Note 14 October on no registration since 27 August.	Deadline not established from the note.
107	49	New deadline 20 May; registration 18 May.	Citizens complied with the new deadline set by the local government.
138	51	Justified non-registration with distance to work.	The source's example for no reasonable reason; not proof of all other conditions.
105	52	Decision with DKK 1.995 and § 40.	Example of estimable amount calculation.
38	58	Guidance on possible enhanced sanction in prior consultation of parties.	Correct guidance, but the main cohort's 20 tightened sanctions all wrong.
96	61/66/71	Former sanctions; § 40 a 26 February 2015 from 2 March to 30 April, but only one possible meeting day for bids.	Daily access to help was missing; 29 absences, 10 decisions and 11 periods in various mention without cross tables.
143	61/71	55 days of absence for five periods; § 40 a 14 October 2015 with effect from 6 October to 6 December.	The dates show decision eight days after the date of effect; review requires appearance / payment data, not automatic further breach of law.
23	61	Internal settings for 15 absences, but only one documented previous sanction decision.	Internal proposals are not sanctions taken and have not been tightened.
40	61-62	12 attendance days of 30 possible over barely six weeks; no § 36 decisions.	Stronger sanctions could not be built on unsanctioned conditions.
43	63	Citizen gave no explanation of absence.	Only the question of reasonable ground.
79	63/68	No NEG ID for a period; Decision of 1 October 2015 without a specified end period.	Indeterminate duration of the penalty; no public effective end date.
36	70-71	Interview 28 May 2015; new application 11 September; eight-week intensified measure from 14 September.	Only one previous decision so that enhanced sanction could not be applied; 106 days for new application are not documented legality / payment figures.
39	71	45-year-old carpenter; one absence 25 August 2015 based on three-month penalty.	Stronger sanction was not proportional; three months have been decided period, not documented actual income loss.

Legally sustainable consistency and concrete requirements

The conclusion is that documented deficiencies in the Act's preconditions for sanctions led to interference with subsistence support, and that the review measure additionally omitted some calculation and reasoning errors. The evidence is the specific tables and case summaries above. The significance is that 70 incorrect and 27 not assessable do not form a complete union of all legal deficiencies. The relevant historical chain of rules is Active Social Policy Act §§ 13,35,37,39,40 and 40 a, the duty to establish the facts and the requirements to give reasons and make records. A municipal sanction without fulfilment of the conditions concerning guidance, contact, illness or proportionality departs from these rules. The consequence must be assessed as reopening and repayment of unjustified deductions with separate examination of time and interest; responsibility for the documented loss of subsistence support cannot be inferred solely from a general hypothetical appeal outcome.

The demand is a decision-specific follow-up list for the 70 incorrect, 27 not assessable and separate calculation/reasoning errors:original decision, interference with income, all appeal/reconsideration dates, reopening, final decision, payment, interest and any compensation. The municipal council's consideration under Legal Protection and Administration in Social Matters Act § 79 a must be linked to actual redress, not general guidance alone. The material documents neither general immunity nor an individual criminal conviction of the caseworkers; personal responsibility requires evidence of action, culpability and the relevant rule of responsibility. The State's human-rights responsibility does not depend on conviction of a particular employee.

Penalties 2017: all result tables, contact guarantees and citizens' programme

The original is text read in memory of all 98 physical PDFs pages. Fourteen pages of results, figures and municipal distributions are also checked visually. Source code **SAN17F**; the locators below are physical PDFs pages. The original isn't hidden locally. This broadens the same 105 cases in the historical main table; it does not create 105 new cases.

Selection, lack of documents and limits of measurement

150 cases were requested with a target of 130; 136 were received, 31 were withdrawn, 105 were tried. They consist of 28 job-ready, 46 training parates and 31 activity parates. The ten municipalities were selected on the basis of high / low sanction shares 2012-2013, not as a random national sample. The call excludes decisions already pending (PDF91). The most recent decision requested before 9 May 2016 must be kept separate from the period actually concluded until 4 May.

Before reminders, 107 were assessable and 29 excluded; after 87 requests, the agency received 86 supplementary responses, after which two further cases were excluded. New material changed the assessment in 44 of 84 cases. These are changed assessments of the same cases, not 44 additional breaches of law. Five municipalities participated in information on 20 June 2016 and six in dialogue on 9 December 2016; all ten answered three organisational questions. Holding meetings documents knowledge and discussion, not actual repayment.

All 105 meet the initial category for a section 36 deduction in annex table 1. This does not mean that 105 sanctions were lawful: that review expressly disregards subsequent failures to meet conditions (PDF11-12). The main result is 62 correct,21 incorrect and 22 not assessable. The 99 partially correct appeal instructions expressly do not affect the main result because the cases had not been appealed (PDF41). Exclusion and error measurement therefore make the main measure of correctness narrower than all documented deficiencies under administrative law.

All main tables

Table 2.1, PDF16: Citizens had reasonable grounds; yes means grounds for exemption

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	2	2
No	72	69
Insufficient information	31	30
Total	105	100

Table 2.2, PDF26: Actual contact, only the 31 inadequately informed

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	25	81
No	6	19
Cannot be assessed	0	0
Total	31	100

Table 3.1, PDF31: Total case information

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Sufficient	75	71
Insufficient	30	29
Total	105	100

Table 3.2, PDF37: Reasons

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Sufficient	38	36
Insufficient	67	64
Cannot be assessed	0	0
Total	105	100

All numeric figures

The three subdimensions of Figure 3.1 are shown separately. Figures 1.1 and 2.4 show the same main outcome. Figure 2.2 on PDF23 is a decision procedure without further counting; its branches relate to grounds for exemption, availability and contact to be tested before penalty.

Figure 1.1 / 2.4, PDF7 / 29: Overall accuracy; two reproductions of the same population

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Right	62	59
Wrong	21	20
Cannot be assessed	22	21
Total	105	100

Figure 2.1, PDF16: Reasons for non-appearance; several registrations in the same case

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Own disease	21	-
Do not offer in My Plan	3	-
Child ill	3	-
Forgot	1	-
Job interview	0	-
Other offers	0	-
Other	50	-
Not answer	45	-
Subject-matter	105	-

Figure 2.3, PDF27: Contact guarantee, only 31 cases with limited information

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Achieved	12	-
Not achieved	18	-
Cannot be assessed	1	-
Total	31	-

Figure 3.1 a, PDF34: Party hearing carried out

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	103	98
No	2	2
Total	105	100

Figure 3.1 b, PDF34: Consultation on all specific days

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	75	71
No	17	16
Cannot be assessed	13	12
Total	105	100

Figure 3.1 c, PDF34: Reasonable deadline for reply

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	98	93
No	2	2
Cannot be assessed	5	5
Total	105	100

Figure 3.2, PDF41: Complaint guidance

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Correct	5	5
Wrong	1	1
Partly correct	99	94
Total	105	100

All local government figures, Annex Table 1-3, PDF51-53

The first number column is both case denominator and the number of properly categorised § 36 deductions; Annex Table 1 has zero no and zero unknown in each municipality. The remaining columns are guidance and overall accuracy.

Municipality	N / § 36 Yes	Vejl.yes	Vejl.no.	Vejl.Unknown	Right	Wrong	Unknown
Furesø	11	11	0	0	8	1	2
Faaborg-Midtfyn	14	13	1	0	7	2	5
Glostrup	4	4	0	0	3	0	1
Herning	11	9	2	0	5	4	2
Corner	6	6	0	0	3	0	3
Copenhagen	17	17	0	0	16	1	0
Medium speed	7	6	1	0	3	3	1
Nyborg	11	8	3	0	3	3	5
Slaughter	9	8	0	1	6	0	3
South Djurs	15	11	4	0	8	7	0
Total	105	93	11	1	62	21	22

Age and sex, Annex Figure 1, PDF50

Age	Male	Women
18-20	10	1
21-25	23	12
26-30	13	6
31-35	6	3
36-40	7	2
41-50	11	4
51-60	3	4
61+	0	0
Total	73	32

Additional counts and original discrepancies

For 72 cases without a reasonable reason, 38 have no answers and 34 have an explanation. The two cases with reasonable grounds relate to the lack of childcare and an unfair offer. The 31 unknown are distributed in six without contact, 18 with own / child disease and seven others (PDF17). Of the 25 with actual contact, 12 are adequately investigated, 12 are inadequate and one is not clear. All six without actual contact had unexhausted contact possibilities; thus the overall outcome of the contact guarantee is 12 / 18 / 1 (PDF26-27).

Only eight out of 31 had documented evaluation for other reasonable reasons; 23 had not. Of these 23, 14 were still unaccounted for, of which ten were sick. The availability was demonstrated in three out of 31 but not in 28; of these 28 16 were undisclosed, of which ten were with disease (PDF22). These groups overlap and must not be summed up to more citizens. The complete cross-division of the remaining subgroups has not been published.

PDF12 calls 93 of 105 correctly advised 90%; PDF7 says 89%, and division gives 88,57%. The main table's 2+69+30% is 101% due to rounding. PDF14 generally states that all ten municipalities use written messages; two also receive provider/progress reports, nine obtain information directly, whereas one lets citizens over 30 submit lists themselves. The specific case count on PDF14 mentions 59 attendance lists, seven emails, 11 telephone reports, 15 other and 14 unknown; the total of 106 against the case denominator of 105 is retained because the stated count provides no unambiguous response/overlap rule. PDF42 discusses the appeal guidance positively, whereas the specific figure shows only five fully correct and 99 partly correct. None of these circumstances is silently corrected in the figures.

All local example codes and the significance of the evidence

Case number no	PDF	Publication	Consistency and evidence limit
38	13	The guide was correct.	This single link does not prove total legality.
44	13/38	Correct guidance, but the explanatory statement was missing.	Repeat number is one matter.
6	13	The guide did not meet the requirements.	No public end date or post-payment.
69	13	The guide did not meet the requirements.	The same definition as Case 6.
24,26,41,75, 94,97,126,132	19	The Board refers to these eight numbers as matters for no reasonable reason.	Eight local case numbers, not eight further documented illegality; original civil acts have not been published.
21	19	Child ill; no other care, father at work. The municipality had refused due cause.	The board assesses reasonable grounds. Information about children is not a national children's census.
105	19	Telefonic responses about serious illness; the board criticises the lack of specific investigation.	The municipality's reproduction of intoxication is a statement, not verified medical certificate.
46	20	Depression and emotional instability; psychological contact should be resumed.	The health basis was not sufficiently investigated.
89	20	Language / pain problems, an often ill child and no telephone credit.	Responses were insufficiently noted; the citizen's reply should not be replaced by inadequate notes.
101	20	Years of daily discomfort in irritable intestines.	Relevant health data were not investigated.
136	20/32/35-36	23-year-old: ten March days, seven of which were explained by illness; correct notification to the school was considered to be the wrong place to report. Phone contact April 19.	The contact concerned absenteeism of 2,3,4,8,10,11,14,15,29,30 March; relevant disease questions were not asked. Three of them are the same thing.
66	28	One unsuccessful call and party consultation; no contact at home or via offers.	The possibilities for contact were not exhausted.
48	28	Disease explained absence, but health issues were missing.	Actual contact is not in itself a fulfilment of the investigation and contact guarantee.
3	31	The board points out that the doctor had not seen the citizen for six months.	Missing medical visits are not independent medical evidence of absence of illness; the published reproduction does not give full medical advice.
65	31-32	Father describes one seriously ill child, another child's traffic accident, mental stress and alcohol.	The Board accepts absence for reasonable reasons; the published text does not provide an independent full medical basis. Two mentioned children cannot be added to other reports' children without personal connection.
103	32	22-year-old with anxiety wanted job clothes; psychologist had referred to attendance with support.	A statement of attendance with support does not demonstrate that the aid was actually provided.
92	32	Mother: own and child's disease, five whole and two partial days; no telephone credit.	Lack of health issues; one mother-child chain, not a deduplicated national series of people.
15	35	Hearing of the parties concerning 4,5,7,8 April.	The Board's example of proper consultation, not proof of all other links.
19	35/37	Consultation on April 4-12; problems with internet and My Plan.	Consultation and justification shall be mentioned; the same number shall be counted once.
129	36	Four days of absence in March were not specifically indicated in the hearing.	The citizen was not given the concrete basis to answer.
29	37-38	Days 4,7,10,11,14 March; hearing 8 April unanswered.	Examples of reasons given by the Management Board; actual end-of-year results not published.

Case number no	PDF	Publication	Consistency and evidence limit
135	38	Hearing 18 January 2016; deduction refers to 4,5,7,8,13,19,22,25,26,27,28,29 January.	The board calls the explanatory statement good. The consultation date precedes several sanctioned days; further consultation cannot be verified from the summary and must be documented before legality can be established.
133	39	277 kr in March for absenteeism 17 February without concrete explanation of the basis.	Declared deduction, unverified bank item or final loss.
124	39	ten days 1-15 February; announced deduction 5.060 DKK before tax 29 February.	Other reasonable reasons and contact were missing; actual payment losses have not been verified.
33	41-42	Correct complaint guidance with office time 15.30 of the historical scheme.	Historical criterion; not to be used as contemporary digital freebar.
88	42	Complaint guidance did not have proper information about office time.	Part of the same 105, not an additional complaint.
67	42	Complaint guidance did not have proper information about office time.	The same definition as Case 88.

There are 34 different local case numbers in the examples. The numbers are deduced within this original; they do not document 34 unique people across surveys.

Knowledge, intervention and responsibility

Conclusion: contact and consultation of parties must be tested according to their content; registered contact or a standard letter itself does not provide a legal basis for deduction. **Statement of authority:** the main result classifies 62 cases as correct. **Original proof:** the published milestones show, among other things, 67 insufficient justifications, 17 hearings without all days and 99 partially correct complaint guides. **Deficiency:** the main result does not cover all deficiencies and it does not actually demonstrate restoration. **Rule:** the rules on asset law, the official principle, the requirements of consultation of the parties and the reasons on which they are based in the original; the historical right of appeal shall be tested in accordance with the rules of the time. **Action:** the municipality reduces the financial assistance without necessary studies or sufficient justification. **Deviation and result:** a defective basis may bear an unjustified deduction and prevent the citizen from effectively responding and complaining. **Responsibilities and requirements:** reopening, proof of actual deduction, full repayment and position on interest / compensation, and concrete assessment of liability. The responsibility of the State for human rights does not require an individual conviction; the liability of each employee requires separate proof of the content and imputability of the offence.

Copenhagen's political treatment 22 June 2017 took note of the study. The municipality stated that one wrong case concerned the care of a sick child, but that the citizen was given work before completion, so that the deduction was not carried out. That is the subsequent information of the municipality, not a verified bank item. No case code uniquely links the statement to the original case 21. Three good examples of reasonable grounds and three of reasons may relate to the same cases. The claim that there are no economic consequences is a municipal assessment; it is not an estimate of the losses of all citizens.

The blank measurement forms ask, among other things, about correct deduction days, implementation within three months and the hearing deadline (PDF83/86-87), but not all completed individual responses are published. There is therefore no complete table of actual income loss, later correction, repayment or time to reparation. The known outstanding tables and published examples have been covered; unpublished citizen case records and reparation dates can be obtained only through separate documentation.

Penalty and pension surveys: main figures checked

Review 7. October 2026. Main outcomes and methodology have been read in the original reports. Sanctions 1/2022 and 2/2023 have now been supplemented with all main and municipal tables and all published case examples in the subsequent full-table modules. Sanctions 3/2024 and the 2025 pension study retain their separately stated status until the full modules are integrated. The figures describe selected decisions; they are neither a national error rate nor a register of unique citizens. An alteration/remittal is the study's hypothetical appeal outcome, not documentation of actual correction or repayment.

Report	Investigated a decisions	Stadkæstelse	Amendment	Remittal	Alteration/ remittal	Important demarcation
Penalties 1 April 2022	95	45	48	2	50	10 municipalities; 59 activity parates and 36 jobready; § 36: 26, § 37: 69
Penalties 2, April 2023	61	9	52	0	52	26 activity rates: all changed; 35 jobs ready: 26 changes. The annex has 13 municipalities, the main report refers to 14
Penalties 3, April 2024	96	65	28	3	31	12 other municipalities; 54 activity parate, 42 jobready; § 36: 30, § 37: 66
Awards of disability pension, May 2025	60	42	11	7	18	Only awards and only submission for rehabilitation teams; 10 municipalities elected, inter alia, after large increases in awards

Penalties 1

105 cases are requested; seven are not included in the population assessed. The 95 examined are 39 / 59 rotated among activity parates and 11 / 36 among job parate.11 of 50 rotated have the guidance as the only decisive error; 39 have other crucial errors. There is no evidence of separate number opt-out for cases already complained of in the controlled method: it may not be introduced from other investigations. The summary of the main report shall indicate decisions after 1 January 2020, the methodology section after 1 May 2020; both shall have the end date of 1 May 2021. Table 5.5 exchanges the names of sections 36 and 37; the substantive legal description of the report and the main figures have been used.

Source: main report, PDF -p.6-7,18-19,66-69; Annexes, p. 4 SHA256 main report a1a999a6723f7cd6a3621958d122274fc6ff42f15e420dce1242345cf7922d95; Annex fd4cc31f1bbf11d38faafe4cdea0a4aa0e85f0abf7a0bcea3a05bd907fb3a75a.

Penalties 2

75 courses requested; 73 received. Two courses each contain two decisions: 75 decisions before category.13 invalid and one unused decision gives 61 examined. Therefore, 61 have not been documented as 61 people. The 13 municipalities of the Annex sum up to 9 endorsements and 52 amendments. The main report's reference to 14 municipalities cannot be used as an actual municipal denominator. The final date of the summary on 1 April 2022 differs from that on 1 May 2022. Cases already pending have not been separately documented as exclusion in the controlled sections of the methodology. The lack of personal coupling and the two conflicting methodology information require the initial call letter and anonymised decision / lead list.

Source: main report, p.8,52-54; Annexes, p. 4 SHA256 main report 738 fd 71 d 0 eae 9 de 0 b 88 e 8379 b 6 e 32 a 26 dcc 2189813 a 5 a 5606 d 4 of 3 fe 89818 e 05; Annex a1861e798a6d25f0501c268d2cd2d845dee94edeb6f3adc15fb2be9041ce4fa8.

Penalties 3

108 cases are requested; four cannot be included.96 are assessed.54 people ready for activity have 34 affirmances,17 alterations and 3 remittals; 42 people ready for work have 31 affirmances and 11 alterations.12 of 31 decisions altered or remitted have guidance as the only decisive error. The period is 1. June 2022-15. April 2023. Missing records and supplementary cases were obtained, whereas this was not done in the two preceding studies. The difference in alteration/remittal rates therefore cannot be read solely as an improvement. The methodology table again swaps the section 36/section 37 labels. Exclusion of cases already appealed is not documented in the methodology section checked.

Source: main report, pp.6-8,52-54; annex. SHA256 main report 3696 eae 699 f 02215329478 eb 857255 f 54 aa 8 f 94 ac 4 af 0 f 781 a 6 b 6 fb 6 b 7 ac 07 ec. The content of the annex has not yet been checked.

Early retirement 2025

40 decisions concern people under 40, 20 concern people over 40. 47 have a sufficient basis for assessing eligibility for the target group; 13 do not. Five of the 47 have other decisive errors.11 alterations comprise two incorrect start dates and nine cases in which another course of action should have been tried; seven remittals are distributed as six in Bornholm and one in Faaborg-Midtfyn. Six cases and one reserve per municipality are requested.60 are selected; exclusion counts by reason are not stated.16 lack a correct preparatory rehabilitation plan, three contain an assessment of capacity for work by a medical consultant and 17 have an incorrect statutory reference. These errors may overlap. Refusals and awards without a rehabilitation team are excluded from the population. Explicit exclusion of decisions already appealed is not documented in the methodology sections checked.

Source: main report, p.6-12,18-21; Annexes, p. 4 -6,12 -13 SHA256 main report 42da8edc5e377d63e333f31eeb14ae20412c60f8b144538f596c9c571010753; Annex 79e7366d33a132a3dde90835be45f07268f8f3fcb586235bde330d3f5d249bd3.

Main tables on errors, with own denominators

Measurement	Penalties 1	Penalties 2	Penalties 3
Insufficient case information	14/95	13 / 61; 14 unknown	13/96
Insufficient justification	48/95	55/61	35/96
Guidance § 35, paragraph 1 incorrect	25/95	15/61	19/96
Extended guidance § 35, paragraph 2 incorrect	not relevant same population	24 / 56, of which 5 without and 19 inadequate	not relevant same population
Visitation not withdrawn	13/95	44 / 52 in behavioural assessment	6/96
Other factors not assessed, activity rate	28/59	26 / 26	12/54
Personal contact not exhausted	6/59	no fully published union in the full original;	2/54
Absence of administrative law, overall Union	51/95	no fully published union in the full original;	36/96
Of which profit or loss	29/51	no fully published union in the full original;	18/36
Criticism	20/95	3/61	27/96
Note	23/95	2/61	14/96

Sanctions 2: the duration is one month in 10, two months in 16, three months in 31 and another duration in 4 of 61 decisions. 46/61 durations lack reasons. This is the sanction duration decided upon, not documented actual time without income. 24/56 incorrect extended guidance instances must not be added to 15/61 general guidance errors; the report's p. 43 refers to 24 as a shared group without a complete cross-table. Row-level errors may overlap both with one another and with the overturnings.

Table locators and additional indicators are recorded in sanctions and pension practical- compact.json. Penalties 1 / 2 now have full visually verified commune columns and all published subdivisions in their own supplements. Their actual follow-up has not been published. Penalties 3 and pension 2025 are handled in separate full modules.

Documentation requirements and consequences

The studies identify interventions in social assistance and deficiencies in pension decisions. They do not document whether each citizen subsequently obtained reopening, repayment, interest or compensation, or how long the benefit was absent. The specific review requirements are therefore: municipal case ID, pseudonymised person ID, date of the original intervention, error found by the study, reopening date, final outcome, payment of arrears and accountability steps. Each municipality and Ankestyrelsen must be asked for outcomes and follow-up; the letters requesting cases must clarify the status of appealed cases and the dating conflicts. Until then, the sum of decisions is solely a sum of study observations.

Penalties 1,2022: all tables and limits of evidence of the investigation

SAN22F. All 69 pages of the main report and 25 pages of the annex are text-read in memory. All 18 numbered result tables are included below; their pages are also visually checked. The same 95 decisions are included in the previous main figures and this supplement, without additional addition. Figure 2.1 on PDF23 is a disease flow with no additional numerical population.

Selection and correctness

Ten municipalities are selected by size/geography. 105 cases are requested to ensure 95; seven of the submitted cases do not meet the criteria, and seven of the ten extra cases are used. Aalborg had two excluded cases; Aarhus contributed one extra. Seven excluded cases must therefore not automatically be subtracted from 105 to give 98 as the final population. By agreement with STAR, the agency expressly does not subsequently obtain missing records (PDF68); an actual appeal case would trigger a request for information. Neither a separate count of cases already appealed nor an unambiguous appealed status for each ID is published. An exclusion from other practice studies must not be transferred to this one.

The main summary states the period after 1 January 2020, before 1 May 2021; the methodology states after 1 May 2020, before 1 May 2021. Both source statements are retained. § 36 is an offer, § 37 an interview according to the main text/statutory boxes; methodology table 5.5 swaps the labels. The correct headline counts are 26 under § 36 and 69 under § 37. An incorrect printed label is corrected in the analysis and retained in the documentation table.

All 18 numbered tables

Table 2.1, PDF19: Overall outturn

Outcome	Activity Parate	Job-ready	Total
Staging	20	25	45
Amendment	37	11	48
Remittal for reconsideration	2	0	2
Total	59	36	95

Table 2.2, PDF22: Reasonable ground; yes means ground for exemption

Category	Number
Yes	7
No	88
Total	95

Table 2.3, PDF25: Other reasonable reasons taken into account

Category	Number
Yes	86
No	9
Total	95

Table 2.4, PDF28: Visiting group involved

Category	Number
Yes	82
No	13
Total	95

Table 2.5, PDF30: Other factors assessed

Category	Number
Yes	31
No	28
Total	59

Table 2.6, PDF33: Potential effect assessed

Category	Number
Yes	33
No	26
Total	59

Table 2.7, PDF36: Contact options exhausted

Category	Number
Yes	53
No	6
Total	59

Table 2.9, PDF40: Total deduction for one month

Category	Number
Yes	5
No	90
Total	95

Table 3.10, PDF44: Correct guidance

Category	Number
Yes	70
No	25
Total	95

Table 4.12, PDF55: Adequate case information before decision

Category	Number
Yes	81
No	14
Total	95

Table 4.13, PDF59: Sufficient justification

Category	Number
Yes	47
No	48
Total	95

Table 4.14, PDF63: Absence of management affects accuracy; only the 51 with deficiency

Category	Number
Yes	29
No	22
Total	51

Table 2.8, PDF38: All relevant aspects involved

Category	Activity Parate	Job-ready	Total
Yes	31	34	65
No	28	2	30
Total	59	36	95

Table 3.11, PDF49: COVID rules; more answers per case

Notice	Number
245/20 March 2020	0
309/30 March 2020	0
686/26 May 2020	11
867/12 June 2020	17
1398/25 September 2020	37
1897/9 December 2020	14
113 / 29 January 2021 with 282	20
282 / 26 February 2021	2
646/13 April 2021	8
Total records	109

Table 4.15, PDF64: Hypothetical criticism / observation

Category	Number
Criticism	20
Note	23
Neither	52
Total	95

Table 5.4, PDF67: Business Distribution

Category	Number
Job-ready	36
Activity Parate	59
Total	95

Table 5.5, PDF67: Printed terms are exchanged; preserved here

Original name	Number
Talk - § 36	26
Offer § 37	69
Total	95

Table Annex 1.1, PDFAnnex 4: Distribution of municipalities; empty printed field retained

Municipality	Staging	Amendment	remittal for reconsideration	N
Gladsaxe	5	3	empty	8
Golden Borgsund	4	4	empty	8
Copenhagen	10	empty	1	11
Næstved	3	5	empty	8
Odense	1	10	empty	11
South Djurs	4	4	empty	8
Vejle	1	10	empty	11
Aabenra	2	6	empty	8
Aalborg	8	2	empty	10
Aarhus	7	4	1	12
Total	45	48	2	95

Empty municipal fields are marked as empty in the original. They may be arithmetic aligned as zero in the sum of the results, but they are not reproduced as printed zeros. All municipalities summer to 45 / 48 / 2 / 95.

All further concrete targets

There are 50 hypothetical alterations/remittals; 11 are due solely to guidance,39 to other decisive factors. PDF19 states that all 39 would be altered, but the main table contains two remittals; 39 is therefore not a separately verified alteration category in addition to 48+2. Five of the seven with reasonable grounds concern illness. All 13 without involvement of the assessment group would be altered; all 26 without an assessment of the effect on availability for work would be altered. All 25 guidance deficiencies would lead to alteration. These groups overlap within the same 50 and cannot be added to them.

The PDF44 uses the correct guidance for the first call in 93 cases, including when it is not stated otherwise that this is not the first conversation or the relationship is not problematic. It does not say that 93 simultaneous original calls are documented. Two are classified without guidance. PDF45 bases some unclear documents on telephone COVID conversation or re-guidance. The number affected by these assumptions is not made public. This is a concrete limit in the basis of control, not proof that the unknown acts were actually legal or illegal.

Five have accumulated monthly deductions; all five have been heard. Four out of 36 people are ready for work; all four are classified with the four necessary fields. The original classifies all 95 as the correct party hearing, all 95 without unlawful criteria / estimates under rule and all 95 with complaint guidance. At the same time, PDF56 / 63- 64 describes a decision by mid-March before the citizens' response deadline at the end of March. The specific lack of time must be shown alongside the total statement, not hidden under the category of information on cases.

Of 48 reasons, 42 relate to activity parates and thus six jobs ready. Of 29 performance-based management deficiencies, 27 relate to faulty justification; 22 out of 51 do not affect the management's accuracy objectives. Criticism 20 and remark 23 are neither 43 further unlawful decisions nor a measure of liability to employees. The COVID table has 109 rule records in 95 cases, explicitly several replies per case.

All published examples

The original does not have stable case numbers for the main text examples. Below, all concrete references and repetitions are brought together; a number of several examples indicate this. It does not provide a documented union of people or cases.

PDF	Publication	Meaning of proof
23	COVID symptoms and expected tests; no further information before sanction.	The agency would remit; no actual subsequent review published.

PDF	Publication	Meaning of proof
24	Headache; no details.	The management would change as transient disease could no longer be reported. The inaction of the Authority detracts from the possibility of proof.
25-26	Four aforementioned explanations: broken simcard, bad internet, it is difficult, sleep problems.	The municipality did not examine the answers; the number of different unique persons cannot be determined by the list.
26	Two examples of confused dates and unheard of telephone.	Other reasonable reasons were assessed; each link does not demonstrate aggregate legality.
26	Friend fell over with cardiac arrest, resuscitated and hospitalized; citizen missed the call.	The municipality did not investigate the timing/significance; the agency would remit.
28-29	Activity Parate without phone, long-standing psychiatric attachment.	The municipality looked solely at the cause of absence and not known mental conditions; the board would change.
30	Three municipal assessments: telephone participation despite health, abuse worsens without offers, mental condition does not prevent conversation.	The existence of assessments is not independent medical evidence of their content.
31	Forgot e-Box; other known activity parate conditions not included.	The board would change.
34	Six availability-for-work assessments mentioned:two self-support trajectories,two earlier effects of sanctions,one support for mental health problems,one course with a psychologist.	Local efficacy statements; reported assessments do not actually document positive treatment effects.
34-35	Psychiatric conditions assessed but the severity of the sanction not assessed.	A met sub-requirement shall not replace the other.
35	The municipality calls the transfer to the service centre an implicit assessment; two other subsequent statements of assessment.	No assessment in simultaneous acts; later municipal explanation is not accepted as evidence.
36-37	Two contacts with address / mentor / social administration and street team.	Examples of exhausted possibilities; not demand for actual contact in all cases.
37	Written consultation / SMS, two days after absence; new interview about 14 d later; citizen replies one month after first absence.	No other contact options tested; one month is provided contact interval, unverified duration of income loss.
37	Two decisions claim telephone contact attempts, but the case file does not document it.	The decision's statement is not independent proof of the call.
37	Dead phone number, mail fails; no contact at home.	Fair contact possibilities not exhausted.
38-39	Overtaken call; other known facts and availability assessed.	A positive control finding in the original; no actual citizen restoration.
39	Diseases were ignored; the municipality only put the emphasis on no sick leave.	Activity Parate conditions and availability also ignored; several errors in the same example.
45	Personal first call with written delivery and later shipment; second example telephone subCOVID and shipment the following day.	Two guidance courses; unpublished unique ID.
46	First interview with extradition, but no documented later shipment; second example shipment, but no documented physical extradition.	The two necessary links cannot replace each other.
47	Undated letter about semi-annual re-guidance, but no documented review.	Sending only does not meet review requirements.
49	Guidance before reopening in May 2020, but no reguidance after May 27.	The additional condition of the COVID rules was not followed.
55	Activity Parate with Disease; Telephone Hearing Contact with Medical Questions.	The agency’s positive assessment of the information basis; the doctor-contact question does not in itself prove absence of illness.

PDF	Publication	Meaning of proof
55	Job-ready with illness; no health information.	Penalty before necessary investigations.
56/63-64	Response deadline until end March, but sanction mid March before reply.	The same sequence of descriptions is found; the report's simultaneous claim of proper consultation of the parties in all 95 does not match this specific deadline. No extra person is counted.
56	Activity Parate without exhausted contact; Second example Activity Parate which had difficulty without deepening.	Two disclosures described; overlap with previous examples unexplained.
60	Social anxiety / depression and psychological services; the municipality justifies sanction with motivation / meeting stability.	The presence of justification shall not be made a clinical evidence of the benefit of economic pressure.
61	Paragraph 13 (8) is added to the legal basis, but no concrete assessment is made.	Reference to a rule is not the application of its conditions.
63	Activity party without justification of other circumstances / availability effect.	The board would change; can repeat earlier description, no union assumed.
65	Assessment is in the note but not justified against the citizen.	The board would confirm with criticism and itself correct the explanatory statement; the municipality's original deficiency consists of historical control findings.
65	Job-ready decision wrongly refers to activity party special rule.	The board would comment, no documented actual individual follow-up.

The annex reproduces principle notices 102-16,88-14,39-15. Their own three and two specific decision examples respectively are earlier case law, not additional cases in the 95 population.102-16 includes, among other things, the municipality obtaining medical evidence too late and disregarding a sick-leave notification from 27 May-27 October 2016 without a sufficient basis.39-15 distinguishes several contact channels from email alone despite a known phone number. They support the requirements for timely investigation, independent assessment and documented contact.

Documented errors, necessary proofs and requirements

Conclusion: the study provides direct documentation of 50 decisions that could not be upheld as submitted, and of further administrative deficiencies within the same 95. **Statement:** the agency’s positive main categories and subcategories. **Original evidence:** all the tables above and the specific deadline/contact/health courses. **Deficiency:** assumed guidance circumstances, records not obtained and a description of deadlines that does not match the overall statement about proper hearing of parties. **Rule:** the Active Social Policy Act conditions applied in the original, § 10 of the Act on Legal Protection and Administration in Social Matters and §§ 19,22-25 of the Public Administration Act. **Action/departure:** deductions without the necessary conditions or before fact-finding and the opportunity to respond have concluded. **Consequence:** interference with subsistence and reduced opportunity for effective review; banking loss and final duration are not published. **Responsibility/demand:** documented reopening, setting aside of unlawful deductions, back payment and separate assessment of interest, compensation and personal responsibility.

All known tables and examples are now included. Suspicion of further hidden errors cannot be counted as proven cases. The remaining material required is the call letters, completed measurement forms, original decisions and response deadlines, as well as actual payment / follow-up per pseudonymised person. The unknown scale jumps are explicitly not set out in the Annex (PDF5). Therefore, the answers provided by the form do not provide a full public matrix of each citizen's programme.

Penalties 2,2023: full tables, family support and decided intervention time;

SAN23F. The 54 pages of the main report and the 16 pages of the annex are all text-read in memory. All 12 numbered tables with municipal distribution have been included and visually verified. Figure 2.1 on PDF15 is an indicative procedure without an additional number population. These are the same 61 decisions as the previous main table of the report, not 61 additional cases or persons.

Selection, delimitation and known authority

75 courses are convened with objective 60.73 courses are received; two have two decisions, so there are 75 decisions.13 do not meet the criteria; one further decision is not used; 61 are tested. Køge did not reply and did not submit the two requested courses. The main report lists 14 municipalities; the blank sheet lists 15 inclusive Køge; the final commune table has 13, without boats Køge and Bornholm. These are different documented boundaries. The explanation for Bornholm's lack of final rows and full commune separation has not been published. Therefore, a main text, which calls 61 cases a material from 14 municipalities, must not become a municipal denomination for the actual rows.

The summary uses before 1 April 2022; the method before 1 May 2022, both after 1 January 2020. Missing documents were not sought by agreement with STAR (PDF53). No separate exclusion figure for decisions already complained of has been published. Two double courses and lack of personal connection mean that 61 cannot be treated as 61 proven unique citizens.

Prior penalties are not explicitly fully tested; the form denotes the test as a check of general conditions and obvious inaccuracy (Annex 8 / 10). Nor are tender and termination decisions under Paragraph 40a (2) / 7 fully tested for resource reasons (PDF6). Subsequent monthly payment decisions pursuant to paragraph 6 shall be completely excluded. The main result must therefore not be read as full control of the legality of the whole process, of all payments or of all family members affected.

All 12 numbered tables

Table 2.1, PDF19: Overall accuracy

Outcome	Job-ready	Activity Parate	Total
Staging	9	0	9
Amendment	26	26	52
Total	35	26	61

Table 2.2, PDF20: Limited review of prior decision

Category	Number
Yes	30
No	26
No documented prior decision	5
Total	61

Table 2.3, PDF26: Assessment reasons; more answers possible

Reason	Number
Previous sanctions	48
Past lack of will	9
Conduct	18
Overall Image	14
Other	3

Table 2.4, PDF27: Reasons

Category	Job-ready	Activity Parate	Total
Yes	6	0	6
No	29	26	55
Total	35	26	61

Table 2.5, PDF29: All relevant factors; only 52 with behavioural evaluation

Category	Activity Parate	Job-ready	Total
Yes	0	14	14
No	18	2	20
Don’t know	6	12	18
Total	24	28	52

Table 2.6, PDF30: Business category withdrawn; same 52

Category	Activity Parate	Job-ready	Total
Yes	3	5	8
No	21	23	44
Total	24	28	52

Table 2.7, PDF34: Duration of sanctions decided

Duration	Activity Parate	Job-ready	Total
One month	7	3	10
Two months	11	5	16
Three months	8	23	31
Other	0	4	4
Total	26	35	61

Table 4.1, PDF48: Party consultation

Category	Job-ready	Activity Parate	Total
Yes	21	22	43
No	14	4	18
Total	35	26	61

Table 4.2, PDF50: Complaint guidance

Category	Job-ready	Activity Parate	Total
Yes	32	25	57
No	3	1	4
Total	35	26	61

Table 4.3, PDF51: Hypothetical criticism / observation

Category	Number
Criticism	3
Note	2
Neither	56
Total	61

Table 5.1, PDF53: Population

Category	Number
Job-ready	35
Activity Parate	26
Total	61

Table Annex 1.1, PDFAnnex 4: All 13 municipalities actually measured

Municipality	Staging	Amendment	remittal for reconsideration	N
Assens	1	4	0	5
Parsley leaves	1	1	0	2
Favrskov	0	4	0	4
Fredensborg	0	2	0	2
Gentofte	0	8	0	8
Gladsaxe	0	2	0	2
Copenhagen	5	8	0	13
Mariners' fjord	0	2	0	2
Medium speed	0	4	0	4
Odense	2	8	0	10
Sønderborg	0	2	0	2
West Himmerland	0	3	0	3
Aarhus	0	4	0	4
Total	9	52	0	61

Table 2.3 gives 92 registrations of reasons in the same 61,expressly allowing multiple responses. Tables 2.5/2.6 concern only 52 with a completed conduct assessment:24 ready for activation and 28 job-ready; they are not a new population alongside 26/35 in the main table. Table 2.7 gives decided duration. It does not measure actual loss of subsistence support for one, two or three months.

All further published target figures

PDF	Measurement	Number	Denomination
20	Prior penalty documented	56	61
20	Prior penalty not documented	5	61
20	Prosa mentions two further unknown; not separate table row	2	61
21	Non-availability: due cause unknown	9	56
21	Non-availability: reasonable reason yes	1	56
22	The municipality assessed a new breach of availability	46	56
22	No reasonable reason for a new non-availability	37	46
22	Reasonable reason unknown in the event of a new non-availability	9	46
22	Of which missing decision	1	9
22	New non-availability correct	30	61
22-23	New non-availability error	31	61
22	Of which no new breach after prior decision	12	31
23	Of which activity rates due to deficiencies	10	31
23	Of which other errors	9	31
25	Behaviour assessment	52	61
26	Other: unclear assessment basis	2	61
26	Second: doubts about residence	1	61
31	Activity rate: other factors / availability not justified	26	26
33	Offer / activity documented	59	61
33	Offer / activity not documented	2	61
34	Amount of the penalty not justified	46	61
34	Activity may start at the time of action	54	61
36	No simultaneous termination decision	14	61
39	General guidance correct	46	61
39	General guidance incorrect	15	61
40	of which: re-guidance not documented	7	15
41	Enhanced guidance given	51	56
41	Enhanced guidance correctly	32	56
41	Extended Guide Wrong	24	56
41	Of which not given	5	24
41	Of which insufficient	19	24
43	Prose: paragraph 1 / 2 collectively referred to as 24; union not separately crossed	24	-

PDF	Measurement	Number	Denomination
46	Sufficient information	34	61
46	Insufficient information	13	61
46	Information not available	14	61
46	Of which no basis for decision	7	14
46	Hence unclear on the basis of	6	14
46	Of which unexhausted contact	1	14
48	No consultation, of which activity rate	4	18
50	Illegal criteria / estimates under rule registered	0	61
44	Prose: no written decision / complaint guidance	3	61
50	Table / prose: no written decision / complaint guidance	4	61

All 26 activity parate main decisions would change; 26 out of 35 jobs ready would also change. The Union of all management deficiencies is not public.55 reasons gaps provide a documented lower limit of 55 decisions concerned within 61; overlap with consultation, information and complaint guidance hinders an exactly larger Union. It is a limit to decisions, not a personal union. In the Contact Trial, four activity parates from 18 are published without party consultation and one contact example, but not a complete contact guarantee table for all 26; the missing full result cannot be filled out from the reply options of the form.

The number contradictions of the original shall be preserved;

Table 2.2 has 30 + 26 + 5 = 61; the prosas also refer to two unknown decisions without indicating their location. The two must not be added and make 63. PDF27 calls the group 54 inadequately justified, but the same page has 26 + 29 = 55 and Table 55. PDF44 mentions three without written decision / complaint guidance, but PDF50 / Table 4.2 indicates four. PDF43 refers to 24 as paragraph 1 / 2 group, but without cross-tables between 15 general and 24 extended deficiencies. 39 unique guidance errors can therefore not be calculated. The wording of the original shall be accurately visible without correcting it tacitly.

All specific examples refer to

PDF	Original progress	Meaning and consistency
22	Prior penalty 16 February 2021; consultation 17 March 2021 on job search.	The municipality deduces a lack of will from unanswered consultation; a municipal statement, not self-verified behavioral / health examination.
23	Absence of October-December 2021; Decisions 10 / 12 / 24 January 2022; Decision 24 January reinforced based on non-compliance 3 January.	The new absence lies before the previous decisions; the board would change. Time order is a home condition.
23	An intensified sanction decision of 30 September 2021 is justified by doubts about the citizen’s address; no documented prior sanction.	The conditions are not fulfilled; the board would change. There's no proof of a lack of availability.
25-26	Sanctions 15 March 2022; new absence 18 March; reinforced decision 28 March; Municipality refers to lack of contact since 22 February.	Example of assessment carried out, not evidence of all legal conditions or actual positive sanction effect.
26-27	Sanctions 17 February 2022; absence 25 February; no concrete assessment of lack of will.	The board would change; repetition of an offence cannot replace necessary estimates.
28	Job-ready, repeated various omissions and unanswered hearing.	The agency’s positive example of reasons; not evidence of actual restoration of subsistence support.
28	Decision imposing an intensified sanction refers only to a new breach after 15 March 2022.	No justified lack of will. Date similarity with PDF25-26 does not in itself demonstrate that it is the same person.
29	Activity Parate: Reinforced Decision 28 January 2021 refers only to previous / new non-shows.	No concrete main considerations in behavioural assessment.
31	Ready for activity:intensified sanction decision on 8 November 2021 without the special considerations.	The board would change.
34	Job-ready: Decision 31 March 2022 in two months from 1 April; previous assessment of availability is mentioned.	Decided duration and justification; no published banking / disclosure history actually results in loss time.
36	Termination decisions shall be taken only after the reinforced decision.	The original says that help cannot cease on that basis; number of concrete examples and end outcomes not published.
42	A number of standard letters omit daily payment, month-end and spouse effect.	Lack of guidance; no public count of actually affected spouses.
47	Activity Parate Mother: hearing 16 September 2021 and email about sick boy / doctor visits the same day; sharpened decision 22 September.	The municipality did not investigate care / medical information. Six days from the reply to the decision shows knowledge before the intervention; it is not verified duration of financial loss.
49	Written consultation / mail 26 May 2021, telephone trial only 2 June; no documented further contact before previous sanction.	The subsequent sharpened sanction cannot rest on the deficient previous decision; the board would change.

No stable cases are published in these cases. Repeated subjects or dates are not enough to establish identity. The mother and the sick boy at PDF47 are a documented mention of a parent and a child; neither the child's total loss, number of children in the family nor actual payment period can be deduced. The form directly asks for consistency for a spouse's right to help (Annex 13), but the report does not publish an overall response column. Legal spouse effect must therefore not be presented as a figure for spouses actually affected.

Liability, time and requirements

Conclusion: 52 of 61 intensified sanction decisions examined would be amended, and all 26 main decisions concerning persons assessed as ready for activation fail. **Authority's statement:** the intensified sanction requires an individually assessed lack of willingness and lawfully established previous/new breaches of availability requirements. **Original evidence:** the tables and dated examples show missing reasons, knowledge of a sick child before the intervention and reliance on a failure to attend that preceded the necessary prior decision. **Deficiency:** allegations about conduct do not replace proof of every condition for legal authority; partial review omits parts of the entire course of subsistence support. **Rule:** the original's Active Social Policy Act §§ 13,35,40 a, Legal Protection and Administration in Social Matters Act § 10 and the Public Administration Act's requirements to hear the parties and give reasons. **Action/departure:** the municipality decides on partial or complete withdrawal of assistance without the necessary conditions being met. **Consequence:** risk of, and specific decisions on, loss of basic subsistence support, also with statutory effects on the spouse; the effect on bank payments and subsequent redress require their own evidence. **Responsibility/demand:** annulment/reopening, repayment of unjustified deductions actually made and a documented determination concerning interest, compensation and specific public liability.

The original has been sent to a municipal hearing, and Paragraph 79 (a) of the Law on Legal Security requires political presentation. It documents a requirement for knowledge and follow-up, not that all municipalities actually resumed and repaired. The well-known tables and examples have now been included; the remaining necessary evidence is the municipal selection list, the completed forms, time-stamped citizens' acts, monthly payment decisions and actual repairs. Individual criminal liability requires separate review; the absence of published criminal proceedings is not, in itself, legal immunity.

Penalties 2024: all original tables and limits of evidence

All 54 + 15 pages actually RAM text read; head 14 / 18 / 53 and Annex 4 visually RAM checked.

Same 96 cases as before SAN24; no extra cohorts. Selected newer sanctions, activity parate over-represented. No national extrapolation.

No explicit exclusion of pending cases found in the originals method; not available from other investigations.

Original tables

2.1 · SAN24F PDF 14 · mentions 96 cases

Outcome	Job-ready	Activity Parate	Total
Right	31	34	65
Wanted to change	11	17	28
Would be remitted	0	3	3
Total	42	54	96

2.2 · SAN24F PDF 16 · mentions 96 cases

Reasonable reason	Number
Yes	7
No	89
Total	96

2.3 · SAN24F PDF 19 · mentions 96 cases

Other reasonable reasons taken into account	Number
Yes	93
No	3

Other reasonable reasons taken into account	Number
Total	96

2.4 · SAN24F PDF 22 · mentions 96 cases

Visitation Category Treated	Number
Yes	90
No	6
Total	96

2.5 · SAN24F PDF 24 · mentions 54 cases

Other factors assessed	Number
Yes	42
No	12
Total	54

2.6 · SAN24F PDF 26-27 · mentions 54 cases

Promotion of availability assessed	Number
Yes	44
No	10
Total	54

2.7 · SAN24F PDF 29 · mentions 54 cases

Contact options exhausted	Number
Yes	52
No	2
Total	54

2.8 · SAN24F PDF 31 · mentions 96 cases

All relevant facts	Activity Parate	Job-ready	Total
Yes	37	40	77
No	17	2	19
Total	54	42	96

2.9 · SAN24F PDF 32 · mentions 96 cases

Total monthly statement	Number
Yes	9
No	87
Total	96

3.10 · SAN24F PDF 36 · mentions 96 cases

Proper guidance	Number
Yes	77
No	19
Total	96

4.11 · SAN24F PDF 43 · mentions 96 cases

Sufficient information	Number
Yes	83
No	13
Total	96

4.12 · SAN24F PDF 46-47 · mentions 96 cases

Expensive justification	Number
Yes	61
No	35
Total	96

4.13 · SAN24F PDF 49 · mentions 36 cases

Absence of management affects accuracy	Number
Yes	18
No	18
Total	36

0.14 (mentioned 4.14) · SAN24F PDF 50 · mentions 96 cases

Response to hypothetical complaint	Number
Criticism	27
Note	14
None	55
Total	96

5.15 · SAN24F PDF 53 · mentions 96 cases

Target group	Number
Job-ready	42
Activity Parate	54
Total	96

5.16, word marks preserved · SAN24F PDF 53 · mentions 96 cases

Printed word mark	Printed paragraph	Number
Discussion	§ 36	30

Printed word mark	Printed paragraph	Number
Tenders	§ 37	66
Total		96

Annex 1.1 · SAN24BF PDF 4 · mentions 96 cases

Municipality	Right	Would amended / repealed	Would be remitted	Total
Ballerup	2	5	1	8
Springby	7	1	0	8
Esbjerg	7	1	1	9
Fax	2	5	0	7
Frederiksberg	9	0	0	9
Frederikshavn	6	3	0	9
Faaborg-Midtfyn	8	0	1	9
Jammerbug	2	6	0	8
Randers	8	0	0	8
Ringkøbing-Skjern	8	0	0	8
Ringsted	4	2	0	6
Slaughter	2	5	0	7
Total	65	28	3	96

Other exact measurements

Measurement	SAN24F PDF	Counter	Denomination	Unit
Called	52	108	-	cases
Objectives	52	96	-	cases
Additional reserve	52	12	108	cases
Replaced without criterion fulfillment	52	4	-	cases
Guidance alone provides grounds for overturning	15/37	12	31	cases
Other reasons	15	19	31	cases
FVL hearing correctly	45	96	96	cases
Appeal guidance	49	96	96	cases
Illegal criteria / estimates under rule	48	0	96	cases
Monthly LAS hearing	33	6	9	cases
Counter letter job-ready	46	11	42	cases
Letter of an agent meets requirements	46	11	11	cases
Lack of justification activity party	47	32	35	cases
Deficiency of justification among performance-influencing deficiencies	49	17	18	cases
Restoration despite criticism	50	15	27	cases
Restoration despite comment	51	10	14	cases
First call relevant	36	1	96	cases
First call not applicable	36	95	96	cases
Failure to send guidance	37	1	19	cases

Example deposits

Locators are local descriptions, not new cases or a personal union. The phone / disease example PDF17 / 43 has been combined; other identity has not been proven. Local effect claims are recorded as assessments, not as documented employment effect.

SAN24F PDF	Event	Test point
17/43	Telephone; sleep during illness	Repeated example; one local description
18	Sickness; five days of default	Wanted to change
20	Substantially operated	Late information must be processed
20	Offer; lack of profit	Absence alone insufficient
20	Medical report	Specific assessment is required
20	Forgotten conversation	Example
20	Mom's dentist.	Example

SAN24F PDF	Event	Test point
21	Car in workshop	Example
21	Decrease / injury	Would be remitted
21	Psychological illness; medical time	Would be remitted
23	Overset date; loads	Wanted to change
25	Forgotten internship	Example
25	No telephone / transport money	Other elements omitted
27	Contact	Local assessment
27	Repeated Absence	Local assessment
27	Tender / aid	Local assessment
27	Close follow-up	Local assessment
28	Motivation / stability	Local assessment
28	Promotion of availability omitted	Wanted to change
29-30	Repeated contact / residence	Example
30	Telephone / mail; no attempt at residence	Exhaust contact missing
30	Place of offer; no attempt at residence	Exhaust contact missing
31	Override call	Example
32	Sick; contact the same day	Relevant factors omitted
33	Three months deduction	Monthly legal basis only
36	First call	Wanted to change
37	Booklet sent; not delivered	Lack of guidance
37	Oral / written; no note	Lack of evidence
38	Telephonic Recorder	Example
38	Booklet without review	Lack of guidance
38	Booklet after non-appearance	Lack of guidance
39	Later conversation guidance	Too late.
44	Sick; oral hearing	Health
47	ADHD; Forgotten conversation	Statement of reasons
48	Assurance of availability without explanation	Deficiency of reasons
48	Contact exhausted; § 13 (8) omitted	Deficiency of reasons
50	§ 13 (8) omitted	Result impacting
51	Journal assessment not in decision	Criticism, no automatic overturning
51	Wrong time	Note
51	Closed exceptions claimed	Note

Source conflicts and necessary divisions

- Table 5.16 PDF53: conversation / offer swap; § 36 = 30 / § 37 = 66. PDF6: Offer 30 / interview 66. Visually verified.
- Annex PDF4 prosa 13 municipalities; table and main report 12. Visually verified.
- PDF15 calls all 19 remaining cases alterations; table 2.1 has 28 alterations+3 remittals. Preserve the separate statements.
- The contents' page references do not fit physical pagination; the physical PDF page is used.
- Table 4.14 is printed 0.14 on PDF50.

Independent analysis

The alteration/remittal rate does not exhaust the deficiencies: reasons, guidance, contact, information and response are measured in overlapping cases. The 31 hypothetical alterations/remittals, 36 administrative deficiencies and 41 outcomes with criticism/comments therefore cannot be added together. An erroneous sanction interferes with income support; documentation of repayment and the timing of actual redress requires the individual decisions and payment entries.

The two party consultation measurements are different: FVL96 / 96 and the monthly total LAS6 / 9. The material assessment of the study is based on the available documents; therefore, a lack of evidence can be decisive without proving that a particular conversation never took place.

The 96 completed measurement forms, exact deduction amounts/dates, person deduplication and actual complaints/redress are not published in these originals. Example descriptions have no stable case numbers, so the number of unique citizens cannot be derived from the occurrences.

Sources

- SAN24F: Main Report April 2024All 54 physical PDFs pages. SHA256 3696eae699f02215329478eb857255f54aa8f94ac4af0f781a6b6fb6b7ac07ec.
- SAN24BF: Annex April 2024All 15 physical PDFs pages. SHA256 a4edf74d67f6ee3f55c73e2d0f58d1003d27b5ead820e982080b0b94491c3ad3.

Early retirement 2025: all original tables, municipal cells and citizens' programme

All 51 pages in the main report and 28 pages in the annex are actually read in memory. All eight original numerical tables / figures or municipal lists as well as five additional block numbers are reproduced with delimiting. The 60 cases are the same PPEN 25 cohorts as before; the repetitions of the series are not counted as new citizens.

Main analysis: late rights and lack of support must not disappear

The study documents two pension cases in Struer in which the award was made later than the rules allowed. Six cases from one municipality were decided orally by a rehabilitation team without jurisdiction; the municipality table shows six hypothetical remittals in Bornholm. There is dialogue with the municipality, but the report does not document a new decision by a competent body, back payment or actual redress. These errors must be investigated as loss of rights and breaches of jurisdiction, with specific decision and payment dates. [PPEN25-FULD,H16/21-22;B12-13]

Only awards are investigated. Refusal and obvious pension cases without rehabilitation teams have been omitted. The results cannot therefore determine how many citizens were illegally refused or delayed pensions. The authorities' interviews themselves describe restrictive refusals, resource flows without development potential, rescheduled refusals and changed municipal practices. These concrete tracks require a separate statement of initial refusal, resumption, repayment and loss over the waiting period. [PPEN25-FULD, H32-37; B4-6]

Lack of support has an independent impact chain. The study describes two cases in which the social burden of the home was not supported before the pension decision. Local staff describe repeated sanctions after failure to appear to citizens whose support needs were not understood and the citizens' progress that is lost between departments. Psychiatric and treatment waiting times are referred to as worsening. These are documented summaries and statements of authority; a concrete replacement or liability conclusion requires simultaneous proof of needs, decision-making, treatment and loss. [PPEN25-FULD, H16 / 46-50]

The review also examines awards that the Appeals Board considers should have been resource programmes or flex jobs. That assessment is accurately reproduced, but missing documentation of permanent loss does not automatically prove an actual capacity for development. In the Dorte and Kim summaries, a realistic prognosis for treatment/work capacity must be checked against original medical information. The 22 awards without employment assessment which the agency assessed as correct also show that a new work placement or resource programme is not an unconditional prerequisite. [PPEN25-FULD, H14-17]

Method and cohort bridge

Ten municipalities were selected particularly for a large relative increase in awards during 2013-23,size and geography. There are three intended groups of 20 cases:young people aged 20-39 with resource programmes, young people aged 20-39 directly from cash assistance and 40+. The actual pre-pension distribution is 20 resource programme benefit+11 cash assistance+8 education assistance+1 self-supporting among 40 young people. Two 40+ cases came from job assessment programmes. The municipalities' final 5-7 cases differ from the request's six plus one reserve; reserves are not automatically counted as new review cases. [PPEN25-FULD, H5/26; B4-6]

Ten interviews took place on May-June 2024, although the report appeared on May 2025. Only cases submitted to rehabilitation teams and awarded within the last two years are included. The method does not indicate a general separation of previously contested cases; such a rule cannot be imported from other reports. Analysis forms and quotes were heard from municipalities / employees, not published as individual full files. [PPEN25-FULD, B5-7]

All original and supplementary data cells

General Table 0.1

PPEN25-FULD, H12. 47 includes 42 affirmances+2 altered dates+3 procedural remittals.18 alterations/remittals are hypothetical appeal outcomes, no actual reopening documented. Prose refers to 2.1 while the table is printed as 0.1.

Assessment	Number	Denomination
Documented no realistic development perspective	47	60
Would be confirmed	42	60
Wanted to change	11	60
Would be remitted	7	60

Table 2.2

PPEN25-FULD,H18. Multiple errors per case;42 error occurrences are not 42 people affected by errors. Original refers to delegation of competence H16/21-22.

Misconduct of proceedings	Number	Denomination
Preparatory rehabilitation plan deficient	16	60
Own medical consultant assesses work ability illegally	3	60
Legal references deficient / outdated	17	60
Decision not taken by competent pension boards	6	60

Main Figure 0.1

PPEN25-FULL, H23. All the grapetics are visually read. Job effort background quoted in the report, not legal control cohorts. Note is empty [Text]. No cells read from just column height.

Year	Less than 40	Exceeding 40 [printed; prosa40 +]	Total
2010	4831	13241	18072

Year	Less than 40	Exceeding 40 [printed; prosa40 +]	Total
2011	4504	12312	16816
2012	3883	10808	14691
2013	1987	5941	7928
2014	1098	5268	6366
2015	1415	6022	7437
2016	1679	6881	8560
2017	2007	8082	10089
2018	2611	10311	12922
2019	3261	13458	16719
2020	4022	13330	17352
2021	4429	12687	17116
2022	4981	14084	19065
2023	6270	16840	23110

Main Figure 0.2

PPEN25-FULD, H24. Printed 16-19; prosa refers to 15-19. Pension at least 18 years of age note. Sum 23110 own control corresponds to main figure 0.1; not 595 pensioners under the age of 18.

Age group 2023 [printed]	Number
16 to 19 years	595
20 to 24 years	934
25-29 years	1281
30 to 34 years	1615
35 to 39 years	1845
40-44 years	2208
45- 49 years	2880
50-54 years	3539
55 to 59 years	4855
60-64 years	2930
65 + years	428

Annex Table 1.1

PPEN25-FULD, B5. Ten selected municipalities, five interviewing municipalities. Blank interview cell preserved, not numerical 0.

Municipality	Review of proceedings	Interview
Struer	X	X

Municipality	Review of proceedings	Interview
Roskilde	X	X
Randers	X	X
Faaborg-Midtfyn	X	X
Copenhagen	X	X
Bornholm	X	
Silkeborg	X	
Svendborg	X	
Road	X	
Norddjurs	X	

Annex Table 4.1

PPEN25-FULL, B12. All cells are visually verified; the printed 0 are preserved. Same 60 as the main table.

Category	KHH Name	Rander s	Silkeboed	Roskilde a	Svendborg	Fabor g-Midtf n	Road	Bornholm	Norddju r	Struer	Total
Enter	7	5	5	7	5	6	6	6	7	6	60
Documents not available for development	6	4	5	7	3	4	4	2	7	5	47
Not sufficiently document t	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4	0	1	13

Annex Table 4.2

PPEN25-FULL, B12. Blank original cell preserved as blank, not raw 0. Bornholmalle 6 would be returned; Faaborg-Midtfyn 1. No new 60 cohorts.

Category	Purchas es port;	Cane r	Silkeborg	Roskilde	Svend Borg	Faabo rg-Mid tfyn	Road	Bornholm	Norddjurs	Struer	Total
Enter	7	5	5	7	5	6	6	6	7	6	60
Would be confirmed	6	4	5	7	3	3	4		7	3	42
Wanted to change	1	1			2	2	2			3	11
Would be remitted						1		6			7

Annex Table 4.3

PPEN25-FULD, B13. No printed total column; empty cells are retained. Two cases with too late a time are Struer; six Bornholm cases distribute 1 + 3 + 2. This is the same 18 hypothetical inverted, not new 18.

Category	KHH Name	Randers	Silk drills g	Roskilde	Svendbo ed	Faaborg -Midtfyn	Road	Bornhol m	Northern Djur s	Struer
Enter	7	5	5	7	5	6	6	6	7	6
Health information missing										1
Substantially / long working capacity loss not documented	1				2	1	1	1		
Both health and work organization loss defective		1				1	1	3		
No development option doc documented, document return						1		2		
No development option doc documented, too late time										2

Kohorte and method

PPEN25-FULD, H5 / B4-7. Only award § 20 (1) after rehabilitation team, not refusal, not obvious awards without team. No explicit general sentence on cases already complained of in this Annex; that exclusion may not be imported from other investigations. Final 5-7 prkommune differs from 6 requirements; reserve cases cannot be automatically added to 60.

Measurement	Figures
Review of awards	60
Participation municipalities	10
20-39 co-resource trajectories	20
20 -39 direct cash benefits	20
40 + Group	20
40 + job clarification exception	2
Original procuring per municipality	6
Reserves submitted per municipality	1
Actual municipal distribution	5-7
Interview	10
Interview municipalities	5
Leader interview	5
Employee Group Interview	5
Leadership participants [2 + 4 × 1, own sum]	6
Interview period	May-June 2024

Measurement	Figures
Calls for tenders	last 2 years

Additional legal limits

PPEN25-FULD, H11 / 14-20. Overlapping subpopulations; 22 without job clarification are legal afterASassessment and not 22 errors. Two examples of aid are repeated H48, not new cases.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Target group correction but error	5	47
Wrong time, late end legal basis	2	11
Would resource path / flex job instead	9	11
Remittal, still correctly within the target group	3	7
Remittal, development not ruled out	4	7
Health information is missing only	1	13
Job satisfaction alone is lacking.	6	13
Both information gaps	6	13
Correct award without an employment assessment	22	42
Preparatory plan without health data present	5	16
Two social stress cases without aid	2	9

Young characteristics

PPEN25-FULD, H25-26. The requested group of 20 directly from cash assistance becomes 11 on cash assistance+8 on education assistance+1 self-supporting in the actual subsistence information. This population difference is retained; no concealed recoding of 19 to 20.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Psychiatric conditions / diagnosis based	26	40
Former regular employment	26	40
Resource programme benefit before	20	40
Cash Helper	11	40
Training assistant	8	40
Self-dependant before	1	40
Education	every three [rounded]	40

National background and additional prosa

PPEN25-FULD, H4 / 7 / 23 / 31 / 32. Background are quoted national series, not errors. 2004 outpatient, methodical baseline. Receiving stock shall not be added to annual awards. Brainskatetal second population.

Relationship	Year	Figures
Persons receiving pensions	2012	259098

Relationship	Year	Figures
Persons receiving pensions	2023	258423
Full-time / labour force	2004	9.4%
Full-time / population	2004	7.2%
Full-time / labour force	2012	9%
Full-time / population	2012	6.6%
Full-time / labour force	2023	8%
Full-time / population	2023	6.3%
Less than 40 cooperative awards	2023	27%
40 + Cooperative awards	2023	73%
Less than 40 increase in award	2014→2023	471%
40 + increase in award	2014→2023	220%
Acquired brain damage nationally quoted	2011	148387
Acquired brain damage nationally quoted	2017	168701
Award in rounded prose	2012	approximately 15000
Award in rounded prose	2014	approximately 6500

Explicit interview / programme number

PPEN25-FULD, H25 / 34-39 / 42-44 / 47 / 50. Authority interview / policy program description; not new error / person occurrences or accurately documented waiting time serie.2 years / 2.5 year versions not harmonised.

Messages / Programmes	Figures
Chopper's refusal	almost every 2nd case, staff estimate
Previous resource trajectory max	5 years
New 2022 maksprråd	3 years, more than possible
Commitment guarantee	first 6 months
Spot-repeated resource allocations	the route numbers 3 and 4;
Roskilde example young	After 2 years, internship 2 hour week
Roskilde, people ready for activity	approx. 760 → 170 over 6 years, management estimate
Potato strain	about 30 cases by project
More must come with	3 roll, first>5 annual assistance
Clarification pool	>8 of the last 10 cash benefits
Mini-flex job	up to 10 paid hours
GladFondeinfoBox	2 years of training
GladFonden	nearly 2.5 years, 1700 hours internship, 500-600 hours instruction
Faaborg-Midtfyn processing perspective	example 3 years of sycatraemia waiting time
Roskilde orthopaedic surgeon	example 1 annual waiting period

Individual and organisational evidence chains

Track	Locator	Own paraffase	Consistency and primary control
Dorte	H14-15	Aged 33, psychiatric diagnosis/treatment, reduced alcohol consumption; most recent employment initiative>10 years earlier. AS considers that further substance misuse treatment/clarification may develop work capacity.	Anonymised case summary, not the medical record itself or a treatment prognosis. Historical lack of clarification does not in itself prove an actual present possibility of improvement;AS' assessment must be tested against specific medical facts. No actual withdrawal of a pension documented.
Katrine	H15	21 years, infantilatism / avIQ / cognitive problems, STUoganden effort interrupted; support for clothing / bath, not possible real internship. Asner pension without resource progression correctly.	Documenting the report's concrete example that work ability clarification / New Resource trajectory can be futile. There is no general rule that all citizens must first carry out an internship.
Kim.	H17	Pain, further treatment recommended, no improvement in function expected in months to come; limited internship interrupted by a recent accident. The team grants an oral pension without competence. Asses further treatment and longer internship relevant.	A specific breach of competence; AS's inference of realistic development of work capacity requires a separate original pain prognosis, effect/risk and necessary accommodations. A treatment option does not automatically document improvement in work capacity. No actual subsequent correction of errors.
Social 01	H16 / 48	Two citizens with health problems and social stress; one short internship interrupted, the other former intermittently self-supporting with support. The municipalities did not support the burden of the home before retirement. H48 refers to children living at home with special needs as an example.	Same two cases repeated. Absence of aid documented in study summary; unknown number of children and practical assistance. Liability requires knowledge of needs, applications / official duty, specific aid decisions and effects.
Competence Bornholm	H16 / 21-22; B12	All 6 Bornholm cases would be remitted for reconsideration; all 6 oral team decisions are described as being from the same municipality. AS is in dialogue with the municipality.	The municipality linkage is a documented inference of our own from one municipality 6/6 and B12. Six invalidity assessments are not six subsequently remitted appeals. Dialogue is not a documented new decision by a competent body or full redress.
TidStruer	H16; B13	Two retirement cases were awarded later than the home allowed; B13 places both in Struer.	Documented delayed right but no dates / amounts / interest / post payment published. In fact, enhanced time and loss accounts require correct start date and payment date.
Psych 01.	H31	The case summary mentions ADHD, borderline, cannabis addiction and signs of schizophrenic disorder in a single citizen.	Diagnostic words are reproduced as a summary, not independently verified medical facts. Can't be added to 60 as a new citizen.
Psych 02.	H31	Other citizens are referred to with congenital brain damage, ADHD and neglect of care in childhood.	Causality and original documentation require specific journal / history; the number of public errors is not derived from the lack of care summary.
Pre-run Roskilde	H32-35	Roskilde describes early very restrictive levels, young people in resource processes even without development potential, later changed line after reversed refusal.	Self-described authority competence / practice change. Demands rejected citizens' cohorts and retroactivity in order to measure losses; this study's 60 awards omitted refusals.
PoliticFaaborg	H36- 37	The leader describes committee policy: award in case of grey zone cases, as well as previous restrictive practices after press / political attention.	Political direction is described by the leader; the original decision of the committee, individual rights and responsibilities must be tested. No evidence of which specific cases were unlawfully rejected.
Psychiatric disorders	H46-47	Communes describe long waiting time, ending without sufficient treatment, worsening while citizens are waiting; Faaborg-Midtfyn talks about treatment three years advance as an example.	Documented authority knowledge at interview level, no precise national 3 year waiting time. Identify concrete references, visitation, processing and subsequent loss of function.

Track	Locator	Own paraffase	Consistency and primary control
Penalties	H48	Faaborg-Midtfyn describes repeated sanctions for non-attendance against persons functioning poorly	Consistency of aid failure → failure to appear → sanction is described by the Authority.

Track	Locator	Own paraffase	Consistency and primary control
		citizens without an understanding of support needs; subsequent recognition of the need for social educational assistance.	Number, amount and concrete legality not examined here; no automatic equivalence of all non-displays with illegal sanction.
Responsibilities	H49	A specific case is described as responsibility pong between the Social Department and the Children's and Family, without anyone taking the necessary everyday support task.	Need / knowledge appears as an interview trail. Internal dissent cannot in itself nullify the municipality's civic duty; concrete help / legal basis and loss require legal action.
Printing	H48-49	Faaborg-Midtfyn describes psychiatric discharge with support needs but neither help nor municipal follow-up; kkconcern for young people left to themselves.	Current chain of responsibility for cross-sector referral and coordination. Entitlement to social support is determined specifically, not by the jobcentre's objective of avoiding a pension.
PhysicVentRo Source	H50	Employees describe the one-year waiting of some citizens on orthopaedic surgery and subsequent stress, depression / anxiety and more difficult rehabilitation.	Statements document known possible causation; not medically established harm in all waiting-time cases. Requires a specific referral/assessment/functioning trajectory and contemporaneous medical records.
Laegefortaelli no	H50-51	Job centre staff describe doctors' assessment of pension / employability as motivation problem and citizen explanation certificates without proper investigation.	The interpretation of authority must be tested against the actual medical statements and facts. The doctor's observation of loss of function cannot be ignored as poor motivation simply because the municipality wants further development.

Source deviations and precise residue

The main table is printed as 0.1 on PDF12, but the prose calls it 2.1. The age graph's youngest category is 16-19, while the prose calls it 15-19; neither label means a pension before age 18. H8 has a sentence with a reversed earlier exclusion criterion, while H4/32-33 describes the other direction; that error is not cited as a legal rule. H20 first mentions three medical-consultant cases and then the last case without a clearly new population; no fourth case is created from the wording.

B14-28 is an analysis form, not actual response counts. It contains specific materiality review of safeguards, but does not show a public distribution of all hearing-of-the-parties, meeting and reasoning fields. The strongest documented criticism is the specific breaches of competence, delayed starting dates, information deficiencies and failures to provide support. Original medical certificates, individual forms, municipal follow-up and payment dates are necessary for person deduplication and a complete account of loss.

Additional original checks: flekjob 2010, additional expenses 2014 and sickness benefit 2016

Checked on 7. October 2026. Figures are case-count measurements; no person deduplication. Locators are physical PDF pages. Sources' own legality assessments are recorded as assessments, not independent examination of each individual's original records.

Fee and unemployment benefit, 2010

Primary: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20091/almdel/amu/bilag/220/871393.pdf. Full municipal original copy: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/543fe3eddee6c626b2c3dbd2acf24a4a3541f435/13-bilag-2.PDF. 106 pages; SHA256 27178ef1b5cd64d5ddea3f330faccf80571cc5874adf7d01a66b03b57496c542 for KP copy.

Population:175 requested; 164 examined =72 municipal grants +32 board grants following amended refusals +60 municipal reassessment cases. 14 municipalities, five boards; the reassessment component only 13 municipalities with actual cases. Three premature reassessment cases excluded; the received total and remaining difference from 175 are not fully reported. Municipal cases: most recent grants before 15.10.2009 and oldest eligibility assessments after 30.4.2007 with continuing unemployment benefit for people eligible for flex jobs. Municipal cases already appealed **and determined**, as well as those previously examined in practice studies, excluded. Boards: most recent grants following overturning before 15.10.2009, without appeal to Ankestyrelsen. Methodology/request letters pp. 59-60,68-72.

Measurement	Number in source category order	Denomination	Locator
Municipal grant: correct / amendment-remittal	53 /19	72	T2.1, p. 8-9
Board award: correct / alteration-remittal	24 /8	32	T2.2, p. 9
Reduced working capacity documented high / none / rings / not, municipality	40/17/11/4	72	T2.3, p. 11
Same name.	9/18/5/0	32	T2.4, p. 12
Working test high / none / none / without purpose, municipality	35/13/7/13/4	72	T2.5, p. 21
Same name.	10/14/4/4/0	32	T2.6, p. 21
Information no / minor / significant / crucial gaps, municipality	43/15/10/4	72	T3.1, p. 33
Same name.	21/5/4/2	32	T3.2, p. 33
Source basis high / some / rings / not, municipality	42/15/10/5	72	T3.3, p. 35
Full resource profile yes / no, name	28/4	32	T3.4, p. 36
Home appearance high / someone / ring / no	51/11/0/10	72	T3.6, p. 37
Reassessment correct / incorrect / missing	40/13/7	60	T4.1, p. 41
High / none / ring / not / unknown	37/13/2/1/7	60	T4.2, p. 41
Review completed / initiated / missing	52/1/7	60	T4.3, p. 42
Review timely / late / missing	42/11/7	60	T4.4, p. 47
Offer high / some / ring / none / re-evaluation missing	38/13/1/1/7	60	T4.5, p. 50
Information basis no / minor / significant / essential deficiencies	47/3/2/1	53	T5.1, p. 54
Resources and development high / some / rings / none	35/16/1/1	53	T5.2, p. 55
Permanent limitation of capacity for work: high/some/low/none	35/16/1/1	53	T5.3, p. 56
Basis for pension cases high / someone / rings / none	42/8/2/1	53	s 56, misnumbered T5.3, text T5.4

Source error: T3.4 gives 28=75% and 4=25%, whereas the derived proportions are 87,5% and 12,5%. Raw counts are retained. Delay in 11 cases: one day to eight months; one reassessment unfinished, p. 41. Overturning outcomes and formal deficiencies overlap. Municipal classification and reassessment may concern the same citizen; no total of unique persons. T3.5 and all six municipality/board matrices and distribution tables T1.3-1.5 are now fully reconciled row by row in praksis-flex2010-fulde-kommunebilag.md:10 blocks/94 rows. These are table rows, not a union of individual persons.

Additional costs for adults, 2014

Primary: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20131/almdel/sou/bilag/246/1376726.pdf. Original copy: https://viden.sl.dk/media/7223/anketyrelsens-praksisundersoegelse.pdf. 74 pp.; SHA256 cd5936d84e5754f6479f822de16c7fcbeaab84cd7f790cf5dc93e04cf44d79d5.

130 requested / 16 municipalities; 117 received; 75 selected / 15 municipalities after premeasurement. Decisions after 1.12.2009 and after teaching May-June 2012. Most recent 39 appropriations and 36 refusals on persons; already appealed and forwarded to the Board ruled out. Several desorption grounds described, without full number distribution. No supplementary acts obtained; p. 32 -33,61-62.

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Correct/amendment-remittal for reconsideration, all	58/17	75	T2.1, p. 8
Authorisation correct / incorrect	33/6	39	T2.1, p. 8
Reject Right / Wrong	25/11	36	T2.1, p. 8
Information no / minor / significant / essential missing, main table	52/13/3/7	75	T2.4, p. 13
Same Annex Table	51/13/3/8	75	T2, p. 59
Overall assessment high / none / none	58/3/5/9	75	T2.5, p. 15
Incoming loss of function yes / no / unknown	34/31/10	75	T2.8, p. 17; duplicate T2.9, p. 19
Overall assessment of 34 with intrusive loss of function	22/8/2/2	34	T2.10, p. 20
Operating mode high / none / rings / none	61/3/1/10	75	T3.1, p. 22
Citizen involvement high / someone / ring / none	68/4/3/0	75	T3.2, p. 22
Reason high / no / no	57/17/1/0	75	T3.3, p. 23
Complaint guidance high / someone / ring / none	70/4/0/1	75	T3.4, p. 24
Written decisions	75	75	T3.5, p. 24
Clear decision high / someone / ring / none	72/3/0/0	75	T3.6, p. 25

Visually verified internal conflicts: the main table / annex distributes one case differently between none and crucial information shortages. S26 prose exchanges 36 / 39 and associated 52 / 48%; T2.1 and tables use 39 appropriations / 36 refusals. S16 T2.7 refers to 39 where the rejection population is 36. Diagnosis groups overlap: grant 17 diabetes / 25 physical / 8 mental / 9 other, refusal 3 / 37 / 16 / 11; these cannot be counted as different people. Justification or non-application of the method shall not result in the nullity of all such decisions without specific submission. Commune table s 58 summer 58 / 17 / 75, same main outcome.

Section 7 of the Health and Safety Act, 2016

Primary: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20151/almdel/beu/bilag/164/1620173.pdf. Original copy: https://www.kk.dk/sites/de fault / files / agenda / 44ffd761-6cc6-4bba -896d-05de22c6667a / a734c6f3-8c94-451c-9040-5df2d25bbc92-Annex -1.pdf. 134 pages; SHA256 591c9787b97bf97b7b108dee601a5b76e428c568aba20201c3751a8e944ba904.

160 requested, 127 received, 12 excluded, 115 examined/16 municipalities. First 12 municipalities:120 requested, 90 received, 4 incorrect+2 extra excluded=84. Additional 4 municipalities:40 requested, 37 received, 6 excluded=31. Most recent cases before 1.7.2015; supplementary case request September 2015. Appealed and forwarded cases excluded; some additional records obtained. Methodology pp. 71-75.

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Correct/amendment/remittal	98/11/6	115	s 6-7
Refusal on the first day: correct/amendment/remittal for reconsideration	11/3/3	17	s 6-7
Paragraph 3: Right / Change / Remittal for reconsideration	44/1/3	48	s 6-7
Subsection 4: correct/amendment/remittal	15/4/0	19	s 6-7
Subsection 5: correct/amendment/remittal for reconsideration	28/3/0	31	s 6-7
Essential information missing; medical of which	14;12	115;14	s 7
Unemployed persons assessed under wrong paragraph 3 instead of paragraph 4	14	48	s 7

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Stop after incorrect paragraph 5; second determination possible	11	31	s 7
Follow-up rules: little / no compliance	8/2	77 rated, 38 not applicable / excluded	s 57-58
Employers not involved, where applicable	27	45,32 of 77 irrelevant	s 58
Information on initiatives yes / part / no	6/1/2	9,68 of 77 irrelevant	s 59
§ 7 a assessment timely / late	50/48	98,17 irrelevant	T5.6, p. 61
§ 7 a citizen involvement timely / late / none	49/43/6	98	T5.7, p. 61
Citizens' reason high / someone / no / uncontrollable	52/58/2/3	115	T6.1, p. 64
Employers' justification high / some / no	8/33/5	46	T6.2, p. 65
Employer's statement of reasons: not employed/irrelevant/unverifiable	53/10/6	115	T6.2, p. 65
Party consultation citizen yes / no	105/9	114 relevant	s 8
Party consultation employer yes / no	38/20	58 relevant	s 8
Lack of complaint guidance, citizen	1	115	s 9

Visually verified conflict: summary p. 8 states 1 entirely inadequate statement of reasons to a citizen; T6.1 and the report's own prose on p. 64 state 2. Summary p. 9 uses 52 relevant statements of reasons to employers; T6.2 shows 46 assessed+6 unverifiable. The report assesses 2 section 7 a case trajectories as incorrect beyond the delay; they are not additional cases on top of 17 alterations/remittals. Formal errors and an incorrect subsection are recorded separately from the hypothetical appeal outcome.

Municipality objection to AP rating: KK-notat 3.6.2016, one page: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/4 4ffd761-6cc6-4bba-896d-05de22c6667a / a734c6f3-8c94-451c-9040-5df2d25bbc92-Annex -2.pdf. KK claims 1 of 2 criticised cases / 10 based on AS 'misreading of the medical document date and overlooked justification. The original of the claim and any correction of AS is missing; therefore, AS 'published 17 / 115 is not amended by the note alone. Specific data request: KK 2016-0030250-8, related to case / dated medical document, measurement form and AS-correspondence on re-processing. It is a local, documented incompetence, not a general defence of municipal practice.

Full supplement check: Sickness benefit 2016 - all tables and citizen's programme. The entire 134 pages original, including all documents of principle, municipality, call and measurement, is now RAM reader.31 reading tables / 188 rows, 25 local examples -IDs and 26 visually controlled pages; the same 115 cases, no extra cohorts. Actual reopening / post-payment and the underlying file of the KK opposition are separate document deficiencies.

Flekjob 2010: T3.5 andsamænge kommunale / omningsalbilitet

Concrete table residue is closed: 10 table blocks / 94 rows at the same 164 case measurements. Main outcomes 72 / 32 / 60 and other main tables are in the previous module. This supplement certifies the listed pages / tables, not a new full 106pages main text reading.

Empty original cells appear; printed 0 is preserved. All six annexes of PDF64-67 are visually controlled in RAM.

T3.5 · PDF36 -37 · N = 72

Form	Number	Printed%
Written decision	45	63
Journalnotate	22	31
Other	5	7
Total	72	100

T1.3 · PDF62-63 · N = 72

Type of authorisation	Number	Printed%
Job 2 / 3	16	23
Job 1 / 2	6	8
Job enlightened	24	33
Self-employed 2 / 3	0	0
Self 1 / 2	1	1
Self-declared	1	1
Other	4	5
Undisclosed	20	28
Total	72	100

T1.4 · PDF63 · N = 72

Time	Number	Printed%
Part-time	6	8
Full-time	66	92
Total	72	100

T1.5 · PDF63 · N = 53

Cause of unemployment	Number	Printed%
Missing job	33	62
Working test	1	2
Sick	16	30
Maternity	1	2
Other	2	4
Total	53	100

T2.1 a · PDF64 · N = 72

Municipality	Right	Amendment/remittal	N
Parsley leaves	3	3	6
Esbjerg	5	0	5
Frederikshavn	3	2	5
Horsens	3	2	5
Hvidover	4	1	5
HøjTaastrup	4	1	5
Hørsholm	5	1	6
Copenhagen	4	1	5
Køge	3	2	5
Medium speed	4	1	5
Oats	4	1	5
Roskilde	5	0	5
Sønderborg	3	2	5
Århus	3	2	5
Total	53	19	72

T2.2 a · PDF65 · N = 72

Municipality	No deficiency	Less	Essential	Decisive	N
Parsley leaves	2	2	0	2	6
Esbjerg	5	0	0	0	5
Frederikshavn	1	3	1	0	5
Horsens	3	0	2	0	5
Hvidover	3	1	1	0	5
HøjTaastrup	3	1	1	0	5
Hørsholm	5	1	0	0	6
Copenhagen	4	0	1	0	5
Køge	2	1	2	0	5
Medium speed	3	1	1	0	5
Oats	4	0	0	1	5
Roskilde	3	2	0	0	5
Sønderborg	4	1	0	0	5
Århus	1	2	1	1	5
Total	43	15	10	4	72

T2.3 a · PDF65 · N = 32

Name	Right	Amendment/remittal	N
Capital	7	0	7
Central Jutland	3	3	6
North Jutland	6	1	7
Zealand	4	1	5
South Denmark	4	3	7
Total	24	8	32

T2.4 a · PDF66 · N = 32

Name	No deficiency	Less	Essential	Decisive	N
Capital	4	3	0	0	7
Central Jutland	4	0	1	1	6
North Jutland	5	1	1	0	7
Zealand	4	0	0	1	5
South Denmark	4	1	2	0	7
Total	21	5	4	2	32

T2.5 a · PDF66 · N = 60

Municipality	Right	Wrong	No review	N
Parsley leaves	3	2	-	5
Esbjerg	5	-	-	5
Frederikshavn	2	1	1	4
Horsens	5	-	-	5
Hvidover	3	1	-	4
HøjTaastrup	0	1	1	2
Hørsholm	-	-	-	0
Copenhagen	5	-	-	5
Køge	2	3	-	5
Medium speed	4	1	-	5
Oats	3	2	-	5
Roskilde	4	1	-	5
Sønderborg	1	-	4	5
Århus	3	1	1	5
Total	40	13	7	60

T2.6 a · PDF67 · N = 53

Municipality	No deficiency	Less	Essential	Decisive	N
Parsley leaves	4	0	0	1	5
Esbjerg	5	0	0	0	5
Frederikshavn	2	1	0	0	3
Horsens	5	0	0	0	5
Hvidover	4	0	0	0	4
HøjTaastrup	1	0	0	0	1
Hørsholm	0	0	0	0	0
Copenhagen	5	0	0	0	5
Køge	2	1	2	0	5
Medium speed	4	1	0	0	5
Oats	5	0	0	0	5
Roskilde	5	0	0	0	5
Sønderborg	1	0	0	0	1
Århus	4	0	0	0	4
Total	47	3	2	1	53

Limitation and source conflicts

175 requested and 164 measurements; 3 immature reassessments deleted, the rest of the difference is not fully explained. Municipalities 14, review cases only 13 municipalities; all 5 boards. The appeal / examination and previous practice investigation are excluded; the case is selected from modified municipal refusals but excludes appeals to the Court of Justice. Ankestyrelsen.72 + 32 appropriations and 60 reviews may relate to the same person.53 information / unemployment measurements leave out 7 without reassessment. No additional persons are formed from the municipal annexes.

T3.5 prosa says 94% in writing; the table says 45 / 72 and 63% .22 journal notes is a separate category. T3.4 raw 28 / 4 versus 75 / 25% is retained. T1.3 percent sum 99; 16 / 72 is 22,2% versus 23 printed. Age / gender figures 61-62 have no exact printed column numbers; raw cells are required. Copies of files shall be provided after report; not proof of the deletion of municipal original records.

Own method analysis: the municipal distribution closes the table hole; it is no person union or proof of actual delivery, early retirement or compensation. Case 093PDF58 describes 1.4.2007 unemployment benefit → 18 m 1.10.2008 → note 6.1.2009 / profile 20.1.2009 only then further clarification. The inspection body criticises the fact that the investigation should have been initiated in the past; there is no evidence of any subsequent grant / compensation.

Flekjob in very few hours 2016: full original tables and citizens' programme

FF16F. All 89 physical original pages are read in RAM. 28 block numbers, of which 21 numbered tables; 170 series of data. 19 different case numbers are recorded; repeat No 112 is counted once. Raster tables and graphs are visually controlled on PDF 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 31, 34, 41, 42, 46, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 60, 68, 71, 72, 73, 74. The same 130 cohorts as the previous main control; no extra cases.

Limitation and method

130 grants from 13 municipalities, ten per municipality. Local authorities selected by number of small flex jobs / unemployment benefits, size and geography. The call required the most recent decisions before 1 May 2015; the actual period of the report ends on 16 June 2015. Cases already appealed and forwarded are omitted; amended after reassembly without forwarding are included (PDF75). All requested 130 received. Annexes were sought from four municipalities (PDF66-67). Copies are shredded after reporting, not evidence of shredding of municipal records (PDF76). No statistically significant national error rate (PDF67).

Plan content and team reasons are examined formally; the correctness of the reasons is not examined. The team's knowledge of information in other records is assumed (PDF52-53/59). AS itself completes the development assessment in 47 of 79 low-hours flexible employment cases (PDF41). Subsequent intervention is not fully covered (PDF51).

Original numbers and deviations

T1.2 presses 39% for 51 / 130; T3.4 presses 38% for the same 51 / 130. T1.1 / T3.3 presses 69% for 89 / 130 (68,46%). Figures and printed percentages have been kept separately. The 37 unresolved cases of the prosaic have to be read with the exception of Case 54, which is described as sufficiently well informed with ordinary work possibilities (PDF34). T3.11 has 10 / 12 / 5 shortcomings in sub-points, although the total missing team justification is 9; the categories may not be added together.

T1.1: Flex job target group

FF16F PDF7; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	89	69
To some extent	4	3
No / very small degree	37	28
Total	130	100

T1.2: Target group very few hours

FF16F PDF9; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	76	59
To some extent	3	2
No / very small degree	51	39
Total	130	100

T1.3: Municipal assessment of development

FF16F PDF10; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	42	32
No	0	0
Undisclosed	88	68
Total	130	100

T1.4: Rehabilitation plan formal content

FF16F PDF11; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	91	70
To some extent	32	25
No	7	5
Total	130	100

T1.5: LEE 265

FF16F PDF12; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	114	88
To some extent	7	5
No	8	6
Not obtained	1	1
Total	130	100

T1.6: Statement of reasons for the team

FF16F PDF13; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	109	84
To some extent	12	9
No	9	7
Total	130	100

T3.1: Overall accuracy

FF16F PDF31; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Right	88	68
Amended/remitted on hypothetical appeal	42	32
Total	130	100

T3.2: Information base

FF16F PDF31; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
No missing	84	64

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Minor deficiencies	10	8
Essential deficiencies	36	28
Total	130	100

T3.3: Flex job target group

FF16F PDF34; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	89	69
To some extent	4	3
No / very small degree	37	28
Total	130	100

T3.4: Target group very few hours

FF16F PDF41; mentions 130; unit cases. Same number as T1.2, but 51 has printed 38% here as against 39% in T1.2. No harmonisation.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	76	59
To some extent	3	2
No / very small degree	51	38
Total	130	100

T3.5: Municipal assessment of development

FF16F PDF42; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	42	32
No	0	0
Undisclosed	88	68
Total	130	100

T3.6: Rehabilitation plan formal content

FF16F PDF53; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	91	70
To some extent	32	25
No	7	5

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Total	130	100

T3.7: The individual information of the planet

FF16F PDF54; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Information point	Yeah.	No.	Total
Experience / CV	123	7	130
Personal resources / family / network	127	3	130
Employment / social challenges	124	6	130
Future wishes	129	1	130
Health	113	17	130
The impact of health on jobs / education	126	4	130
Absence History	120	10	130
Current offers	113	17	130

T3.8: LEE 265 total

FF16F PDF56; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	114	88
To some extent	7	5
No	8	6
Not obtained	1	1
Total	130	100

T3.9: LEE 265 individual information

FF16F PDF57; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Information point	Yeah.	No.	Not obtained	Total
Relevant health conditions	125	4	1	130
Specific considerations	126	3	1	130
The citizen's own perspective	126	3	1	130
Other factors	124	5	1	130

T3.10: Team statement of reasons

FF16F PDF60; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	109	84

Category	Number	Printed percentage
To some extent	12	9
No	9	7
Total	130	100

T3.11: Teams single justification points

FF16F PDF60; mentions 130; unit cases. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Point	Yeah.	No.	Total
Strict employment / social / health conditions	120	10	130
Clarified and unable to work ordinary	118	12	130
Type of job / function / consideration / support	125	5	130

B4-T1: Total accuracy

FF16F PDF71; mentions 130; unit cases. Each municipality N = 10; total N = 130. The four tables repeat the main cohort.

Municipality	Right	Modified / remitted
Aalborg	8	2
Aarhus	6	4
Egedal	7	3
Esbjerg	7	3
Frederiksberg	7	3
Helsingør	6	4
Corner	8	2
Holbæk	8	2
Holstebro	9	1
Kalundborg	6	4
Næstved	3	7
Svendborg	7	3
Sønderborg	6	4
Total	88	42

B4-T2: Information

FF16F PDF72; mentions 130; unit cases. Each municipality N = 10; total N = 130. The four tables repeat the main cohort.

Municipality	No missing	Minor deficiencies	Essential deficiencies
Aalborg	7	1	2

Municipality	No missing	Minor deficiencies	Essential deficiencies
Aarhus	6	0	4
Egedal	6	2	2
Esbjerg	8	0	2
Frederiksberg	7	0	3
Helsingør	7	0	3
Corner	7	1	2
Holbæk	7	1	2
Holstebro	10	0	0
Kalundborg	5	1	4
Næstved	3	0	7
Svendborg	7	0	3
Sønderborg	4	4	2
Total	84	10	36

B4-T3: Flechog target group

FF16F PDF73; mentions 130; unit cases. Each municipality N = 10; total N = 130. The four tables repeat the main cohort.

Municipality	Very much	To some extent	No / very small degree
Aalborg	7	1	2
Aarhus	7	0	3
Egedal	9	0	1
Esbjerg	8	0	2
Frederiksberg	7	0	3
Helsingør	7	0	3
Corner	8	0	2
Holbæk	7	1	2
Holstebro	9	0	1
Kalundborg	6	0	4
Næstved	3	0	7
Svendborg	7	0	3
Sønderborg	4	2	4
Total	89	4	37

B4-T4: Target group very few hours

FF16F PDF74; mentions 130; unit cases. Each municipality N = 10; total N = 130. The four tables repeat the main cohort.

Municipality	Very much	To some extent	No / very small degree
Aalborg	8	0	2
Aarhus	5	0	5
Egedal	4	0	6
Esbjerg	7	0	3
Frederiksberg	7	0	3
Helsingør	6	0	4
Corner	8	0	2
Holbæk	7	1	2
Holstebro	7	0	3
Kalundborg	6	0	4
Næstved	2	0	8
Svendborg	7	0	3
Sønderborg	2	2	6
Total	76	3	51

F1.1: Overall accuracy

FF16F PDF6; mentions 130; unit case markings. Several responses possible in F1.3 / F3.1-3.3; same cases. F1.3 and F3.1 repeat each other. Acts on subsequent efforts are incomplete, PDF51.

Category	Number
Right	88
Modified / remitted	42

F1.2: Information base

FF16F PDF8; mentions 130; unit case markings. Several responses possible in F1.3 / F3.1-3.3; same cases. F1.3 and F3.1 repeat each other. Acts on subsequent efforts are incomplete, PDF51.

Category	Number
No missing	84
Minor deficiencies	10
Essential deficiencies	36

F1.3: Assessed modes of development

FF16F PDF10; mentions 42; unit case markings. Several responses possible in F1.3 / F3.1-3.3; same cases. F1.3 and F3.1 repeat each other. Acts on subsequent efforts are incomplete, PDF51.

Category	Number
Auxiliary products	3
Intensity	5

Category	Number
Management	6
Accommodation needs	8
Training	8
Mentor	10
Hours	14
Other	19

F3.1: Assessed modes of development

FF16F PDF46; mentions 42; unit case markings. Several responses possible in F1.3 / F3.1-3.3; same cases. F1.3 and F3.1 repeat each other. Acts on subsequent efforts are incomplete, PDF51.

Category	Number
Auxiliary products	3
Intensity	5
Management	6
Accommodation needs	8
Training	8
Mentor	10
Hours	14
Other	19

F3.2: Basis for development assessment

FF16F PDF50; mentions 42; unit case markings. Several responses possible in F1.3 / F3.1-3.3; same cases. F1.3 and F3.1 repeat each other. Acts on subsequent efforts are incomplete, PDF51.

Category	Number
Working time	3
Other	7
Tasks	11
Working at the workplace	14
Clarification / internship	22
Health	22

F3.3: Measures planned / undertaken

FF16F PDF51; mentions 42; unit case markings. Several responses possible in F1.3 / F3.1-3.3; same cases. F1.3 and F3.1 repeat each other. Acts on subsequent efforts are incomplete, PDF51.

Category	Number
Auxiliary products	1

Category	Number
Accommodation needs	1
Intensity	1
Management	2
Hours	2
Other	3
Training	3
Mentor	6
Unstated / No	30

B1-F1: Gender and age

FF16F PDF68; mentions 130; unit cases with personal data. The same 130-case cohorts; measurements overlap.

Age	Male	Women
Less than 30	1	9
30-39	3	18
40-49	22	27
50-59	18	28
60+	1	3
Total	45	85

Other Facts

Measurement	Counter / value	Denomination	Locator
Municipal consultation sent	17.12.2015	-	PDF4
Time limit for submission	01.07.2015	-	PDF75
Actual decision period	11.05.2013-16.06.2015	130	PDF5
Requested / received / analysed	130	130	PDF65-67
Municipalities	13	-	PDF65-66
Decisions 2013/2014/2015	6/21/103	130	PDF5
Local development assessment in small flex jobs	32	79	PDF41
AS fills in development assessment	47	79	PDF41
Not small flex jobs but municipal development assessment	10	51	PDF42
Suspension proceedings	9	130	PDF38-41 / 67
Absence incorrect	5	9	PDF31 / 38-41
Medical consultant’s opinion used; AS disregards it	12	130	PDF59
Team set flekjob and the municipality followed	130	130	PDF59 / 63
Absence of team justification among total errors	8	9	PDF60
Actions planned / implemented	12	42	PDF50-51
Weight decrease as development	4	42	PDF46
Request for missing supporting documents	At least one case in four municipalities	-	PDF66-67

Citizens' programme: local case numbers

Compact factual records; all assessments in the final column are the report’s. No national union of people or actual individual redress is inferred.

No	PDF	Documented facts	Assessment of the report
18	32-33	54 F; head trauma; 1 ½ month / 9 hours	Insufficient clarification / considerations of safety
119	33	38 M; vertebral fracture / ADHD; seven months internship	Special studies not requested
54	34-35	23 F; Asperger; 13 weeks + nine months	AS assesses the possibility of regular work
66	36	47 M; bipolar; 2 ½ months	Current treatment; clarification inadequate
61	37	46 M; depression / abuse / HIV; one year	AS assesses fleksjobgrund correctly
96	38	59 F; blood clots; near one year	AS assesses fleksjobgrund correctly
40	39-40	39 F; fixed head injury; six months	Maintenance conditions not met
63	40-41	57 F; progressive nervous disorder; seven months	AS considers the retention exception satisfied

No	PDF	Documented facts	Assessment of the report
11	42-43	41 M; brain injury; year + six months	AS complements the municipality's lack of development assessment
31	43-44	52 M; knee / depression; three months	AS complements development assessment
112	44-45;61	51 M; Parkinson; nine weeks / 18 hours effective	General flexible jobs; team reasons deficient
76	46-47	59 F; disease load; three months / four-hour test	Pension wish; doctor predicts the most quality of life; AS accepts the municipality's development statements
98	47-48	35 F; knee injury; 2 ½ hours / week	AS accepts development option
117	48-49	53 M; lung injury after cancer; three months	AS accepts development statements such as work motivation
12	54-55	58 M; neck / back; 2 ½ month	Plan / information insufficient; treatment not completed
4	55-56	46 M; depression; handicapped resident son	The son's care / support and current social conditions insufficiently elucidated
36	57-58	46 F; chronic pain; 2 ½ month	LÆ265 lacks current treatment information
106	58-59	49 F; anxiety / agoraphobia; resource progression one year	LEE265 over one year old, not updated
67	61-62	48 F; hip disorder; 13 weeks	Practice in medically unsuitable kitchen work; team justification inadequate

Own evidence and impact assessment

Overall correctness does not count every safeguard deficiency. The evidence is the documented procedural examination, the 47 subsequent assessments completed by the reviewing authority and the sub-items with more deficiencies than the overall count of incorrect reasons. This shows the review test’s limitation: a public decision may be classified as correct while an originally mandatory assessment element is absent from the municipality’s records. Such a review measure does not prove that the individual received adequate reasons and an opportunity to challenge the material when the decision was made.

Case 67 documents that the clarification itself took place in work excluded by the doctor's recommended adjustments; the result therefore cannot support a reliable assessment of capacity for work. Case 4 links inadequate fact-finding with the actual burden of caring for a child with disabilities, but the child is not automatically counted as another person subject to a decision. Case 76 documents a wish for a pension, exhaustion and an expectation of development; neither subsequent development nor a final pension decision is documented here.

Specific requirements: initial acts and measurement forms, actual subsequent effort / health / employability, resumption and benefits per case, and responsible follow-up. This information requires authorised passenger coupling. The well-known reading hole of the 89- page original is closed; individual repairs and historical sources of law outside this original have not been declared.

Sickness benefit 2016: full tables and citizens' programme

The entire public original of 134 PDFs pages has been read in memory, including rules, principles, municipalities, calls and schedules. 26 pages are visually checked in memory. The municipality's separate opposition note of 1 page has also been read. This supplement uses the same 115 examined decisions as the previous module; the figures may not be added again.

Ankestyrelsen 17 decisions wrongly assessed: 11 would have been amended and 6 returned by complaint. A remittal for reconsideration is a new procedure, and the investigation does not document a full series of actual resumed benefits or post-payment. Error in legal reference, consultation, information and result overlaps. A decision which the board calls overall correct may still have separately documented errors in the handling of the case.

Original: Section 7 of the Health and Safety Act concerning incapacity for work, April 2016;. SHA256: 591c9787b97bf97b7b108dee601a5b76e428c568aba20201c3751a8e944ba904. The PDF page is physically 1-based; the printed page is usually the PDF page minus 3. ISBN978-87-7811-322-1.

Scope and sample

Search	Precise demarcation
Request / received / measured	160 / 127 / 115. First 120 cases from 12 municipalities: 90 − 4 incorrect − 2 extra = 84. Extra 40 from 4 municipalities: 37 − 6 incorrect = 31.
Exclusion of complaints	Cases appealed and forwarded to Ankestyrelsen should be excluded. Modified by reassembly without transmission. The number of excluded complaints and such reassessments shall not be made public.
Period	The first 12 municipalities' most recent decisions before 1 July 2015; the 4 new municipalities' sample is expanded at the end of September to decisions after 30 June and before the request. Examples cover 2013-2015.
Difficulty	The municipalities found it difficult to find first refusal and settlement cases. They informed many alleged post office cases and agreements for quick notification without a decision. The remaining section 7 (3) cases were accepted.
Information	The Authority's requirement for all relevant documents is not an independent audit of the municipality's full archives. Some additional documents were obtained.
Application	Small sample; the original does not say statistically significant. Commune tables do not provide a secure national or local error rate.
Dedup	25 local example IDs are contained in 115. No publicly verifiable personal union between them or through other reports.
Repair	Hypothetical appeal outcome; no full list of actual resumption, post-payment, amount or end date of the period of error.

All published figures

31 reading tables with 188 rows. Repeats in summary, method and municipal annexes are versions of the same population. All printed percentage cells are retained even when rounding or the original classification results in deviations. The response codes of the form are separate.

Summary Outcome: Overall and case type outages

Original PDF6. Mention / delimitation: 115 cases; hypothetical complaint outcome, non-successful reopening.

Type	Correct	Change	remittal for reconsideration	N
All	98	11	6	115
Refusal first day	11	3	3	17
Paragraph 3	44	1	3	48
Paragraph 4	15	4	0	19
Paragraph 5	28	3	0	31

Summary section: Summary of the special groups

Original PDF7. Denominator/scope: PDF7–9 different sub-denominators, repetitions; 2 section 7 a cases: one hypothetical remittal/one affirmance; not additional cases.

Milling	n	N
Determining information missing	14	115
Lesson deficiencies	12	14

Milling	n	N
Free in error (3)	14	48
Paragraph 5 incorrect, other possible	11	31
Worker not involved	27	45
§ 7 a incorrect	2	98
Citizens of the Party	105	114
Employers' representative	38	58
Citizens' motivation any degree	58	115
Citizens' justification No summary	1	115
Employer's statement of reasons: some	33	52
Employer’s reasons: no	5	52
Appeal instructions to the citizen missing	1	115

4.1: Total correctness

Original PDF32. Denominator/scope: 115 decisions.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Correct	98	85
Would be amended/remitted	17	15
Total	115	100

4.2: Information base

Original PDF33. Denominator/scope: 115.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
No missing	77	67
Minor shortcomings	24	21
Determining deficiencies	14	12
Total	115	100

4.3: Conditions of sale

Original PDF36. Denominator/scope: 17 first-day resolutions.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
High degree	12	71
Some degree	0	0
No	4	24
Irrelevant	1	6
Insufficient information	0	0

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Total	17	100

4.4: Assessment first day

Original PDF37. Denominator/scope: 17.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
High	11	65
Someone.	0	0
No	6	35
Irrelevant	0	0
Total	17	100

4.5: Types of errors first day

Original PDF37. Denominator/scope: 6 incorrect; types of errors overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Paragraph 1	4	67
Paragraph 3	2	33
Paragraph 4	0	0
Paragraph 5	0	0
§ 7a	0	0
Insufficient information	5	83
Other	0	0
Total decisions	6	100

4.6: Paragraph 3 assessment

Original PDF42. Denominator/scope: 48.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
High	30	63
Someone.	14	29
No	4	8
Total	48	100

4.7: Paragraph 3 error

Original PDF42. Denominator/scope: 4; overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Wide premature	0	0

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Not widely working	1	25
§ 7a	0	0
Information	4	100
Other	0	0
Total decisions	4	100

4.8: Paragraph 4 assessment

Original PDF46. Denominator/scope: 19.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
High	14	74
Someone.	1	5
No	4	21
Total	19	100

4.9: Paragraph 4 error

Original PDF46. Denominator/scope: 4; overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Not fit for work	4	100
§ 7a	0	0
Information	2	50
Other	0	0
Total	4	100

4.10: Statement and result

Original PDF49. Denominator/scope: 67 only paragraph 3 / 4.

Result	Consignee	Free	Self-employed	Total
Correct	29	28	2	59
Amendment / remittal for reconsideration	3	5	0	8
Total	32	33	2	67

4.12: Paragraph 5 assessment

Original PDF50. Denominator/scope: 31.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
High	16	51,6
Someone.	12	38,7

Category	Number	Printed percentage
No	3	9,7
Total	31	100

4.13: Paragraph 5 error

Original PDF50. Denominator/scope: 3; overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Non-stationary	1	33
Court of Justice	1	33
§ 7a	0	0
Information	2	67
Other	0	0
Total	3	100

5.1: Legal basis

Original PDF56. Denominator/scope: 115.

Category	First day juice layer	Paragraph 3	Paragraph 4	Paragraph 5	Number	Printed%
High	8	36	14	23	81	70
Someone.	4	8	4	6	22	19
No	5	4	1	2	12	11
Total	17	48	19	31	115	100

5.2: Observation

Original PDF57. Denominator/scope: 115; 19 free municipality + 19 irrelevant sample.

Category	First day juice layer	Paragraph 3	Paragraph 4	Paragraph 5	Number	Printed%
High	0	24	8	17	49	43
Someone.	0	7	4	7	18	16
Rings	0	5	3	0	8	7
No	0	2	0	0	2	2
Free municipality	0	10	3	6	19	16
Irrelevant	17	0	1	1	19	16
Total	17	48	19	31	115	100

5.3: Employers' involvement

Original PDF58. Denominator/scope: 77 staff report 45 relevant.

Category	First day juice layer	Paragraph 3	Paragraph 4	Paragraph 5	Number	Printed%
Yes	0	11	0	7	18	23
No	0	16	2	9	27	35
Irrelevant	8	12	3	9	32	42
Total	8	39	5	25	77	100

5.4: Information to employers

Original PDF59. Denominator/scope: 77 only 9 relevant; non-relevant action.

Category	First day juice layer	Paragraph 3	Paragraph 4	Paragraph 5	Number	Printed%
Yes	0	4	0	2	6	8
Partial	0	0	0	1	1	1
No	0	1	0	1	2	3
No relevant initiatives	8	34	5	21	68	88
Total	8	39	5	25	77	100

5.5: Decision employer

Original PDF60. Names / delimits: 77 staff reports.

Category	First day juice layer	Paragraph 3	Paragraph 4	Paragraph 5	Number	Printed%
Yes	6	27	1	15	49	64
No	1	4	0	3	8	10
Non-employed	1	8	4	7	20	26
Total	8	39	5	25	77	100

5.6: § 7a position

Original PDF61. Denominator/scope: 115,98 relevant.

Category	First day juice layer	Paragraph 3	Paragraph 4	Paragraph 5	Number	Printed%
2 weeks at the latest	0	24	8	18	50	44
Later	0	24	11	13	48	42
None	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irrelevant	17	0	0	0	17	15
Total	17	48	19	31	115	100

5.7: § 7 a citizen involvement

Original PDF61. Denominator/scope: 115,98 relevant.

Category	First day juice layer	Paragraph 3	Paragraph 4	Paragraph 5	Number	Printed%
2 weeks at the latest	0	23	8	18	49	43
Later	0	20	10	13	43	37
None	0	5	1	0	6	5
Irrelevant	17	0	0	0	17	15
Total	17	48	19	31	115	100

6.1: Citizens' motivation

Original PDF64. Denominator/scope: 115,112 evaluable.

Category	Number	Printed%
High	52	45
Someone.	58	50
No	2	2
Not evaluable	3	3
Total	115	100

6.2: Employers' statement of reasons

Original PDF65. Denominator/scope: 115; 52 relevant incl. 6 non-controllable, 46 assessable.

Category	Number	Printed%
High	8	7
Someone.	33	29
No	5	4
Non-employed	53	46
Irrelevant	10	9
Not evaluable	6	5
Total	115	100

6.3: Appeal instructions to the citizen

Original PDF66. Denominator/scope: 115,112 evaluable.

Category	Number	Printed%
High	105	91
Someone.	6	5
No	1	1
Not evaluable	3	3
Total	115	100

6.4: Appeal guidance to employers

Original PDF66. Denominator/scope: 115; 42 relevant incl. 5 unknown 37 evaluable.

Category	Number	Printed%
High	33	29
Someone.	4	3
No	0	0
Non-employed	53	46
Irrelevant	20	17
Not evaluable	5	4
Total	115	100

6.5: Orphans

Original PDF67. Denominator/scope: 115,114 relevant.

Category	Number	Printed%
High	98	85
Someone.	7	6
No	9	8
Irrelevant	1	1
Total	115	100

6.6: Employers' hearing

Original PDF69. Notices / delimits: 115; 52 hearing outcomes + 6 irrelevant; letter 6 under 14 not aligned.

Category	Number	Printed%
High	33	29
Someone.	5	4
No	14	12
Non-employed	54	47
Self-employed	3	3
Irrelevant	6	5
Total	115	100

Annex 1T1: Type

Original PDF74. Denominator/scope: 115; percentage sum 101 rounding.

Type	Number	Printed%
First day	17	15
Paragraph 3	48	42

Type	Number	Printed%
Paragraph 4	19	17
Paragraph 5	31	27
Total	115	100

Annex 1F1: Meat

Original PDF75. Denominator/scope: 115 cases.

Milk	Number	Printed%
Male	55	48
Female	60	52
Total	115	100

Annex 4T1: Local authorities and total results

Original PDF108. Denominator/scope: Same 115; no municipal statistically secure estimates.

Municipality	Correct	Amendment / remittal for reconsideration	N
Esbjerg	8	1	9
Fredericia	4	2	6
Frederikssund	6	0	6
Herlev	8	0	8
Herning	9	0	9
Holstebro	7	0	7
Corrosion	5	1	6
Port of Copenhagen	8	2	10
Kidney	4	0	4
Odense	4	3	7
Silkeborg	4	0	4
Thisted	1	1	2
Vejle	9	1	10
Viborg	5	2	7
Vordingborg	7	3	10
Aabenra	9	1	10
Total	98	17	115

Annex 4T2: Local authorities and information bases

Original PDF109. Names / delimits: Same 115; composition • country frequency.

Municipality	No missing	Minor deficiencies	Determining deficiencies	N
Esbjerg	5	3	1	9
Fredericia	3	1	2	6
Frederikssund	0	6	0	6
Herlev	6	2	0	8
Herning	8	1	0	9
Holstebro	7	0	0	7
Corrosion	5	0	1	6
Port of Copenhagen	5	4	1	10
Kidney	3	1	0	4
Odense	5	0	2	7
Silkeborg	3	1	0	4
Thisted	1	0	1	2
Vejle	7	2	1	10
Viborg	4	1	2	7
Vordingborg	7	0	3	10
Aabenra	8	2	0	10
Total	77	24	14	115

Concrete stops and citizens' programmes

The date in the stop column is stop effect when explicitly stated; at first refusal, the date of decision is indicated. Date alone does not prove when the money was actually missing or later paid. The assessment by the Management Board may be verified against the original documents; the extracts are its published summaries of cases.

Local ID	PDF	Age	Sick from	Stop / desist ag	AS Assessment	Routine information
62	34	53	2014-09-08	2015-02-01	Change	After cancer 2011; neurology 17 Aug 2014; 15 h/week varying; stability/work capacity not clarified
104	34â €35	Not available	2014-10-09	2015-04-25	Remittal for reconsideration	Operator Operation; Back Merterfeb 2015 / Physio 4 Mar 2015 ~ 1 month down; Back status missing
18	35	41	2014-11-18	2015-06-15	Correct	Depression/bullying, “no medical” [source unclear: “ingenmedical”], personally agrees to other jobs; AS: an earlier end being possible is only a hypothesis
30	35â €36	21	2014-10-27	2015-05-06	Correct	SOSUstress / life situation, medical 20 Apr 2015consultation; availability
43	37â €38	56	2014-08-21	Not available	Change	Later hospital 25 Sep 2014,life-threatening alcoholism/anaemia/COPD; postponement and refusal incorrect
55	38â 39	26	2015-04-29	2015-06-18	Change	Refusal from the first day; form not submitted, possible stoppage under section 21 from 2 June 2015 after a 1 June deadline; section 21(4) reopening deadline 4 weeks; payment 29 April–1 June assumed but not documented
8	39	45	2013-03-19	Not available	Correct	Medic 7 feb / 30 apr 2013 rating; suicide 9 apr 2013

Local ID	PDF	Age	Sick from	Stop / desist ag	AS Assessment	Routine information
70	39â 40	55	2014-06-02	2014-08-22	Correct	Recruitment ends 1 Jun; early 18 Dec 2013; internship 37 h / week
111	40	49	2015-04-10	2015-06-10	Correct	Reported 26 Apr retroactively from 10 Apr; previously 28 Jan–10 Apr 2015;7 Apr decision to stop from 11 Apr; stable/clarified AS assessment
81	40â 41	Not available	2015-02-04	2015-04-01	Remittal for reconsideration	Previously 2–4 January 2015/specialist November 2014; postponement justified but current medical information missing; no basis for an advance refusal
84	41	24	2013-12-18	2014-01-28	Remittal for reconsideration	Key economic problems; medical not retrieving one, away from business enough
33	43	49	2014-11-11	2015-04-01	Remittal for reconsideration	Teacher, stress; employment ends 30 September 2015;February medical:partial without a time horizon; psychological information omitted
86	43 €44	34	2014-05-30	2014-11-30	Change	Recurrent depression; psychiatry 26 May–19 Aug/GP 31 Aug; antidepressant increased 20 Aug; cannot manage 4 h/week exercise+moving in October
32	44	26	2015-03-20	2015-06-02	Correct	Stress, poor environment; broad before 3 months, notice expected; AS medical assessment: fit for work
87	44â 45	39	2013-06-20	2014-08-02	Correct	Status 23 May 2014, last seen 9 Apr; expected recovery in 1–2 months; 12 Jun interview, own expectation after the holiday
7	45	Not available	2015-01-06	2015-07-09	Wrong piece; stop possible	Apprenticeship 31 May 2015; 3â † '4; 32 hmax self-education course; self-education 15 Junelast 16 mar
22	46â €47	44	2014-10-30	2015-05-31	Change	Depression after mother's death 2 years earlier;debt/medication/cannabis/stress;medical 22 May 2015 unfit for work
103	47	34	2014-12-10	2015-06-27	Change	Colitis post-birth; past 37 hpraktik 18 h; medical 1 Jun 2015 downstilltime; not fully ordained in scope
9	48	29	2014-07-28	2014-12-20	Correct	Floor sander/unemployed; bouts of abdominal pain, gastrointestinal diagnostic assessment without a diagnosis/irritable bowel; 14 October improvement
39	48	55	2014-09-25	2015-04-01	Correct	Chronic pancreas / diabetes; medical 3 mar 2015 no seizures 2 m; diffuseled pain 1 m
21	51	51	2015-03-16	2015-05-21	Change	Progressive neuropathy, unknown level of functioning; hospital status report of 3 Jun 2015 missing, B12 every 3 months; other interventions not clarified
98	51	55	Not available	2015-03-27	Correct	Road traffic accident; pain clinics from 2014 without recovery; 30 h / week delviskraskfrajan 2014
99	52	35	2014-01-17	2014-11-13	Absence of reasoning; stop possible	12–15 effective hours/week in the current work placement against the previous 30 hours; objective findings versus demonstrated functioning is AS's assessment, reasons concerning the intervention missing
49	52â 53	54	2015-01-19	2015-05-08	Wrong piece; stop possible	Flexible employment 2001,25 hours→15 hours from 20 February 2015;section 7(5) not applicable because already in flexible employment,AS section 7(3) another flexible job possible
97	53	44	2014-09-01	2015-01-19	Wrong piece; stop possible	32 hrs; medical 11 Dec 2014 hypermobility 30 hrealistic; § 7 (5) before otherpieces

Case 55 shows a specific income interval: the Board considers that the first refusal should not have replaced payment from 29 April to 1 June 2015; instead, no form could justify a later stop from 2 June. The original does not disclose any actual post-payment. Case 86 describes stop 30 November 2014 during continued depression without current

health information. Case 21 describes stop 21 May 2015 in the case of progressive neuropathy without clear function or alternative efforts. An unknown post-payment link does not cancel the documented error in the decision.

Absence of the original and independent source verification

Locator	Deviation
PDF13 - 14	Category 1 first follow-up within the 8th week stated in PDF13;PDF14 says no required time/form. The historical rule version is reproduced, not harmonised.
PDF60	Employer 8/77 described as employed at cessation, but PDF58 says 77 were employed at the start of sick leave; retain the conflict over the population's time point
PDF64 vs PDF7	Justification completely inadequate 2 in main text against 1 summary; read in Table 6.1 before choice
T4.10â † '4.12PDF49â 50	No table 4.11 on the intervening original pages;the original numbering jump is retained
T5.7 vs PDF62	6 without citizen involvement in the table against 2 incorrect applications in the overall section 7 a assessment;4 others not identified in the information provided
T6.1 vs Summary	Table and main text 2 without reasons against summary 1; no harmonisation
T5.6	Printed 44 + 42 + 15 = 101 pga round
T6.6PDF69	14 no and 6 irrelevant separate in table, text 6 of 14 not applicable; not applicable 6 + 14 = 20 assumed error union
T6.6 vs 6.2 / 6.4	Not employed 54 versus 53;self-employed 3 also classified differently,retain
PDF110	'Friday 2 September 2015 'calendar 2 September Wednesday; free press is preserved
PDF116 vs PDF73	16 September letter: before 1 July; late-September methodology extends beyond 30 June until the request; different version samples
PDF111 / 117 vs 74	Letter: no subsequent retrieval; methodology describes a few records obtained subsequently; the assertion of the same record basis is not audit evidence
Table 5.6PDF134 vST6.6	T6.6 has 6 correspondingly printed response code; blank categories are not counted citizens

The City of Copenhagen Note 3 June 2016 states that, in its view, 1 of 2 criticised cases were misjudged: the board should have misunderstood the date of the medical document and overlooked part of the explanatory statement. The note identifies journal 2016-0030250 / document 2016-0030250-8, but does not include any original act or accepted management correction. The municipality's claim must be tested by medical document, decision, measurement form and correspondence. The published 17 / 115 series is not changed on this basis alone. Note: HA256: 6db578a6ed19ba1c4bfae5681575a3433606b3004b1e24f25dab25a05a9890b2.

Historical rules and principles

The following are the historical rules and principles of the 2016 report reviewed. They are not automatically applicable 2026 law or new 2016 statisticians.

Search	PDF	Historical content	
Review	4	22 weeks / 9 months	Reform 1 July 2014; not actual benefit duration
Width assessment	10	After 3 months	Authorized; previous / late final round; vacant days of absence
Information document	12	8 days	Deadline for despatch
Category 1	12	Rash within 8 weeks	Only first 8 weeks
Category 2 / 3	13	Rash later 8 weeks	Professional Barrier Specific Category 3

Search	PDF	Historical content	
Observation category 2 / 3	13	Before 8 weeks; thereafter every 4 weeks	First 5 Jan 2015 or ancient rules
Team Category 3	14	No later than 4 weeks from visitation	Preparing for citizens
LOCAL 285	15	First response to 8 week's expectations	5 Jan 2015 rule; no citizen penalty for late certificate PDF16
Partial absence	17	At least 4 hours / week	Flexible employment 70 c exception; self-employed working at most half-time
Historical principle 141-10	19	Pain on ceiling>2 liqueur milk	Referendum, non-newcomer
Historical D-16-04	20	Document 4 - 6 months old	Later information from the citizen about pain required assessment
Forecast	20	For example, 3 months' notice	Expectations not actually correlated, reproducibility
Example part-time	27	25 hours / week	No new trial proceedings
Station year	28	3 conditions	Diagnostic work completed/treated/time for effect elapsed
§ 7a	30	No later than 2 weeks	Citizens' involvement; guarantee of writing; concretedecision effect
Rule Annex versions	76	§ 7 before/from 1 Jul 2014; follow-up before/from 5 Jan 2015, first follow-up determines the version	
Early detection	79	Cat 1 / 3: 8 weeks † '3 m' every 3 sts;cat 2: 8 weeks † every 4 weeks; 13 weeks	
Nycat 1	84	Local number / how; after 8 weeks review; category 2 / 3 before 8 weeks • every 4 weeks; prior request 2 weeks	
Team Category 3	85	4 weeks from visitation; none of the 115 embraced the new piece	
Certificate of formal qualifications	83	Expected> 8 weeks of illness; paid by the municipality; form 8 days; citizen participation for certificate	
Time limit for certification	87	Preferably 14 days/minimum 8 days for the doctor, no later than first follow-up; the citizen must book an appointment immediately	
Reassessment medicine	88	22 absenteeism; recent change / ill health picture	
Historical Match	89	Bek 66520 Jun 2006 visitation 3 mådershīt	
Matchophones	90	Bek 141028 Dec 2011 suspended 13 Jul 2015 at 88010 Jul 2015	
§ 7a	91	2 weeks to reach a position; new measure immediately on cessation; involvement of doctor/professional/company	
Information / consent	92	RSLÂ § 10 Authority liability; § 11 Acquisition rules	
Management version	93	FVL19 before 1 July 2014 versus PDF94 external professional assessments	
Resumption	95	FVL20 at least 14 additional time limit for appeal; not actually extended	

Search	PDF	Historical content
Reasons	96	FVL2314 request / response time; 24 concise reasons; 25 complaint guidance

Principle ID	PDF	Meaning	Time / number information
D-10-00	16	Personal interview not only invalidate in another investigation	
D-4-02	16	Substantive lack of performance without impact	
D-20-05	16	Report of the Court of Auditors	Not original judgment here
181-09	17	Category of procedural decision	
D-3-95 / D-16-00 / D-34-05	17	Abuse of a single disease	
D-5-06	17	Flex rope transition	
232-11	18	A doctor’s failure to reply does not fulfil the duty to establish the facts	
141-10	19	Pain at minimum load does not stop supported	>2 liqueur milk
D-2-02	20	Customer information not comprehensive	
D-16-04	20	Current information	Lægeacten 4 - 6 months old
D-9-05	21	Clarification needs to be maintained	
D-23-05	21	Previous work requirements continued	8 months of sick leave
32-15	29	Case 1 altered, case 2 remitted with capacity for work unresolved	20 hrs, 24 hrs, 37 hrs; 4 hrs rule
177-12	21	A cashier reporting not only proof	
161-10	22	Citizens' information positive progress	
106-10	22	Job search with needs not only stop	
83-14	23	Payment as the starting point, exception for particularly significant doubt	
3-15	25	Width assessment from 1 day exception	Just under 2 weeks before the more recent decision; 1 week for reopening
D-4-05	25	Time of broad assessment	Case 1 mid-Apr 2003/28 May no stop/31 Aug departure; case 2 ill 29 Mar 2004/4 months’ notice/3 Jun broad possibility
D-8-00	26	Wide assessment for early	11 Nov 1997 ill / 26 Nov 1997 rejected
D-9-08	26	Broad assessment; release from duties permitted	11 Sep 2006 ill / 30 Oct 2006 free position
2-15	26	Self 3 months starting point	
D-28-08	26	Sports students wide-ranging assessment	Barely 1 year ill

Principle ID	PDF	Meaning	Time / number information
D-14-08	29	StopultildigtÂ § 7a / clarification needs	28 years; ledigmar 2005; sick days 2006; stop 18 Jul 2007; examination week 2007
D-14-03	30	Sickness stop / termination of an employment-oriented measure	2 weeks * § 7 African
122-11	67	The municipality, itself the employer, has no right of appeal	Not available
75-15	70	Late decision requires clarification of the specific period	Not available
D12-04	102	Referral to H27 May 2004 in D4-05; not new trial	2 cases D4-05 already own a map

Instrument, phase and time fields

The measurement form is blank. Response codes and municipal numbers are not counted as cases. Multiple responses explain overlapping types of errors; no response code may be treated as citizens' number.

Field	PDF	Coding / delimiting
Local code	122	1Copenhagen, 2Odense, 3Vejle, 4Køge, 5Vordingborg, 6Fredericia, 7Frederikssun d, 8Herlev, 9Silkeborg, 10Thisted, 11Viborg, 12Aabenraa, 13Herning, 14Hjørring, 1 5Holstebro, 16Esbjerg
1.1	122	Date of birth; non-public list of persons
1.2	123	1 man 2 woman
2.1	123	Date of decision / unknown
2.2	123	1 first day 2 subsection 3 3 subsection 4 4 subsection 5
3.1	124	1 correct 2 change / remittal for reconsideration hypothetical
3.2	124	1 no 2 minor 3 major deficiencies
3.3	124	4 high 3 no 2 no 1 irrelevant 5 not available
3.3.1	124	4 high 3 no 2 no 1 irrelevant
3.3.2	125	Multi-answer: paragraph 1 / paragraph 3 / paragraph 4 / paragraph 5 / § 7a / information / other
3.4	125	4 high 3 no 2 no
3.4.1	126	Premature broad assessment / disability / § 7 a / information / other
3.5	126	4 high 3 no 2 no
3.5.1	126	Multi-answer: Disability / § 7 a / information / other
3.6	127	4 high 3 no 2 no
3.6.1	127	Multi-answer: station / right of action / § 7a / information / other
4.1	127	1 Table 2 No
4.2	128	Medical 3 high 2 no 1 no
4.3	128	3 high 2 no 4 rings 1 no 5 free municipality 6 irrelevant
4.3.1	128	Recruitment 1 Yes 2 No 3
4.3.1.1	129	Employed on request 1 yes 2 no 3
4.3.2	129	Involvement 1 yes 2 no 3 irrelevant

Field	PDF	Coding / delimiting
4.3.3	129	Information 1 yes 2 partly 3 no 4 no initiatives
4.3.4	129	Decision 1 yes 2 no 3 not employed
4.4	130	Position 1 within 2 weeks 2 later 3 no 4 irrelevant
4.5	130	Citizens' involvement same four codes; calculated from last payout day
4.6	131	Multi-purpose / professional / enterprise / others / none / irrelevant
4.7	131	Andinvolvement 1 within 2 weeks 2 later 3 no 4 irrelevant
4.8	131	§ 7 accuracy 4 high 3 no 2 no 1 irrelevant
5.1	132	Citizens' justification 3 high 2 no 1 no 4 unknown
5.2	132	Employer's reasons 1 high 2 some 3 no 4 not employed 5 irrelevant 6 unknown
5.3	133	Counselling 3 high 2 no 1 no 4 unknown
5.4	133	Employer guidance 1 to a high degree 2 to some degree 3 no 4 not employed 5 irrelevant 6 unknown
5.5	133	Citizen hearing 4 high 3 no 2 no 1 irrelevant
5.6	134	Employers 4 high 3 no 2 no 1 not employed 5 self-employed; no printed irrelevant code
5.7	134	Andformality 1 yes 2 no; free comment field
Page 1	113	First day / stop date, diagnosis / period of detection, no reassessment / reimbursement
Page 2	119	Corresponding plus reassessment and reimbursement, still not actual reopening
List of Standards	114	All acts including subsequent call for competition; annual calendar month
Startup List 2	120	Same but 16 September version of the request for cases

Scope of controls and specific residues

Pages	Actual Read Content
PDF1â 8	Title / content / summary; all figures retained
PDF9 - 31	Study and historical rules / principles
PDF32â 54	All material tables, case IDs and stop / reassessment times
PDF55â 70	All special / formal tables and error classes
PDF71â 75	Full methodology, sample, revised sample, sex
PDF76 - 96	Full historical annexes to the rules
PDF97â 107	All principle ferates; repetitions deduced
PDF108 - 109	Both municipal tables visually
PDF110â 121	Both letters, blank front pages, records and municipal lists
PDF122 - 134	Whole blank coding instrument; no blank boxes counted as persons

All 134 pages of available table / annex content are dealt with. Visual pages: 6, 7, 8, 32, 33, 36, 37, 42, 46, 49, 50, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 74, 75, 108, 109. There is no known available table residue in this original. Individual municipal fuldacts, response to Copenhagen's objection, actual payout data and identity dedup er

separate documentary gaps. Necessary next steps are case-ID-based linkage of records and payments at the 16 municipalities, together with Ankestyrelsen's measurement forms and correction correspondence. No such linkage may be filled in with a national rate estimate.

The strongest documented criticism follows the chain: decision or omission → published case summary and exact table → deficiency in information/hearing of the parties/legal authority → historical rule → cessation of income support or absence of specific review → responsibility of the decision-making authority → demand for verification against original records, a new correct decision and documented financial redress. Actual loss and duration require payment history, which the report does not publish.

Sickness-benefit reassessment 2015: all tables, methodology and specific individual case histories

All 133 original pages have actually been read in RAM, including seven annexes. The 16 numerical tables and three figures are fully reproduced with all explicit data cells; supplementary summary, process, surveillance and method blocks are kept separate. Physical PDF page is printed page number + 1. It is the same 125 decisions as the existing series; the fuller control adds no new 125 citizens.

Main analysis: the lack of information can change the dependency of the citizen

The municipalities had made 26 decisions without the necessary medical basis, and according to the study 39 decisions would have been altered or remitted on appeal. This is a specific review of 125 decisions, excluding cases already appealed and forwarded. There are thus documented errors in the part of practice not already examined in Ankestyrelsen's appeal system. The 39 are neither 39 appeals actually resulting in alteration/remittal nor 39 documented deprivations of income support: some adverse assessments concern extensions that the agency would change to a job clarification programme. Direction and consequences for the citizen must therefore be linked to each case. [SYREV15-FULD,PDF33-35/41/45/51/72-74/119]

Case 31 shows the opposite error, directly burdening the individual: the municipality stopped sickness benefits and referred the person to job clarification despite an overall assessment that, according to Ankestyrelsen’s own assessment, supported an extension. Case 102 shows that a medical certificate received before reassessment did not trigger a new assessment. Case 56 shows 25 days from reassessment and the original refusal to a new extension decision with a retroactive start. The last decision does not in itself document when the money was paid, nor that the case was now sufficiently investigated: the agency still required information from the psychologist. [SYREV15-FULD, PDF38-39/42-43]

The time rules were not met in all substantively correct cases either. 29 assessments under § 7 a of the Act on Legal Protection and Administration in Social Matters were late, 26 individuals were not involved at all, and six cases had both deficiencies. 10 extensions were limited in time in advance contrary to the rules. None of these errors must disappear in the statement that 86 substantive decisions were correct. The original’s assessment that there was no effect on the outcome is separate from whether the individual received timely participation, a comprehensible decision, uninterrupted support and actual payment. [SYREV15-FULD, PDF57-66]

A specific stop instruction has subsequently been disregarded

The report's annex reproduces 16-15 with an instruction to stop at the reassessment date despite an insufficient basis. On 11. November 2015, precedent decision 75-15 specifically discarded those passages. It states that cessation requires a valid decision and describes the earlier practice as an error of law following Højesteret's judgment of 10. September 2015. It requires consideration of reopening; the decision's account is not an independent reading of the original judgment here. The historical study's stop instruction therefore cannot prove the lawfulness of a specific cessation of income support. Its figures are retained while this legal error is precisely delimited.75-15 also describes that remittal with annulment requires the benefit to be reinstated until a valid cessation decision exists. [SYREV15-FULD,PDF102; SYREV15-75,PDF1-5/7]

Cohorts and test limits

Thirteen municipalities were each required to submit ten decisions divided into 3 No 2 extensions, 3 No 3 extensions and 4 job clarification cases. The first round gave 123 cases where 38 were excluded, so 85 could be used. According to extended criteria, 109 of the original 123 could be used; 21 additional were requested. The final accounts shall indicate 130 received after adjustment, 5 excluded and 125 analyes.21 requested shall not be treated as 21 further analysed or added to 109. The letter of 29 May shows a specific request of 1 No. 3 + 2 job clarification; it is a single municipality's letter, not all 13 municipalities' second round. [SYREV15-FUD, PDF72- 74 / 125]

Decisions following the enlargement were due to be taken before 15 April 2015; sick leave before 1 July 2014 could now be included if the review followed the 22 week rule. Cases already appealed and forwarded to Ankestyrelsen are omitted, while locally modified reassessments without transmission could be included. The number of such omitting complaints and actual reassessments shall not be made public. The municipalities' submitted documents were accepted in full after few concrete requests for obvious lack of documents. The summons said that after retrieval would not happen. The original documents this actual method difference. [SYREV15-FUD, PDF72- 74 / 119]

The first follow-up in all 125 cases was before 5 January 2015. The new requirement for LÆ285 at the first follow-up is therefore not the basis for testing this particular part of the cohort; later visitation / follow-up follows the entry into force. The survey includes the wider experiences of the municipalities, including with new rules. The local authorities' statements of waiting time for medical certificates and treatment are not an individual proof of who caused the delay. They document a known risk of a shorter period being translated into lower dependency without adequate information. [SYREV15-FULD, PDF11-16 / 67-69 / 78-92]

All original and supplementary data cells

Table 4.1 - PDF33

Category	Number	Percentage
Correct	86	69
Would be amended/remitted on appeal	39	31
Total	125	100

Substantive study assessment, not 39 appeals actually overturned.

Table 4.2 - PDF34

Type of error	Number of cases
Absence of an extension	2
Lack of reference to job clarification	1
Absence of a position on Paragraph 7a	0
An extension option achieved	1
No extension option achieved	10
Incorrect reassessment date	0
Insufficient information	26
Other	8
Total	39

N39 negative assessments; several errors per case. Eight out of 26 information gaps have additional flaws; cell sum 48 is not 48 cases.

Table 4.4 - PDF41

Type of error	Number of cases
Absence of an extension	2
Lack of reference to job clarification	1
Absence of a position on Paragraph 7a	0
An extension option achieved	1
No extension option achieved	0
Incorrect reassessment date	0
Insufficient information	8
Other	1
Total	11

N11 negative in 49 refusal / job clarification cases. 47 actually referred and 2 missing positions in other tables. Cell sum 13, overlap.

Table 4.5 - PDF45

Type of error	Number of cases
Absence of an extension	0
Lack of reference to job clarification	0
Absence of a position on Paragraph 7a	0
An extension option achieved	0
No extension option achieved	7
Incorrect reassessment date	0
Insufficient information	12
Other	4
Total	20

N20 negative of 39 extensions under No 2 Cellesum 23; two of 7 no extension option also have insufficient information.

Table 4.6 - PDF51

Type of error	Number of cases
Absence of an extension	0
Lack of reference to job clarification	0
Absence of a position on Paragraph 7a	0
An extension option achieved	0
No extension option achieved	3
Incorrect reassessment date	0
Insufficient information	6
Other	3
Total	8

N8 negative of 37 extensions under No 3 Cellesum 12; two of 3 no extension options also have insufficient information.

Table 4.3 - PDF35

Category	Number	Percentage
No information is missing	91	73
Minor material information missing	8	6
Essential information missing	26	21
Total	125	100

All 26 major deficiencies relate to medical basis; 22 lack of timeliness, 4 requires additional information. Not 26 extra outside the 39.

Table 5.1 - PDF56

Assessment	Rejection + Reference to j obflaring for run	Rejection + missing Commission position on: job clarification running	Extension § 27 pcs 1 nr 2	Extension § 27 pcs 1 nr 3	Number	Percentage
Very much	34	2	24	31	91	73
To some extent	5	0	3	0	8	6
No	8	0	12	6	26	21
Total	47	2	39	37	125	100

Medical basis; 26 inadequate, distributed 8/0/12/6. The same 26 as T4.3.

Table 5.2 - PDF57

Assessment	Rejection + Reference to j obflaring for run	Rejection + missing Commission position on: job clarification running	Extension § 27 pcs 1 nr 2	Extension § 27 pcs 1 nr 3	Number	Percentage
Very much	37	2	27	24	90	72
To some extent	4	0	7	9	20	16
No	6	0	5	4	15	12
Total	47	2	39	37	125	100

Visitation / Revitation. The summary 88% includes both high and some degree; accepted deferrals at hospitalization / operation / citizen's request.

Table 5.3 - PDF58

Assessment	Rejection + Reference to j obflaring for run	Rejection + missing Commission position on: job clarification running	Extension § 27 pcs 1 nr 2	Extension § 27 pcs 1 nr 3	Number	Percentage
Very much	40	2	29	28	99	79
To some extent	5	0	6	5	16	13
No	2	0	4	4	10	8
Total	47	2	39	37	125	100

Follow-up. The summary 92% includes high and some degree. Lack of follow-up is described as 1 ½ -2 months or more, not exact average time.

Table 5.4 - PDF59

Assessment	Rejection + Reference to j obflaring for run	Rejection + missing Commission position on: job clarification running	Extension § 27 pcs 1 nr 2	Extension § 27 pcs 1 nr 3	Number	Percentage
Previous / not later than two weeks before termination	38	1	33	24	96	77
Later than two weeks before discontinuation	9	1	6	13	29	23
Not made up	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	47	2	39	37	125	100

§ 7 A-rating time; 29 late. This is not zero procedural error despite 125 with position.

Table 5.5 - PDF59

Category	Number	Percentage
Withdrawal earlier / not later than two weeks before termination	76	61
Involved later	23	18
Not involved	26	21
Total	125	100

Citizens' involvement under section 7a. Six both late assessment and total non-inclusion; all six were extended. 29 + 26 − 6 = 49 is computable union between these two actually coupled negative dimensions, not national error numbers.

Table 6.1 - PDF61

Category	Number	Percentage
Very much	69	55
To some extent	53	43
No	3	2
Total	125	100

Reasons. A lack of justification for the reason / facts chosen and section 24 is mentioned. No case judged invalid solely by formal deficiency.

Table 6.2 - PDF62

Category	Number	Percentage
Very much	116	93
To some extent	0	0
No	9	7
Total	125	100

Complaint guidance is missing from 9; 2 of these have an oral decision. Lack of guidance affects the right of appeal, not automatic material entitlement to benefit.

Table 6.3 - PDF63

Category	Number	Percentage
Very much	62	96
To some extent	1	2
No	1	2
Total	64	100

Original number and 96% retained after visual inspection. SummePDF8 says 60 / 61 and prosaPDF63 / 64 says 62 irrelevant of 125; this is not consistent with 64 relevant. No tacit harmonisation.

Annex 4Table 1 - PDF116

Municipality	Yes, correct.	No, would be amended/remitted	Total
Aalborg	7	3	10
Mariners' fjord	6	4	10
Frederikshavn	7	3	10
Disc	9	1	10
Randers	5	3	8
Horsens	8	2	10
Road	6	4	10
Haderslev	8	1	9
Roskilde	6	4	10
Golden Borgsund	7	3	10
Bornholm	6	3	9
Fredensborg	5	4	9
Høj-Taastrup	6	4	10
Total	86	39	125

The same 125; municipal denominators 8-10. Not actually ruling on the national practice of each municipality.

Annex 4Table 2 - PDF117

Municipality	No information deficiencies	Less information deficiencies	Essential information missing;	Total
Aalborg	6	2	2	10
Mariners' fjord	7	1	2	10
Frederikshavn	7	1	2	10
Disc	9	1	0	10
Randers	5	1	2	8
Horsens	9	0	1	10
Road	7	0	3	10
Haderslev	8	1	0	9
Roskilde	8	0	2	10
Golden Borgsund	7	0	3	10
Bornholm	7	0	2	9
Fredensborg	5	0	4	9
Høj-Taastrup	6	1	3	10
Total	91	8	26	125

Coins with T4.3; all zeros explicitly original.

Annex 1Figure 1 - PDF75

Age	Male	Women
Less than 30	4	6
30-39	15	24
40-49	10	24
50-59	11	15
60+	12	4
Total	52	73

Visually controlled figure; N125. Prosa describes women as almost 60% and men just over 40%, not new exact percentages.

Annex 1Figure 2 - PDF76

Age	Job Clearing Mode	§ 27 (1) No 2	§ 27 (1) No 3
Less than 30	3	5	2
30-39	17	11	11
40-49	15	9	10
50-59	7	10	8
60+	5	4	6
Total	47	39	37

Visually controlled; N123 = 47 + 39 + 37, while main cohort 125 includes two without a position on job clarification. No missing cells invented; figurprosa wrongly says 40-49 second most also number 2, where 50-59 has 10 versus 9.

Annex 1Figure 3 - PDF77

Sex	Job Clearing Mode N47 %	No 2 N39%	No 3 N37%
Male	40	49	35
Female	60	51	65

Visually controlled percentage figures; not exact number reconstructed by percentage multiplication.

Additional main types - PDF6

Type of decision	N	Would be altered/remitted	Essential lack of medical information;
No 2	39	20	12
No 3	37	8	6
Refusal / job clarification	49	11	8
Total	125	39	26

Summary and T4.4-4.6 / T5.1, PDF6-7 / 41 / 45 / 51 / 56; same 125.

Additional party consultation versions - PDF8

Original passage	Counter / denominator
Summary: carried out / applicable	60/61
Table 6.3: High degree / relevant	62/64
Table 6.3: some degree / relevance	1/64
Table 6.3: None / applicable	1/64
Prose: not applicable / all	62/125

Original inconsistency, not five independent populations. Summé60 / 61 has not been replaced by the 62 / 64 table.

Additional survey - PDF67

Questions	Response	Municipalities	N
Changes in working procedures	Yes	11	13
Changes in working procedures	No	2	13
Timely information possible	Yes	4	13
Timely information possible	No	9	13
Prolongation assessment difficult	Yes	7	13
Prolongation assessment difficult	No	6	13
LES285 when re-evaluated	Yes	4	13
LES285 when re-evaluated	No	9	13
Of 9 without LEA285: other certificate	Yes	1	9
Of 9 without LEA285: other certificate	No	5	9
Of 9 without LEA285: other certificate	Other	3	9

PDF10 / 67-69: municipal self-statements, unverified deficiency in each citizen. Summary says all 9 use other certificates, while retail indicates 1 / 5 / 3; both passengers must be kept.

Additional selection versions - PDF72

Step	Number / date
Municipalities	13
Planned per municipality	10
Total planned	130
No 2 quota per municipality	3
No 3 quota per municipality	3
Job clarification quota per municipality	4
First call	15 April 2015
First received	123
the first subparagraph is deleted;	38
First applicable	85
New call	29 May 2015
The original 123 is now deleted	14
Of original 123 applicable now	109
Additional requested	21
Total after adjustment received	130
in total, the text is deleted;	5
Total analysed	125

PDF72-74 / 118-125.85 / 109 / 125 are selection versions, not summable cohorts; 21 requested are not documented 21 extra analysed. Extended decision limit 15 April 2015, sick leave before 1 July 2014 allowed if 22 week rule.

Additional process findings - PDF55

Find	Number	N / locator
Information document sent	115	125; PDF55
Schedule received according to journal but not included	6	125; PDF55
Table obtained together	121	125; PDF55
Template capture not documented	4	125; PDF55
Article 7 (a)	5	125; 4%; PDF55
No others involved	120	125; PDF55
Medical data upon decision, no reopening	5	PDF65
Of which no performance effect assessed	2	5; PDF65
of which change / remittal for reconsideration assessed	3	5; PDF65
New consultation without new decision	1	PDF65
Unlawful advance time limitation	10	Extensions; PDF65
Decision >1 month before re-assessment	5	Extensions; PDF66
Re-assessment decision	2	Extensions; PDF66
No decision to refer in writing	1	PDF66
Only employer notified in writing	1	PDF66
Medical information awaited, promised new decision failed	1	PDF66
Invalid alone pgaformal deficiency	0	125; PDF9
Both late § 7 a assessment and no citizen involvement	6	125; PDF60

Occurrence may overlap; PDF65 / 66 individual cases without ID cannot be added to the 24 identified examples.5 other + 120 = 125, not new citizens.

Additional historical deadlines - PDF17

Type of rules	Historical Timeline	Locator
Review	More than 22 weeks before 9 calendar months	PDF17 / 82 / 89
No 2 extension	69 weeks	PDF23-25 / 83 / 90
No 3 extension	134 weeks	PDF23 / 26 -30 / 83 / 90
§ 7a	2 weeks before stopping	PDF32 / 95
Category 1 / 3 first before 5 Jan 2015	8 weeks	PDF80
Category 1 / 3 other before 5 Jan 2015	3 months from first absence	PDF80
Category 1 / 3 later before 5 Jan 2015	Every 3 months	PDF80
Category 2 first before 5 Jan 2015	8 weeks	PDF80
Category 2 later before 5 Jan 2015	Every 4 weeks	PDF80
Category 2 / 3 first from 5 Jan 2015	8 weeks	PDF86
Category 2 / 3 later from 5 Jan 2015	Every 4 weeks	PDF86
Early Request Follow-Up from 5 Jan 2015	2 weeks	PDF86
Category 3 team from 5 Jan 2015	4 weeks from visitation	PDF87
Medical Certificate from 5 Jan 2015	Normally 14 d, minimum 8 d	PDF91

Historical rule matrix, unobserved waiting times; other deadlines / numerical conditions are found in paraphrased method / rule cards. New rules at first follow-up 5 Jan 2015 or later; first conversation in all 125 was before that date.

The 24 cases identified

The Office's descriptions are public reproductions of health and file files. The full individual medical records have not been published in the report. The reproduction can therefore demonstrate the reported assessment of the authority and its internal inconsistencies; it does not make any diagnosis, forecast or actual payment independently verified. The local numbers are deduplicated only within this original.

Case	Locator	Reported progress	Meaning of proof and specific delineation
5	PDF36	61 year old SOSU-helper, on sick leave 14 July 2014, pain hands / feet; reassessment 31 Jan 2015. Journal 12 Nov 2014 describes stabilized / stationary condition and wound infection, control mid-January. The municipality calls the state unresolved and stops for job clarification.	AS: current information/reasons missing; the hospital's information as reproduced does not support the municipality's conclusion that matters remain unclarified.
115	PDF36-37	45-year-old teacher, load response 11 Feb 2014; review 31 Aug 2014. Doctor 6 Jun expects a quick announcement 13 Christmas and work after-work; psychological treatment. The city stops for job clarification.	AS: The municipality does not investigate why the forecast failed or the current information of the psychologist. No actual post-payment documented.
47	PDF37	Age 31, unemployed, on sick leave from 25 July 2014 after pregnancy with pelvic pain, suspected sleep apnoea/stress; reassessment 31 January 2015. No. 2 extension based solely on awaited sleep-clinic information.	AS: missing current information and insufficient reasons for clarification; not evidence of no illness or lawful later cessation.
75	PDF38	53 year building painter, knee wear, operation 10 Sep 2014 and later mental problems. No 2 extension	AS: no current health / clearance basis. Several months old information, not verified

Case	Locator	Reported progress	Meaning of proof and specific delineation
		at 31 Mar 2015; latest journal 24 Sep and psychiatry 19 Nov 2014.	psychiatric prognosis.
56	PDF38-39	44 years old, free, anxiety / stress, psychologist, sick leave 11 Aug 2014. By 28 Feb 2015 refuse pending certificate; 25 Mar 2015 new No. 3 extension back from reassessment. Certificate 26 feb is based on the last medical visit 1 Dec 2014.	25 days elapsed between reassessment and new decision; initially stop reproduced, actual payment interruption / postpayment day unknown. AS still criticises the lack of psychological basis; a new decision is not full restoration.
108	PDF39	38 year old SOSU-helper, knee pain 2 Oct 2014; review 31 Mar 2015. Physiotherapist 19 Feb 2015 expects part-start within 4-6 weeks, 1 ½ -2 hours four times a week. Latest medical information 13 Nov 2014.	AS: general physiotherapy status does not have a certain medical expectation of past work.
87	PDF39-40	35 years old, free, depression / back 5 Aug 2014, re-evaluation 28 Feb 2015; physician 21 Jan and psychiatrist 16 Feb describes major mental illness and continued treatment.	AS accepts job clarification on current basis; not a negative decision error. Treatment needs are actually described.
34	PDF40	55-year-old self-employed driver, neck / shoulder / knee 12 Aug 2014, re-assessment 28 Feb 2015. Doctor 11 feb describes prolapse / wear extraterritorial improvement and clear workability.	AS accepts no 2 extension for clarification; no new injury / payment measurement.
23	PDF40-41	36 years old, free, shoulder drop 3 Sep 2014; operation 6 feb 2015, doctor 19 feb, interview 27 mar, reassessment 31 Mar 2015. Expected 3-4 months of rehabilitation.	AS accepts no 3 prolongation, known surgery without described complications; actually later rattling undetected.
31	PDF42	46 year-old educator, depression / anxiety / stress 11 Aug 2014; treatment and good prognosis. The municipality stops at 28 Feb 2015 for job clarification with reference to uncertain time and training.	AS would change: the overall assessment bears the number 3 extension. The municipality makes escalation and imprecise time to refusal despite sufficient positive forecast; actually new decision / pay not shown.
102	PDF42-43	29 year-old unskilled, prolapse 7 Aug 2014, review 28 Feb 2015. The municipality stops for job clarification before medical certificate 20 Feb 2015, which is received immediately after decision and before re-assessment; expected non-backloading work after few months.	AS: new trial failed; would be remitted. At the same time, the original does not say any current information on reassessment despite the certificate before 28 Feb; precise date of the proceedings requires acts, not explanation of proven failure to resume.
51	PDF43	38 years old full-time personal helper, severe depression 1 Aug 2014; worsening occasionally before 28 Feb 2015, psychiatrist 26 Jan. Part-start had to be abandoned.	AS accepts job clarification; no secure time / volume forecast. Not proven healthy simply because overall prognosis is described well.
78	PDF43-44	32-year-old SOSU assistant, knee pain 29 Sep 2014; operation 17 Dec 2014/4 Mar 2015; suicide attempt, psychologist and suspected personality disorder. Decision 9 Apr 2015,reassessment printed as 31 Apr 2015; psychiatry on 10 Mar expects 1½-2 years of treatment.	April 31 is invalid calendar date, no recoding until April 30. AS accepts job clarification; duration of treatment is reproduced forecast, not actually two years intervention.
26	PDF45-46	47 year self-forestry, lumbar pain; original sick leave 19 Sep 2015 but review 31 Mar 2015 / Decision 25 Feb 2015. Physician 18 Feb 2015 recommends physiotherapy / 3 months and further blockade.	AS would change job clarification, points out premature decision and security clarification. The year of sick leave contradicts the chronology; the correct year is not guessed. 34 d from 25 Feb to 31 mar shows the distance of the decision, not illegal stopping time.
48	PDF46-47	56 year-old teacher, blood clot 4 Aug 2014, re-evaluation 28 Feb 2015; part-start 23 Feb and full time after summer. Doctor 24 feb mentions mental withdrawal, social distress / loss of sight. No 2 extension.	AS: stepping up is not an assessment, no. 2 incorrect; no. 3 requires further information. Would remit for reconsideration, not evidence of no impediment to work.
49	PDF47-48	35 year-old secretary, borderline, sick leave 8 Aug 2014, no 2 at 28 Feb 2015. Psychiatric 24 Nov 2014 no current treatment needs, doctor 5 Mar 2015 stable phase; flexible working time is recommended.	AS assesses no incapacity for work and would amend. A later 5 Mar status cannot simply be treated as proved available on 28 Feb; the report's expanded scope including later records must be stated.

Case	Locator	Reported progress	Meaning of proof and specific delineation
73	PDF48	62-year-old property administrator, blood clot 25 Aug 2014,reassessment 28 Feb 2015. Rehabilitation centre 5 Feb:basic daily needs/longer rehabilitation expected, assumed discharge 21 Apr and a better assessment at the end of 2015.	The AS wanted to change number 2 for job clarification. Massive cognitive problems and dependence must be maintained; prognosis is not actually rapidity.
93	PDF48-49	35-year-old slaughterhouse employee, lymph cancer 25 Aug 2014. Review 28 Feb 2015, last chemo plan 11 mar, start 3-4 weeks later. No 2 time limited 3 Christmas 2015 to 30 hours per week.	AS: no. 3 should have been applied, advance time limit unlawful.30 hours not necessarily the previous full extent; reduced hours do not automatically mean complete recovery.125 days from 28 February to 3 July is a set horizon, not documented actual loss of income support.
9	PDF49-50	58-year-old fisherman, pain/wear/nerve involvement 4 Aug 2014,reassessment 31 Dec 2014. Condition stable with no treatment options, no longer able to do fishing work. The certificate is mentioned as both 4 Aug and 8 Sep 2014.	AS accepts No 2; conflicting certification dates are retained, without unknown actual workability produced as proven.
136	PDF50	58 year old CFO, lung cancer with bone metastases 21 Jul 2014, review 31 Jan 2015. Oncology 17 Nov 2014: stable and motivated, tired / residual workability unclear; doctor life-threatening, cannot be cured.	AS accepts No 2 but refers to possible No 5 with a lack of information about currently life-threatening. Criticism of documentation must not turn serious cancer into ferociousness.
64	PDF51-52	37 years old, free 25 Aug 2014, accident / tooth injury and socialphobia; own doctor 21 Jan 2015 awaits 3 months dental prostheses; No 3 delimited 28 Apr 2015 from 28 Feb.	AS would amend; mental-health treatment not documented and waiting for prostheses not equated with the illness period. Unlawful advance time limitation also identified; 59 days is the set horizon, not a documented actual cessation of payment.
83	PDF52-53	32-year-old agricultural employee, shoulder 14 Aug 2014; physiotherapy 11 Dec, own doctor 27 Jan 2015: uncertain prognosis. No. 3 as at 28 Feb based on a typical 6-month course and expected recovery on 1 Jul 2015.	AS would change job clarification: general forecast is not individual security forecast. In fact, subsequent payment / outflow undetected.
45	PDF53	37 years old laborant, depression 21 Jul 2014, treatment and partial work. Doctor 16 Feb 2015 evaluates full extent after coming months from 28 Feb.	AS accepts No 3; concrete escalation plan and stable attachment, not proof of realised recovery.
138	PDF53-54	44 year old SOSU-helper, knee accident 3 apr 2014, operation and screws removed; review 31 Oct 2014. Doctor 7 Oct expects part-start 1 nov and full-time work after 2-3 months; training 3 times weekly.	AS accepts No 3; later actual return has not been observed.

Documented errors and verified source discrepancies

The 39 adverse substantive assessments,26 significant information deficiencies, late section 7 a assessments, missing involvement, advance time limits and absence of a new decision are specifically documented in the cited tables and case accounts. These are overlapping dimensions of review. The internal contradictions below are also specific source findings; they do not remove other documented errors.

Passage	Precise problem
PDF8 / 63 / 64	Party consultation 60 / 61 in summary vs 62 / 64 in table; 62 irrelevant of 125 gives 63 relevant, not 64.96% for 62 / 64 is also original printed.
PDF10 / 69	The summary says all 9 WITHDRAWAL 285 uses other certificates; details indicate 1 yes / 5 no / 3 other.
PDF43-44	Case 78 has 31 April 2015, a non-existing calendar date.
PDF45-46	Case 26 has sick leave 19 Sep 2015 before reassessment 31 Mar 2015; correct years cannot be determined on this alone.
PDF42-43	Case 102 has received a pre-evaluation but subsequent formulation of no current information on re-evaluation. The actual date of receipt / processing of new information requires acts.

Passage	Precise problem
PDF49-50	Case 9 has two different certification dates, 4 Aug and 8 Sep 2014.
PDF76	Age / type figure covers 123, not all 125. The second most frequent 40-49 does not apply to No 2, where 50-59 has 10 to 9.
PDF102 / 75-15PDF5	Historical stop instruction 16-15 was discarded 11 Nov 2015; should not be reproduced as valid or independent law finds.

Suspects, necessary evidence and priority requirements

The published material does not document bank dates, precise differences in benefits, interest rates, actual resumption / correction dates for the 39 cases, individual guilt or a nationwide personal union. These are concrete investigative tracks: bring in the original decision, full file and reception tracks for medical information, consultation and guidance, new decision and post-payment account. Suspicions of further loss or damage must be linked to each course, not to a national amount.

The strongest documented demand order is: try the validity of the maintenance stop; clarify the municipality's responsibility for lack of information and re-evaluation; try the participation / time breaks independently; require actual and dated recovery / post-payment by the documented invalidity; investigate individual responsibility and loss consequences based on the complete chain. An improved post-survey workflow is not proof that already affected citizens got their dependants back.

The assessment form PDF126-131 and survey PDF132-133 have been read in full. They contain more fields than the published results; response codes are not new statistical measurements. The summaries of decisions on matters of principle PDF100-115 have been read as historical legal background, not added to 125 as new survey cases. Criticism concerning safeguarding provisions/the factual basis is described, among others, in D-8-03, R-1-06, D-12-08, D-14-08 and 232-11; the specific legal consequences must be applied using the correct historical version.

Sources and original controls

[SYREV15-FULD] Appeals Board,November 2015, ISBN978-87-7811-306-1.133 pages actually read; all 16 numerical tables and three figures, seven annexes. Official FT original: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20151/almdel/beu/bilag/40/1565744.pdf. Delivery actually read in full: https://trung.dk/api/politi k/bilag/7749fc83-f68b-40f5-a921-70256a7a1af4?filename=Ankestyrelsens%20praksisunders%C3%B8gelse%20om%20revurdering%20og%20forl%C3%A6ngelse%20af%20sygedagpengeperioden.pdf. This is the Appeals Board's identified report, delivered through a mirror of Slagelse's minutes/annexes; trung.dk is not an authority domain. SHA2568f052ec42c9dbff7234e92e8634c1427503c0e78609580a6c85a92d5d2f9f068,1.142.589 bytes. Figure/table visually checked on PDF63/75/76/77.

The 20230323172028 capture of / publications / appeal management -practice examination -re-evaluation -and -fordelelse -of the -sickness benefit period / @ download / publication gave only 1.048.576 bytes by an announced 1.142.617 bytes. It is a specifically interrupted copy and was not treated as full-read storginal. Aalborg's well-known documentation route provided HTML about missing file. FT direct RAMdownload 403; the later found full copy closed the material 133 pages. No official original PDF / full text / images are stored locally.

[SYREV15-75] Decision of the Appeal Board of Appeal 75-15, KEN11009 of 11 Nov 2015, public Kkcopi: https://www.kk. dk / sites / default / files / agenda / f76aa402-f4ca-4c5e-8190-4a316b9a16db / 505886e2-4ccf-49c-92de-69e8ace4c59a-car ag-2.pdf. All seven pages read via official PDF reproduction. PDF1-3: valid decision / error of law / reopening; PDF4: F3-00 on annulment and recovery; PDF5: discarded 175-12 and 16-15; PDF5-7: the case and reproduced Supreme Court premium. No new population is added from this historical source of rules.

Youth Visitation 2015: full original tables and citizens' programme

All 86 original pages have actually been read in memory. All 17 numerical tables and 13 figures as well as four additional method / historical bet blocks are reproduced. Visual check of stacked figure and commune cells: PDF39 / 50 / 52 / 53. This replaces UNGE15's previous sub-control, but does not add any new 102case reports.

Main analysis: a proper category does not guarantee the statutory assistance

The survey's 85 correct classifications must not be read as 85 error-free courses. The same sample contains 52 courses without compliance with the interview duty/time limits, 42 without the first education order, 69 of 98 without the mandatory test and 40 of 48 without a documented offer of a coordinating caseworker. 11 additional tests were late. The deficiencies affect assessment, support and educational opportunities; their overlap is not published. 17 classifications would be amended/remitted for reconsideration on appeal, but the survey does not represent 17 actual overturning decisions. [UNGE15-FULD, PDF5-14/33-45/52-53]

Benefit calculation and other LAS decisions are expressly excluded. Incorrect activity/education eligibility assessment may affect the activity supplement, but the report does not document each individual's monetary benefit, back payment or actual redress. The historical rates below show legal significance without inventing losses. Case 62 shows lengthy case processing and missing support for a young person formerly in care; case 18 shows a single mother and insufficiently investigated care/childcare needs. [UNGE15-FULD, PDF16/26-27/30-31/54-55]

The figures 70 without duck steps and 26 without offers are registrations, the general legality of which was not tested. Case 99 shows in concrete terms that the second stage could be superfluous in the case of actual training. The fact that the process was described as generally correct on classification can therefore neither remove documented mandatory breaches nor create 70 new breakthroughs on an uninvestigated criterion. [UNGE15-FUD, PDF4 / 35-38 / 50]

Kohorte, test limits and source criticism

120 requested, 112 received, 10 excluded, 102 checked. Twelve municipalities are distributed geographically 3/2/3/2/2 and by size; each was to supply quotas of 1 obviously ready for education+4 other people ready for education+1 obviously ready for activity+4 others ready for activity. Most recent eligibility assessment before 1 Jun 2014,first contact after 1 Jan 2014,ages 18-29 and grants. Municipality tables have 5-10 cases and cannot be used as national error rates. [UNGE15-FULD, PDF47-50/75-79]

Cases already appealed against on the basis of benefit and forwarded to Ankestyrelsen is omitted; municipal revaluations may be included. The documents are assumed to be fully submitted and no missing documents are requested. Consultation correction only accepts material from the original submission and the period before 1 Jun 2014. This delineates the control against complaint statistics and subsequent actual corrections; the number of complaints omitted and the number of corrected assessments not to be disclosed. [UNGE15-FULD, PDF49 / 76 / 86]

The demographic prose at PDF50 actually has 202 men in the 18-21 group and repeats 22-25 in the final group. The specific figure at PDF51 shows 20 men and 26-29 as the final group; the totals of 46 men/56 women agree with the graph. The erroneous string is retained as a source error, not as an additional 202 people. References to Table 4.1 on eligibility categories are imprecise: the table actually numbered 4.1 concerns the factual basis, while the categories appear in Figure 4.1.

All original and supplementary data cells

Figure 2.1 - PDF6

Classification	Percentage
Correct	83
Not correct	17

The same 102file; no new population.

Figure 2.2 - PDF7

Basis for information	Correct grading	Incorrect grading
No missing	74	4
A few minor deficiencies	11	3
Essential deficiencies	0	10

The same 102file; no new population.

Figure 2.3 - PDF8

Factors involved	Number
All	73
3	19
2	6
1	3
None	1

The same 102file; no new population.

Figure 2.4 - PDF9

Conversation	Number
Training / Activity Parate: all mandatory conversations in due time	35
Opencast groups: mandatory first call in due time	15
Duty calls / deadlines not complied with	52

The same 102file; no new population.

Figure 2.5 - PDF11

Training requirement first step	Number
Gived	60
Not given	42

The same 102file; no new population.

Table 2.1 - PDF12

Category	Number	Percentage
Test before first contact	7	7
Test within one month	11	11
Test later than one month	11	11
No tests	69	68
Youth education	4	4
Total	102	100

The percentage column has N102. The duty group is 98 without youth education; 69 / 98 is referred to as 70% in prosa.11 late tests are further temptations in the same 98.

Figure 2.6 - PDF13

Offer Coordinating Case Manager	Number
Yes	8
No	40

N48 Activity Parate including 8 Obvious Activity Parate. Documentation in files submitted; not 8 / 102.

Figure 4.1 - PDF23

Classification	Number
Apparent Training Parate	12
Training Parate	42
Activity Parate	40
Apparent Activity Parate	8

The same 102file; no new population.

Figure 4.2 - PDF24

Classification	Number
Correct	85
Not correct	17

The same 102file; no new population.

Table 4.1 - PDF27

Category	Number	Percentage
No missing	78	76
A few minor deficiencies	14	14
Essential deficiencies	10	10
Total	102	100

The same 102file; rounded original percentages.

Figure 4.3 - PDF29

Category	Number	Percentage
All factors	73	72
3 factors	19	19
2 factors	6	6
1 factor	3	3
None	1	1

The same 102file; rounded original percentages.

Table 4.2 - PDF30

Category	Number	Percentage
Motivation involved	93	91
Motivation not withdrawn	9	9
Total	102	100

Invoice records overlap; no common misunion can be deduced. Concrete meaning depends on the case.

Table 4.3 - PDF30

Category	Number	Percentage
Professional involvement	93	91
Professional not involved	9	9
Total	102	100

Invoice records overlap; no common misunion can be deduced. Concrete meaning depends on the case.

Table 4.4 - PDF31

Category	Number	Percentage
Social aspects involved	90	88
Social aspects not involved	12	12
Total	102	100

Invoice records overlap; no common misunion can be deduced. Concrete meaning depends on the case.

Table 4.5 - PDF32

Category	Number	Percentage
Health involved	88	86
Health not involved	14	14
Total	102	100

Invoice records overlap; no common misunion can be deduced. Concrete meaning depends on the case.

Table 5.1 - PDF33

Category	Number	Percentage
First conversation within a week	77	75
Not within a week.	25	25
Total	102	100

The same 102file; rounded original percentages.

Table 5.2 - PDF34

Conversation	Apparent training nelsparate	Training Spa rate	Activity Parate	Obviously. activity rate	Total
First call in due time in exceptional groups	9			6	15
First in time and at least two more within three months		19	16		35
First late or at least two more not in due time	3	23	24	2	52
Total	12	42	40	8	102

Blank original cell is blank, not inserted raw 0.52 overlaps 25 first talks.82 without obvious exceptions gives 35 correct.

Table 5.3 - PDF35

Category	Number	Percentage
First step given	60	59
Not given	42	41
Total	102	100

The same 102file; rounded original percentages.

Table 5.4 - PDF36

Category	Number	Percentage
Second step given	32	31
Not given	70	69
Total	102	100

The relevance of the second step is not generally tested. 70 must therefore not be renamed 70 illegalities.

Table 5.5 - PDF36

Category	Number	Percentage
Third step given	2	2
No	64	63
No, but busy.	10	10
Not reported	26	25
Total	102	100

The relevance of the third step has only been tested in example.12 started / busy is 2 + 10, not 12 extra.

Table 5.6 - PDF37

Category	Number	Percentage
Tenders launched	76	75
No offers	26	25
Total	102	100

The relevance and absence of offers are tested only in examples, not all 102.

Table 5.7 - PDF38

Type of offer	A course	Two courses	More than two	No.	Total
Mentor support	21	2	0	53	76
Counselling / upgrading	40	8	2	26	76
Practical / useful effort	19	5	1	51	76
Wage subsidies	1	0	0	75	76

N76 with offers. Multiple types / process per case; cell sum is not person number.

Figure 5.1 - PDF39

Number of different types of offers	One course per type [column]	Two / more courses of the same type [scraped]
1 type	40	14
2 types	17	4
3 types	1	

Visually controlled stacked columns 1 type = 54 and 2 types = 21, not 40 / 17 total; 3 types = 1. Blank no visibly scratched label remains.

Table 5.8 - PDF42

Category	Number	Percentage
The job is adequately occupied	5	42
Not documented	7	58
Total	12	100

N12 obvious training parate.

Figure 5.2 - PDF43

Test	Number
Before first contact	7
Within one month	11
Later	11
No	69
Youth education	4

Repeat T2.1; 29 tested / 98 duty group.

Figure 5.3 - PDF44

Test requirements and follow-up	Number
Need, course initiated	3
Need, course planned	2
Needs not planned / implemented	4
No need	9
Needs not shown	11

N29 tested; 9 participants = 3 + 2 + 4,5 / 9 course planned / initiated. The plan has not been implemented.

Table 5.9 - PDF45

Category	Number	Percentage
Coordinator offered	8	17
Undocumented offers	40	83
Total	48	100

N48 activity rate. Repeat Fig 2.6, not new 48.

Annex 1Figure 1 - PDF51

Age	Male	Women
18-21	20	40
22-25	18	11
26-29	8	5

N102. ProsaPDF50 actually has 202 men in 18-21 and repeats 22-25 for the last group; grapetics are 20 and 26-29. Prosa 55% women 56 / 45% men 46 and age 59 / 28 / 13 are kept separate as original errors, not 202 persons.

Annex 2Table 1 - PDF52

Municipality	Correct	Would be altered/remitted on appeal	Total
Albertslund	6	4	10
Frederiksberg	8		8
Golden Borgsund	7	2	9
Hillerød	6		6
Corner	6	3	9
Cold	8	1	9
Langeland	4	1	5
Lemvig	8	2	10
Morsø	8	1	9
Ringsted	7		7
Silkeborg	8	2	10
Peas (without pods)	9	1	10
Total	85	17	102

All cells visually checked; blanks retained. Hypothetical appeal outcomes, not 17 actual appeal overturnings. Municipal denominators 5-10.

Annex 2Table 2 - PDF53

Municipality	No missing	Minor deficiencies	Essential deficiencies	Total
Albertslund	5	2	3	10
Frederiksberg	6	2		8
Golden Borgsund	8	1		9
Hillerød	5	1		6
Corner	7		2	9
Cold	4	4	1	9
Langeland	4		1	5
Lemvig	7	2	1	10
Morsø	9			9
Ringsted	7			7
Silkeborg	7	1	2	10
Peas (without pods)	9	1		10
Total	78	14	10	102

The same 102 as municipality table 1; not an additional 102. All blanks visually verified.

Additional method - PDF48

Relationship	Figures
Municipalities	12
Recorded per municipality	10
Total recovered	120
Received	112
Excluded	10
Completed	102
Region	3
Region Zealand	2
Region South Denmark	3
Regional Central Jutland	2
North Jutland Region	2
Training Parate Inclusive	54
Activity Parate Inclusive	48

Geography and size targeted; latest cases per quota. Not a random national person sample.

Additional demographiprosa - PDF50

Original prosa	Number /%
Female Number	56
Women%	55
Male Number	46
Men%	45
18- 21%	59
22% -25%	28
Last group error named 22-25 percent	13
18-21 men misprinted	202

202 is original error; figure PDF51 has 20. This block is no additional population.

Additional legal rates - PDF54

Historical LAS § 23 (2) category	Kr / md
Single parent with additional family allowances	11505
Partner SU / Youth Assistance	8051
Manager with other partner	5753
Pregnant by Week 12	10500
Psychiatric disorders + dependants	13952
Psychological disorder resident	10500
25 + resident	5753
25 + resident	2479
Less than 25 residents	5753
Less than 25 residents	2479
Maximum assistance + supplement	13952

Historical rule amounts, not actually recorded losses; payability was omitted PDF16.

Additional activity allowance - PDF55

LAS § 24 (2) Reference	Kr / md
Article 23 (1)	2447
No 2	5901
No 3	8199
No 7	4747
No 8	8021
No 9	1014
No 10	786

Historical rates. Entitlement normally after 3 months or from the first timely classification as ready for activity; actual payment of arrears unspecified.

All 20 published examples

ID	Locator	Original summary, own paraphrase	Meaning and delineation
27	PDF24-25	18-year-old woman; former assault and cessation of education, mental illness in family; now college and HFplan. The AS accepts obvious education and training.	The family's illness is not automatically her function barrier.
9	PDF25	18-year-old woman, anxiety / grief after father's death, absence; psychological offer refused; SOSUS recording announced before submission.	The summary of the report documents recording, not completed training.
57	PDF25	24-year-old man; dyslexia, abuse by father, out-of-home placements, no contact with 4 siblings; mental health assessment; agricultural work placement 20 hours/week. AS accepts readiness for activity.	Traineeships are not evidence of education and training within a year.
78	PDF25-26	24-year-old man new schizophrenia diagnosis, welfare home with massive support for a few years, abuse. AS obviously accepts the activity party.	Specifically justified exemption from three conversations.
22	PDF26	18-year-old woman ADHD, former heavy alcohol abuse, housing lost with girlfriend, immaturity and unstable attendance. The municipality training parate; AS believes activity parate.	Resources / support and possible additional activity must be tested; actual cash difference not investigated.
62	PDF26-27	20-year-old woman previously placed, abandoned HF, mental problems, pain and sparse parent networks; early psychologistic but still no treatment at the end of business due to waiting time; wants support person. The municipality of education, AS activity party.	The treatment waiting and lack of concrete support are part of incorrect training requirements; precise waiting time / post-payment is not publicly available.
34	PDF27-28	21-year-old woman with physical illness/mental health assessment; municipality mentions a health certificate not found in the submitted records; assessed as ready for education.	AS requires more detailed information; the Authority's statement of the statement obtained does not prove the content of the statement.
35	PDF28	20-year-old woman training, difficult for others; party of activity on summarical psychological information only.	Lack of information, not evidence of absence of disease.
100	PDF29	20-year-old woman ill for 2 years, diagnostic assessment of pain, a caravan at her partner’s father’s home, HF plan; municipality classifies her as ready for activation without examining the factors.	AS cites both insufficient investigation and possible readiness for education; not direct proof of actual resources without assessment.
18	PDF30-31	21-year-old single mother of a single child, gastronomic course interrupted after 5 weeks; caring for a crèche, seeking relief; stress / psoriasis. Municipality of Activity Parat.	Network, medical basis, motivation / professionalism missing; documented child minimum 1 in this course, not national child count.
11	PDF31	24-year-old man with ADHD/depression, electrical engineering studies abandoned after 1.5 years, successful watchmaking work placement. Municipality: ready for activity.	Social background / information not deepened, no evidence of automatic development only through practical success.
73	PDF32	19-year-old man ADHD and widespread abuse after 60 d prison; municipality education parate but relieves him of activities.	AS considers activity-friendly; simultaneous and incompatible performance assessments require concrete testing.
92	PDF35 / 41	21-year-old male neurological genes after concussion not recovered; no education requirement; wants kindergarten practice, gets 4 weeks at coffee company / comrade, company bankruptcy.	SammeID two places; AS criticises information and lack of educational purposes. Not two people.
99	PDF36-37	21-year-old man terminated by order, 4 weeks of fitness practice, recorded 1 yearHG.	The AS assesses andetrin superfluous; the absence of step 2 is therefore not automatically illegal.
90	PDF39	18-year-old man, EGU ended, shoulder injury/migraine, dyslexia teaching, mentor+hotel work placement.	Three types of offer in the same case; not three citizens.
7	PDF40	22-year-old woman drug abuse since 14 years, anxiety / depression, activity parate; conversation rules and instructions not followed; mentor 1 h / week 6 months.	Correct mentoring does not cancel simultaneous process errors.

ID	Locator	Original summary, own paraphrase	Meaning and delineation
82	PDF40	24-year-old male 5 years of hash use; first education partner later activity parate; mentor 1.5 h / week 6 months, no other offer.	The two visits of the course are the same person, no repair date documented.
96	PDF40-41	28-year-old man with partner and their child, and a child from an earlier relationship, released after 8 months; ADHD assessment, offer of Dialog mod vold/clarification.	At least two children mentioned in the household; not new 2 cases. Stray information is a summary of authority without primary judgment.
88	PDF41	26-year-old man wants educationand training, SFOintern until the start of training.	AS accepts training-oriented offers.
55	PDF42	20-year-old male agricultural enrolment but 4 weeks' work experience + 8 weeks' wage subsidy at the bridging apprenticeship.	AS evaluates training-oriented; the apprenticeship is planned, not actually documented.

The 20IDs have different numbers, but full person deluxation and union across reports cannot be verified without original person key. Case 92 is repeated without new occurrence. Two background cases in Decision 50-14, PDF20-21 / 74, are excluded from the 102 addition; the report does not prove that they are additional unique persons. No actual post-payment or full course of training is added.

Measurement form and follow-up

Records sex / age, visitation, interview date intervals, information, factors, steps, offers, tests and coordinator. No public distribution of all instrument fields; response codes are not statistical figures. No actual recovery / post-payment / sequencing is measured. [UNGE15-FULD, PDF80-85]

Consideration by the municipal council under § 79 a; consultation 8 Dec 2014 to 5 Jan 2015; 12 responses,6 without comments. Only support in records already submitted leads to correction; new material and material later than 1 Jun 2014 excluded. No public before/after count of error categories or actual correction for citizens. [UNGE15-FULD, PDF47/86]

Lost earnings 2022: all tables and family history

The entire main report of 38 pages and the annex report of 17 pages have been read in RAM. Both figures and the central annex outcomes have been visually checked on 4 pages. All listed tables and annexes have been addressed; the same 42 cases as before, no new cohort. 27 cases contain errors wholly or partly; the hypothesis of an appeal outcome is separate from actual payment and redress.

Sources and scope of control

H: Original, 38 pages. SHA256: 83b8fcb5accd49de314d08c48870d87bea46fe45e43ec2601e1182e3f5f353bb. All pages read.

B: Original, 17 pages. HA256: 5c49ab6260ea9c507d464bdbb06015e766cffa256f76850389f4fb871637f315. All pages read.

Original parts	Actual Read Content
H1-8	Title, summary, 2 questions, delimitation
H9-26	All care / income / hour sub-allocations and examples
H27-35	Specific types, authorisation / follow-up, reinforced justification, whole
H36- 38	Total method, exclusions and follow-up requirements
B1-6	Title, municipality distribution, all misclass tables and notes
B7-11	Whole blank instrument including unpublished conditional leaps
B12-17	All annexes to the rules and principles

Sample and population

Search	Limitation
Municipalities	Six with at least 15 overturnings/2 years+high rate; TF child-disability participants/last 3 years excluded; geographical spread
Case	Most recent§42 initial determination of amount/follow-up change in hours; not appealed to AS
Covido Envelope	Decisions 17 March-18 Jun 2020 and 24 Dec 2020-15 Apr 2021 excluded
Provided	Personal scope and whether parental care is most appropriate assumed, not examined
Basis for action	All records requested for submission; a few clearly missing records subsequently obtained; no proof of a complete case-record archive
Power	Hypothetical appeal outcomes; actual payment/redress/union of persons not published
§ 79 a	Duty to hold a municipal council meeting; information may be requested; no actual compliance list here

All published figures

12 reading tables with 44 rows. Repeals and subsets of the same cohort shall not be added together. N and response categories are retained from each original.

H1.1: Overall assessment

Original H, PDF, page 6. 42.

Outcome	n	N
Yes	15	42
No	17	42
Partial	10	42

H2.1 Figure: Information

Original H, PDF page 11. 42.

Category	n	N
No missing	22	42
A few deficiencies	3	42
Essential deficiencies	17	42

H2.1 Table: Care Information

Original H, PDF page 11. 14; multiple answer overlap.

Deficiency	n	N
Institution / school / offer	9	14
Objectives / tasks / timing / organisation	8	14
Home alone	5	14

H2.2: Income data missing

Original H, PDF page 21. 12; overlap.

Deficiency	n	N
Work / times / hours / flexibility	11	12
Previous appropriation follow-up	2	12
Previous reduction in working time	1	12

H3.3: Type of decision and authorisation

Original H, PDF page 28. 42; finding wholly in the party's favour 20 including 5 follow-up.

Type	Authorisation	Partial	Reduction	Termination	N
First wave	15	4	0	0	19
Follow-up	5	1	15	2	23
Total	20	5	15	2	42

H3.4: Overall assessment

Original H, PDF page 34. 42.

Type	Yeah.	No.	N
First wave	16	3	19
Follow-up	20	3	23
Total	36	6	42

Hescope: Specific assessments

Original H, PDF page 33. Sub-volumes 42 overlap.

Measurement	n	N
Full relief, conditions unclear	5	20
Follow-up unclear conditions	11	23
Reduction / Termination insufficient reinforced statement of reasons	4	17

B2.1: Municipalities and outcomes

Original B, PDF page 5. 42/7 each; N: own sum, defined in the original note.

Municipality	Correct	Amendment	remittal for reconsideration	Partial	N
Corner	3	0	0	4	7
Holbæk	2	0	4	1	7
Holstebro	1	1	2	3	7
Rødover	3	0	3	1	7
Stevns	5	0	2	0	7
Sønderborg	1	0	5	1	7
Total	15	1	16	10	42

B2.1 Note: Partial outage

Original B, PDF page 5. 10 cases with mixed outcomes; not added to decision counts.

Combination	n	N
Stasis + change	5	10
Staging + Revocation	3	10
Conviction + remittal for reconsideration	2	10

B3.2: Deficiency class

Original B, PDF page 6. 27 / 42 heroic part error.

Class	n	N
Formula only	2	27
Content only	9	27
Both	16	27
Total	27	27

B3.3: Formal deficiencies

Original B, PDF page 6. 18 formal; multiple responses.

Deficiency	n	N
Enhanced statement of reasons	1	18
Reason / hour measurement	12	18
Official principle	17	18
Total cases	18	18

B3.4: Absence of content

Original B, PDF page 6. 25 content; multiple responses.

Deficiency	n	N
Illegal time limit	5	25
No fitting-out period	2	25
Measurement	7	25
Conditions unclear	14	25
Total cases	25	25

Examples, time and citizens' consequences

The study documents errors in determining amounts, unlawful time limits and missing adjustment periods. They may limit the family's income and ability to care for the child. No complete payment history, correction date or common child/parent identifier is published. The 42 cases are therefore counted as cases, and no automatic sum of 42 children or 84 parents is used. The examples' page references are our own locators; the original publishes no stable case IDs, so the same family may appear again without verifiable deduplication.

Own locator	PDF	Example type	Number / progress	Assessment
H13	13	Sample sample	15 years; full-time appropriations	Not yet published; needs for care
H14	14	Sample sample	10 years;37 h/week intensive rehabilitation granted	Care/looking after a person, not healthcare treatment as such
H14-15	14	Sample sample	Short-day care / training for tsatauthorisation	No approval of home training; other provisions should be examined
H15-16	15	Sample sample	17 years; development / sustainability	Necessary care needs not stated
H12 / H20	12	Hypothetical teaching example	10 year football	Age-typical leisure activity; alternative time/sport in relation to necessary loss of income
H21	21	Hypothetical teaching example	37 h / week	Previous weekly limit on hours is not automatically a new need for full-time care
H22- 23	22	Hypothetical teaching example	07.30-15.30 → 10-18, Needs 09	Hours fixed but scheduling of working time changes; previously 1½ hours+transport
H24	24	Hypothetical teaching example	Beho 14, normal 15.30, departure 13.30	2 hinkl transport
H25	25	Hypothetical teaching example	School 15 h / week, work 37 h → 22 awarded	Pure redundancy without concretetime / loss of income
H26a	26	Sample sample	27 → 4 h / week	More school, currently 4 nursing, both parenting times illuminated; correct
H26 b	26	Sample sample	16 years of cancer; 17 h / week	Current care needs and working hours not established
H29-30	29	Sample sample	1 year; 37 h / week granted	Necessary full-time care, reasons given
H30-31	30	Sample sample	8 annual days; up to 6,5 h / week	Incorrect one-off grant; would be amended to an ongoing benefit
H32	32	Sample sample	1 year-old parents	Missing current information; breach of the duty to establish the facts
H33 a	33	Sample sample	Single treatment / sick days; cessation	No specific changes compared with the previous award
H33 b-34	33	Sample sample	37 → 17 h / week	Child, more nursery hours; alteration justified
H35	35	Sample sample	Follow-up meeting	Loss profit + additional costs + other needs

Source deviations

Locator	Deviation
H10 versus B5	H10 calls all 17 material deficiencies in the factual basis hypothetical remittals for reconsideration; B2.1 divides the 17 wholly incorrect cases into 1 amendment and 16 remittals for reconsideration. Retain both without a distorted national count of 17 remittals for reconsideration
H33 versus B6	Enhanced reasons 4/17 reduction/cessation in the main report versus 1/18 in the procedural-deficiency subset in the annex. Different measurement/denominator, not reconciled
B5	Introduction says “table 1.1” whereas the number is 2.1; original table number retained
InstrumentB9 versus B5	Form 3.1 lacks a partial-response category, while 10 of 42 actual outcomes have Partial
InstrumentB8	Code 2.7 order 4,6,5; codes 5/6 retained without renumbering
InstrumentB7	Conditional branching not published; public form is not the entire decision logic

Other factual incisions

Locator	Precise information
H4	49,5% reversed § 42- Appeals 1 Jul 2020- 30 Jun 2021, no n / N here; including modification / annulment / remittal for reconsideration, not 42 sample cases.
H5-6	42 cases, 6 municipalities;15 correct, 17 no, 10 partial. No generalisation;the report's selection of themes does not exhaust all legal challenges.17 negative assessments concerning material information=hypothetical remittal,not documentation that the benefit was substantively incorrect in 17 cases.
H12	Hypothetical football illustration concerning a10-year-old, not a sample case count. Disability compensation requires necessary care needs+loss of income, not only medically necessary tasks.
H13-25	Care also outside the home, practical chores, sleep, accompaniment. Healthcare treatment versus care and training versus approval of home training must be examined separately. The school sector must support resources; a parental benefit is not automatically a substitute for the school budget. Working hours at transition are fixed, their scheduling is not; an earlier reduction due to disability may … [source unclear: “førdatogrundlag”]. Flexibility requirements must be considered in terms of their significance for family life; transport and unsocial hours included.

Historical Rule references

These are the rules and principles of the original. They are not counted as new investigations and are not automatically used as applicable 2026.

Reference	Locator	Defined content
69-16	B15-16	2-3 working days/year normally not significant; total across both parents/all disabled children/forms of absence; no holiday requirement, not automatically an absolute 2-3-day limit
C-52-06	B16	32 hours/week basis; an earlier reduction caused by the child has not been sufficiently established
C-24-08	B16	Ongoing benefit without a time limit unless agreed with the recipient
101-13	B16	Starting from the application, special exceptions
231-10	B16	3-month adjustment period at 13½ h/week, substantial reduction; historical precedent case, not the TA22 cohort
25-19	B16-17	School transport: education sector; no transfer to the social sector without a rule
SEL42	B12	Under 18; hospital visits also for a child in care § 42(2); printed monthly ceiling 31.936 kroner,10% pension,ATP1/3 individual 2/3 municipality, historical 2022 reproduction
SEL148 (2) / RSL5,10,68,76, 79,79 a / FVL22-24	B13-14	Follow-up/comprehensive fact-finding/coordination/municipal council responsibility; 14-day time limit for written reasons

Instrument and stage of execution

Blank fields, codes and illustrations are method information, not citizens' numbers. Actual correction, delivery and payment shall not be deduced solely from a follow-up decision.

Field	Locator	Meaning
1.1-1.4	B7	6 municipality codes; case number, case manager, age of the child
2.1-2.3	B7	Date; initial / follow-up; authorisation / partial / refusal / reduction / cessation / other
2.4-2.8	B8	Full-time/part-time/single days/combination; amended/upheld, times, old award date, written/oral
3.1-3.2	B9	Yes/amendment/annulment/remittal for reconsideration; formal/content/both; multiple responses for error classes
3.3-3.4	B9-10	None/minor/significant;9 information categories, multiple responses
3.6-3.11	B10-11	Statement of reasons, complaints, interpretation rule, quality standard, invariably
4.1,5.1,5.2,6	B11	Overall assessment; case description/strengths/“fritrelevant”; no actual payment date

Concrete remains and evidence chain

No known unread public table or attachment page consists of these two originals. Necessary self-coupling: The Anchor's completed 42 analysis forms and municipal fuldacts, all children / parents per case, justification for code differences and concrete actual measurement / payment / repair. The current grant and the individual grant have different courses of action. A reopening shall be documented by decision and execution separately.

The source chain is the original table or case summary → delimited error → the stated historical rule → the act or omission of the municipality → concrete significance for performance / testing → responsibility and requirement for act-based correct decision as well as documented effectiveness. Actual loss, guilt and personal union require the separate documents specified. The assessment by the Authority is not merely proof of its own correctness.

Business practice 2022: full tables, method and citizens' programme

All 50 pages of the main report and 13 pages of the annex report are text read in RAM. The municipal table and the conflicting follow-up / signature / extension cells are also visually controlled in RAM. The module complements the already registered cohort of 95 decisions; no new person or error amount is added.

Sources and scope of control

H: Original, 50 pages. SHA256: 33f7cc70d4517e23of89ce0cdae23adb9a138c72eb0a06dc3dd9d1b83caf7ed. All pages read.

B: Original, 13 pages. SHA256: 81aa6a3da0c43d8235b64e84e0fbd04fdfa3a64a8of2651376be4a16d9c382. All pages read.

Original parts	Actual Read Content
H1-26	Title, legal population, main outcomes, target groups, all material tables and practical examples.
H27-40	All organisation tables, follow-up, Min Plan, VITAS, reasonableness and extension discussions.
H41-50	Administrative law, reasons, guidance, the entire selection/case-request/preliminary-assessment methodology.
B1-13	The entire municipal table and the analytical table including categories and unpublished jumps.

Sample and population

Search	Limitation
Population	95 decisions from 10 municipalities concerning unemployment benefits and social-assistance recipients ready for work and ready for activity. Decision month August 2020; legal study 2021, publication January 2022. Not a nationally representative sample.
Two trials	Question 1: substantive legality of offers. Question 2: special organisational requirements; deficiencies here are not automatically classified as invalid decisions in the report.
Municipalities	Gladsaxe, Holstebro, Guldborgsund, Lolland, Assens, Esbjerg, Frederiksberg, Viborg, Aarhus and Aalborg.
Efficacy / Persons	Hypothetical outcome of the complaint; no evidence of actual change, cessation, compensation or overall employment effect. Examples have not published a personal identifier.
Cases already pending	No explicit rule of exclusion for cases already complained of is contained in the fully read main method or annex. This is a lack of information, not an established absence of such cases.
Date and version	January 2022 main report ISBN 978-87-7811-411-2, annex ISBN 978-87-7811-412-9. August 2020 decisions, also November 2020 extensions; study 2021.

All published figures

23 reading tables with 97 rows. Repeals and subsets of the same cohort shall not be added together. N and response categories are retained from each original.

2.1: Assessment by the Board of Appeal of the materiality of the decisions

Original H, PDF page 11. 95 decisions examined; substantive examination of question 1.

Outcome	Benefit recipients	Job-ready	Activity Parate	Total
Consistency	26	19	26	71
Wanted to be amended or repealed	3	9	3	15
Would be remitted	5	4	0	9
Total	34	32	29	95

2.2: General conditions, LAB § 53

Original H, PDF page 15. 95 cases; 23 self-found practices are included in the "Yes" cases, although Section 53 is not required for them.

Response	Number
Yes	75
No	11
Lack of information	9
Total	95

2.3: Duration, LAB § 61 stk.1

Original H, PDF page 20. 95; three duration errors would change, the fourth also missing information and remittal for reconsideration back.

Response	Number
Yes	91
No	4
Lack of information	0
Total	95

2.4: Prolongated enterprise practice

Original H, PDF page 22. 95; two job-ready extensions illegal. Of 19 activity parate extensions: 18 meets conditions and one inadequately disclosed.

Response	Daily subsistence allowance	Job-ready	Activity Parate	Total
Yes	0	2	19	21
No	34	30	10	74
Not reported	0	0	0	0
Total	34	32	29	95

S16: Self-found internships and known subsequent employment

Original H, PDF page 16. 23 self-found among 95; employment information available for three, not documentation of zero employment among the other 20.

Target group / Outcome	Number
Daily subsistence allowance	10
Job-ready	9
Activity Parate	4
Total self-employed	23
Reported subsequent ordinary/wage-subsidised employment	3

S24: Previous internship / employment in the same enterprise

Original H, PDF page 24. 95; six previous traineeships and one last appointment cannot be summed up as separate persons.

Relationship	Number
Last appointment, same function, illegal offer	1
Former enterprise practice in the same place	6
Of which lack of time / functionality	1
Of which no extension or other function	5

3.1: Tasks agreed

Original H, PDF page 30. 95 cases; Chapter 3 tests documented organisational requirements without overall assessment of invalidity.

Response	Number
Yes	84
No / not shown	11
Total	95

S31: Specific sub-objectives among cases with tasks

Original H, PDF page 31. 84 cases; Chapter 3 tests documented organisational requirements without overall assessment of invalidity.

Response	Number
Yes	3
No / not shown	81
Total	84

3.2: Follow up plan

Original H, PDF page 32. 95 cases; Chapter 3 tests documented organisational requirements without overall assessment of invalidity.

Response	Number
Yes	35
No / not shown	60
Total	95

3.3: Follow-up by extension

Original H, PDF page 33. 19 cases; Chapter 3 tests documented organisational requirements without overall assessment of invalidity.

Response	Number
Yes	6
No / not shown	13
Total	19

3.4: Contact person from the company in agreed follow-up

Original H, PDF page 34. 95 cases; Chapter 3 tests documented organisational requirements without overall assessment of invalidity.

Response	Number
Yes	14
No / not shown	33
Unagreed follow-up	48
Total	95

S36: My plan prepared

Original H, PDF page 36. 95 cases; Chapter 3 tests documented organisational requirements without overall assessment of invalidity.

Response	Number
Yes	85
Not reported	10
Total	95

3.5: Religious requirements examined

Original H, PDF page 37. 95 cases; Chapter 3 tests documented organisational requirements without overall assessment of invalidity.

Response	Number
Yes	66
No / not shown	29
Total	95

3.6: Signature of the employer / shop steward on fairness

Original H, PDF page 38. 95 cases; Chapter 3 tests documented organisational requirements without overall assessment of invalidity.

Response	Number
Yes	64
No / not shown	31
Total	95

S30: Traineeships with parallel pay hours

Original H, PDF page 30. 3 cases; Chapter 3 tests documented organisational requirements without overall assessment of invalidity.

Response	Number
Number	3
Of which the functions are not separated in the material	3

S38: One-man business, spring bread text

Original H, PDF page 38. Source body text 66; table 3.6 shows 64. No harmonisation. cases; chapter 3 examines documented organisational requirements without an overall invalidity assessment.

Response	Number
Specified one-man activities	16
The text of the text shall state in writing	66
Of which school with 22,56 full-time employees	1

3.5- P40: Prolongation discussion (printed table number 3.5 recycled)

Original H, PDF page 40. 19 of the eight JA cases indicate a one-man activity in which the representative is assessed irrelevant.

Response	Number
Yes	8
No / not shown	11
Total	19

4.1: Notification of the decision

Original H, PDF page 43. 95; 72 not-found and 23 self-found.

Form	Number
Written decision	49
Part of My Plan	23
Written journal note	0
No	0
Self-employed work experience	23
Other	0
Total	95

4.6: Complaint guidance (printed number 4.6)

Original H, PDF page 44. 95; 23 without guidance are the 23 where authorization is only shown in My Plan.

Response	Number
Yes	49
No	23
Self-employed work experience	23
Total	95

S45: bulking justification, non-self-found

Original H, PDF page 45. 72 non-self-detected. The source estimates that Ankestyrelsen be able to repair by new justification; no actual subsequent repair documented.

Response	Number
Validating	0
Deficient	72
Total	72

5.7: LAB target group (printed number 5.7)

Original H, PDF page 48. 95 the same cases as Table 2.1, not new population.

Group	Number
Daily subsistence allowance	34
Job-ready	32
Activity Parate	29
Total	95

S48: Call, reserve and feasibility study

Original H, PDF page 48. 105 called; exact number received and reserve disposition not shown as full flow. No discharge 105 − 8 = 95.

Search	Number
Municipality designated by STAR	25
Local authorities selected	10
Five municipalities × nine cases	45
Five municipalities × 12 cases	60
Cases summoned	105
Additional reserves	10
Additional actual use	8
Not met criteria among submitted	8
Final sample	95
Preliminary study within the 95	10

B1.1: Material outcomes of municipalities

Original B, PDF page 4. 95 same decisions. The original has ten municipality rows; our sum is a reconciliation, not an additional original row.

Municipality	Correct	Amendment / repeal	remittal for reconsideration	Total
Aalborg	10	1	0	11
Aarhus	9	0	2	11
Assens	5	2	2	9
Esbjerg	9	1	0	10
Frederiksberg	8	1	0	9
Gladsaxe	7	2	0	9
Golden Borgsund	5	1	3	9
Holstebro	6	2	1	9
Lolland	4	3	1	8

Municipality	Correct	Amendment / repeal	remittal for reconsideration	Total
Viborg	8	2	0	10
Own sum	71	15	9	95

Examples, time and citizens' consequences

The examples document the duties, hours, duration and individual follow-up of the work experience. Three self-finding processes have subsequently been reported as ordinary or supported recruitment; this is not a full series of effects. In the former case of recruitment, the citizen was granted 13 weeks of internship in the same role as the wage subsidy, and VITAS contains conflicting information. Hypothetically abrogation shows an illegal offer, but does not demonstrate that the offer was actually abrogated or which part of the period the citizen completed. Example passenger without kildecase ID can overlap and is not summed to unique persons.

Own locator	PDF	Example a	Number / progress	Assessment
H15-E1	15	Sample sample sample size	Daily subsistence allowance, cleaning, four weeks; daily subsistence allowance by being used up	Evaluated correct offer; actually subsequent jobs not disclosed.
H16-E1	16	Sample sample sample size	Self-employed car dealer internship, four weeks, 37 hours / week; telephone follow-up	Subsequent wage subsidies reported; ordinary recruitment and duration not documented.
H17-E1	17	Sample sample sample size	Job-ready, property service four weeks, 25 hours / week; job-targeted teacher and assistant	Trade changes did not assess the fastest path despite labour shortages in both areas.
H17-E2	17	Sample sample sample size	Benefit recipient, marketing three weeks; previous jobs / competences not disclosed	Would be remitted for reconsideration; good job prospects alone do not document an individually suitable offer.
H18-E1	18	Sample sample sample size	Activity Parate, place of training 13 weeks; three days 09- 11, extension two months; follow-up every four weeks, contact over two sick days	Ankestyrelsen evaluate purposes relevant despite undeclared job goals / assumptions.
H20-E1	20	Sample sample sample size	Job-ready cleaning, four weeks, 30 hours / week	Subsequent wage subsidies the same company; possible overlap with three subsequent appointments at H16 is unresolved.
H21-E1	21	Sample sample sample size	Job-ready shop assistant 37 hours / week, four weeks and two days	Would also change if exceeded in only two days.
H22-E1	22	Sample sample sample size	Activity Parate Supermarket, 13 weeks, beginning 12 hours / week, extended 13 weeks with several hours / tasks	Follow-up conversation informed; extension deemed lawful.
H24-E1	24	Sample sample sample size	Pedel 16 traineeships and four paid hours / week, 13 weeks from 5 August 2020; former traineeship November 2018- November 2019, wage subsidy from 3 February 2020	VITAS says no previous employment but describes wage subsidies in the same place / function. Wanted to be cancelled.
H25-E1	25	Sample sample sample size	The daily allowance takes first post office four weeks, then the shop assistant four weeks the same supermarket, 37 hours / week	Ankestyrelsen considers the functions different despite the task overlap; not extension.
H30-E1	30	Sample sample sample size	Job-ready shop assistant four weeks; seven internships and seven pay hours	No separation of functions; tasks include closure and all tasks.
H31- E1	31	Sample sample sample size	Self-employed customer service activities four weeks, 37 hours / week	Concrete tasks documented: customer service, offers, communication and marketing.
H31- E2	31	Sample sample sample size	Job-ready special construction work	A general statement of skills development does not document which work tasks.

Own locator	PDF	Example a	Number / progress	Assessment
H31- E3	31	Sample sample sample size	Activity Parate with Anxiety, store 13 weeks; starting one day 09.30-11.30, target two days	Step-by-step task training and milestones described.
H31- E4	31	Sample sample sample size	Job-ready grocery store four weeks, 37 hours / week	Tasks described but not linked to specific sub-targets.
H32-E1	32	Sample sample size, continued H33	Activity Parate Electronic Workshop 13 weeks, 12 → 32 hours / week; meeting after three weeks, new meeting a month later	The employer actually participated; follow-up of attendance and tasks.
H33-E1	33	Sample sample sample size	Activity Parate Assistant six hours / week, separate follow-up two hours / week; extension further 13 weeks	Close vocational guidance continues during extension.
H34-E1	34	Sample sample size, continued H35	Activity Parate cleaning nine weeks, 15 hours / week; wants employment April 2021, until then call replacement	The employer's intention, not documented actual April launch.
H45-E1	45	Sampling procedure	Only reference to LAB Chapter 11 and on-call / penalty rules	Deficiently precise legal basis; extracts have no independent source ID.

Source deviations

Locator	Deviation
H16 / 20 / 22	Bread text refers to Table 1.2 / 1.3 / 1.4, but the printed tables are called 2.2 / 2.3 / 2.4. Locators follow printed table headings.
H32 / 34	Table 3.2 has 35 with plan and 60 without / unknown, while Table 3.4 has 14 + 33 with follow-up branch and 48 without agreed follow-up. Cists / coding cannot be deduced as identical; no redistribution.
H38	Bread text indicates 66 signatures, Table 3.6 indicates 64; bread text also uses 16 / 66 one-man companies. Both original figures are retained.
H39	Prolongation rule is referred to LAB § 62 st.2, while H21 reproduces § 61 stp.2. Reference deviation retained.
H30-39	Bread text refers repeatedly to Table 4. x; printed tables are called 3. x.
H40	Table number 3.5 repeated:H37 reasonableness, H40 discussion of extension. Registered as two separate measurements.
H44 / 48	Complaint guidance is printed as 4.6, target group as 5.7; text refers to 3.2 and 5.1. Not tacitly renumbered.
H48	105 requested cases, eight cases outside the criteria and 95 measured cases do not in themselves provide a complete received/selected flow. Two unused reserves cannot be recorded as rejected cases without original information.
B6 / H14	The general exception in the Annex refers to Article 53 (3); the main report reproduces paragraph 4. Original references are retained, no new legal update.
B9	Total material schematic text refers to paragraphs 3.1 to 3.5, but the main text's illegal ex-recruitment example also relates to 3.8 to 3.9. Not proof that it was actually omitted from the overall assessment.

Other factual incisions

Locator	Precise information
H5-13	71 substantively correct decisions and 24 with hypothetical amendment, annulment or remittal for reconsideration; this is not an overall assessment of freedom from errors concerning all formal requirements.
H12-13	The 15 cases of amendment / termination include 12 per diem / jobready (of which one with a duration error) and three periods of activity (two duration, one internship by former employer in the same function).
H13	Ankestyrelsen assumes that specified job targets are the citizen's fastest way to employment. The assumption does not document an actual ex post employment result.
H11-13	None of the nine remittal assessments concerns people ready for activity. The report explains this by their distance from the labour market; this does not generally remove the requirement to document complete information on employment goals.
H18-19	None of the 95 offers are available to test under Section 54. All 95 are estimated to meet § 57- 58.
H14-15	No offers awarded under Section 53 (4) for social understanding or, by way of derogation, to the wishes of the citizen were examined. Trainees must not worsen health.
H27 / 37-38	Ankestyrelsen had no access to VITAS. Missing VITAS records are among the explanations for missing documentation; all 31 cases without signature information lack the submitted application form. This does not in itself prove that signatures never existed.
H34	Among the 48 without agreed follow-up, three are actually implemented follow-up with a business contact person. Agreement, plan and actual follow-up are different measurements.
H39	For extensions, a written indication of discussion exists in eight of 19 cases assessed as ready for activity; the continuation page must be read before the final table.
H39-40	Four of eight documented extension discussions indicate a sole-trader business; in eleven others the VITAS application is missing.
H41-45	All 72 decisions not independently located have deficient references to the legal basis. The Appeals Board assesses the deficiencies as remediable; this does not document actual reconsideration or redress.
H42- 44	23 awards solely in Min Plan without appeal instructions. According to the report, missing instructions suspend the appeal deadline until correct instructions are given; not in itself a ground for alteration/remittal.
H47-50	Selection from STAR's 25 municipalities with greater use in August 2020, by geography and size. Oldest decisions meeting the criteria after 1. August 2020, an equal distribution of target groups, also extensions for people assessed as ready for activity in November 2020.
H48-49	No subsequent call for missing documents, based on resource / delimitation choices. Preliminary study 10 of the same 95; completed forms locally consulted. No generalisation to national or municipal overall error level.

Historical Rule references

These are the rules and principles of the original. They are not counted as new investigations and are not automatically used as applicable 2026.

Reference	Locator	Defined content
LAB § 53- 54,57- 58,61	H7-13	Offers must target the individual's employment situation and the earliest possible self-support; work placements must have a specific purpose. Duration up to four weeks for unemployment-benefit recipients/people ready for work and 13 weeks for people ready for activity, with special conditions for extension.
LAB § 59	H8-10	Precise purpose is agreed between citizen, company and job centre. My plan does not replace a decision and complaint guidance.
LAB 548 of 7 May 2019	H3-4	New Employment Act entered into force on 1 January 2020. The investigation concerns decisions taken in August 2020.

Reference	Locator	Defined content
LAB § 61 stk.2	H21-23	Activity Parate can be extended up to 26 weeks on the basis of a concrete assessment, then for special needs not more than 13 weeks at a time. No extension of benefit / job-ready.
BAB § 61 stk.2-3	H23-26	Last place of work excluded from benefit / job ready. Activity Parate requires other working functions documented in the agreement. Repeated internship in the same place requires specific needs and distinct functions.
LAB § 40-41; BAB § 51	H35-36	My plan must be prepared / updated by offers and contain where, when, why and current status.
LAB § 63; BAB § 65 stk.1 -8	H36- 39	Limitation of proportionality: one person per five ordinary employees up to 50 employees, then one per ten; always the possibility of one. Full-time fractions, four previous months' average, excluded grant employees and less than 18. Written statement before establishment; representative thierarchy and over three days' absence.
BAB § 62 stk.1	H32-35	Follow-up as part of individual contacts and necessary employer involvement.
LAB § 63 stk.2; BAB § 64	H39	For work placements exceeding 13 weeks, discussion and a written statement from the employer and employee representative are required.
Administration Act § 22-25	H41-45	Justification by a decision which is not fully favourable in writing; written justification may be required within 14 days of the oral notification. Complaint guidance with instance, procedure and time limit.
BAB § 129	H43	The report's reproduction requires notification of offers through Digital Post. My plan does not replace the decision.

Instrument and stage of execution

Blank fields, codes and illustrations are method information, not citizens' numbers. Actual correction, delivery and payment shall not be deduced solely from a follow-up decision.

Field	Locator	Meaning
1.1	B5	Municipality
1.2	B5	Case numbers; five code names, not five citizens.
1.3	B5	Case number; field name but no completed IDs published.
1.4	B5	Yes / no and grounds for withdrawal.
2.1	B5	Three LAB target groups.
3.1	B6	§ 53 met: yes / no / missing information.
3.2	B7	§ 57- 58: yes / no / missing information.
3.3	B7	Duration: yes / no / missing information.
3.4	B7	Extension: yes / no / unknown.
3.5	B7	Extension conditions: yes / no / missing information.
3.6	B7-8	Previous internship same company: yes / no.
3.7	B8	Same place of work: yes / no / missing information / not the same.
3.8	B8	Previous appointment of the same company: yes / no.
3.9	B9	Previous recruitment rule: yes / no / missing information.
3.10	B9	Overall substantive outcome: correct/amendment or annulment/remittal.

Field	Locator	Meaning
4.1	B9	Form of decision: written / My Plan / journal note / no / self-found / other. Code order 1,2,3,4,6,5.
4.2	B9-10	Complaint guidance: yes / no / self-employed advantage.
4.3	B10	Reason: yes / no / other.
4.4	B10	Invalidity concerning reasons: yes/no, remediable/other.
5.1	B11	Specifically agreed purpose: yes / no or unknown.
5.2	B11	Target code 1 pay hours, 2 specific competences, 3 job / training clarification.
5.3	B11	Tasks agreed: yes / no or unknown.
5.4	B11	Sub-measure: yes / no or unknown.
5.5	B11- 12	Follow-up plan: yes / no or unknown.
5.6	B12	Extension follow-up: yes / no or unknown / not extended.
5.7	B12	Company contact person: yes / no or unknown / unagreed follow-up.
5.8	B12	My plan: yes / no or unknown.
5.9	B12	Validity examined: yes / no or unknown.
5.10	B12-13	Reasonable signature: yes / no or unknown.
5.11	B13	Discussion of extension: yes / no or unknown / not extended.
6	B13	Summary for report example; no public case identification or actual subsequent power measurement.
Jump	B5	The instrument contains activation / deactivation jumps which are not published.
Note fields	B5-13	Subfields explanations are recorded, but completed forms and individual data have not been published.

Concrete remains and evidence chain

The identified public table / annex residue is closed. Specifically not published: completed individual forms, VITAS originals, industry jumps, unique person / case combinations, full received / reserve flow, appeal status, actual resumption / modification / termination and full subsequent recruitment / salary loss. Necessary requirements are action-based correct decision, precise justification and guidance, as well as evidence of effective implementation; personal responsibility and compensation require simultaneous action on concrete progress.

The source chain is the original table or case summary → delimited error → the stated historical rule → the act or omission of the municipality → concrete significance for performance / testing → responsibility and requirement for act-based correct decision as well as documented effectiveness. Actual loss, guilt and personal union require the separate documents specified. The assessment by the Authority is not merely proof of its own correctness.

Pension without rehabilitation team 2019: full originals and control limits

PEN19F / PEN19BF. All 41 + 27 = 68 physical pages actually RAM-read, five main and six attachment pages visually controlled. All 6 numbered tables and 5 figures; with two prosa -number blocks 13 blocks / 98 data rows. Same 100 cases as previous main control.

Limitation

100 cases from 10 municipalities, 36 refusals/44 obvious cases/20 terminal cases. Target of ten per municipality +three reserves, actual uneven distribution 8-12. Decisions from 1.10.2017; already appealed cases excluded. A shortage of cases meeting the criteria is filled with the most recent cases regardless of type and from other municipalities. The actual total received/replaced is not printed (PEN19BF5-8). STAR selection figures are indicative and constitute a separate population.

Questionnaire October-28 November 2018: 97 / 98 municipalities, one response per municipality, validated with municipalities. Two binding collaborators are kept as municipalities. Pilot test three municipalities / pilot analysis three cases are not additional cases of error.

The check omits formal facts, explicit consultation / complaint guidance (PEN19BF8- 9). Therefore, 96 is not an objective of full legality. Two remittals for reconsideration are hypothetical; two awards by wrong decision are not automatically incorrect pension rights.

All published tables and figure cells

F2.1: Overall municipal decision

PEN19F PDF12; N=97; unit municipalities. One municipal response; responses overlap in F2.2-2.4. Not decisions or people.

Category	Number of municipalities
Yes	82
No	14
Don’t know	1

F2.2: Types covered by municipal decision

PEN19F PDF13; N=82; unit municipalities. One municipal response; answers overlap in F2.2-2.4. Not decisions or people.

Category	Number of municipalities
Refusal	75
Apparent	79
Terminal	82

F2.3: Actual use

PEN19F PDF15; N=97; unit municipalities. One municipal response; responses overlap in F2.2-2.4. Not decisions or people.

Category	Number of municipalities
Terminal	94
Apparent	91
Refusal	80
Never	1

F2.4: Jurisdiction

PEN19F PDF16; N=96; unit municipalities. One municipal response; responses overlap in F2.2-2.4. Not decisions or persons.

Category	Number of municipalities
Technical Coordinator	38
Team leader	32
Legal officer	31
Professional consultant	20
Others	37

F2.5: Experienced challenge

PEN19F PDF18; N = 97; unit municipal replies. Each column N97; same 97 municipalities, not 291 unique municipalities.

Grade	Refusal	Apparent	Terminal
High	0	1	0
Someone.	18	14	6
Less	29	34	7
Not at all	47	44	81
Don’t know	3	4	3

Andre competence: Other functions

PEN19F PDF16; N = 37; unit function markings. Multiple functions; total 44, not 44 municipalities or employees.

Function	Number of markings
Pension boards etc.	10
Head of department, etc.	9
Head of meeting	6
Health coordinator	4
Specialist	4
Legal officer	4
Medical Adviser	2
Team leader	2
Management	1
Group meeting	1
Two-area committee	1

B-T1.1: Selection basis

PEN19BF PDF7; N = not one common denominator; unit indicative selection data. STAR third quarter 2017-first quarter 2018, delivered July 2018. The precise municipal denominators of the award percentage are not printed. Residents are separate DSTnumbers; no fault population.

Municipality	STAR awards;	STAR Refusal	Printed percentage	Population 2018	Region
Copenhagen	109	117	29,1	616098	Capital
Sønderborg	32	14	23,5	74773	South Denmark
Randers	35	13	24,8	98071	Central Jutland
Aalborg	31	10	9,2	213271	North Jutland
Slaughter	15	4	9,0	79010	Zealand
Frederiksberg	14	11	16,3	103914	Capital
Holstebro	12	7	30,8	58546	Central Jutland
Herning	9	5	8,4	88839	Central Jutland
Svendborg	16	5	15,8	58707	South Denmark
Peas (without pods)	12	5	16,9	37702	South Denmark

B-T1.2: Actual assessment distribution

PEN19BF PDF8; N = 100; unit cases. The same 100-case main cohort; not new cases.

Municipality	Refusal	Apparent	Terminal	Total
Copenhagen	5	4	2	11
Randers	5	4	2	11
Sønderborg	5	5	1	11
Aalborg	0	5	3	8
Slaughter	5	4	2	11
Frederiksberg	2	4	2	8
Holstebro	5	5	1	11
Herning	2	4	2	8
Svendborg	5	5	2	12
Peas (without pods)	2	4	3	9
Total	36	44	20	100

B-T4.1: All outages

PEN19BF PDF24; N = 100; unit cases. No changes found; hypothetical complaint outcome. The second provision is not automatic refusal of a pension.

Municipality	Hypothetically confirmed	Hypothetically remitted for reconsideration	Second provision	Total
Aalborg	7	0	1	8
Frederiksberg	8	0	0	8
Herning	8	0	0	8
Holstebro	11	0	0	11

Municipality	Hypothetically confirmed	Hypothetically remitted for reconsideration	Second provision	Total
Copenhagen	10	1	0	11
Randers	11	0	0	11
Slaughter	10	1	0	11
Svendborg	12	0	0	12
Sønderborg	11	0	0	11
Peas (without pods)	8	0	1	9
Total	96	2	2	100

B-T4.2: Refusal

PEN19BF PDF25; N = 36; unit cases. The same 100-case main cohort; not new cases.

Municipality	Hypothetically confirmed	Hypothetically remitted for reconsideration	Total
Frederiksberg	2	0	2
Herning	2	0	2
Holstebro	5	0	5
Copenhagen	4	1	5
Randers	5	0	5
Slaughter	4	1	5
Svendborg	5	0	5
Sønderborg	5	0	5
Peas (without pods)	2	0	2
Total	34	2	36

B-T4.3: Apparent awards

PEN19BF PDF26; N = 44; unit cases. The same 100-case main cohort; not new cases.

Municipality	Correct after application Note	Second provision	Total
Aalborg	4	1	5
Frederiksberg	4	0	4
Herning	4	0	4
Holstebro	5	0	5
Copenhagen	4	0	4
Randers	4	0	4
Slaughter	4	0	4
Svendborg	5	0	5
Sønderborg	5	0	5

Municipality	Correct after application Note	Second provision	Total
Peas (without pods)	3	1	4
Total	42	2	44

B-T4.4: Terminal awards

PEN19BF PDF27; N = 20; unit cases. The same 100-case main cohort; not new cases.

Municipality	Hypothetically confirmed	Second provision	Total
Aalborg	3	0	3
Frederiksberg	2	0	2
Herning	2	0	2
Holstebro	1	0	1
Copenhagen	2	0	2
Randers	2	0	2
Slaughter	2	0	2
Svendborg	2	0	2
Sønderborg	1	0	1
Peas (without pods)	3	0	3
Total	20	0	20

Distribution-correct-open: Basis of health

PEN19F PDF33; N = 42; unit cases. The same 100-case main cohort; not new cases.

Category	Number
Congenital / Early Acquired	19
Later acquired	22
Incompensable function, other	1

Additional numbers and times

Measurement	Counter / value	Denomination	Original
Questionnaire sent / reply	98	97	PEN19BF4
Piano-test municipalities	3	-	PEN19BF4
Pilot analysis cases	3	-	PEN19BF8
Commitment to cooperation maintained	2	97	PEN19BF5
Target head / reserve	100+30	-	PEN19BF5
Refusal of clear health, unexplained work	3	36	PEN19F22
Coordinator followed	44	44	PEN19F28
Incomplete Coordinator Assessment	1	44	PEN19F30
Decision less than 1 month after Coordinator	26	44	PEN19F35
Young people with disabilities	14	44	PEN19F35
Young persons aged 18 years	8	14	PEN19F35-36
Of which Decision 3 / 6 months after 18 years, retrospective	2	8	PEN19F36
Retirement pension	6	14	PEN19F36-37
Of which 47 months after 18 years	1	6	PEN19F37
Other five 1-4 months after 18 years	5	6	PEN19F37
Terminal with unnecessary coordinator	2	20	PEN19F40
Terminal with improper medical consultant	1	20	PEN19F41
Terminal Decision less than 1 month after documentation	18	20	PEN19F41
Other terminals over 1 / over 2 months	2	20	PEN19F41

Concrete progress

IDs are own page tags, unpublished file numbers; several observation tracks may relate to the same citizen. The table is not a personal union.

Own ID	Main PDF	Compact facts	Assessment / own calendar calculation;
L22	22	Middle-aged woman; sick leave 2007; second course of resources; internship 5 hours / week	Lack of support / follow-up; AS correctly assesses refusal of available evidence
L23	23	Female 60s; sick leave 2006; resident adult autistic child; resourceMay 2018	The burden of care / support needs to be clarified prior to work ability; AS assesses refusal correctly
L25	25	Female; 30 years of labour market; sick leave 2009; internship 3 months in 2016; home clarification 2017	Functioning almost immaterial; AS would remit to the team, no pension entitlement finally determined
L26	26	Female; anxiety / depression / abuse; course 2018 only two appearances	Non-attendance for treatment: motivation or lack of ability unresolved; AS would remit
L31	30-31	Male with severe brain damage; status after coordinator informs treatment exhausted	Pension materially correct, but missing new coordinator / team

Own ID	Main PDF	Compact facts	Assessment / own calendar calculation;
L32	31-33	Male 20s; schizophrenia / ADHD; about 2 years of practice during abuse; no offers since Jan 2015	Opposite medical assessments; AS requires team, not automatic withdrawal of pension
L34	34	Female 60 s; COPD / pain / cancer; clarification of interrupted health	Resource course possibly harmful according to doctor; AS assesses the award correctly
L36	36	18 years; cognitive level 4 years; helps 15 hours / month	Pension from 18 years
L40 a	40	Female with terminal cancer; coordinator seeking additional home help information	Overstatement, not incorrect material attribution
L40 b	40	Terminal 7Jun 2018; Coordinator 4Jul; Decision 12Jul 2018	35 calendar days from already documented terminal status to decision
L41	41	Terminal Document 6Nov 2017; Medical Adviser 16Nov; Decision 30Nov 2017	24 calendar days; undue medical consultant

Own analysis: time and guarantees

The six early retirement young people are a separately documented injury indicator within the award cohort. One waited 47 months after 18 years, five 1-4 months. The eight with appropriate effect from 18 years also include two decisions taken three and six months later, but with retroactive effect. The settlement time and economic impact date must therefore be shown separately; retroactive performance does not prove the absence of temporary stress. Actual payment and additional compensation are not documented in this original.

The terminal run of June 7 → 12 July 2018 shows 35 days from known terminal status, where further co-ordinator opinion was unnecessary according to the report. It must not be overruled by a general three-month period: compliance with time limits does not preclude the verification of unnecessary waiting time after sufficient evidence has already been provided. The separate 24-day course includes a directly prohibited medical consultant, although the award is properly classified.

Specific demands are the original measurement form, a complete timeline from known information to commencement/decision/effect/payment, a back-payment account, possible reopening and accountability consequences. No withdrawal of pension or person count is inferred from the two procedurally incorrect awards. The known gap in public reading coverage of the main report and annex report is closed; individual redress and exact unpublished times require case-record data.

Additional expenses 2014: full original tables and citizens' programme

All 74 physical PDFs pages actually RAMs text read; PDF13 / 17 / 20 / 27-30 / 58-60 actually visually RAMs controlled.

The same 75 cohorts as previous additional expenditure module; tables and examples are not extra cases. Diagnosis tables count several checks per case.

130 convened / 117 received / 75 selected; 16 → 15 municipalities. Decisions after 1.12.2009 and subsequent May-June 2012. Persons covered, not the amount of benefits. The appeal and forwarded to the Board excluded. No additional act is expected; AS bases the submitted act. Submitted copies are shredded after reporting (PDF62), not the municipality's own records. VUM-specific requirements not tested (PDF21-22).

All numbered tables

2.1 · MER14F PDF 8 · mentions 75 cases

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
Right	33	85	25	69	58	77
Would be amended/remitted for reconsideration	6	15	11	31	17	23
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

2.2 · MER14F PDF 9 · mentions 39 cases

59 diagnostic checkbox selections in 39 cases; percentages use selections 49/10/59,not 39.

Deficit of function	Real N	Real%	Wrong N	Wrong%	Total N	Total%
Diabetes / diet	15	31	2	20	17	29
Physical	21	43	4	40	25	42
Psychological	6	12	2	20	8	14
Other	7	14	2	20	9	15
Total	49	100	10	100	59	100

2.3 · MER14F PDF 10 · mentions 36 cases

67 diagnostic ticks in 36 cases; the original note incorrectly says 39. Percentages use 48/19/67.

Deficit of function	Real N	Real%	Wrong N	Wrong%	Total N	Total%
Diabetes / diet	2	4	1	5	3	4
Physical	26	54	11	58	37	55
Psychological	12	25	4	21	16	24
Other	8	17	3	16	11	16
Total	48	100	19	100	67	100

2.4 · MER14F PDF 13 · mentions 75 cases

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
No missing	29	74	23	64	52	69
Minor deficiencies	6	15	7	19	13	17
Essential deficiencies	1	3	2	6	3	4
Decisive deficiencies	3	8	4	11	7	9
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

2.5 · MER14F PDF 15 · mentions 75 cases

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
High	26	67	32	89	58	77
Someone.	2	5	1	3	3	4
Rings	3	8	2	6	5	7
None	8	21	1	3	9	12
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

2.6 · MER14F PDF 16 · mentions 39 cases

Overlapping diagnoses, 59 checkups.

Deficit of function	High	Someone.	Rings	None	Total
Diabetes / diet	7	1	1	8	17

Deficit of function	High	Someone.	Rings	None	Total
Physical	23	0	2	0	25
Psychological	6	1	1	0	8
Other	7	1	1	0	9

2.7 · MER14F PDF 16 · mentions 36 cases

Overlapping diagnoses, 67 checkups. Original note denotes 39 instead of 36.

Deficit of function	High	Someone.	Rings	None	Total
Diabetes / diet	3	0	0	0	3
Physical	33	1	3	0	37
Psychological	14	0	1	1	16
Other	11	0	0	0	11

2.8 · MER14F PDF 17 · mentions 75 cases

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
Yes	28	72	6	17	34	45
No	7	18	24	67	31	41
Uncontrollable	4	10	6	17	10	13
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

2.9 · MER14F PDF 19 · mentions 75 cases

Exact repeat of 2.8, not another 75 cases. Title measures intrusive character, not actual aid.

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
Yes	28	72	6	17	34	45
No	7	18	24	67	31	41
Uncontrollable	4	10	6	17	10	13
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

2.10 · MER14F PDF 20 · mentions 34 cases

Only 34 cases of intrusive nature.

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
High	21	75	1	17	22	65
Someone.	5	18	3	50	8	24
Rings	1	4	1	17	2	6
None	1	4	1	17	2	6
Total	28	100	6	100	34	100

3.1 · MER14F PDF 22 · mentions 75 cases

Functional ability/adult assessment method; VUM-specific requirements not examined.

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
High	30	77	31	86	61	81
Someone.	0	0	3	8	3	4
Rings	1	3	0	0	1	1
None	8	21	2	6	10	13
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

3.2 · MER14F PDF 22 · mentions 75 cases

Citizens' involvement

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
High	35	90	33	92	68	91
Someone.	2	5	2	6	4	5
Rings	2	5	1	3	3	4
None	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

3.3 · MER14F PDF 23 · mentions 75 cases

Reasons

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
High	33	85	24	67	57	76
Someone.	6	15	11	31	17	23
Rings	0	0	1	3	1	1
None	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

3.4 · MER14F PDF 24 · lists 75 cases

Appeal guidance

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
High	38	97	32	89	70	93
Someone.	1	3	3	8	4	5
Rings	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	0	1	3	1	1
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

3.6 · MER14F PDF 25 · mentions 75 cases

Transparency of the decision

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
High	37	95	35	97	72	96

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
Someone.	2	5	1	3	3	4
Rings	0	0	0	0	0	0
None	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

3.5 · MER14F PDF 24 · mentions 75 cases

Category	Included N	% covered	Refusal N	Refusal%	Total N	Total%
Written	39	100	36	100	75	100
Journalnotate	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	39	100	36	100	75	100

Annex 1 · MER14F PDF 58 · lists 75 cases

The original does not print a total series. Own column 33 / 6 / 25 / 11 / 58 / 17 / 75.

Municipality	Included Right	Included wrong	Reject Right	Refusal wrong	Real total	Wrong total	Total
Assens	1	0	1	0	2	0	2
Parsley leaves	1	1	1	1	2	2	4
Esbjerg	5	1	5	1	10	2	12
Fax	3	0	1	2	4	2	6
Frederikshavn	2	0	2	1	4	1	5
Glostrup	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Haderslev	0	2	0	1	0	3	3
Horsens	2	1	3	1	5	2	7
Høj-Taastrup	3	0	2	0	5	0	5
Hørsholm	1	0	1	0	2	0	2
Copenhagen	5	0	5	1	10	1	11
Medium speed	3	0	0	2	3	2	5
Oats	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Thisted	5	0	2	2	7	2	9
West Himmerland	1	0	1	0	2	0	2

Annex 2 · MER14F PDF 59 · lists 75 cases

51 / 13 / 3 / 8 deviates from main table 52 / 13 / 3 / 7.

Municipality	No missing	Less	Essential	Decisive	Total
Assens	2	0	0	0	2
Parsley leaves	3	1	0	0	4

Municipality	No missing	Less	Essential	Decisive	Total
Esbjerg	7	4	0	1	12
Fax	5	0	0	1	6
Frederikshavn	4	1	0	0	5
Glostrup	1	0	0	0	1
Haderslev	0	0	1	2	3
Horsens	6	0	0	1	7
Høj-Taastrup	3	2	0	0	5
Hørsholm	2	0	0	0	2
Copenhagen	9	1	0	1	11
Medium speed	2	1	2	0	5
Oats	1	0	0	0	1
Thisted	4	3	0	2	9
West Himmerland	2	0	0	0	2
Total	51	13	3	8	75

Annex 3 · MER14F PDF 60 · lists 75 cases

Municipality	High	Someone.	Rings	None	Total
Assens	2	0	0	0	2
Parsley leaves	4	0	0	0	4
Esbjerg	10	1	1	0	12
Fax	4	0	0	2	6
Frederikshavn	4	1	0	0	5
Glostrup	1	0	0	0	1
Haderslev	0	0	3	0	3
Horsens	7	0	0	0	7
Høj-Taastrup	5	0	0	0	5
Hørsholm	1	0	0	1	2
Copenhagen	11	0	0	0	11
Medium speed	4	0	0	1	5
Oats	1	0	0	0	1
Thisted	2	1	1	5	9
West Himmerland	2	0	0	0	2
Total	58	3	5	9	75

Other original figures and historical comparisons

The 2011 percentage is the 2014 original reproduction; they do not close the control of the 2011 original's raw figure.

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	MER14F PDF
Called	130	-	cases	33
Received	117	130	cases	33
Selected	75	117	cases	33
Local authorities called	16	-	municipalities	33
Participation municipalities	15	16	municipalities	33
Within 3 months	40	75	%	28
Within 6 months	68	75	%	28
Consultation	0	15	municipalities	74
Cancelled dialogue meetings	2	-	meetings;	74
2011 accuracy	92	-	%	6
2011 diabetes / diet	40	-	%	6
2014 diabetes / diet	27	75	%	6
2011 overall high / some	87	-	%	14
2011 overall ring / none	13	-	%	14
2011 total refusal high / no	88	-	%	15
2011 total refusal ring / none	12	-	%	15
2011 total included high / some	85	-	%	15
2011 total covered rings / none	15	-	%	15
2011 sufficiently informed	91	-	%	12
2011 method	86	-	%	21
2011 citizens' involvement	95	-	%	22
2011 reason high / no	88	-	%	22
2011 justification poor	12	-	%	22
2011 intrusive refusal yes	10	-	%	17
2011 intrusive refusal unknown	10	-	%	17
2011 included	57	-	%	26
2011 refusal	43	-	%	26

Local case codes

Case	MER14F PDF	Age	Theme	AS-rating
025	10-11	31	Refusal; duration	AS agrees
042	11	43	Psoriatic arthritis / fibromyalgia	Included
046	11	18	Extensive family aid	Included
011	11-12	25	Back bone injury; 25 t work	AS Included
049	12	20	Allergy; discontinuation of medicine	Would be remitted
012	13	37	Whiplash / PTSD; Child 11	Information assessed
013	13-14	60	No medical records	Insufficient information
057	14	18	Arthritis; former § 41	Would be remitted
024	18	50	MS; bath 2 h / time<50 m	Wanted to change
036	20	21	Colitis; internship 25 t / toilet 30 sec	AS not included
018	23	-	Diabetes; § 2 Reference	§ 1 more comprehensive

Original conflicts

• Head 2.4 = 52 / 13 / 3 / 7; municipal annex 2 = 51 / 13 / 3 / 8.

• PDF17 prose: all 39 covered have severe functional impairment; T2.8 = 28 yes / 7 no / 4 unknown. Visually controlled.

• T2.9 repeats T2.8,although the section concerns assistance measures; no new measurement of assistance measures.

• PDF26:36 covered 52%/39 refusals 48%, reversed against main tables 39/36. PDF26 says one diabetes refusal, but T2.3 has 3.

• T2.3/T2.7 notes say 39 cases; the refusal population is 36,with 67 overlapping diagnostic checkbox selections.

• Citizen involvement summary PDF5 = 95%, bread text PDF22 = 96%; raw 72 / 75 = 96%.

• Home May 2014; kolofonPDF3 / 31 March 2014; hearing 4-25 April 2014. Version dates shall be retained.

• Fig 4.1-4.4 visually read: no exact number labels; underlying graph cells not invented. Figure 4.2 / 4.4 repeats the time distribution.

Independent impact and evidence analysis

Cases 024 and 011 document published refusals that Ankestyrelsen assessed as substantively incorrect. They provide specific evidence of the risk of lost compensation where there are severe functional limitations. The published assessment does not, however, document when the citizen actually obtained an altered decision or received the money. This requires the municipal reopening decision and payment history.

A combined 2011/2014 error count cannot be constructed from the printed percentages. Both samples' selection and the changed diagnostic composition must be retained; the explanation concerning less complex cases is Ankestyrelsen's assessment, not an independently proved causal analysis.

42 individual grounds for discarding received but not selected, 13 non-delivered cases, 16. commune, raw graph cells, completed 75 measurement forms, actual resumption / post-payment / personunion have not been provided by this public original.

Sources

• MER14F: Additional expenses 2014, original copyAll 74 pages. SHA256 cd5936d84e5754f6479f822de16c7fcbeaab84cd7f790cf5dc93e04cf44d79d5. Official FT- reference: SOU Annex 246.

Regional Employment Appeals Board Midtjylland 2012: all sanction figures and exclusions

80 terminations of social assistance in six municipalities;76 would, according to the board, have been amended/remitted on appeal. Most recent decisions before 1.2.2012; appeal cases and cases previously examined in practice studies excluded. Planned 84, initially 10 outside scope replaced, then a further 4 excluded; final 80. Hedensted 14 planned/10 final. PDF38-43 documents selection and original case record 2012-413/13. [BANMIDT12]

Original Table	Measurement	Categories	Number	Original procedure nter	Denomination	PDF
1	Total outflows	Correct / Change Home View	4/76	5/95	80	8
2	Information relating to proceedings	No missing / minor / essential / essential	56/14/5/5	70/18/6/6	80	9
3	Follow-up guidance	High / some / rings / no / irr relevant	44/0/1/21/14	55/0/1/26/18	80	11
4	Guidance on recovery	High / some / rings / no / irr relevant	18/6/19/23/14	23/8/24/29/18	80	11
5	Documented provision of guidance	Yes / no / irrelevant	46/18/16	58/23/19	80	12
6	Rejection / repeated absence	High / some / rings / no / irr relevant	27/16/10/13/14	34/20/13/18/16	80	16
7	Assessment of no reasonable reason	High / some / rings / no / irr relevant	38/16/4/6/16	48/20/5/8/20	80	18
8	Job plan for sanctioned offers	Yes / no / irrelevant	59/7/14	74/9/18	80	21
9	Open tender	Yes / no / irrelevant	38/28/14	48/35/18	80	23
10	Open Offer Job Plan	Yes / no / irrelevant	34/4/42	43/5/52	80	23
11	Termination	First refusal / decision on first / first / second / unknown	27/2/9/31/11	34/3/11/39/14	80	27
12	Correct termination time	Yes / no / irrelevant	28/12/40	35/15/50	80	28
13 message	Decision received before end of service	Yes / no / not available	61/12/7	76/15/9	80	29
13 -Competency e	Real municipal department	Yes / no / unknown	61/12/7	76/15/9	80	31
14	Parties' consultations	Yes / No	72/8	90/10	80	33
15	Reasons	High / some / rings / no / irr relevant	5/50/7/7/11	6/63/9/9/14	80	35
16	Appeal guidance	High / some / no	29/42/9	36/53/11	80	37

Relevant sub-denominators: guidance overall 19 yes/47 no out of 66, because 14 cases involved an incorrectly sanctioned employment interview. Guidance on consequences 22/66 insufficient; regaining entitlement 42/66 insufficient; documentation of provision 18/64 insufficient. Refusal condition 23/66 and reasonable-grounds assessment 10/64 errors according to the main text. Open offer missing in 28/66;38 open offers comprise 25 continued/13 new. Job plan for an open offer missing in 4/38, but expressly not included in the total invalidity figure. Cessation date incorrect in 12/40, including 8 before the first non-attendance.

All municipal documents

All cells are number. "-" retains the original's empty cell, not a hidden personal information.

Table 1.7: Overall outturn

Municipality	Yeah.	alteration-remittal	Denomination	PDF
Heath site	-	10	10	45
Herning	-	17	17	45
Holstebro	4	10	14	45
Ikast-Brand	-	14	14	45
Struer	-	8	8	45
Viborg	-	17	17	45
Original total	4	76	80	45

Table 1.9: Rejection / repeated non-displays

Municipality	High	someone	Small	no.	irrelevant	Denomination	PDF
Heath site	2	1	3	4	-	10	45
Herning	6	3	3	2	3	17	45
Holstebro	9	1	-	2	2	14	45
Ikast-Brand	6	2	2	3	1	14	45
Struer	1	1	-	3	3	8	45
Viborg	3	8	2	-	4	17	45
Original total	27	16	10	14	13	80	45

Table 1.12: Open offers

Municipality	Yeah.	no.	irrelevant	Denomination	PDF
Heath site	-	10	-	10	45
Herning	13	-	4	17	45
Holstebro	11	1	2	14	45
Ikast-Brand	12	1	1	14	45
Struer	2	3	3	8	45
Viborg	-	13	4	17	45
Original total	38	28	14	80	45

Table 1.16: Impact guidance

Municipality	High	Small	no.	irrelevant	Denomination	PDF
Heath site	7	-	3	-	10	46
Herning	-	-	14	3	17	46
Holstebro	12	-	-	2	14	46
Ikast-Brand	8	-	4	2	14	46
Struer	4	1	-	3	8	46
Viborg	13	-	-	4	17	46
Original total	44	1	21	14	80	46

Table 1.17: Guidance on regaining entitlement

Municipality	High	someone	Small	no.	irrelevant	Denomination	PDF
Heath site	-	-	7	3	-	10	46
Herning	-	-	-	14	3	17	46
Holstebro	9	-	2	1	2	14	46
Ikast-Brand	5	-	3	4	2	14	46
Struer	4	-	-	1	3	8	46
Viborg	-	6	7	-	4	17	46
Original total	18	6	19	23	14	80	46

Table 1.18: Evidence of extradition

Municipality	Yeah.	no.	irrelevant	Denomination	PDF
Heath site	5	3	2	10	47
Herning	11	3	3	17	47
Holstebro	6	6	2	14	47
Ikast-Brand	7	5	2	14	47
Struer	5	0	3	8	47
Viborg	12	1	4	17	47
Original total	46	18	15	80	47

Table 1.16-1.18: Overall duty of guidance

Municipality	Yeah.	no.	irrelevant	Denomination	PDF
Heath site	0	10	0	10	47
Herning	0	14	3	17	47
Holstebro	5	7	2	14	47
Ikast-Brand	4	8	2	14	47
Struer	4	1	3	8	47
Viborg	6	7	4	17	47
Original total	19	47	14	80	47

Own source criticism and citizens' consequences

Table 6 has 13 no / 14 irrelevant, while municipality table 1.9 has 14 no / 13 irrelevant. Table 1.18 total 46 + 18 + 15 = 79, although the denominator is 80; the third column of the commune totals 16. Table 5 has 16 irrelevant and presses 19% where 16 / 80 = 20%. Table 6 presses 18% for 13 and 16% for 14. The deviations are visually controlled and maintained. Table 13 is recycled for two different measurements. Termination examples 39 / 42 PDF29-30 have date 31.12.2012 in the course of decisions January 2012; these dates may not be tacitly rewritten.

Our evidential scrutiny: the total of 76 is the reviewer's conditional outcome, not 76 completed complaint cases or payments of arrears. The board states in PDF4 that it could not reopen of its own motion. A municipal promise to change practice concerning competence in PDF31 does not document reinstatement of the 12 specific citizens' benefits. Errors in reasons 14 and absence of appeal instructions 9 include 7 decisions not communicated at all; they must not be summed as 30 people. Unclear guidance on regaining entitlement is accepted in 6 cases, and deficiencies in reasons/job plans are partly not included in the overall error indicator. The 95% figure therefore cannot be treated as an exhaustive record of all procedural errors.

Documented consequences: in case 77, payment for October 2011 had not been made before the decision on 24.11.2011; in case 11, re-registration and new assistance are refused following non-attendance; in case 67, two weeks of attendance are required before reconsideration without identified legal authority; case 39 requires repayment for December 2011 despite first non-attendance on 5.12 and actual attendance. The report examples are the reviewer’s accounts, not the individuals’ own records. Necessary demand: municipalities must disclose original decisions, payment/back-payment histories, reopening decisions, affected spouses/children and a specific assessment of responsibility for each case ID.

The 14 employment-interview cases excluded and the 4 cases removed are different populations; the 4 cannot be added to 76 as proven invalid cessations.84 original submissions plus 10 replacements give 94 submission occurrences, not 94 unique affected citizens. PDF43 plans destruction of submitted records after reporting; seek the original municipal case records and the retained measurement dataset at Ankestyrelsen/Rigsarkivet.

6. Handicap, equal treatment, environment and other practices

Controlled 7.10.2026. The physical PDF page is used. Raw counters are preserved by source conflict; no uncritical harmonisation. Measurements of different requirements in the same case overlap. The studies include selected decisions, not all citizens with illness, dementia or disability.

Cash benefits and wealth, January 2014

Original 65 pages: https://viden.sl.dk/media/6876/ankestyrelsens-praksisundersgelse-kontanthjlp.pdf. SHA256 49dccfce343ea6b3e562625de17527787d426d4eb0d46be0e0621d70127b9c29.

155 requested, 137 received, 7 excluded, 130 examined in 14 municipalities. Most recent decisions before 10.5.2013; 18-65 years old. Appealed and forwarded to a board excluded. Excluded:2 grants, 1 without a decision, 1 withdrawal, 1 appeal, 2 uncertainties about personal scope. Pp. 38-39,52-53. Some municipalities located cases from memory; one submitted none because of deficient registration. The basis for repayment and the correct length of the self-support period were not examined,p. 4. The 47 partly correct asset assessments contain calculation deficiencies, even though the outcome of the refusal is assessed as correct.

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Correct/amendment-remittal	116/14	130	T3.1, p. 12
Value of claimant / spouse / other, overlapping	125/20/3	130	T3.2, p. 12
Progress: applicant / spouse / new / other, overlapping	30/1/99/1	130	T3.3, p. 13
Assets cash / loans / back-payments / housing / securities / other, overlapping	111/3/0/7/15/33	130; 169 registrations	T3.4, p. 14
Information no / minor / significant / essential deficiencies	84/38/7/1	130	T3.5, p. 14
Investment evaluation high / someone / ring / no	69/47/9/5	130	T3.6, p. 19
Free allowances correctly high / someone / ring / no	117/2/3/8	130	T3.7, p. 25
Same: right in each category	106/2/1/7	116	T3.8, p. 26
Same: wrong in each category	11/0/2/1	14	T3.8, p. 26
Derogation paragraph 2 correct high / someone / ring / no	114/10/4/2	130	T3.9, p. 27
Derogation paragraph 3 correct high / someone / ring / no	124/3/2/1	130	T3.10, p. 30
Derogation paragraph 4 correct high / someone / ring / no	124/3/2/1	130	T3.11, p. 31
Derogation paragraph 5 correct high / someone / ring / no	123/3/3/1	130	T3.12, p. 31
Decision in writing / journal note / other	119/11/0	130	T4.1, p. 33
Reason high / someone / ring / no	105/19/4/2	130	T4.2, p. 34
Complaint guidance high / someone / ring / no / irrelevant	19/102/0/0/9	130	T4.3, p. 35
Party consultation yes / no / irrelevant	26/3/101	130; relevant 29	T4.4, p. 35

Main tables checked; municipality-row outcomes on p. 42 total 116/14/130. The factual-basis annex PDF43 has now been fully reconciled row by row and visually in praksis-formue2014-fulde-kommunebilag.md; the same 84/38/7/1 and 130 cohort. S4-5/T3.6 shows that a low overturning rate must not be presented as an overall error rate.

Rehabilitation teams, October 2014

Original 112 pages: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/a9c0cb4f-2fdc-41f3-b83e-09880a5e4ea9/b91d566a-db66-456d-8f2e-cfadfbf1ac11-Annex -1.pdf. SHA256 7a7c49c76a0f1d2f53ebcf323a4ecac6f129e2d3f77b4a69e6894409e7a08e24.

150 requested, 143 received, 4 excluded, 139 examined in 10 large/larger municipalities. Grants:49 flex jobs, 53 resource programmes, 37 other measures; refusals/pensions excluded. Request letter 1.9-1.12.2013, pp. 98-100; the summary says quarter 4 of 2013,p. 5 (period conflict). Appealed and forwarded excluded; amended on reconsideration without forwarding allowed. Additional records received from 5 of 9 municipalities contacted; missing decisions not obtained. Ordinary party consultation/appeal guidance was not the study's focus,pp. 81-83.

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Overall correct/alteration-remittal/no decision	107/21/11	139	s 6-7
Material error / formal error alone	20/1	21 incorrect	s 7
Adequate / insufficient / untested information	100/17/22	139	s 7
Sex woman / man in the cases	85/54	139	s 84

The full check in praksis-rehabilitering2014-fulde-tabeller-og-borgerforloeb.md now covers all 112 original pages and 31 main tables as well as 2 municipality tables. Clarification:11 cases WITHOUT an actual decision are included among 26 assessable cases concerning other intervention because the Appeals Board assumes that the municipality followed the team (PDF67-69). A further 11 case steps have not received a main assessment. The two groups must not be conflated, and neither represents 11 actual overturnings.

Use of force against people with dementia,2015

Original 183 pages: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/68f01f0d-7282-4233-9625-849e77f0ca06/b6c71b37-68c-40e7-afeb-e7c45f3a6f5b-Annex -1 _ 0.pdf. SHA256 59334a225ac2dd69386cc718cee0734db7383d0faab1efbf2841a3c2833e87b2.

112 requested / 14 municipalities; 106 received; 49 left, mainly § 125 and § 126 a which were outside the practice test; 57 cases / 13 municipalities. Latest before 31.12.2014. Appeal and forwarded excluded; reassessment modified without transmission allowed, PDF116- 118 / 149. The questionnaire all 98 municipalities, 86 replied in full / in part, with changing questions. Two explicit three-case groups for the same citizen mean that 57 cases do not involve more than 53 unique persons before any additional clutches. Case study and questionnaire are different populations.

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Correct/amendment-remittal for reconsideration	27/30	57	s 6
Case type: acute retention / applied detention / detention without authorisation / substance harness / outside	23/4/7/19/4	57	T1, p. 118
Improper detention without authorisation	6	7	s 6-7
Assessment by the municipality of outside intervention	4	4	s 7; does not mean all 4 operations legally
Action plan yes / no / unknown	35/11/11	57	s 7
Timely registration yes / no / unknown	9/21/4	34 relevant	s 8
Sufficient statement / guardianship	16	23 applications	s 9
Special § 130 requirements met	16	23 applications	s 10
Complaint guidance yes / no / unknown	17/6/34	57	s 10
Justification high someone / ring no	21/3	24 written applicationdecisions	s 10
Case estimated men / women	35/22	57	T2, p. 118

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Municipal guidelines on use of force/decision-making competence	82/84	84 each	s 7
Guidelines for substance belt monitoring	30	81	s 7
Guidelines on recording necessity/authority to record	84/83	84 each	s 8
Annual report / special cases, overlap	68/20	86	s 8
Demen Coordinator exists	82	83	s 9
Coordinator advises / determines / reports / records, overlap	76/36/34/33	81	s 9
Training / internal material / staff tasks, overlap	62/31/28	81	s 9
Pears / guardians typically involved	75	81	s 9
Parents / guardians typically agree, the municipality's own answer	74	80	s 9

The entire 183-page original has now been read in RAM in praksis-demens2015-fulde-tabeller-og-indgrebsforloeb.md/.json:87 reading tables/461 rows, all 12 numerical figures and the municipality annex, annual statistics 2012-14, methodology, summaries of precedent decisions and blank forms. 26 pages have been visually reconciled. The source's conflicting total and percentage cells are retained. No national union of people, employees' guilt or actual redress can be inferred from 57 cases. Not all municipal records could isolate dementia from other individuals.

Rare disability and acquired brain damage, 2015

Original 158 pages: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/a72b4d38-79b7-4b7a-a07d-6fa6d86360c2/606f6151- 5d5d-4a92-981f -9373f42c8bce -Annex -1.pdf. SHA256 1b1ad88416f1254363915d0863aa96d23ca9de85df0d49405aba8b7a109bf0da.

120 requested, 101 received, 3 deleted, 98 examined / 24 municipalities; 44 rare disabilities, 54 brain damage. Latest 1.1.2013- 1.10.2014, s 103 / 130, while summary s 6 indicates 1.7.2014 (conflict). Call letter s 131 says 25 municipalities, actually method 24. Not random selection: the municipality's knowledge of the target group governs. Appeal and forwarded excluded, reassessment modified without transmission allowed. Additional material assessed, p. 5. Latest 94 appropriations / 4 refusals; three-year history mapped, p. 6 / 103-104.

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Correct/amendment-remittal for reconsideration	59/39	98	T2.1, p. 21
Rare Disabilities Right / Wrong	25/19	44	T2.1, p. 21
Brain damage right / wrong	34/20	54	T2.1, p. 21
§ 83 right / wrong	9/3	12	T2.2, p. 22
§ 85 right / wrong	16/11	27	T2.3, p. 24
§ 83 + 85 right / wrong	2/4	6	T2.4, p. 29
§ 102 Right / Wrong	4/4	8	T2.5, p. 30
§ 107 Right / Wrong	14/8	22	T2.6, p. 32
§ 108 Right / Wrong	8/5	13	T2.7, p. 36
ABL § 105 right / wrong	6/4	10	T2.8, p. 39
Information no / minor / essential missing	36/28/34	98	T2.9, p. 42
Individual assessment high / some / no	54/24/20	98	T2.10, p. 43

Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Locator
Service level used, rare / brain damage	4/1	44/54	T2.11, p. 47
Individual derogation assessment missing	4/1	4/1	T2.12, p. 47
Auxiliary needs covered yes / no, rare	29/15	44	T2.13, p. 49
Auxiliary needs covered yes / no, brain damage	33/21	54	T2.13, p. 49
All requests processed high / someone / no, rare	28/13/3	44	T3.2, p. 55
Same, brain damage	33/5/16	54	T3.2, p. 55
Overall assessment high / someone / no, rare	19/16/9	44	T3.3, p. 57
Same, brain damage	31/5/18	54	T3.3, p. 57
Needed professional information missing, rare / brain	10/10	44/54	T6.1, p. 87
These not subsequently obtained	10/9	10/10	T6.2, p. 88
Citizens' information used yes / no, rare	34/10	44	T6.4, p. 89
Same, brain damage	41/13	54	T6.4, p. 89
Current information used yes / no, rare	29/15	44	T7.5, p. 100
Same, brain damage	45/9	54	T7.5, p. 100
Uncurrent information affects help high / someone / no, rare	2/4/9	15	T7.6, p. 100
Same, brain damage	3/0/6	9	T7.6, p. 100

Visually checked conflicts in the original: the summary on p. 7 states 35 correct/19 incorrect brain injury cases, but T2.1 gives 34/20 and reconciles the 59/39 total. P9 confuses percentages with counts:37/28/35 sum to 100; T2.9 shows 36/28/34=98. These are not two additional individuals. Missing assessment of assistance needs 36/98 is separate from 39 overturnings; no known union. T6.5, p. 91 has 79 extension cases, while the prose says 9; the denominator requires separate documentation. All 158 pages of the original, all outcome/municipality tables, numerical figures and form annexes have now been checked. See the full disability 2015 module:92 reading tables/461 rows, 33 visually checked original pages and 40 local case IDs. The same 98 cases; no additional cohort. Actual subsequent assistance/moving dates and person linkages are not published as completed tables.

Form 2014: municipal annex and age / gender figure fully aligned

This supplement closes the specified municipal annex residue at the same 130 case cohort. Method / Annex PDF38-65 is read; PDF41 / 43 is visually controlled in RAM. Empty original cells appear as -, not as a printed zero. Row-N and column totals are retained.

Annex 2, T2.1-2.2: All municipalities and original columns

Municipality	Right	Hypothetically change / hj training;	N	No oply tappa ngel	Less	Essential a	Decisive	Locator
Aarhus	13	2	15	8	6	1	-	PDF42-43
Dragons	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	PDF42-43
Favrskov	8	2	10	5	3	2	-	PDF42-43
Herlev	6	4	10	7	1	2	-	PDF42-43
Hvidover	10	-	10	6	4	-	-	PDF42-43
Copenhagen	20	-	20	15	5	-	-	PDF42-43
Køge	7	-	7	4	3	-	-	PDF42-43
Lolland	10	-	10	9	1	-	-	PDF42-43
Nordfyn	7	1	8	6	2	-	-	PDF42-43
Odsherd	6	1	7	6	1	-	-	PDF42-43
Skanderborg	6	3	9	2	5	1	1	PDF42-43
Sunred	3	-	3	2	1	-	-	PDF42-43
South Djurs	9	1	10	7	2	1	-	PDF42-43
Sønderborg	10	-	10	6	4	-	-	PDF42-43
Total	116	14	130	84	38	7	1	PDF42-43

Figure 1: All printed age / sex cells

Age	Male	Women	Own-row Sum	Locator
Less than 30	32	19	51	PDF41, Figure 1
30-39	7	15	22	PDF41, Figure 1
40-49	7	8	15	PDF41, Figure 1
50-59	16	14	30	PDF41, Figure 1
60+	7	5	12	PDF41, Figure 1
Total	69	61	130	PDF41, Figure 1

Method and limit of evidence

155 requested→137 received→7 excluded→130 measured. The 7 excluded=2 awards+1 no decision+1 withdrawal+1 appealed+2 doubts about eligibility. 15 municipalities were invited; 14 have a measurement row. Cases already appealed/forwarded are excluded. The original assumes all records received and does not request missing documents. The letter states that submitted copies are shredded after final reporting; this does not document shredding of original municipal case records. Only the asset basis for refusal is examined, not the length of the self-support period or the basis for repayment. 116 correct therefore is not a declaration concerning all statutory requirements.

Own voting: the municipal columns give 116 / 14 / 130 and 84 / 38 / 7 / 1 / 130; the figure gives 69 men / 61 women. No new case / person sum is added to earlier 130. Lack of effective payment, loss of income and individual responsibility requires the original records and subsequent follow-up.

Rehabilitation 2014: full tables, annexes and documented citizens' programmes

The entire 112 pages original is actually text read in memory. VisuelRAM control: PDF7-9,11-12,74,85-86,96-97.This expands the control of the cohort of the already registered 139- case; there is no additional population.

Control limit

150 requested → 143 received → 4 removed → 139 cases: 49 flex jobs, 53 resource courses, 37 second rates. Decisions 1.9.-1.12.2013 from 10 major municipalities. All appeals and forwarded to AS have been omitted; modified remonstration without forwarding included. PDF81-83,98-100.

107 correct/21 would be amended-remitted for reconsideration/11 not assessable state the main measurement.Formalities such as hearing the parties and appeal guidance are outside the focus; AS did not obtain missing decisions. 11 of 26 assessable cases concerning other intervention lack an actual decision; AS assumes that the team recommendation was followed. 22/37 were not examined for sufficiency of the factual basis.Six partly followed resource-programme recommendations and two other interventions are regarded as valid on the separate question of resubmission, which had not been resolved as a matter of principle. 13 deficient intervention components expressly do not automatically entail an invalid award.PDF58,66-69,79,83.

Submitted COPIES were to be shredded after completion; this is not evidence of deletion of the municipalities' case records.PDF99.

Number recording

The number and print percentages are kept each for sight- is an empty original cell; 0 is a printed zero. Tables / figures must not be added up as new cases. Figure percentages do not give exact integer figures.

1.1: The effort part of the management of the resource

REH14F, PDF13, printed 10; mention 53.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	27	51
To some extent	13	25
Very small	4	8
No	9	17
Total	53	100

3.1: Flex job: total accuracy

REH14F, PDF27, printed 24; mentions 49.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Correct	33	67
Would be amended/remitted for reconsideration as an appeal case	16	33
Not applicable	0	0
Total	49	100

3.2: Flekjob: overlapping error categories

REH14F, PDF28, printed 25; mention 49.

Category	Number; non-additive
Material assessment	16

Category	Number; non-additive
Information	15
Preparatory plan	3
Medical assessment	4
Team Statement	9

3.3: Flex jobs: information base

REH14F, PDF29, printed 26; mentions 49.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
No missing	27	56
Minor deficiencies	7	14
Essential deficiencies	7	14
Decisive deficiencies	8	17
Not applicable	0	0
Total	49	100

3.4: Flex jobs: material assessment

REH14F, PDF32, printed 29; mentions 49.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	28	57
To some extent	5	10
Very small	13	27
No	3	6
Not applicable	0	0
Total	49	100

3.5: Flex jobs: preparatory plan

REH14F, PDF37, printed 34; mentions 49.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	36	74
To some extent	10	20
Very small	3	6
No	0	0
Total	49	100

3.6: Flex jobs: plan content

REH14F, PDF37, printed 34; mentions 49.

Point	Yes number	Yes%	No number	No%	Total	Total%
CV	45	92	4	8	49	100
Personal resources	47	96	2	4	49	100
Barriers	49	100	0	0	49	100
Request	49	100	0	0	49	100
Health	48	98	1	2	49	100
The importance of health	48	98	1	2	49	100
Absence History	47	96	2	4	49	100
Current offers	42	86	7	14	49	100

3.7: Flekjob: assessment by medical practitioners

REH14F, PDF40, printed 37; mentions 49.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	37	76
To some extent	8	16
Very small	2	4
No	2	4
Total	49	100

3.8: Flex job: content of medical assessment

ReH14F, PDF41, printed 38; mentions 49.

Point	Yes number	Yes%	No number	No%	Total	Total%
Relevant health conditions	46	94	3	6	49	100
Specific considerations	45	92	4	8	49	100
Citizens' perspective	44	90	5	10	49	100
Other factors	46	94	3	6	49	100

3.9: Flekjob: team justification

REH14F, PDF43, printed 40; mentions 49.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	32	66
To some extent	8	16
Very small	7	14

Category	Number	Printed percentage
No	2	4
Total	49	100

3.10: Flex jobs: elements of the setting

REH14F, PDF43, printed 40; mentions 49.

Point	Yes number	Yes%	No number	No%	Total	Total%
Settlement / non-ordinary terms	40	82	9	18	49	100
Work function / special considerations	42	86	7	14	49	100

3.11: Flekjob: representation

REH14F, PDF45, printed 42; mentions 49.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	0	0
No	0	0
Not applicable	49	100
Total	49	100

4.1: Resource cycle: total accuracy

REH14F, PDF46, printed 43; mention 53.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Correct	50	94
Would be amended/remitted for reconsideration as an appeal case	3	6
Not applicable	0	0
Total	53	100

4.2: Progress of resources: information base

REH14F, PDF46, printed 43; mention 53.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
No missing	36	68
Minor deficiencies	16	30
Essential deficiencies	1	2
Decisive deficiencies	0	0
Not applicable	0	0
Total	53	100

4.3: Resource cycle: material assessment

REH14F, PDF48, printed 45; mention 53.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	34	64
To some extent	17	32
Very small	1	2
No	1	2
Not applicable	0	0
Total	53	100

4.4: Progress of resources: preparatory plan

REH14F, PDF54, printed 51; mention 53.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	42	79
To some extent	10	19
Very small	1	2
No	0	0
Total	53	100

4.5: Progress of resources: medical evaluation

REH14F, PDF55, printed 52; mention 53.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	46	87
To some extent	5	9
Very small	2	4
No	0	0
Total	53	100

4.6: Progress of resources: content of the medical assessment

REH14F, PDF56, printed 53; mention 53.

Point	Yes number	Yes%	No number	No%	Total	Total%
Health	53	100	0	0	53	100
Specific considerations	51	96	2	4	53	100
Citizens' perspective	50	94	3	6	53	100
Other factors	51	96	2	4	53	100

4.7: Resource trajectory: effort part, repeated table version

REH14F, PDF57, printed 54; mention 53.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	27	51
To some extent	13	25
Very small	4	7
No	9	17
Total	53	100

4.8: Resource trajectory: the elements of the bet part

REH14F, PDF58, printed 55; mentions 53.

Point	Yes number	Yes%	No number	No%	Total	Total%
Objectives	42	79	11	21	53	100
Sub-objectives	39	74	14	26	53	100
Partial justification	37	70	16	30	53	100
Specific offers	40	75	13	25	53	100
Short-term objectives	39	74	14	26	53	100
At least six months	39	74	14	26	53	100
Follow-up / mentor	40	75	13	25	53	100
six months follow-up	37	70	16	30	53	100

4.9: Resource cycle: Team justification

REH14F, PDF64, printed 61; mention 53.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	44	83
To some extent	5	9
Very small	3	6
No	1	2
Total	53	100

4.10: Resource cycle: team setting, specifically mentioning 51

REH14F, PDF64, printed 61; mention 51.

Point	Yes number	Yes%	No number	No%	Total	Total%
General objectives	47	92	4	8	51	100

Point	Yes number	Yes%	No number	No%	Total	Total%
Inserts	48	94	3	6	51	100
Follow-up / mentor	48	94	3	6	51	100

4.11: Progress of resources: representation

REH14F, PDF65, printed 62; mention 53.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	0	0
No	2	4
Not applicable	51	96
Total	53	100

5.1: Other actions: total accuracy

REH14F, PDF67, printed 64; mention 37.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Correct	24	65
Would be amended/remitted for reconsideration as an appeal case	2	5
Not applicable	11	30
Total	37	100

5.2: Other activities: information base

REH14F, PDF70, printed 67; mentions 37.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
No missing	12	32
Minor deficiencies	2	5
Essential deficiencies	1	3
Decisive deficiencies	0	0
Not applicable	22	60
Total	37	100

5.3: Other activities: material assessment

REH14F, PDF72, printed 69; mention 37.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	23	62
To some extent	1	3
Very small	1	3

Category	Number	Printed percentage
No	1	3
Not applicable	11	30
Total	37	100

5.4: Second effort: preparatory plan; original sum conflict

REH14F, PDF74, printed 71; cited 37.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	24	65
To some extent	15	35
Very small	0	0
No	0	0
Total	37	100

5.5: Second effort: medical assessment, includes exempted pension applications

REH14F, PDF75, printed 72; mentions 37.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	34	92
To some extent	2	5
Very small	0	0
No	1	3
Total	37	100

5.6: Other actions: Team Statement

REH14F, PDF77, printed 74; mentions 37.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Very much	16	43
To some extent	7	19
Very small	3	8
No	11	30
Total	37	100

5.7: Other actions: elements of the setup

REH14F, PDF77, printed 74; mentions 37.

Point	Yes number	Yes%	No number	No%	Total	Total%
Inserts	24	65	13	35	37	100

Point	Yes number	Yes%	No number	No%	Total	Total%
Mentor / aids	19	51	18	49	37	100

5.8: Other activities: representation

REH14F, PDF78, printed 75; mention 37.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	0	0
No	0	0
Not applicable	37	100
Total	37	100

B4.1: Total municipalities' decisions

ReH14F, PDF96, printed 93; mentions 139.

Municipality	Correct	Would be amended/remitted for reconsideration	Not applicable	Total
Copenhagen	10	2	1	13
Hvidover	11	2	1	14
Lolland	8	6	1	15
Assens	13	1	-	14
Odense	9	1	-	10
Sønderborg	15	0	-	15
Esbjerg	12	2	1	15
Ringkøbing-Skjern	10	3	2	15
Aarhus	11	2	1	14
Aalborg	8	2	4	14
Total	107	21	11	139

B4.2: Local authorities' information base

ReH14F, PDF97, printed 94; mentions 139.

Municipality	No missing	Less deficiencies	Essential deficiencies	Decisive deficiencies	Not applicable	Total
Copenhagen	9	2	-	1	1	13
Hvidover	9	2	2	-	1	14
Lolland	7	1	2	1	4	15
Assens	7	4	-	1	2	14
Odense	7	2	1	-	-	10
Sønderborg	12	2	-	-	1	15

Municipality	No missing	Less deficiencies	Essential deficiencies	Decisive deficiencies	Not applicable	Total
Esbjerg	6	4	2	-	3	15
Ringkøbing-Skjern	2	5	1	2	5	15
Aarhus	10	1	1	1	1	14
Aalborg	6	2	-	2	4	14
Total	75	25	9	8	22	139

F1.1: Overall accuracy, figure percentages

REH14F, PDF7, printed 4; denominator [49, 53, 37, 139].

Group	Correct%	Error%	Not applicable%
Flex jobs	67	33	0
Resource cycle	94	6	0
Other efforts	65	5	30
Total	77	15	8

F1.2: Information base, figure percentages

REH14F, PDF8, printed 5; denominator [49, 53, 37, 139].

Group	No%	Less%	Significant%	Decisive%	Irrelevant%
Flex jobs	56	14	14	16	0
Resource cycle	68	30	2	0	0
Other efforts	32	5	3	0	60
Total	54	18	6	6	16

F1.3: Preparatory plan, figure percentages

REH14F, PDF9, printed 6; denominator [49, 53, 37, 139].

Group	High%	Some%	Low%
Flex jobs	74	20	6
Resource cycle	79	19	2
Other efforts	65	35	0
Total	73	24	3

F1.4: Medical assessment, figure percentages

REH14F, PDF11, printed 8; denominator [49, 53, 37, 139].

Group	High%	Some%	Low%	No%
Flex jobs	76	16	4	4

Group	High%	Some%	Low%	No%
Resource cycle	87	9	4	0
Other efforts	92	5	0	3
Total	84	11	3	2

F1.5: Team motivation, figure percentages

REH14F, PDF12, printed 9; denominator [49, 53, 37, 139].

Group	High%	Some%	Low%	No%
Flex jobs	66	16	14	4
Resource cycle	83	9	6	2
Other efforts	43	19	8	30
Total	66	14	10	10

BF2: Age by type of case, figure percentage

REH14F, PDF85, printed 82; denominator [49, 53, 37, 139].

Group	Less than 30%	30-39 %	40-49 %	50-59 %	60+ %
Flex jobs	4	27	22	43	4
Resource cycle	19	21	21	34	6
Other efforts	4	27	22	43	4
Total	9	22	27	36	6

BF3: Sex by type of case, figure percentages

REH14F, PDF86, printed 83; denominator [49, 53, 37, 139].

Group	Male%	Women%
Flex jobs	51	49
Resource cycle	28	72
Other efforts	38	62
Total	39	61

Methodology and population

Field	Original numerals and locator
Selection	150; 143; 4; 139; PDF82; 10 municipalities, 50 desired by each type; substitution between types
Demography	54; 85; 139; PDF84; Women 85 / 139 = 61,15%, prosa 60%
Assessment coverage	107; 21; 11; 139; PDF96; 20 materially wrong and 1 only formally wrong, PDF7
Adding	9; 5; 10; PDF83; 9 municipalities were lacking acts; 5 provided nothing; no case-N for acts
Action part	40; 13; 53; PDF12-13 / 57; 13 low / none, not automatic main failure
Non-disclosure	22; 37; PDF69; 11 without effective decision + 11 action
Settlement assumption	11; 26; 37; PDF67-69; 11 of 26 evaluable without actual decision
Partly followed settings	6; 53; 2; 37; PDF66 / 79; 6 resource + 2 second rate, not total

Original deviations

Block	Locator	Deviation
5.4	PDF74 visual	24 + 15 = 39, printed total 37; 65% + 35% = 100%; retain all original cells
1.1/4.7	PDF13 / 57	The same 4 cases are 8% early / 7% later; 4 / 53 = 7,55%
3.3 / F1.2	PDF29 / 8	Decision 8 / 49 printed 17% in Table / 16% in Figure; no missing 27 / 49 printed 56%
3.9	PDF43	32 / 49 = 65,31%; printed 66%
4.10	PDF64	N51 versus 53 resource cases; the reduction must not be harmonized away
BF1 / BF3	PDF84 / 86	85 women / 139 = 61,15%; prosa 60% opposite figure 61%
Rule version	PDF98-112 / 88-95	Decisions 2013 and measurement form 1418 / 2012; production / reprint 814 / 2014; not redating the case rules
Partial follow-up	PDF71 / 79	Case 13: amendment/remittal for reconsideration due to the factual basis; subsequent statements of validity concern the separate question of resubmission

Case code chains

18 single example codes; several locators by the same code are the same case. Family members have no common staff key or independent misunion.

Code	PDF	Age / gender	Time	Documented item
77	29-31	39 / M	2010→2013	Expected MRI result missing at team meeting 3.10.2013
8	31	52 / M		External work clarification missing
93	32-34,41,44	33 / K		25 hours considered inadequately reduced; repeat same code
90	34-35	50 / K	2010→2013	Physician warns about worsening at work
78	38-39	36 / K		Three children; one with Down; unclear clarification and treatment
91	39	55 / M		Practice nine hours alone citizens' statements

Code	PDF	Age / gender	Time	Documented item
73	47,53,56	29 / M	three-year programme	Medical certificate without consultation; mentoir / accommodation in the setting
85	50	28 / K	one-year programme	Treatment and development limited to validity
104	50-51	21 / M	five-year programme	Low cognitive level; planned support not documented
20	51-53	52 / K	25.1.2013→28.1.-22.3 .2013	Disrupted and new work tests despite exhausted medical treatments
4	56-57	41 / K		Deficient certificate assessed against other information
64	59-60	42 / K	18-year-old dependants,	No concrete action part; future meeting 29.1.2014
61	60-61	38 / K	2011/2012	Disrupted training courses; imprecise targets
100	61-62	52 / K	26.1.2012-30.6.2013	Four-six hours / week; unlasting effort and mentor
13	70-71,79	47 / M	2000-2005/2007	History of torture; neuropsychological assessment recommended but not followed up; disability-pension decision NOT examined
140	72-73	43 / K		Mother to three children, two under 18; illegal requirement for exhausted treatment in resource management
98	75-76	38 / K	March 2008 on sick leave	LES265 missing; action taken; actual implementation not disclosed
112	79	53 / K	New Team Assessment after 3 months of planning	Practice and conversations initiated; mentor not documented

Independent analysis and necessary legal consequences

The headline figure cannot be used as complete certification of lawful processes for individuals. It excludes review of particular safeguards and accepts some deficiencies without counting them in the main error. This reduces the statistics' scope; it does not remove the documented deficiency. For a specific demand, the original decision, the significance of the safeguard error, the intervention carried out and the actual subsequent correction must be connected. A missing decision requires a decision and access to effective review; a hypothetical remittal does not document that it actually happened.

Documentation residue

No identified unread original pages in this 112 page's version.139 full directories, dedup against other years, actually subsequent correction / replacement and raw data backgraph without cells require separate material.

Demens 2015: full tables and concrete action programmes

Controlled 7.10.2026. The entire 183-page original is read in RAM; 26 original pages are also visually controlled. The 87 reading tables contain 461 recorded rows, including repetitions and the own section of the summary. The numbers of the tables are different measurements of the same sample and must not be added to persons.

Original: Anchors' Demense Survey 2015. SHA256 59334a225ac2dd69386cc718cee0734db7383d0faab1efbf2841a3c2833e87b2. PDF page is physical page; the printed header page is usually PDF page minus 3. No original PDF, full text or image is stored locally.

Documented result and citizen consistency

The Appeals Board assesses 30 of 57 cases as incorrect. This is a hypothetical appeal assessment, not 30 actual overturnings. The specific documentation includes locking a person in for 10 minutes, use of a restraint belt without documented necessity, forced injections and 11 insertions of a nasogastric tube over a couple of months. Each of two three-case groups concerns the same citizen; 57 cases therefore cannot be described as 57 unique people. The explicit links give an upper limit of 53, not a verified exact population.

The strongest documented criticism is that interventions against people with a weakened ability to complain themselves were not sufficiently justified, individually tested or followed up. The report's correct municipal judgment could be precisely the denial of illegal power. It must not be rewritten as meaning that all actions in the 27 properly assessed cases were lawful.

Limitation and evidence chain

Search	Control and delimitation	The original locator
Sample	112 requested in 14 municipalities; 106 received; 49 left; 57 cases measured from 13 municipalities. Frederiksberg's cases dropped everyone. The most common dispositions were § 125 and § 126 a.	PDF116-119
Exclusion of complaints	Cases already appealed are forwarded to the Ankestyrelsen should be excluded. Local authorities changed cases after re-assessment, which were not forwarded, could be included.	PDF116 / 149
Time-out	Recent decisions before 31 December 2014, then backwards; about 2 of each of four types. Transmission deadline 3 March 2015.	PDF116 / 148-149
Passenger coupling	101 / 102 / 103 is one citizen; 82 / 83 / 84 is another. Therefore, a maximum of 53 unique persons among 57 cases before any additional clutches. The report does not publish a full list of persons.	PDF80 / 84 / 88
Survey	86 out of 98 municipalities answer in whole or in part; 81 examine the whole scheme, but not all questions. Five partial answers: Haderslev, Læsø, Hallsnæs, Hjørring and Køge. Questions have their own denominators.	PDF120-121
Missing survey	12 Unanswered: Dragør, Gribskov, Rudersdal, Lemvig, Syddjurs, Horsens, Billund, Jammerbugt, Morsø, Mariagerfjord, Ishøj, and Brønderslev.	PDF120
Validation	Only selected very high / low reporting figures were requested. Other figures and totals were not systematically validated. Qualified estimates were allowed.	PDF121 / 174 / 182-183
Annual denominators	All years of response and the committee with replies for all three years are different statements. Each type of action has its own municipal congress. The total row is the separately lit total of municipalities and is not to be replaced by the row number.	PDF42-46 / 144-147
Legal scope	The assessment covers § 126,§ 127,§ 128 and interventions outside the Social Services Act. Reports of already approved § 127/128 interventions have not been individually assessed; approval cases are included. § 125/129 are examined through a survey,§ 126 a at an overall level.	PDF4-6 / 64 / 119
Full basis	Ankestyrelsen assumes that all relevant acts have been received. The letter says that missing documents are not normally requested and copies are shredded after reporting. This does not prove completeness.	PDF119 / 148-149
Time of registration	Frequently read on the date of the reporting form. A previous note could not be excluded but was not visible. It is a documented measurement restriction, not a general presumption of timely registration.	PDF103
Actual duration	Time in a harness and the residential facilities' more detailed supervisory frameworks could not be measured. Four detention permits were time-limited, but ongoing examination of less intrusive measures was not documented. A harness was permitted for 3 months.	PDF90-91 / 96-98
Repeals	18 cases had repeated interventions; 37 had unknown history. Only 1 of 18 documents follow-up; 5 none and 12 unknown. These aren't 18 unique people.	PDF77-79
Redress	Blank measurement form has dates for intervention, registration, reporting, municipal assessment, application and decision. No complete public data sector for actual cessation, relocation, compensation or individual liability is found in the original.	PDF152-166
Policy follow-up	Municipal council consideration under § 79 a of the Act on Legal Protection and Administration in Social Matters and feedback in quarter 3 of 2015 are stated. This does not document actual reopening or cessation of the individual interventions.	PDF115 / 150
Self-reporting	The municipality's description of the agreement or its own guidelines is not verified citizen / oncoming responses or documented actual compliance. One 'each time' reply itself states that the frequency of use of the permit may not necessarily be disclosed.	PDF61-63
Schemes	Annexes 7 and 8 are blank instruments. Cross-boxes are not citizens. Question 10 (a) repeats the task of decision; 32 has 129 but not 128, while the results tables have 128 and not 129.	PDF152-183
Praxis Minutes	27 summaries of precedent decisions are kept separate. They are not 27 new 2015 cases or an individual register checked against complete records; material before 2006 is not included in the period's case count.	PDF133-143

Search	Control and delimitation	The original locator
Statistical range	The original denotes the trial as not statistically significant. There is no scaling-up for all dementia citizens, alerts or employees.	PDF119

All published tables and figures

Printed percentages and total amounts shall be retained even when the original is contradictory. Categories may overlap, and their own denominators are at each table. § 126 is acute retention; § 127 retention / return; § 128 drug harness; § 129 movement without consent. 'Not authorised' does not necessarily mean illegal: emergency intervention may lack prior authorisation and still fulfil its own conditions.

Summary municipalities: local authorities' self-enlightened practice

PDF7; printed page 4. Denominator/scope: PDF7-9; multiple responses, different question denominators; not people/interventions.

Measurement	Yes n	Denomination
Guideline power	82	84
Decision-making powers	84	84
Guidelines for supervision of fabric restraint belts	30	81
Registered	84	84
Registration competence	83	84
Annual report to the political level	68	86
Important individual cases at political level	20	86
Demen Coordinator	82	83
Coordinator advice	76	81
Coordinator decisions	36	81
Coordinator report	34	81
Coordinator Registration	33	81
Training / competence	62	81
Infra material	31	81
Annual discussion at a staff meeting	28	81
Preferential involvement	75	81
Relatives' agreement: the municipality's statement	74	80

Summary sample: The summary's own repeated cut

PDF7; printed page 4. Denominator/scope: PDF7/9-10; repeats the same 57-case selection, subdenominators; the summary’s 30 against T9.8’s 31.

Cut	Figures	Denomination
Information sufficient%	62	57
Insufficient information%	39	57
Identification of alternatives	Two thirds	54

Cut	Figures	Denomination
Educational alternatives	30	54
Relatives' comments adequate	16	23
Reason high / some degree	21	24
Reason number	3	24

T3.1: Guidelines on Power

PDF18; printed page 15. Denominator/scope: 84 municipalities.

Response	n	%
Yes	82	98
No	2	2
Total	84	100

T3.2: Absence of guidelines

PDF19; printed page 16. Denominator/scope: 2 no iT3.1.

Response	n	%
Non-needs, employees oriented	1	50
Under-preparation	0	0
Planned preparation	1	50
Total	2	100

T3.3: Guidelines on decision-making competence

PDF19; printed page 16. Denominator/scope: 84 municipalities.

Response	n	%
Written	77	92
Unwritten	7	8
No	0	0
Total	84	100

F3.1: who decides

PDF20; printed page 17. Denominator/scope: 84 municipalities / multiple responses.

Actor	%
Others	58
Demen consultant / coordinator	53
Nearest Leader	29
Action Officer	22

Actor	%
Vedikke	1

T3.4: Written protective clothing monitoring

PDF21; printed page 18. Denominator/scope: 81.

Response	n	%
Yes	30	37
No	44	54
Vedikke	7	9
Total	81	100

T3.5: No monitoring guideline

PDF22; printed page 19. Names / delimits: 35 of 44 no, niomedsvar; bread text 44% opposite 43%.

Response	n	%
Knowledge practice	15	43
Under-preparation	5	14
Planned	15	43
Total	35	100

T3.6: Control of belt surveillance

PDF22; printed page 19. Denominator/scope: 76.

Response	n	%
Yes	17	22
No	46	61
Vedikke	13	17
Total	76	100

T3.7: Guidelines for alternatives

PDF23; printed page 20. Denominator/scope: 84.

Response	n	%
Written	43	51
Unwritten	28	33
No	13	15
Total	84	100

T3.8: No alternative guideline

PDF23; printed page 20. Denominator/scope: 11 of 13 no.

Response	n	%
Employees informed	9	82
Under-preparation	0	0
Planned	2	18
Total	11	100

T3.9: Typing alternatives

PDF24; printed page 21. Denominator/scope: 81 municipalities, multiple answers.

Response	n	%
Social education	80	99
Ambient device	68	84
Other	20	25
Vedikke	0	0
Total	81	100

F3.2: Power restraint

PDF25; printed page 22. Denominator/scope: The municipality's survey assessment; no number of refusals / persons.

Type	High%	Some%	Low%	Delete%	Unknown%	Municipalities
128	34	42	13	10	1	77
127	56	18	16	10	0	76
126 a	31	42	18	9	0	78
126	41	31	18	9	1	79
129(3)	42	26	8	8	16	77
129(2)	38	27	16	10	9	77
125(3)	14	32	27	24	3	77
125(1)	13	20	34	32	1	78
125(2)	5	9	31	55	0	77

T4.1: Registration competence

PDF28; printed page 25. Denominator/scope: 84.

Response	n	%
Written	78	93
Unwritten	5	6
No	1	1

Response	n	%
Total	84	100

F4.1: registrant

PDF29; printed page 26. Denominator/scope: 82 of 83 municipalities.

Actor	%
Action Officer	39
Head	23
Demen Coordinator	20
Others	18

T4.2: Reporting competence

PDF30; printed page 27. Names / delimits: 83; printed 6 / 83 = 6% and collected 98% unrounded 100.

Response	n	%
Written	75	90
Unwritten	6	6
No	2	2
Total	83	100

F4.2: Reporting actor

PDF31; printed page 28. Denominator/scope: 79 of 81 municipalities.

Actor	%
Head	67
Action Officer	19
Demen Coordinator	10
Others	4

F4.3: Policy orientation

PDF32; printed page 29. Denominator/scope: 86 municipalities, multiple responses.

Orientation	%
Annual statement	79
Key cases	23
Fixed time	12
Other	7
Vedikke	2

T4.3: Centre of Care in Policy Review

PDF33; printed page 30. Denominator/scope: 84.

Response	n	%
Yes	49	58
No	35	42
Total	84	100

T4.4: General follow-up procedure

PDF34; printed page 31. Denominator/scope: 83.

Response	n	%
Yes	38	46
No	39	47
Vedikke	6	7
Total	83	100

T4.5: Follow-up content

PDF34; printed page 31. Denominator/scope: 31 of 38 yes.

Response	n	%
Communication to care homes	29	94
Development of competence	2	6
Other	0	0
Total	31	100

T4.6: Annual comparison

PDF36; printed page 33. Denominator/scope: 82.

Response	n	%
Yes	65	79
No	17	21
Total	82	100

T4.7: Follow-up to changing intervention number

PDF36; printed page 33. Denominator/scope: 65 yes iT4.6.

Response	n	%
Yes	25	38
No	40	62
Total	65	100

T4.8: Content of follow-up when the number changes

PDF37; printed page 34. Denominator/scope: 25 municipalities, multiple answers.

Response	n	%
Education	18	72
Care home follow-up	21	84
Suitable rules	9	36
Other	6	24
Total	25	100

T4.9: Alerts 2014

PDF42; printed page 39. Denominator/scope: varies between 55-66 municipalities; total 60 is municipalities' own reported figure, not the sum of rows.

Type	2014 alerts	Municipalities
125 alarms / door openers	455	62
126 retention	529	65
126 hygiene	1380	66
127 detention	61	59
128 fabric harness	328	60
129 movement 2 / 3	147	58
Outside SEL	53	55
Enjoying total	2398	60

T4.10: REPORTS ALL 3 YEARS

PDF43; printed page 40. Cists / delimits: Kunkommunerne med alle 3 åransretning; type-dependent 48-56, total self-information 53 not sum.

Type	2012	2013	2014	Municipalities
125 alarms / door openers	267	366	448	52
126 retention	529	387	481	56
126 hygiene	1263	1161	1063	56
127 detention	36	39	56	51
128 fabric harness	202	122	235	52
129 movement 2 / 3	152	131	140	51
Outside SEL	37	47	48	48
Enjoying total	2000	1509	1233	53

T4.11: Eligible Action 2014

PDF43; printed page 40. Denominator/scope: 52-61 municipalities, total 60 not total.

Type	2014 approved	Municipalities
125 alarms / door openers	308	56
126 hygiene	821	61
127 detention	16	52
128 fabric harness	318	53
129 movement 2 / 3	122	54
Enjoying total	1357	60

T4.12: Approved all 3 years

PDF44; printed page 41. Denominator/scope: 45-50 types, total 53 municipalities. Original note / text of bread 45-51. The same 3 year type, not necessaryT4.10 same municipalities.

Type	2012	2013	2014	Municipalities
125 alarms / door openers	158	241	302	48
126 hygiene	1340	918	608	50
127 detention	36	13	14	46
128 fabric harness	201	123	227	45
129 movement 2 / 3	107	99	105	45
Enjoying total	2406	1784	1612	53

T4.13: Unauthorised action 2014

PDF45; printed page 42. Denominator/scope: 42-53 types of municipalities; total 58 own data, not total.

Type	2014	Municipalities
125	22	43
126	114	53
126 a	252	51
127	44	47
128	2	42
Total declared	564	58

T4.14: Unauthorised action three years

PDF46; printed page 43. Names / boundaries: 38-44 type communes, total 49; bread text 48-56 deviates.

Type	2012	2013	2014	Municipalities
125	18	22	21	38
126	122	106	108	44

Type	2012	2013	2014	Municipalities
126 a	242	166	220	41
127	4	15	2	38
128	2	0	2	38
Total declared	489	532	553	49

T5.1: Demen Coordinator

PDF47; printed page 44. Denominator/scope: 83.

Response	n	%
Yes	82	99
No	1	1
Total	83	100

F5.1: Coordinator tasks

PDF48; printed page 45. Denominator/scope: 81, multiple responses.

Task	%
Advice	94
Decisions	44
Annual policy report	42
Registration	41
Other	26
Don’t know	1

F5.2: Development of competence

PDF50; printed page 47. Denominator/scope: 81 multiple responses.

Task	%
New staff training	77
Competence	65
Infra material	38
Annual meeting	35
Other	30

F5.3: Competence activities

PDF51; printed page 48. Denominator/scope: 80 multiple responses.

Activity	%
Coordinator	98

Activity	%
Courses	78
Methods	65
Key Persons	61
Permanent meetings	46
Other	6

T5.2: Nursing centre follow-up

PDF52; printed page 49. Denominator/scope: 81 multiple responses.

Response	n	%
Head	66	81
Education	63	78
Technical discussion	46	57
Coordinator	32	40
Other centres	27	33
Other	10	12
Total	81	100

T5.3: Care home meeting frequency

PDF52; printed page 49. Denominator/scope: 81.

Response	n	%
Annual	15	19
Half-yearly	13	16
More often	5	6
Other	48	59
Total	81	100

T6.1: Decision on 129 (2)

PDF54; printed page 51. Denominator/scope: 82.

Response	n	%
Head	43	52
Employee	3	4
Coordinator	14	17
Others	21	26
Don’t know	1	1
Total	82	100

T6.2: Setting 129 (3)

PDF55; printed page 52. Denominator/scope: 80.

Response	n	%
Head	41	51
Employee	3	4
Coordinator	19	24
Others	15	19
Don’t know	2	3
Total	80	100

T6.3: Development 129 (2)

PDF56; printed page 53. Denominator/scope: 81 municipalities' development assessment, not population figures.

Response	n	%
Rising	11	14
Unchanged	54	67
Falling	8	10
Don’t know	8	10
Total	81	100

T6.4: Development 129 (3)

PDF56; printed page 53. Denominator/scope: 82 development assessments.

Response	n	%
Rising	5	6
Unchanged	63	77
Falling	4	5
Don’t know	10	12
Total	82	100

F6.1: Reason for non-inclusion 129 (2)

PDF57; printed page 54. Denominator/scope: The municipality's survey assessment; no number of refusals / persons.

Type	High%	Some%	Low%	Delete%	Unknown%	Municipalities
Help not documented	2	14	9	34	41	56
Convenience not documented	7	22	9	24	38	58
Guardian not accepted	0	5	16	36	42	55

Type	High%	Some%	Low%	Delete%	Unknown%	Municipalities
Other	9	11	6	19	55	47

F6.2: Reason refusal 129 (3), lack of documentation

PDF58; printed page 55. Denominator/scope: The municipality's survey assessment; no number of refusals / persons.

Type	High%	Some%	Low%	Delete%	Unknown%	Municipalities
Own interest	4	6	10	15	65	48
Relationship to family	4	6	6	19	65	48
Care	6	13	2	15	65	48
Other	4	0	2	20	74	46

T7.1: Early involvement

PDF59; printed page 56. Denominator/scope: Table / body 81 counter-note 80.

Response	n	%
Yes	75	93
No	3	4
Don’t know	3	4
Total	81	100

T7.2: Written instruction

PDF60; printed page 57. Names / delimits: Table / body 81 counter note 80; 46 / 81 printed 58%.

Response	n	%
Yes	46	58
No	35	43
Total	81	100

F7.1: Spring orientation

PDF61; printed page 58. Denomination: 80; never no visible column part / no printed number; zero is derived only from the figure.

Response	%
Each time	78
Sometimes	19
Don’t know	3
Rare	1
Never	No printed numerical value

T7.3: Relatives' agreement, municipality's assessment

PDF62; printed page 59. Denominator/scope: printed cells 81 versus total 80; not relatives' responses.

Response	n	%
Yes	74	91
Neither	4	5
No	1	1
Don't know	2	3
Total	80	100

F7.2: Do relatives want less power

PDF63; printed page 60. Denominator/scope: 79; municipality's assessment.

Response	%
No	63
Low degree	10
Some degree	10
High degree	4
Don't know	14

T8.1: Types of sampled cases

PDF64; printed page 61. Denominator/scope: 57 cases.

Type	n	%
Urgent 126	23	40
Approved 127	4	7
Refusal 127	0	0
Without permission 127	7	12
Approved 128	19	33
Refusal 128	0	0
Without permission 128	0	0
Outside SEL	4	7
Total	57	100

T9.1: Correctness of the decision

PDF65; printed page 62. Denominator/scope: 57, not actual appeal outcomes.

Response	n	%
Correct	27	47
Amended/remitted on hypothetical appeal	30	53

Response	n	%
Total	57	100

T9.2: Rightness after type

PDF66; printed page 63. Denominator/scope: 57; proper local assessment is not necessarily lawful intervention.

Type	Correct	Wrong	n	%
Urgent 126	11	12	23	40
Approved 127	2	2	4	7
Refusal 127	0	0	0	0
Without permission 127	1	6	7	12
Approved 128	9	10	19	33
Refusal 128	0	0	0	0
Without permission 128	0	0	0	0
Outside SEL	4	0	4	7
Total	27	30	57	100

T9.3: Information in wrong cases

PDF67; printed page 64. Denominator/scope: 30 incorrect of 57.

Response	n	%
No missing	5	17
Minor deficiencies	3	10
Essential deficiencies	16	53
Decisive deficiencies	6	20
Total	30	100

T9.4: Further information of the municipality

PDF69; printed page 66. Denominator/scope: 57.

Response	n	%
Yes	16	28
No	24	42
Unknown	17	30
Total	57	100

T9.5: Case information crossed further catch up

PDF70; printed page 67. Mention / delimitation: 57 cases; note 57 municipalities say wrongly.

Deficiency	Yeah.	No.	Unknown	n	%
None	7	7	8	22	39
Less	6	2	5	13	23
More / decisive	2	10	4	16	28
Decisive	1	5	0	6	11
Total	16	24	17	57	100

T9.6: Principles documented

PDF71; printed page 68. Names / delimits: 57; no includes undocumented, not all established actually omitted.

Principle	Yes%	No%	Total%
Care / care / social education	19	81	100
Voluntary participation	14	86	100
Minimum interventions	26	74	100
Gentle / short-lived	21	79	100

T9.7: Specific alternatives proposed

PDF72; printed page 69. Denominator/scope: 57.

Response	n	%
Yes	3	5
No	54	95
Total	57	100

T9.8: Possible alternatives without municipal direction

PDF74; printed page 71. Denominator/scope: 54 without alternatives; summary 30 pedagogy / 36 relevant deviations.

Type	n	%
Care / care	4	7
Education	31	57
Management	3	6
Other	5	9
None	10	19
Unknown	1	2
Total	54	100

T9.9: Power born of insufficient help

PDF76; printed page 73. Denominator/scope: 57.

Grade	n	%
High	0	0
Someone.	4	7
Rings	1	2
No	10	18
Unknown	42	74
Total	57	100

T9.10: First intervention

PDF77; printed page 74. Denominator/scope: 57 cases.

Response	n	%
Yes	2	4
No	18	32
Unknown	37	65
Total	57	100

T9.11: Follow-up to repetitions

PDF78; printed page 75. Denominator/scope: 18 repetitive action cases.

Response	n	%
Yes	1	6
No	5	28
Unknown	12	67
Total	18	100

T9.12: Possible action on repetitions

PDF79; printed page 76. Denominator/scope: 17 no / unknown follow-up.

Response	n	%
Care	1	6
Education	12	71
Other aid	0	0
Education	0	0
Unknown	3	18
None	0	0
Other	1	6
Total	17	100

T9.13: Action plan prepared

PDF82; printed page 79. Denominator/scope: 57.

Response	n	%
Yes	35	61
No	11	19
Unknown	11	19
Total	57	100

T9.14: Action plan attached

PDF82; printed page 79. Denominator/scope: 35 informed plan.

Response	n	%
Yes	32	91
No	3	9
Unknown	0	0
Total	35	100

T9.15: Preventive action plan

PDF83; printed page 80. Denominator/scope: 32 annexed plans.

Response	n	%
High degree	17	53
Someone.	7	22
Rings	6	19
No	2	6
Total	32	100

T9.16: type of restraint

PDF85; printed page 82. Denominator/scope: 23 emergency cases; unlawful form not all materially unjustified.

Response	n	%
First hand	14	61
Driver's handle	0	0
Guidance	0	0
Illegal	2	9
Other	6	26
Unknown	1	4
Total	23	100

T9.17: The municipality's acute eligibility

PDF86; printed page 83. Denominator/scope: 23.

Response	n	%
Yes	21	91
No	2	9
Total	23	100

T9.18: AST specific emergency conditions

PDF86; printed page 83. Denominator/scope: 23; 14 conditionality deficiencies vs 12 total wrong, two municipal subsidents can be correctly judged.

Response	n	%
Yes	9	39
No	14	61
Total	23	100

T9.19: Specific detention conditions

PDF90; printed page 87. Denominator/scope: 4 clearance cases.

Response	n	%
Yes	2	50
No	2	50
Total	4	100

T9.20: Specific belt conditions

PDF94; printed page 91. Denominator/scope: 19; bread text exchanges yes / no 9 / 10.

Response	n	%
Yes	9	47
No	10	53
Total	19	100

T9.21: Selenium authorisation limited in time

PDF98; printed page 95. Denominator/scope: 19.

Response	n	%
Yes	15	79
No	4	21
Total	19	100

T9.22: Ongoing minor action in the case of a restricted belt

PDF98; printed page 95. Denominator/scope: 15 delimited permits.

Response	n	%
Yes	0	0
No	2	13
Unknown	13	87
Total	15	100

T10.1: Timely registration

PDF103; printed page 100. Notices / delimitation: 34 current interventions; body 26% counter table 27.

Response	n	%
Yes	9	27
No	21	62
Unknown	4	12
Total	34	100

T10.2: Timely reporting

PDF104; printed page 101. Denominator/scope: 34.

Response	n	%
Yes	15	44
No	8	24
Unknown	11	32
Total	34	100

T10.3: Specific Decision 127 / 128

PDF104; printed page 101. Denominator/scope: 23; bread text 91% as against 96.

Response	n	%
Yes	22	96
No	1	4
Total	23	100

T10.4: § 130 formalities

PDF106; printed page 103. Denominator/scope: 23.

Response	n	%
High	8	35
Someone.	8	35

Response	n	%
Rings	6	26
No	1	4
Total	23	100

T10.5: Citizen informed

PDF109; printed page 106. Denominator/scope: 57.

Response	n	%
Yes	25	44
No	2	3
Unknown	30	53
Total	57	100

T10.6: Reasons

PDF111; printed page 108. Mention / delimitation: 57; 33 no written justification, particularly acute; not all illegallack of simultaneous confession.

Response	n	%
High	13	23
Someone.	8	14
Rings	2	4
No	1	2
Unknown	33	58
Total	57	100

T10.7: Complaint guidance

PDF112; printed page 109. Denominator/scope: 57.

Response	n	%
Yes	17	30
No	6	11
Unknown	34	60
Total	57	100

B1T1: Repeated case types of the method

PDF118; printed page 115. Denominator/scope: Repeat 57 cases; not new cohorts.

Type	n	%
Urgent 126	23	40

Type	n	%
Approved 127	4	7
Refusal 127	0	0
Without permission 127	7	12
Approved 128	19	33
Refusal 128	0	0
Without permission 128	0	0
Outside SEL	4	7
Total	57	100

B1T2: Sex cases

PDF118; printed page 115. Denominator/scope: 57 cases, not 57 unique.

Sex	n	%
Male	35	61
Female	22	39
Total	57	100

B2T1: Results of municipal legality

PDF122; printed page 119. Denominator/scope: The same 57; not statistical municipality prevalence.

Municipality	Correct	Wrong	N
Copenhagen	3	3	6
Helsingør	2	1	3
Count	1	1	2
Roskilde	1	3	4
Slaughter	1	2	3
Golden Borgsund	4	0	4
Faaborg-Midtfyn	2	1	3
Svendborg	2	3	5
Haderslev	3	3	6
Vejle	3	1	4
Randers	0	4	4
Ringkøbing-Skjern	2	5	7
Aalborg	3	3	6
Total	27	30	57

B2T2: Local information base

PDF123; printed page 120. Denominator/scope: Same 57.

Municipality	None	Less	Essential	Decisive	N
Copenhagen	4	0	0	2	6
Helsingør	1	2	0	0	3
Count	1	0	1	0	2
Roskilde	1	0	1	2	4
Slaughter	0	1	2	0	3
Golden Borgsund	3	1	0	0	4
Faaborg-Midtfyn	2	0	0	1	3
Svendborg	1	1	2	1	5
Haderslev	0	4	2	0	6
Vejle	3	1	0	0	4
Randers	0	0	4	0	4
Ringkøbing-Skjern	3	1	3	0	7
Aalborg	3	2	1	0	6
Total	22	13	16	6	57

B5T1: Reported 2012

PDF144; printed page 141. Denominator/scope: 52-61 type municipalities, total 56; total self-information not sum; all annual replies vs 3 annual committees.

Type	Number	Municipalities
125	272	56
126	564	58
126 a	1344	61
127	36	52
128	550	58
129	154	53
Outside SEL	46	52
Total declared	2335	56

B5T2: Reported 2013

PDF145; printed page 142. Names / delimits: 55-66, total 60; total self-information not sum; all annual replies vs 3 annual committees.

Type	Number	Municipalities
125	369	57

Type	Number	Municipalities
126	457	64
126 a	1376	66
127	49	56
128	389	60
129	137	56
Outside SEL	66	55
Total declared	2073	60

B5T3: Approved 2012

PDF145; printed page 142. Names / delimits: 47-56, total 55; total self-information not sum; all annual replies vs 3 annual committees.

Type	Number	Municipalities
125	163	51
126 a	1393	56
127	36	47
128	220	51
129	110	48
Total declared	2045	55

B5T4: Approved 2013

PDF146; printed page 143. Denominator/scope: 49-62, total 58; total self-information not total; all annual replies vs 3 annual committees.

Type	Number	Municipalities
125	245	53
126 a	1051	62
127	13	49
128	138	52
129	109	51
Total declared	1591	58

B5T5: Not approved 2012

PDF146; printed page 143. Names / delimits: 39-46, total 51; total self-information not total; all annual replies vs 3 annual committees.

Type	Number	Municipalities
125	20	40
126	132	46

Type	Number	Municipalities
126 a	273	45
127	4	39
128	2	39
Total declared	521	51

B5T6: Not approved 2013

PDF147; printed page 144. Denominator/scope: 42-50, total 53; total self-information not sum; all annual replies vs 3 annual committees.

Type	Number	Municipalities
125	25	43
126	127	50
126 a	199	49
127	25	43
128	1	42
Total declared	568	53

Concrete procedures and identity couplings

The following are their own brief summaries of the original case summaries. The underlying individual acts have not been published in the report. Source statements about behaviour and injury causes attributed to the report and are not an independent full-scale test.

Local case ID	PDF Page	Progress and follow
79	68	Two employees maintain arms after entering the residence of the other residents. The AST considers risk, absolute necessity, cooperative experiments and processes undocumented.
62	68	Refresh wheelchair: concrete material damage, fall rate / injury and alternatives not documented.
52	71/72	Lifting by force after falling without immediate medical needs; the municipality overlooks due to lack of personal injury risk and volunteering; offers education.
24	73	Sele approved simultaneous proposal comfort chair; AST finds testing should be before permission.
30	73/96	Night-time restlessness: restraint belt with alternative calming suggestions, but alternatives should have been clarified before approval. Permission for 3 months at night, round-the-clock attendance; the alleged countless falls are not found in extensive medical records, AST finds that the conditions are not documented.
48	74/91/92	Infectious unclean citizen, permit power; concrete more frequent supervision before meals alternative. AST finds the wrong Article 127 legal basis: internal transfer does not exit the settlement.
86	75	Two employees lead woman from the city to residence; the municipality simply signed, no separate assessment; AST points to diversion / accompanied walk.
47	76	Door-seeker without ID / light dress by traffic-driven road; GPS / alarms inadequate, need more suitable dementia section; no public actual moving date.
51	78	11 nasogastric tube insertions against the person's will within a couple of months. The municipality finds no legal authority under SEL and provides advice/training. No documented cessation date or redress.

Local case ID	PDF Page	Progress and follow
33	79/80	Maintenance and soothing injection, reported with 6 other interventions within 1 month. Citizen dies later; AST also requires evaluation afterwards; the report does not prove cause of death.
101/102/103	80/87/88	Three cases the same citizen, repeated retention / driver's own residence, inadequate municipal follow-up.
82/83/84	84/87/88	Three cases the same citizen goes to former homes; the action plan describes daily rhythm / escorts and demealing.
64	88/89	Described with broomstick impact on wheelchair user after pending action; AST finds acute risk / necessity.
91	89	Described as the rusk / turn / push against wall; short retention after conversation, AST approves.
96	89	Self-injury head against wall / floor with wound; retention after pending guidance, voluntary hospitalization follows; AST approves.
28	93/94	Door locked 10 minutes after return. The municipality accepts Section 127; AST finds illegal detention without a SEL legal basis.
42	97	Selenium after proven repeated falls and tested alternatives; AST finds concrete permission correct.
57	99	Soil / plant removed by force from the mouth, AST accedes exceptionally distressed against asphyxiation / poisoning.
32	99/100	Held in bed and injected after door search. The municipality / AST finds outside SEL; acute life-threatening exception not documented in two of three health cases.

Principles contained in Annex 4

The minutes are not a new case committee. Age, number and time data are kept outside the 2015cohort; original single acts and any actual movement / return cannot be derived from this.

Principle ID	PDF Page	Legal result of the report	Number / time of record
C-10-02	133	Approval alert / detention	Age 28;2 exits through windows;2 visits by strangers; staffing coverage throughout the day and night
C-35-00	133	Signature alert / restraining order	Age 43;8 months, application, versus the measure's 1-2 weeks; absence in hours
C-14-08	134	Internal screen 126 not 127	No separate N
C-59-05	134	Locking not under SEL; delimitation of jurisdiction	No separate N
57-10	134	Selenium approved underbreak healing / rehabilitation	47 years
C-36-00	134	Selenium overruled both cases	2 cases
6-15	135	Guardian cannot replace citizen consent to new accommodation	SEL107 also temporarily
65-14	135	Specific vacancy required	1 example of a rare diagnosis
53-13	136	Relocation/free choice also on institutional closure	no separate N
20-11	136	Movements to wife / family approved	1 brain injury
19-11	137	Moving closer mother denied without documentedeffect	1 young woman
C-20-07	137	Relief → permanent at the same address requires rules	1 woman

Principle ID	PDF Page	Legal result of the report	Number / time of record
C-5-06	137	Not opposed, guardian agree, municipality competent	1 woman
C-10-05	137	Admission accepted	Age 90; round-the-clock care
C-45-04	138	Uncertainty is not grounds for a different jurisdictional track	1 woman
C-42-04	138	Admission accepted	81 years; at least 2 non-eligible
C-36-04	138	Admission denied, alternative help not clarified	36 years
C-12-04	139	Admission accepted	76 years
C-28-02	139	Relocation set aside, physical space problems do not constitute sufficient risk	1 woman Down / dementia
C-1-02	140	Department move set aside	1 woman
C-49-01	140	Admission set aside, plus missing guardianship safeguard	82 years
C-26-01	141	Councillor → municipal rules	1 person
C-29-01	141	Sheltered→ordinary in the same nursing home; rules required	1 person
C-34-00	141	Recording accepted	Age 66; care throughout the day and night
C-33-00	142	Recording accepted	43 years
C-26-00	142	Recording Unrecognized	64 years; 3 episodes 1996 / 2000
C-21-00	143	Recording Unrecognized	77 years; schizophrenia 1950; 6 entries from the 1980s / barely 20 years old

Source deviations retained

Locator	Deviation
PDF21-22	15 / 35 printed 43% against bread 44%.
PDF30T4.2	Unwritten 6 / 83 printed 6%; percentages 90 + 6 + 2 = 98.
PDF43T4.10	Total 2000 → 1509 → 1233 decreases, but summary PDF8 and bread text PDF42 says increase.
PDF43-44T4.10 / 12	Approved total 2406/1784/1612 exceeds reported total 2000/1509/1233;53 municipalities in both, but identities/counts not public. No inference from the difference.
PDF44T4.12	53 municipalities in total, outside the note's range of 45-51; type cells 45-50.
PDF47-48	Annual policy report coordinates 42% in Figure, 44% bread text; summary 34 / 81.
PDF45-46	Non-approved total response 58 / 49 municipalities lie without type ranges; text 48-56 modT4.14 type 38-44.
PDF59-60	T7.1 / 2 total 81 counternote 80; T7.2 yes 46 / 81 printed 58%.
PDF62T7.3	74 + 4 + 1 + 2 = 81 counterprinted total 80; 74 / 80 = 92,5 not 91.
PDF70T9.5	Note 57 municipalities are 57 cases from 13 municipalities.
PDF94T9.20	Bread text says 10 / 53% met, 9 / 47% not; Table T9.2 says vice versa.
PDF102- 104	Timely registration 9/34 printed as 27% against 26% in the main text; specifically 22/23 printed as 96% against 91% in the main text; the main text says the vast majority report on time,44% yes 32% unknown.
PDF172 question 10a	AogC repeats the decision § 125- 128; registration iB, self-form may give overlapping choices.
PDF183 question 32	The model form has 129 but not 128; the result tables have 128 but not 129.
PDF57F6.1	Note 47-56 municipalities, but the appropriateness bar 58.
PDF7 versus 74	Summary educational alternatives 30; T9.8 cell 31. Two thirds is the rounded statement of the summary, not a published exact 36-person number.
PDF147	The original text / table is visibly staggered and overlaps. Numbers 568 / N53 and row cells read in both original text layer and RAM image; the original layout error is not report layout.

Legal liability and necessary follow-up requirements

The conclusion in case 28 is specific: the municipality approved locking a person in under § 127, whereas the original's description gives a locked door for 10 minutes and the Appeals Board finds an intervention without legal authority under the Social Services Act. The significance of the evidence is an actual interference with personal liberty, not merely a deficient document. The historical legal framework in the original is Constitution § 71, Social Services Act §§ 82,124-128 and the delimited rules on the use of force. The staff's action and the municipality's subsequent approval are separate avenues of responsibility. Specific follow-up must require documentation of cessation, a review of similar incidents and consideration of redress; the original does not document that these legal consequences were actually implemented.

Case 30 shows an evidentiary conflict:according to the Appeals Board's review, the extensive record does not support the alleged countless falls, although a night-time restraint belt was permitted for 3 months. A hypothetical amendment in the practice survey does not establish an actual cessation date. Case 51 shows 11 forced feeding-tube insertions, and case 33 repeated interventions followed by a death. The report provides no basis for claiming that the death was caused by the use of force. Failure to prevent and municipal follow-up can be criticised separately without inventing medical causation.

For precise person, duration and responsibility counts, the complete local personal connection is missing, the dates of the beginning / end of each action, the actual reopening of the municipality after the examination, the effectiveness and any disciplinary, criminal or compensation consequences. The shortcomings lie in these concrete links; they do not tone down the documented interventions and errors.

Scope of checks

Pages	Contents	Actual treatment
PDF1-113	Main text, all resulttables and figures	Text read; all 11 shapes visually controlled
PDF114-121	Front page of Annex / method	Text Read
PDF122-123	Two municipal tables	Text and Image
PDF124-132	Historical legal annexes	Text Read
PDF133-143	27 principals	Text read, kept out of new kohorte
PDF144-147	Six annual statistical annex tables	Text and Image
PDF148-151	Call letter	Text Read
PDF152-166	Blank measurement scheme	Text Read
PDF167-183	Blank municipal questionnaire	Text Read

Visually controlled originals: 20, 25, 29, 31, 32, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 94, 122, 123, 144, 145, 146, 147. The actual scope of the check is all published results, annexes and schedules; it does not document the truth of all municipal statements or a national personal union.

Rare Disabilities and Acquired Brain Damage 2015 - all tables and published citizens' programmes;

All 158 original pages have been reviewed in memory. The 92 reading tables below contain 461 rows of original numbers and percentages, including repeated figures and conflicting cells. It's the same 98 cases. The published case summaries comprise 40 different local case numbers; repeated descriptions of case 57 are grouped together. No additional population has been created.

Source: Review by the Board of Appeal, November 2015. SHA256 1b1ad88416f1254363915d0863aa96d23ca9de85df0d49405aba8b7a109bf0da. PDFside is physical page; printed page is usually three lower. All 158 pages are textual; the following 33 pages are also visually controlled in RAM: 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 51, 53, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 84, 91, 92, 94, 95, 105, 106, 124, 125, 126, 136.

Committees, exclusions and denominators

120 cases were requested, 101 were received and 3 were omitted, 98 of which came from 24 municipalities. Of which 44 rare disabilities and 54 acquired brain damage. The municipalities' target group knowledge determined the selection; it was not random and is not a national estimate. Only the most recent decision was legally assessed; the three-year history was used to examine needs and continuity. ABL § 105 was added upon receipt. The delineation in Annex / call is 1 January 2013- 1 October 2014; the main section indicates 1 July 2014 as the end date.

Complaint cases forwarded to Ankestyrelsen were excluded. Municipal reconsiderations granting relief that had not been forwarded could, however, be included. The study therefore cannot be added to complaint statistics or reconsiderations without checking overlap between decisions and individuals. The benefit distribution 12/27/6/8/22/13/10 is mutually exclusive by the most recent decision; later section 83/85 tables include the six combined cases under both benefits.

Locator	Limitation
PDF 5-6	Decisions 1 Jan 2013-1 July 2014
PDF 5-6	recent non-contested to AS
PDF 5-6	not random sampling
PDF 5-6	later municipal material examined when the parties were heard

Locator	Limitation
PDF 103-104	120 requested(60 brain+3×20 rare);101 submitted,19 missing;3 excluded under the criteria;98 measured. Municipality size/municipal knowledge used for target-group selection, not random sampling.
PDF 103	Annex requires decisions 1 Oct 2014 and back before 1 Jan 2013; main chapter 1 Jul 2014 is second version limit, retained.
PDF 103-104	Only the legality of the latest decision; earlier decisions over three years for need/continuity. ABL 105(2) added after receipt. General municipal responses are not specific case decisions.
PDF 130	Forwarded AS appeals are excluded; decisions amended on reconsideration without forwarding are INCLUDED.
PDF 131 / 136	Notice 25 municipalities, compared with 24 in fact. The visually visible 24 municipalities of the Annex list are correct; the extra 25-36 of the text extract is not visible source data and is not counted.

Errors detected, aid and actual effect

Table 2.1 and the municipality table reconcile 59 rule-compliant decisions and 39 decisions that, in Ankestyrelsen's assessment, would be amended or remitted on appeal. Brain injury cases are 34/20 in these tables, while the summary states 35/19. A further 36 cases with insufficient needs coverage and 51 with other procedural remarks are described. The procedural-remark category does not in itself document invalidity in all 51. Overlap with the 39 substantive outcomes and 36 unmet needs is not published.

The specific cases show consequences that a decision percentage does not describe: a waiting list for support, assistance placed on a relative with a disability of their own, moving back to parents because of inadequate residential provision, support terminated without a written decision, and residential provision terminated without an alternative. These are the report's documented descriptions and Ankestyrelsen's assessments; underlying municipal records and actual subsequent redress are not published here.

An appropriation shall be counted separately from aid provided. The measurement form shall obtain the date of application and implementation, but the report shall not print the date table of complete 98 cases. A half-year waiting list in case 39 is an enlightened actual delay; planned relocations in case 4 / 75 / 28 are not proof of completed relocation. Case 59 refers to a complete return to own homes without date. No total person month sum can be calculated.

All original result cells

The percentage columns represent printed percentages, even when they do not match numbers. They have not been redesigned. An unmarked zero bar in a figure is not a separate printed number; where this is essential, it is explicitly indicated. Recurrence is shown by its own locator, but must not be summed up. The denominator is at each table.

F 1.1 - Result

Original: PDF 7, printed page 4. Covers and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Result	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
Correct	57	65	60
Wrong	43	35	40

F 1.2 - Destination

Original: PDF 8, printed page 5. Denominator and overlap: provision total excluding the shared 6 cases.

Destination	N	Correct%	Wrong%
83	12	75	25
85	27	59	41

Destination	N	Correct%	Wrong%
83/85	6	33	66
102	8	50	50
107	22	64	36
108	13	62	38
105	10	60	40
Total	98	60	40

F 1.3 - Information

Original: PDF 8, printed page 5. Covers and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Information	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
No missing	39	35	37
Minor deficiencies	27	30	28
Decisive deficiencies	34	35	35

F 1.4 - Destination

Original: PDF 9, printed page 6. Denominator and overlap: 98 distributed.

Destination	N	No%	Less%	Decisive%
83	12	25	50	25
85	27	33	30	37
83/85	6	17	17	66
102	8	37	13	50
107	22	41	36	23
108	13	62	8	30
105	10	30	30	40
Total	98	37	28	35

F 1.5 - Tyre

Original: PDF 10, printed page 7. Covers and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98; No -n own diffusers.

Covered	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Yes	29	66	33	61	62	63
No	15	34	21	39	36	37

F 1.6 a - Uncovered aid

Original: PDF 11, printed page 8. Covers and overlaps: 44; several missing copies.

Uncovered help	Number
97	1
84	1
112/113	1
104	2
103	2
107	2
100	2
108/105	9
83	9
85	10

F 1.6 b - Uncovered aid

Original: PDF 11, printed page 8. Covers and overlaps: 54; several missing copies.

Uncovered help	Number
100	1
84	3
86	3
102	3
112/113	3
97	5
103	5
107	5
83	6
108/105	7
104	9
Other	9
85	10

F 1.7 a - Position 83

Original: PDF 12, printed page 9. Covers and overlap: 12 / 6 / 18 incl. 6 joint 83 / 85.

Position 83	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
High	66	50	61
Someone.	17	17	17
No	17	33	22

F 1.7 b - Other posts

Original: PDF 12, printed page 9. Covers and overlap: 32 / 48 / 80.

Other posts	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
High	63	63	62
Someone.	34	8	19
No	3	29	19

F 1.8 - Whole

Original: PDF 13, printed page 10. Name and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Whole	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
High	39	58	49
Someone.	41	9	23
No	20	33	28

F 1.10 - Technical information

Original: PDF 14, printed page 11. Name and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Technical information	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
High	59	72	66
Someone.	18	9	13
No	23	19	21

F 1.9 - Destination

Original: PDF 14, printed page 11. Name and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Destination	Rare	Brain n	Total n
83	8	4	12
85	12	15	27
83/85	4	2	6
102	0	8	8
107	7	15	22
108	7	6	13
105	6	4	10

F 1.11 - Supplier

Original: PDF 15, printed page 12. Denomination and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98; nice 0 character mark.

Supplier	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
Own	74	64	68

Supplier	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
Other municipalities / region	9	20	15
Private	17	10	13
Unexplained / irrelevant	0	6	4

F 1.12 - Destination

Original: PDF 16, printed page 13. Notices and overlaps: 83 / 85 common 6 are counted in both performance categories; the colour key is visually controlled.

Destination	N	Own%	Other%	Private%	Irrelevant%
83	18	83	0	17	0
85	33	94	0	6	0
102	8	50	0	25	25
107	22	41	37	22	0
108	13	42	33	8	17
105	10	80	20	0	0
Total	98	68	15	13	4

F 1.13 - Tools

Original: PDF 16, printed page 13. Name and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Tools	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Yes	36	82	48	89	84	87
No	8	18	6	11	14	13

F 1.14 - Tool type

Original: PDF 17, printed page 14. Denomination and overlap: 36 / 48 / 84; overlap.

Tool Type	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
VUM	50	69	61
Functionality	19	19	20
Other	42	29	36

F 1.15 - Other legislation

Original: PDF 18, printed page 15. Denomination and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98; overlap.

Second legislation	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
Health	30	48	40
Education	9	11	10
Employment	9	35	24

Second legislation	Rare%	Brain%	Total%
None	61	33	46

T 2.1 - Validity of the decision

Original: PDF 21, printed page 18. Name and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Result	Rare	%	Brain damage n	%	Total n	%
Correct	25	57	34	63	59	60
Amended/remitted for reconsideration, hypothetical appeal	19	43	20	37	39	40
Total	44	100	54	100	98	100

T 2.2 - Material accuracy - § 83

Original: PDF 22, printed page 19. Name and overlap: 8 / 4 / 12.

Result	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Correct	8	100	1	25	9	75
Wrong	0	0	3	75	3	25
Total	8	100	4	100	12	100

T 2.3 - Material accuracy - § 85

Original: PDF 24, printed page 21. Name and overlap: 12 / 15 / 27.

Result	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Correct	7	58	9	60	16	59
Wrong	5	42	6	40	11	41
Total	12	100	15	100	27	100

T 2.4 - Material accuracy - combined § 83 / 85

Original: PDF 29, printed page 26. Denomination and overlap: 4 / 2 / 6.

Result	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Correct	1	25	1	50	2	33
Wrong	3	75	1	50	4	66
Total	4	100	2	100	6	100

T 2.5 - Material accuracy - § 102

Original: PDF 30, printed page 27. Name and overlap: 0 / 8 / 8.

Result	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Correct	0	0	4	50	4	50

Result	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Wrong	0	0	4	50	4	50
Total	0	0	8	100	8	100

T 2.6 - Material accuracy - § 107

Original: PDF 32, printed page 29. Name and overlap: 7 / 15 / 22.

Result	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Correct	1	14	13	87	14	64
Wrong	6	86	2	13	8	36
Total	7	100	15	100	22	100

T 2.7 - Material accuracy - § 108

Original: PDF 36, printed page 33. Name and overlap: 7 / 6 / 13.

Result	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Correct	5	71	3	50	8	62
Wrong	2	29	3	50	5	38
Total	7	100	6	100	13	100

T 2.8 - Material accuracy - ABL § 105

Original: PDF 39, printed page 36. Name and overlap: 6 / 4 / 10.

Result	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Correct	3	50	3	75	6	60
Wrong	3	50	1	25	4	40
Total	6	100	4	100	10	100

T 2.9 - Information given in the case

Original: PDF 42, printed page 39. Name and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
None	17	39	19	35	36	37
Less	12	27	16	30	28	28
Decisive	15	34	19	35	34	35
Total	44	100	54	100	98	100

T 2.10 - Specific and individual assessment

Original: PDF 43, printed page 40. Name and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
High	24	55	30	55	54	55
Someone.	15	34	9	17	24	25
No	5	11	15	28	20	20
Total	44	100	54	100	98	100

T 2.11 - Service level / quality standard mentioned

Original: PDF 47, printed page 44. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Yes	4	9	1	2
No	40	91	53	98
Total	44	100	54	100

T 2.12 - Individual assessment of the need to deviate from standard

Original: PDF 47, printed page 44. Denominator and overlap: 4/1 references to quality standards.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High	0	0	0	0
Someone.	0	0	0	0
No	4	100	1	100
Total	4	100	1	100

T 2.13 - Total aid needs covered

Original: PDF 49, printed page 46. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Yes	29	66	33	61
No	15	34	21	39
Total	44	100	54	100

F 1.6 a repeat - Uncovered help

Original: PDF 51, printed page 48. Mention and overlap: 44; several shortcomings; similar action, no additional course.

Uncovered help	Number
97	1
84	1
112/113	1
104	2

Uncovered help	Number
103	2
107	2
100	2
108/105	9
83	9
85	10

F 1.6 b repeat - Uncovered help

Original: PDF 51, printed page 48. Mention and overlap: 54; several shortcomings; similar action, no additional course.

Uncovered help	Number
100	1
84	3
86	3
102	3
112/113	3
97	5
103	5
107	5
83	6
108/105	7
104	9
Other	9
85	10

T 2.14 - Other legislation involved

Original: PDF 53, printed page 50. Name and overlap: 44 / 54; overlap.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Health	13	30	26	48
Education	4	9	6	11
Employment	4	94	19	35
No other	27	61	18	33
N	44	-	54	-

T 2.15 - Other aid granted

Original: PDF 53, printed page 50. Denominator and overlap: 17/36 cases under other legislation.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Yes	17	100	34	94
No	0	0	2	6
Total	17	100	36	100

T 3.1 - All requests for § 83assistance processed

Original: PDF 55, printed page 52. Mention and overlap: 12 / 6 decisions 83 including 6 joint 83 / 85.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High	8	66	3	50
Someone.	2	17	1	17
No	2	17	2	33
Total	12	100	6	100

T 3.2 - All requests processed - All benefits

Original: PDF 55, printed page 52. Mention and overlap: 44 / 54; all provisions; F 1.7; others 80.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High	28	64	33	61
Someone.	13	29	5	9
No	3	7	16	30
Total	44	100	54	100

T 3.3 - Overall assessment

Original: PDF 57, printed page 54. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High	19	44	31	57
Someone.	16	36	5	9
No	9	20	18	33
Total	44	100	54	100

T 3.4 - The efforts and objectives of the accommodation offer described

Original: PDF 59, printed page 56. Name and overlap: 14 / 21 offers 107 / 108.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High	3	21	11	52
Someone.	4	29	5	24

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
No	7	50	5	24
Total	14	100	21	100

T 4.1 - Form of the decision

Original: PDF 61, printed page 58. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Written	29	66	41	76
Journal	6	14	5	9
Other	9	20	8	15
Total	44	100	54	100

T 4.2 - Form of the decision § 83 / 85

Original: PDF 61, printed page 58. Notices and overlaps: 24 / 21 SEL 83 / 85 incl 6 joint.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Written	15	62	16	76
Journal	5	21	1	5
Other	4	17	4	19
Total	24	100	21	100

T 4.3 - The result of the decision is clear

Original: PDF 63, printed page 60. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High	30	68	31	57
Someone.	12	27	11	21
No	2	5	12	22
Total	44	100	54	100

T 4.4 - The legal basis of the decision is clear

Original: PDF 64, printed page 61. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High	16	36	22	41
Someone.	20	46	21	39
No	8	18	11	20
Total	44	100	54	100

T 4.5 - Justification requirements

Original: PDF 66, printed page 63. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High	18	41	23	42
Someone.	8	18	16	30
No	18	41	15	28
Total	44	100	54	100

T 4.6 - Complaint guidance

Original: PDF 68, printed page 65. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High	3	7	17	31
Someone.	24	54	20	37
No	17	39	17	31
Total	44	100	54	100

T 4.7 - Other procedural observations

Original: PDF 70, printed page 67. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Yes	27	61	24	44
No	17	39	30	56
Total	44	100	54	100

T 5.1 - Results of the latest decision

Original: PDF 71, printed page 68. Name and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Decision	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
Award	42	95	52	96	94	96
Refusal	2	5	2	4	4	4
Partial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	44	100	54	100	98	100

T 5.2 - Target group of the decision

Original: PDF 72, printed page 69. Name and overlap: 98.

Target group	N	%
Back marrow hernia	12	12
Huntington	16	16

Target group	N	%
Syndrome	16	16
Rare subtotal	44	45
Brain	54	55
Total	98	100

T 5.3 - Recent decision-making

Original: PDF 72, printed page 69. Mention and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98; 6 common oak category, the original note says percent not 100.

Destination	Rare	%	Brain n	%	Total n	%
83	8	18	4	7	12	12
85	12	27	15	28	27	28
83/85	4	9	2	4	6	6
102	0	0	8	15	8	8
107	7	16	15	28	22	22
108	7	16	6	11	13	14
105	6	14	4	7	10	10
Total	44	-	54	-	98	100

T 5.4 - § 83 assistance frequency

Original: PDF 73, printed page 70. Notices and overlaps: 12 / 6 including six combined 83 / 85.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Daily	10	83	4	67
Weekly	2	17	2	33
Monthly	0	0	0	0
Rarely	0	0	0	0
Total	12	100	6	100

F 5.1 - § 85 aid

Original: PDF 74, printed page 71. Denominator and overlap: the figure does not print its own N; includes 6 combined 83/85 cases. Percentages fit 21/25 rather than the 85 cohort's 16/17; N not inferred, multiple responses.

§ 85 help	Rare%	Brain%
Self-help	10	60
Instructions	48	56
Support / training daily	43	52
Recreation / culture / network	48	52

§ 85 help	Rare%	Brain%
Administration / Conflict	24	36
Training	24	36
Advice	33	32
Other	52	24
Economy	33	12

T 5.5 - § 85 support for everyday life

Original: PDF 75, printed page 72. Mention and overlap: 9 / 13, more answers; three combined 83 / 85.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Clothing	1	11	7	54
Eating training	0	0	6	46
Purchasing	5	56	7	54
Personal care	5	56	6	46
Other aid	5	56	12	92
Total	9	-	13	-

T 5.6 - § 85- the accommodation of the beneficiary

Original: PDF 75, printed page 72. Nozzles and overlap: 16 / 17 including six combined 83 / 85; cells exceed the denominator.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Own dwelling	11	69	15	88
Old-age housing	7	44	3	18
Housing	2	13	0	0
107	1	6	4	24
Other	1	6	1	6
Residential home 192	0	0	0	0
Protected 192	0	0	0	0
108	0	0	0	0
Total	16	100	17	100

T 5.7 - § 102- Form of treatment

Original: PDF 76, printed page 73. Name and overlap: 0 / 8, more answers.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Physio- / ergotherapy	0	0	5	63
Second reading	0	0	4	50
Psychologist	0	0	1	13

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Specialist psychiatry	0	0	1	13
Psychotherapy	0	0	0	0
Nursing	0	0	0	0
Dental treatment	0	0	0	0
Total	0	-	8	-

T 5.8 - § 107 - Purpose of residence

Original: PDF 77, printed page 74. Mention and overlap: 7 / 15; Note 1: A case for two purposes.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Assessment	0	0	8	53
Acute situation	5	71	8	53
Other	3	43	0	0
Total	7	-	15	-

T 5.9 - Information on aid under § 107 offers

Original: PDF 77, printed page 74. Denominator and overlap: 7/15 information on whether support is included, not a separate measurement of actual awards.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Information on support in accommodation offers	5	71	15	100
No information	2	29	0	0
Total	7	100	15	100

F 5.2 - § 107 aid

Original: PDF 78, printed page 75. Notices and overlaps: Figurine genN; support JAT 5.9 n 5 / 15; multiple responses; non-cocohorts.

§ 107 aid	Rare%	Brain%
Other	No visible bar	27
Advice	20	13
Food services	40	47
Instructions	40	47
Maintenance	20	53
Personalpractice	60	67
Social pedagogical	80	80
Aid	80	80

T 5.10 - § 108 authorisation / refusal

Original: PDF 78, printed page 75. Mention and overlap: 7 / 6 § 108.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Authorisation	6	86	6	100
Refusal	1	14	0	0
Total	7	100	6	100

T 5.11 - Aid for § 108 stay

Original: PDF 79, printed page 76. Mention and overlap: 6 / 6 § 108 appropriations; several replies; percentage deviations retained.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
83	5	80	4	67
85	6	100	4	67
86	0	0	1	17
103	0	0	1	17
104	0	0	2	35
Other	0	0	4	67
Total	6	-	6	-

T 5.12 - Aid for ABL § 105- stay

Original: PDF 80, printed page 77. Denomination and overlap: 6 / printed 3; the series of brain damage 4 / 100 gives rise to conflict.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
83	2	33	0	0
85	5	83	4	100
86	0	0	0	0
103	1	17	0	0
104	1	17	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
Total (printed)	6	-	3	-

F 5.3 - Other aid

Original: PDF 81, printed page 78. Mention and overlap: Note 14 cases, T 5.13 nine / five; brain percentages 25 / 50 / 75 not compatible with 5 outside filters; multiple responses.

Other aid	Rare%	Brain%
Second Law	33	25
Accompanying case 97	No visible bar	25
Retraining 86	No visible bar	25

Other aid	Rare%	Brain%
Auxiliary products 112 / 113	11	50
Protected 103	11	50
Additional expenditure 100	No visible bar	50
Activity 104	78	75

T 5.13 - Information on other assistance for long-term accommodation

Original: PDF 81, printed page 78. Mention and overlap: 12 / 10 appropriations 108 / 105.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Yes	9	75	5	50
No	3	25	5	50
Total	12	100	10	100

T 5.14 - Concurrent authorisation under other legislation

Original: PDF 82, printed page 79. Name and overlap: 44 / 54, at the same time the most recent decision.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Yes	1	3	0	0
No	43	97	54	100
No information	0	0	0	0
Total	44	100	54	100

T 5.15 - Former adult assistance last three years

Original: PDF 83, printed page 80. Name and overlap: 44 / 54, three years backwards.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Yes	40	91	50	95
No	4	9	4	5
Total	44	100	54	100

T 5.16 - Previous same benefit

Original: PDF 83, printed page 80. Mention and overlap: 44 / 52, two brain cases unclear.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Yes	30	68	21	40
No	14	32	31	60
Total	44	100	52	100

T 5.17 - Reduction in benefits

Original: PDF 83, printed page 80. Name and overlap: 30 / 21 earlier same performance.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Reduced	2	7	7	33
Not reduced	28	93	14	67
Total	30	100	21	100

T 5.18 - Change in need of reduction

Original: PDF 84, printed page 81. Mention and overlap: 2 / 7 reductions; percentages 75 / 25 incompatible 6 / 7 and 1 / 7.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Needs changed	0	0	6	75
Not modified	2	100	1	25
Total	2	100	7	100

T 5.19 - Individual assessment - conflicting filter

Original: PDF 84, printed page 81. Notices and overlaps: Printed 28 / 14, not changed needs in heading but 2 / 1 IT 5.18.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Individual assessment yes	24	85	13	93
No	4	15	1	7
Total	28	100	14	100

T 5.20 - Change in need of new service

Original: PDF 85, printed page 82. Name and overlap: 14 / 31 previously not the same service.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Needs changed	0	0	21	68
Not modified	14	100	10	32
Total	14	100	31	100

T 6.1 - Technical information

Original: PDF 87, printed page 84. Mention and overlap: 44 / 54 professional education.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High degree	26	59	39	72
Some degree	8	18	5	9
No	10	23	10	19
Total	44	100	54	100

T 6.2 - Information obtained after detection of deficiency

Original: PDF 88, printed page 85. Mention and overlap: 10 / 10 insufficient professional information.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Collection	0	0	1	10
Not obtained	10	100	9	90
Total	10	100	10	100

T 6.3 - Visits to citizens

Original: PDF 89, printed page 86. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Visits	24	55	50	93
No visits	20	45	4	7
Total	44	100	54	100

T 6.4 - Information used by the citizen

Original: PDF 89, printed page 86. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Citizens' information used	34	77	41	76
Not used	10	23	13	24
Total	44	100	54	100

T 6.5 - Justification for extension of proceedings

Original: PDF 91, printed page 88. Names and overlaps: 43 / 36 according to table / note; 19 without extension (1 / 18). Bread text says 9 extended cases!.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Reason given	2	5	4	11
Not available	41	95	32	89
Total	43	100	36	100

T 6.6 - Reported reason for delay

Original: PDF 91, printed page 88. Denomination and overlap: 2 / 4 reason notified.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Many cases	0	0	0	0
Staff resources	0	0	0	0
Obtaining information	2	100	2	50
Other	0	0	2	50

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Total	2	100	4	100

F 6.1 - Destination

Original: PDF 92, printed page 89. Mention and overlap: RepeatedF 1.12, same 98 cases not recom-mendation.

Destination	N	Own%	Other%	Private%	Irrelevant%
83	18	83	0	17	0
85	33	94	0	6	0
102	8	50	0	25	25
107	22	41	37	22	0
108	13	42	33	8	17
105	10	80	20	0	0
Total	98	68	15	13	4

T 6.7 - Supplier of § 83

Original: PDF 93, printed page 90. Mention and overlap: 12 / 6 § 83 incl 6 joint 83 / 85.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Own	10	83	5	83
Other municipalities / regions	0	0	0	0
Private	2	17	1	17
Total	12	100	6	100

T 6.8 - Supplier of § 85

Original: PDF 93, printed page 90. Mention and overlap: 16 / 17 § 85 incl 6 joint 83 / 85.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Own	16	100	15	88
Other municipalities / regions	0	0	0	0
Private	0	0	2	12
Total	16	100	17	100

T 6.9 - Supplier of § 102

Original: PDF 93, printed page 90. Name and overlap: 0 / 8 § 102.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Own	0	0	4	50
Other municipalities / regions	0	0	0	0
Private	0	0	2	25

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Undisclosed / irrelevant	0	0	2	25
Total	0	0	8	100

T 6.10 - Supplier of § 107

Original: PDF 94, printed page 91. Name and overlap: printed 7 / 20 § 107 counter-cohort 7 / 15.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Own	2	29	9	45
Other municipalities / regions	0	0	10	50
Private	5	71	1	5
Total	7	100	20	100

T 6.11 - Supplier of § 108

Original: PDF 94, printed page 91. Denomination and overlap: 6 / 6 § 108; a refusal omitted.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Own	3	50	2	33
Other municipalities / regions	2	33	2	33
Private	1	17	0	0
Undisclosed / irrelevant	blank	blank	2	33
Total	6	100	6	100

T 6.12 - Supplier of ABL § 105 - different tabular title

Original: PDF 95, printed page 92. Mention and overlap: printed 6 / 6; Bread text 105 (2) but heading 108 and Brain rows 4 versus 6.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Own	3	50	4	100
Other municipalities / regions	3	50	0	0
Private	0	0	0	0
Total	6	100	6	100

T7.1 - Assessment tool used

Original: PDF 97, printed page 94. Name and overlap: 44 / 54 / 98.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%	All n	%
Yes	36	82	48	89	84	87
No	8	18	6	11	14	13
Total	44	100	54	100	98	100

T 7.2 - Form of the assessment tool

Original: PDF 98, printed page 95. Name and overlap: 36 / 48, more answers.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
VUM	18	50	33	69
Functional ability assessment	7	19	9	19
Other	15	42	14	29
Total	36	100	48	100

T7.3 - Assessment fields completed

Original: PDF 99, printed page 96. Name and overlap: 36 / 48.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
All Points	30	83	32	66
Not all	6	17	16	34
Total	36	100	48	100

T 7.4 - The municipality’s general assessment methods

Original: PDF 99, printed page 96. Mention and overlap: 24 municipalities; overlap methods; row 27 / 27 / 29 / 27 / 27 not necessarily 24.

Destination	VUM communes	Other method	Unlit municipalities
83	3	18	6
85	20	7	0
102	14	2	13
107	20	6	1
108	20	5	2

T 7.5 - Current information used

Original: PDF 100, printed page 97. Name and overlap: 44 / 54.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Current information	29	66	45	83
Not applicable	15	34	9	17
Total	44	100	54	100

T 7.6 - Impact of current information on aid

Original: PDF 100, printed page 97. Notices and overlaps: 15 / 9 without actualinformation.

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
High Importance	2	13	3	33

Response	Rare	%	Brain n	%
Some significance	4	26	0	0
Not applicable	9	61	6	67
Total	15	100	9	100

B 1 F 1 - Age

Original:PDF 105,printed page 102. Denominator and overlap:98; heading Sex/age but colour groups represent diagnoses. N for age rows not printed.

Age	Rare%	Brain%
Less than 30	63	37
30-39	69	31
40-49	42	58
50-59	17	83
Exceeding 60	31	69
Total	45	55

B 1 F 2 - Target group

Original:PDF106,printed page 103. Denominator and overlap:44/54/98; legend total versus body text 50 men 51% and 48 women 49%.

Target group	Male%	Women%
Rare	36	64
Brain	60	40
Total	49	51

B 1 F 3 - Age

Original:PDF 106,printed page 103. Denominator and overlap:repeated B 1 F 1 diagnostic distribution, not an additional age cohort.

Age	Rare%	Brain%
Less than 30	63	37
30-39	69	31
40-49	42	58
50-59	17	83
Exceeding 60	31	69
Total	45	55

B 3 T 1 - Local authorities

Original:PDF124,printed page 121. Denominator and overlap:98 most recent decisions; small municipal cohorts not representative of municipalities.

Municipality	Rule Conform	Would be altered/remitted	Total
Copenhagen	9	0	9
Frederiksberg	1	2	3
Gentofte	1	1	2
Count	2	0	2
Roskilde	3	2	5
Slaughter	2	2	4
Sorø	1	1	2
Næstved	2	2	4
Medium speed	1	0	1
Odense	3	3	6
Billund	1	1	2
Sønderborg	2	2	4
Esbjerg	5	1	6
Aabenra	2	0	2
Horsens	2	2	4
Cold	2	2	4
Vejle	4	2	6
Herning	4	2	6
Lemvig	1	1	2
Silkeborg	5	1	6
Aarhus	2	4	6
Viborg	3	1	4
Mariners' fjord	0	1	1
Aalborg	1	6	7
Total	59	39	98

B 3 T 2 - Information gaps distributed by municipalities

Original: PDF 125, printed page 122. Mention and overlap: 98 same cases; not added B 3 T 1.

Municipality	No deficiencies	Minor deficiencies	Decisive deficiencies	Total
Copenhagen	5	4	0	9
Frederiksberg	2	0	1	3
Gentofte	1	0	1	2
Count	2	0	0	2
Roskilde	1	2	2	5
Slaughter	1	1	2	4

Municipality	No deficiencies	Minor deficiencies	Decisive deficiencies	Total
Sorø	1	0	1	2
Næstved	1	1	2	4
Medium speed	0	1	0	1
Odense	3	0	3	6
Billund	1	0	1	2
Sønderborg	1	2	1	4
Esbjerg	2	3	1	6
Aabenra	0	2	0	2
Horsens	2	1	1	4
Cold	3	1	0	4
Vejle	3	1	2	6
Herning	2	2	2	6
Lemvig	1	0	1	2
Silkeborg	3	2	1	6
Aarhus	1	1	4	6
Viborg	0	3	1	4
Mariners' fjord	0	0	1	1
Aalborg	0	1	6	7
Total	36	28	34	98

Variations of the original

Locator	Deviation	Management
s 4 bread text	59 correct 39 wrong overall versus 25 + 35 = 60 / 19 + 19 = 38	Maintain original main counters, vote against later Table 2.1
PDF 9 / s 6	34 out of 6 as stated, reference to 34%	Preserve 34 as printed error, not factorial number
PDF 16 / s 13	84/98 assessment tool; printed 87%; figure 13% not (14/98)	No harmonisation
PDF 18 / s 15	No other legislation 35 of 98 / 46%; subgroups 27 + 18 = 45	Preserve 35 / 45
PDF 17 / s 14	VUM 51 / 84 = 61%; other 29 / 84 printed 36%; function 16 / 84 printed 20%	Percentages original version
PDF 7 / s 4 versus PDF 21 / s 18	Brain damage 35 / 19 and 65% / 35% versus 34 / 20 and 63% / 37%	Table 2.1 has 34 / 20; total 59 / 39 unchanged
PDF 9 / s 6 modT 2.9 PDF 42 / s 39	Summary essential 35 / no 37 / less 28; table essential 34 / no 36 / less 28	Table 98; Summary 100 cases
PDF 54 / s 51 modT 3.1 PDF 55 / s 52	Bread text 4 brain high (67%); Table 3 high + 1 any (50% + 17%)	Maintain different modulation
F 1.8 PDF 13 modT 3.3 PDF 57	Graphhøj 39 / 58%, Table 44 / 57%; Graphene 41 / 9%, Table 36 / 9%	Total 80 / 67% unchanged but not modulation
T 3.4 PDF 59 p 56	Bread text 16 high 76%; table 11 high 52% + 5 no 24%	High and some must not be mixed together
PDF 75 T 5.6	Housing cells summer 22 / 23 above the denominator 16 / 17. Original percentages and total are retained; cannot be used as exclusive housing categories.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 79 T 5.11	5 / 6 printed 80% and 2 / 6 printed 35%; not mathematical rounding 83 / 33.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 80 T 5.12	Brain count 3 versus 85-row 4 / 100%. Note 1 refers to 108 refusal while table refers to 105; not harmonised.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 83 T 5.15	50 / 54 printed 95 and 4 / 54 printed 5; the percentages in both bread text / table are retained.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 84 T 5.18 / 19	Brain 6/7 printed 75%,1/7 as 25%; next table 28/14 fits the non-reduced T5.17,but the question heading requires changed needs. No harmonisation.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 91 T 6.5	Table / note describes 79 extended and 19 without; following bread text 9 extended and 6 co-cause. Not 79 people were waiting outside the vote.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 94 T 6.10	Brain-injury denominator 20 against 15 § 107 cases, aggregate provider cells 27 against 22. Retained as a version conflict.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 95 T 6.12	ABL 105text counterheadline 108; brain count 6 mosquitoes 4 / 100. No recalculation.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 103	Committee Period End October 1, 2014 counter main method 1, Christmas 2014.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 97 T 7.1	Overall 84 / 98 printed 87%, 14 / 98 printed 13%, but groups correct 36 / 44 and 48 / 54.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 100 T 7.6	Rare 6 / 15 important printed 39%, 9 / 15 printed 61%; cells 2 / 13% + 4 / 26% preserved.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 53 T 2.14	Employment: 4 / 44 printed 94% (visa confirmed, not 9 with footnote).	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 74 F 5.1	Figure percentages match denominators other than 16/17 section 85; no printed figure denominator. No back-calculation as source fact.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.

Locator	Deviation	Management
PDF 81 F 5.3	Brain gas percentages 25 / 50 / 75 under Note 14 = 9 + 5 cases; none corresponding to 5%.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.
PDF 105-106 B 1 fig 1-3	Fig. 1 sex/age heading covers diagnosis. Fig. 2 colour legend Women 51%/Men 49% overall versus body text 50 men 51%,48 women 49%. Reproduce both; do not swap them authoritatively.	Preserve original cells; no harmonisation.

PDF 136 shows visually only 24 municipalities. The additional 25-36 section of the text extract is not visible in the document and is treated as extract card. It's not really an extra community population.

Case numbers, interventions, time and consequences

The numbers are local anonymized case IDs in this original. They cannot be connected to other reports' case numbers or to CPR.40 different IDs below are not proof of 40 different failed individuals: also correctly assessed cases are used as examples. All are subgroups of the 98 cases.

Case	PDF page	Citizen / progress	Decision and actual effect	Proof of demarcation
1	62	72 years Huntington	Written decision without clear help § 89	Lack of counter-writing
2	25	60 yearcrane traumas	Retraining target car / traineeship reached; 104 → 85 support	Correct
4	33	49 years post-meningitis 2012 / accident	107 Rehabilitation → self-housing targets	Non-actual moving date
8	62	21 varicella / PTSD after 4 operations / 1 month	Borhosmor; kommune terminates aid at not used	No written adverse decision; the individual does not want cessation
10	40	50 blood clots	Wanted ABL 105 accommodation	Correct
11	41	55 years Prader Willi	Political 108→ABL 105, same building; self-harm; consent/personal scope unresolved	No actual subsequent redress stated
12	44	36 varicella / amputation	85 → needs 83 known; municipality requires new application	Should make a decision without a new application
17	56	41 years Huntington	Old-age housing / support / purchase / companion	Correct
19	37	20 Years	108 Oct 2013 → second bobudsaug 2014	Guardian's consent, no 129; citizen's consent unclear
21	42	45 years old brain cancer at 9 years old	Anxiety admissions; current physical / psychiatric defect	Unmet needs cannot be assessed
23	36	31 years	108 since 2003	Corretor
24	58	39 years Angelman	108 since 2003 / 104	Overall assessed
26	63	43 years Huntington	85 clear support for post / authority / structure	Correction clarity
27	30	49 years of aneurysm 2013	Rehab extended; accommodation waiting list with asset rehab	Correct
28	52	20 year-old brain injury	Apr-nov 2013 hospital → rehab → 107; depressive family concern / neuropathy inadequate pgaafasi	Referred to own GP without a specific decision on mental-health needs; return home unresolved
31	66	44 year schizophrenia / brain haemorrhage 2011	102, reasons based on discretion; spouse+son 1½ years/family department notified	Correction; not child error population

Case	PDF page	Citizen / progress	Decision and actual effect	Proof of demarcation
34	91	60-year-old brain bleeding Feb	Very long processing explained by exceptional staff training in spring 2014	AS does not assess factual justification;

Case	PDF page	Citizen / progress	Decision and actual effect	Proof of demarcation
		2014; paralyzed / driving chair		no exact duration / date of actual assistance
35	69	44 years of age	85 reduced upon improvement; appeal guidance lacks receipt deadline/office hours/option to appear in person	The report's contemporary formal assessment
36	56	36 years Prader Willi	Mother-concerned / daughter-eating garbage; authority's belief in assessment	Power of attorney/guardianship guidance and handling of consent missing
38	33	20 years spinal cord / ADHD	107 AND STU	Clarifying stay correctly
39	25	48 years Huntingtondem similar	½ annual waiting list 85 support	Decision type correct; duty to implement/supply discussed at 26-27
40	67	20 years Prader Willi	107+103 lifelong need but no specific intervention	Absence of justification
44	58	59 years Huntington	Auxiliary for home summer 2014; Introduced forefoot, hallucination 1 floor; wishes for accommodation	Later the same month shifts cannot be bodied without explanation
49	88	41-year-old male; several blood clots last 3 years; memory / tr density / overview	Residential rejection because needs still unresolved	AS requires information and concrete person training; in fact, subsequent help is not provided
57	44, 88	26 yearAngelman / 26-year-old Angelman; bobudsNov 2009	ABL 105 since 2009; pays self-cleaning; no verbal language / Get functional information / action plan against described basic 83 / 85 needs	Authority's care assessment left to the residential facility / Repeated ID, not a new person
58	23	27 years old spinal cord hernia	83 correct; wheelchair / flexjob	No newborn population
59	63	58 years of brain damage	Rehab 107 → home; 86 reference but possible 85 / 83	Actual return without date; decision-making
64	42	60 years	83 / 84 / 85 / 86 and VUM	Sufficient information
66	90	48-year-old Huntington; street-walk-away; emergency aid / surveillance	The municipality withdrew its offer without any other support	AS assesses cessation without an alternative as incompatible with the need; information about judgments and violence consists of statements in the report, not separately verified against sources
67	34	19 years of brain damage from 15 years	Residential stay under 52(3)7 before 18; continued without a proper adult decision; increasing weight	107 wrong persons; were needed
68	37	44 year schizophrenia	108 fall January 2014; informed consent assessed	Correct; cause not to be affected later on
74	28	23 Years Sotos	Property Home 2014 → Parents Autumn 2014 pgas anxiety	Outstanding housing needs / parents' wishes are not stays
75	52	50 years Prader Willi	Residential offer 1 Nov 2012 could not be a year care; new moveable month 2014 with awake night shift	Needs assessed after new decision; actual date of relocation not disclosed
76	38	63 year-olds 2012	Wheelchair; spouse applies for training; forwarded to the residential facility without assessment by the authority	Consent / guardianship not clarified
81	34	42 year skitraume	107 extension without assessment, reasons given	Variable needs
87	67	46 years Huntington	85 level 3 without details of assistance; wants more practical help	Unsubstantiated level 3

Case	PDF page	Citizen / progress	Decision and actual effect	Proof of demarcation
88	31	61 blood clots / aphasia	Health / decision / functional assessment	Unknown treatment coverage
90	23	73 years after cycle crash	12,5 hours/week without reasons; needs and the spouse’s resources insufficiently investigated	Net missing amount / useful time
94	27	47 cerebral injury / sc izofraenia	15 hour week insufficient estimation needs; girlfriend's handicap extra support	Medication allegedly caused cardiac arrest; not verified against primary evidence
96	47	18 year-old hernia	7 hours / day at secondary school 2012-14	Departure from the rule not examined, but substantively correct p. 48

Other figures, method and source of law

Measurement / Locator	Number or short explanation	Limitation
Measured	98	24 municipalities
Rare Disabilities	44	Back marrow hernia 12; Huntington 16; Syndrome 16
Acquired brain damage	54	adults 18 +
SEL 83	12	without 6 joint 83 / 85
SEL 85	27	without 6 joint 83 / 85
SEL 83 / 85	6	own category
SEL 102	8	
SEL 107	22	
SEL 108	13	
ABL 105 (2)	10	
Appropriations	94	
Refusal	4	
Corrected count	59	60%
Not correct total	39	40%
Corrected Rare	25	57% of 44
Wrong Rare	19	43% of 44
Corresponding brain damage	35	65% of 54
Incorrect brain damage	19	35% of 54
SEL 102 incorrect without decision + function assessment	2	of 4 wrong
SEL 102 incorrect without a functional assessment	1	of 4 wrong
SEL 102: reasons for reduction missing	1	of 4 wrong
SEL 102 correct hab	3	of 4 correct
SEL 102 correct specialist psychiatry	1	of 4 correct
108 incorrect 129 consent rare	1	of 2 wrong
108 incorrect 129 consent brain	2	of 3 wrong
108 discontinuation without second aid	1	rare; freezes / missing money
108, missing information on personal scope	1	brain damage,
PDF 87	The § 141 action plan is expressly not independently included in the lawfulness assessment. Chapter 6 municipal questionnaire:24 municipalities, whereas 6.1/2 lawfulness measurement:44/54 cases.	
PDF 95	Advice under § 12, municipal questionnaire:23 of 24 responded. Self-reporting, not individual effect.	

Measurement / Locator	Number or short explanation	Limitation
PDF 96	Municipal tool questions concern general practice in 24 municipalities, not solely 98 most recent decisions. Functional-capacity methodology requirements particularly concern§100,not automatically all benefits examined.	
PDF 105	50 men 51% / 48 women 49%, not all picture figures are sex: Figure 1 playful brain / rare.	
PDF 105	The methodology rejects statistical significance/municipality-specific assessment of case samples from small target groups.	
PDF 107-112	The annex's statutory version LBK 150/16 February 2015; section 83 a mentioned, while selected decisions are from 2013-2014. Application of dates must be examined specifically, not all 2015 wording applied retrospectively. Section 107 duration is measured by purpose, not a fixed maximum time.	
PDF 113-114	Responsibility for provision does not end when a residential facility closes; the individual's informed consent or the 129 procedure must be examined. ABL 105 tenancy cannot be terminated by the municipality; the specific §§ 81/82/88/89/130/141/148 and RTL 3/4/5/6/10/11 are the annex's framework for examination.	
PDF 115-120	Precedent references 83:48-13,93-12,83-12,53-12, C-31-08, C-54-06, C-1-05, C-14-02, C-17-01, C-17-99; service standard C-83-12, C-82-12, C-51-06, C-52-05, C-3-05, C-16-01, C-17-99; family 67-13,221-11, C-31-08, C-18-01, C-17-01;85:78-14, C-38-07,81-10,39-09, C-18-08, C-3-06, C-22-03;102:5-13;107:6-15,71-14. Report summary, not the original of each precedent decision.	
PDF 116-119	The annex recounts 4 home-help cessation cases in C-17-99(1999 without a period),2 weekly cleaning hours C-1-05,24-hour assistance 39-09, contact every other weekend versus 1 weekend C-3-06. These are legal examples, not additional 2015 individuals.	
PDF 121-122	Precedent references 108:72-14(3 cases/developmental age 1-4 years),53-13;105:137-10(23-year-old without an appeal guardian),C- 29-05(action-plan deficiency causing invalidity). Not new 2015 case IDs.	
PDF 129-132	Case-request example:11 cases/participant, time limit 28 Nov 2014; most recent decisions from 1 Oct 2014 backwards to 1 Jan 2013; three years of records; presentation expected in the 2nd quarter of 2015,actual report Nov 2015.	
PDF 133-134	Socialstyrelsen's background estimate: rare<1000 per diagnosis, approximately 800 diagnoses/30-50.000 people; spina bifida approximately 1200, Huntington 350-400, PWS 200, Angelman 200, Williams 200-250, Sotos 50, Rubinstein-Taybi 30-40, Rett 104 girls. Brain 5%/350-450 specialised rehabilitation; no national register for the broader group. Not a count of people affected by errors.	

Measurement / Locator	Number or short explanation	Limitation
PDF 137-158	Both municipal forms/cover pages are blank instruments, not data; 2013/2014 count/estimate fields without published completed cells. Multiple-choice benefits/tools overlap.	

Measurement / Locator	Number or short explanation	Limitation
	Measurement form PDF154 asks for application date and actual implementation date, but no complete date table for 98 people is provided.	
PDF 150	Filter 2.10.4: individual assessment when the answer to 2.10.2 is NO (reduction); explains T 5.19 n 28/14 but the main table heading “unchanged need” differs.	

The forms PDF 137-158 have been reviewed, including both versions of the municipality and front page form. Empty checkboxes and annual fields are not citizens or registrations. The filter in the measurement scheme 2.10.4 refers to a lack of performance reduction; the heading of the main table 5.19 describes a lack of change in needs. This evidence chain makes the table error concrete, but does not allow the original cells to be altered.

Responsibilities and concrete missing links

The strongest substantiated criticisms are a lack of decision on known aid needs, a lack of concrete or unfounded needs assessment, a lack of involvement of the citizen, insufficient actual support and relocation without clear consent / procedure. In Case 12 / 39 / 57 / 66 / 19 / 76 / 11, the responsibility of the municipality for supply and decision is directly affected. Legality must be linked to the individual case and the rule of the time. The 2015legislative annex to the report is not simply an 2013text.

The specific subsequent investigation must require the municipality’s reopening decision and actual assistance date for each identified error sequence; for a move, the consent document, any § 129 decision, residence date and actual alternative support; for unpaid care by relatives, an assessment of needs, support hours and loss. Ankestyrelsen can clarify the report’s conflicting tables and release anonymised linkage between substantive outcome, procedure, needs coverage and waiting time. These person/implementation links do not appear as completed annexes in the original now read in full.

Additional Practice Content 2022-2025

Control 7 October 2026. Figures refer to the individual reporting populations. Absence of information, formal errors, reasons for change and qualitative practices must not be confused.

Loss of earnings, May 2022

Field	Verified registration	Locator
Actual n	**42** cases, six municipalities × seven	Main Report PDF 5; Annex PDF 5
Measuring absolutely right / completely wrong / partially wrong	**15 / 17 / 10**	Main Report PDF 6
The 17 completely wrong.	**1 modification, 16 remittal for reconsideration**	Annex Table 2.1, PDF 5
The 10 partially wrong	5 partial amendment, 3 partial annulment, 2 partial remittal for reconsideration	Annex PDF 5 Note
Fail union	**27 of 42**, of which 2 only formal, 9 only content, 16 both	Annex Table 3.2, PDF 6
Formal error categories, overlapping	1 reinforced statement of reasons, 12 incorrect statement of reasons, 17 official principle; Union **18**	Annex Table 3.3, PDF 6
Content error, overlapping	5 illegal time limitation, 2 missing period of fitting-in, 7 measurement errors, 14 unclear condition tests; Union **25**	Annex Table 3.4, PDF 6
Selecting	At least 15 overturned cases and a relatively high overturning rate in the last two years; recent Task Force participation excluded; geographical spread	Main Report PDF 36
Cases closed	The defendant is excluded; the special COVID periods 17.3.-18.6.2020 and 24.12.2020- 15.4.2021 are excluded;	Main Report PDF 37 and Note
Control limit	Persons and most appropriate parents assumed to be satisfied; some obviously omitted documents were requested	Main Report PDF 37

The published material does not provide a full distribution of the receipt / exit or a precise final decision date. "27 with errors" is correct union in this targeted sample; 17 alone would overlook partially unlawful decisions. An illegal time limit is a specific benefit limit; the actual subsequent loss and duration of the family requires follow-up in the cases.

Sources: Main report, 38 pages, SHA-256 83b8fcb5accd49de314d08c48870d87bea46fe45e43ec2601e1182e3f5f353bb; full Annex, 17 pages, SHA-256 5c49ab6260ea9c507d464bdbb06015e766cffa256f76850389f4fb871637f315. Release date 2.5.2022.

Business practice, January 2022

Field	Verified registration	Locator
Actual n	**95** decisions by ten municipalities; August 2020, Activity Parate with possible extension November 2020;	PDF 5, 47-48
Main Outcome	**71** confirmation; **15** amendment / repeal; **9** remittal for reconsideration	Table 2.1, PDF 11
Benefit recipients	26 / 3 / 5 of **34**	Table 2.1
Job-ready social assistance recipients	19 / 9 / 4 of **32**	Table 2.1
Social assistance recipients assessed as ready for activity	26 / 3 / 0 of **29**	Table 2.1
Absence of justification	**72 of 72** non-self-found practices; 23 self-found not in this required goal	PDF 45
Convening and terminated	**105** called; 8 did not meet the criteria; 8 of 10 reserve measurements were used. Total number of arrivals not unique	PDF 48
Selecting	STAR designated 25 municipalities with a high level of internship, AST chose 10; oldest cases after 1.8.2020	PDF 47-48
Complementary acts	No call for missing VITAS acts	PDF 48
Already complained of	Explicitly exclusive criterion **not documented,** in the read method and annex cases;	PDF 47-50; Annex

Primaries apply to selected material conditions. Absence of administrative regulations was recorded, but their significance for validity was not tested (PDF 49-50). Ankestyrelsen considered that all 72 errors in the statement of reasons could be repaired in a hypothetical complaint; this is its follow-up assessment and does not eliminate the error in the statement of reasons. Not all sub-tables are complete.

Sources: Main report, 50 pp., SHA-256 33f7cc70d4517e23of89ce0cdae23adb9a138c72eb0ae06dc3dd9d1b83caf7ed; Annex January 2022, 13 pp., SHA-256 81aa6e3da0c43d8235b64e84e0fbd04fdfa3a64e8of2651376be4a16d9c382.

Payout Denmark: marriage-like relationship, February 2024

Field	Verified registration	Locator
Actual n	**30** non-defendant: 15 family allowances and 15 pensions,	PDF 3
Selecting	Unmarried, separate addresses; both cohabitation and single decisions; 25 by means of a notice of principle 44-22, 5 before 14.12.2022	PDF 3, 8
Consequences / does not follow practice	**27 / 3** of 30	PDF 3, 7
The three errors	Lack of profit comparison; misdistributive object; community of ownership treated as sufficient proof of cohabitation	PDF 6-8
First case	The result is considered by the AST to be correct; the error in assessment could, in its opinion, be repaired in complaint	PDF 7
Other error observations	One without any practical information; one initially without a current personal relationship informed, later supplemented by a citizen	PDF 4-5

The three departures from practice do not equal three decisions actually amended. The report shows, among other things, a repayment case with a missing assessment, but states neither the amount repaid, the case duration nor actual subsequent redress. The original numbers requested/received/excluded are not given. Combination with appeal statistics requires verification of later appeal and case ID.

Source: Original report, 8 pages, SHA-256 5f771492f996094c86d215d75a2fabd55336b113a210aa81286dfc78ae6f9a97.

Special day and club offers, September 2025

The report title calls this a practical study, but **the report does not examine the requirements of the provisions; the responsibility for the supply or the number of places required is fulfilled;**. Therefore, it cannot provide a counter for legal / illegal cases.

Field	Verified registration	Locator
Interview	**11**, six on day offers and five on club offers; seven municipalities; September-November 2024	PDF 53-54
Additional information	Mailanswers; two municipalities did not have or used special club offers	PDF 53-54
Register population	The Ministry of Social Affairs and Housing's own calculations on DST data; separate child / adolescent characteristics	PDF 54-55
Legal exclusions	No purpose of control for supply responsibilities, grants / own-account payments, parental boards, home training or access of senior 18 year olds	PDF 55
Alleged / wrong -n	Not applicable as a sample of legality	PDF 55

Source: Original report,58 pages, SHA-256 2eb4d09b9381034197770ce1d0455e0d3aa706d7ee4580b7710e00fea2573d23. The full check against the original has now been completed in praksis-dagklub2025-fulde-registertal-og-kontrolgraenser.md/.json:all 58 pages read, both diagnostic-percentage tables and the code annex visually read; 9 numerical/code blocks with 78 rows. The rounded register figures still provide neither a count of unlawfulness nor a deduplicated union of day/club participants.

Full supplementary review: Compensation for lost earnings: all 38+17 pages, municipality table, subcategories and instrument. The same 42 cases.. The known outstanding public table/annex material is closed; actual redress and a union of people do not automatically follow from decision figures.

Full supplementary review: Work placements: all 50+13 pages, municipality table, requirements for organisation and instrument. The same 95 decisions.. The known outstanding public table/annex material has been covered; actual redress and a union of individuals do not automatically follow from decision counts.

Special day and club offers 2025: full registries and control limits

All 58 original pages have actually been read in RAM. Image tables PDF12,31 and 57 have been read visually; PDF56/58 also seen. This supplements the earlier methodology check; no new cohort is created.

Population and excluded control issues

2023 recipients under 18 registered in the population at the beginning/end of the year:1.910 day services and 980 club services, rounded to 10.Diagnoses are based on hospital contacts in 1995-2022; general practitioners and privately practising specialists are excluded.Groups overlap; no overall day/club union of persons.

The report expressly does not examine statutory requirements, responsibility for provision, capacity needs, payment/subsidies, parent boards, home training or access over 18. Interviewees' insight does not necessarily cover operations/buildings/finances.PDF54-55.The four municipal chains below are self-descriptions, not review of decision records.

All registry, method and capacity figures

- means that no numerator has been printed. The percentage must not be multiplied to the exact number of persons found. Local space figures are not national denominators.

2.1: Daily offers: diagnostic groups

DAG25F, PDF12; mentions 1910; device: Overlapping diagnostic units; non exact human cells.

Diagnosis	Printed%
Autism spectrum	28

Diagnosis	Printed%
Development inhibition	14
Epilepsy	10
Cerebral palsy	8
Movement disorder	6
Acquired brain damage	3
ADHD	2

3.2: Club offers: diagnostic groups

DAG25F, PDF31; mentions 980; unit: Overlapping diagnostic units; non-exact human cells.

Diagnosis	Printed%
Autism spectrum	44
Development inhibition	34
ADHD	26
Epilepsy	16
Cerebral palsy	11
Movement disorder	10
Acquired brain damage	5

R1: Daily offers: population and age

DAG25F, PDF11; mentions 1910; entity: persons under 18 in 2023; not cases of error.

Field	Number rounded to 10	PDF
All	1910	11
0 - 5 years	1320	13
6 to 11 years	580	13
12 to 17 years	10	13

R2: Daily offers: sex and additional support

DAG25F, PDF11; mentions 1910; unit: Categories of aid may overlap; numbers rounded to 10.

Field	Number if printed	Printed%	PDF
Boys	-	69	11
Girls	-	31	11
Preventive action / measure	460	24	14
Imported outside the home	100	5	14

R3: Club offers: population, sex, age and support

DAG25F, PDF30; mentions 980; unit: Population rounded to 10; no exact support / sex cells; overlap possible.

Field	Number if printed	Printed%	PDF
All	980	-	30
Boys	-	72	30
Girls	-	28	30
12 to 17 years	-	66	33
Preventive action / measure	-	25	34
Imported outside the home	-	9	34

R4: Club offers: school form

DAG25F, PDF33; mentions 980; unit: Percentage, non-exact integer cells.

School form	Printed%
General primary school, including special class	30
Special school	53
Other schools	15
No school connection	2

M1: Interview and method

DAG25F, PDF53; does not mention a single population; unit: Interview / Commune; not citizens or errors.

Field	Number / unit	Locator
Interview	11	PDF53
Municipalities	7	PDF53
Day-to-day interview	6	PDF53
Club offer interview	5	PDF53
Participants per interview	2-4	PDF53
Mailkommune om dagbud	1	PDF53
Additional Club mails	2 municipalities	PDF54
Without own or used special clubs	2 municipalities	PDF54
Words of the report more	2-6 municipalities	PDF54
Interview period	September-November 2024	PDF53

L1: Local capacity and time statements

DAG25F, PDF23; does not mention a single person; unit: Local interview statements; not national capacity or unique citizens.

Field	Number / unit	PDF
Slagelse day offer	24 children / 3 living rooms	23
Staff per living room	5-6 employees	23
Day-to-day storage period	0 - 6 years	23
Minimum pick up	at 14	23
Afternoon routine	14am to 15 pm	23
Frederikshavn day offer	approx. 25 seats / 4 living rooms	25
Slagelse parents' representatives	3	28
Gladsaxe 1: 1 aid	2 children	32
Holbæk STUcitizens	70% own municipality / 30% others	37
Frederikshavn clubtransport	2 buses	39
Holbæk special clubs	3	39
Holbæk STukubalder	16 to 25 years	39
Holbæk group example	20 adolescents; 2 together; half-hour activity	39
Gladsaxe Club Offers	26	41
Hvidovre notified sighting	2 days	49
Disc external supervision	2 times a year	50
Disc Revisitation	1 time annually	51
Frederikshavn's Parental Meeting	1 time annually	45
Day offers typically age	0-6 years; visitation 3-6 years; minimum 4 months	6
Interview clubs age	8-29 years	7
Development statements	5-10 years / 10 years / 20 years are municipal experiences, not year series	13,24,32
White Paper policy	Decision 2023; entered into force 1.4.2024	38

B1.2.1: Diagnostic groups: register coding

DAG25F, PDF57; does not mention a single person population; unit: Codes; not case or person number.

Group	ICD10 / Reference
ADHD	DF90 *, DF988C
Autism spectrum	DF840, DF841, DF845, DF848, DF849
Cerebral palsy	DG80 *
Hearing loss	DH90, *DH91*
Arthralgia	DM05, *DM06*, DM08 *
Muscle wind	DG111C, DG12, *DG600*, DG70 *, DG71
Development inhibition	DF70, *DF71*, DF72, *DF73*, DF78, *DF79*, DQ871E, DQ90 *, DF842
Movement disorders	DR25, *DR26*, DR27, *DZ740, DG81*

Group	ICD10 / Reference
Other developmental disorders	DF80, *DF81*, DF82, *DF83*, DF843, DF844, DF88, *DF89*
Visual impairment	DH54 * excluding DH543
Acquired brain damage	Reference to the Danish Health Authority's 2020 pathway programme; not an exhaustive local ICD list
Back marrow hernia / injury	DQ01, *DQ05*, DC720, DD334, DG373, DG82, *DG952*, DS141, *DS241*, DS341 *, DS343, DT093, DT913
Sclerose	DG35 *
Epilepsy	DG40, *DG41*

Concrete municipal source chains

Municipality	PDF	Objections, not self-certification of legality
Disc	35-36	No separate club search / no separate target group assessment in driving; practice under consideration
Gladsaxe	50	Supervision of specialist institutions not previously carried out; new concept is being developed
Hvidover	38	Clubs treated in the same way as other SFOs from 1.4.2024; previously free comprehensive provision
Holbæk	20-21	Lack of seats leads to purchases in neighbouring municipalities and possible relocation back; waiting time is covered by additional aid

Independent analysis and specific investigation requirements

Failure to check legality does not result in a zero measurement of law.In the allegation of correct action, the actual individual needs study, decision and aid actually provided must be demonstrated. For past lack of supervision, a period is required, time-stamped monitoring reports, risk assessment and citizen-oriented correction. A new supervisory concept does not prove that past deficiencies or losses have been corrected. For comparison with the SFODecision itself, the 2023 decision is required, the legal basis, the payment basis and individual needs tests. The published material justifies these specific investigations but does not provide an exact illegality -N.

Residues

All 58 pages of reader's test closed. Exact unrounded person cells, day / clubunion, commune-distributed raw registry numbers, decision / supervision files and actual fixes have not been published in this report. No figures document the number of illegally treated children.

Additional material practice controls: delegation, assistance arrangements and ancestry

Controlled October 7, 2026. The population below is self-employed. Completed complaints may be the subject of some investigations, while others disallow them. Illustrations and written procedures are not extra people.

Second actor in sickness benefits 2013 [PAKT13]

Statement	Counter / denominator	Local, printed page
Questionnaire	91 / 93 job centres; 38 other actors used	2,79
Called / received / omitted / examined	50 / 50 / 2 / 48; 10 municipalities; two cases appealed to the Board omitted	79-80
Total compliance / non-compliance	42 / 6 of 48	T3.1.7,89
Destination	§ 7:25; § 21:1; § 27:22	T3.1.2,87
Illegal delegation	5 / 48, same municipality; contract 1 / 21	3-5
Other contract populations	41 received / 26 actors; questionnaire 75 / 34 job centres	81,83
Information: no / minor / significant / essential deficiencies	34/13/1/0 of 48	T3.1.9,89
Party hearing: yes / no / not applicable	20 / 1 / 27 of 48	T3.1.13,90
Reason: high / no / low / no fulfillment	38/3/2/5 of 48	T3.1.14,91
Other procedural observations	13/48	T3.1.15,91

Recent decisions before 31 March 2012; private operators, not other municipal administrations. The sixth, overall, wrong case stopped the grant without a final decision. Another matter of hearing the parties as a decision overlaps the five delegates. Absence of written reference: 19 cases, two of which have no real other actor; the report classifies this as a rule of law. Five illegal delegations are not five further mistakes on top of the six. Full complement control has now been implemented on all 180 original pages and the scanned AMS orientation: practice -second actoer2013-full -original tables.md / .json.106 data lags and 527 number rows, 62 local example -ID, same 48 decisions. The old sub-control is thus extended, without new cohorts. All necessary tables and scanned legal annexes are actually checked.

Aid schemes under § 95- 96, 2023 [PBPA23]

16 grants from eight municipalities, eight per provision; no refusal by the Committee of the Regions. Recent applications; already complained allowed if not pending in AS. Five interviewing municipalities. Fredericia's license data were misrecorded. No overall legality assessment; concrete comments were sent to municipal supervision. Five analytical courses are subsets of the 16, and follow-up cases are not included. Method s.81-83.

Population	2018	2019	2020	Locator
Full-time benefits § 95, 93 municipalities	475,4	445,9	408,3	T2.2, p.14
Full-time benefits § 96	1.544,4	1.530,7	1.510,1	same
§ 95 of the Staff Regulations	94	79	82	T0.1, p.16
§ 96	178	171	161	same

Causes 2019-2021	§ 95	§ 96
Other matters of procedure	3	3
New material information	3	2
Information / justification	81	135
Complaints not dealt with	18	20
Legal use	30	31

Causes 2019-2021	§ 95	§ 96
Causal records	135	191
Cases dealt with	113	167

T0.2, p.17. Reasons overlap;191 reasons are not 191 cases. Full-time benefits are not people. T0.1's heading says 2018-2021, but contains absolute counts for only three years. The p.16 figure also shows 2021 percentages; these are not converted into absolute counts. Retrospective register entries can change figures for the same year.

Non-Western Background, 2023 [PHER23]

24 cases obtained from six municipalities; two over the age of 17 excluded; from 22, AS selected 12 with variation in age, intervention and the municipality's assessment of complexity. Seven had placement decisions, one without consent. Three immigrants/nine descendants; residence permit temporary 4/permanent 1/unspecified 7. The age groups 5+4+6 exceed 12 cases: they must not be treated as mutually exclusive case groups. If possible, cases should not previously have been considered as appeals/concern reports; one had in fact been an AS appeal case. Six group interviews with 4-6 participants, two expert interviews/two presentations. The study is not representative and does not examine the correctness of decisions. Five constructed narratives summarise 2-4 cases each; they are not five additional families. Methodology pp.6-7,40-43; fieldwork May-June 2022. Error count: not reported, not zero.

Independent analysis of scope and consequences

The delegation survey documents specific invalid decisions on entitlement to subsistence support. The consequences for the citizen must then be measured as actual cessation of payment, duration, back payment and consequential loss; this cannot be inferred solely from the report's sample proportion. Municipal political follow-up and the agency's contact with the municipality likewise do not prove individual redress or a sanction against a responsible employee.

The personal assistance scheme study leaves refusals outside the case review and follow-up outside the analytical examples. Its complaint statistics separately document several grounds for error in the same case and a large number of alterations/remittals based on insufficient information/reasons. The award cases reviewed cannot be used to exonerate the refusal population. Similarly, the ethnic-background study's municipal assessments of families cannot be treated as documented fact about a particular family without the contemporaneous original records.

For the three studies, record-based deductibility against the complaint records, information on actual follow-up and the implementation / payment dates of the individual citizens concerned are required. The absence of a public malfunctioning counter is an information gap; it does not eliminate the need to try out a concrete illegal intervention.

Second actor 2013: full tables, cessation of dependency and municipal responsibility

All 180 original pages have been read. Scanned PDF105-116 have all been visually read in RAM. **104 numbered original tables**, a municipal list of providers, a population crosswalk and 62 numbered examples are reproduced below. The same cohort of 48 cases as earlier PAKT13; neither 48 nor 62 new citizens are added to the annual series.

Main analysis: known illegal delegation and actual loss of support

Municipalities could deprive persons on sick leave of their subsistence support through a private provider, even though statutory decision-making competence rested with the municipality. In five of 48 cases, the Appeals Board found invalid delegation. The sixth incorrect case shows cessation without a final decision; approximately 9 months later, the municipality had still not made it. This is a specific course involving lost subsistence support and deferred review. The back payment and compensation actually received by the citizen are not stated. [PAKT13-FULD, PDF23/44-47/103]

The municipalities' responsibility had been expressly communicated before the review report. The AMS letter of 17. January 2012 instructed municipalities also to reopen other cases involving unlawful delegation, inform the citizen, secure information and a hearing of the parties, and make a new decision. Where there was a substantive entitlement to benefits, the municipality was to determine the period and pay as quickly as possible. The letter required independent municipal verification of private providers' case presentations. Responsibility must therefore be examined through the municipality's receipt of the notification, contract, management instruction, signature, decision/payment records and timing of redress. [PAKT13-FULD,PDF105-107/111-113]

The 42 cases assessed as correct overall are not 42 error-free cases. The report describes, among other things, missing statutory references in five of them, insufficient reasons and information. The information deficiency was itself treated as a breach of a non-invalidating procedural rule; this does not make a concurrent competence error lawful. Private providers' statements about illness/work identity and descriptions such as objective are their assessments, which must be tested against the medical/functional material. [PAKT13-FULD,PDF31/41/48-57]

Cohort, selection and source differences

The review concerns the most recent decisions before 31. March 2012 in 10 selected municipalities. 50 received, 2 already appealed/forwarded cases excluded, 48 examined. The selection is not a national probability sample. Submitted records were used as the basis; the Act's historical resource-profile requirements change from 2013.41 submitted contracts/26 providers and 21 contracts linked to 48 cases are different denominators. 34.753 persons on sick leave as at 31. March and 3.558 with a provider in the 1st quarter are stock/flow figures based on estimates from 14 and 25 municipalities respectively; they cannot be used as a nationwide error count. [PAKT13-FULD, PDF18/80-85/123-125]

The source has 92 responses inT3.1, but 91 in summary / method; 33 contracting municipalities in main text, 34 in summary / annex; the same 3 ring-border responses with 7% iT3.9 and 8% iB3.3.31 T3.1.8 mistakenly presses total 1 / 17 even if the reasons for errors 5 and 2 overlap. The printed total is visually controlled and maintained as source error. T5.5 has 20 hearings, T5.6 has 22 relevant classifications; no harmonization has been suggested. The rounded 101% of the originals shall be retained. T6.1 summers 52 events, not 52 unique persons. [PAKT13-FUD, PDF5 / 17-21 / 50-51 / 59 / 82 / 84 / 92 / 98- 103]

All original tables and explicit population data

3.1 - Use of other actor

PAKT13-FUD, PDF17, printed on page 14. Names: 92. Summary / method indicates 91 / 93; here 92 replies.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	38	41
No	54	59
Total	92	100

3.2 - Option for choice

PAKT13-FUD, PDF18, printed on page 15. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	19	50
No	5	13
No, just one actor.	14	37
Total	38	100

3.3.3 - Same address

PAKT13-FUD, PDF19, printed on page 16. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	3	8
No	35	92
Total	38	100

3.4 - Contract forms

PAKT13-FULD, PDF19-20, printed page: PDF minus 3. Denominator: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Individual	25	66
Default	5	13
Both	7	18
None	1	3
Total	38	100

3.5 - Guidelines

PAKT13-FUD, PDF20, printed on page 17. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	22	58
No	16	42
Total	38	100

3.6 - Guidelines on information

PAKT13-FUD, PDF20, printed on page 17. Denomination: 22.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	19	86
No	3	14
Total	22	100

3.7 - Scope

PAKT13-FULD, PDF20-21, printed page: PDF minus 3. Denominator: 38. Multiple responses; no sum of persons.

Category	Number	Percentage
Visitation	1	3
Retrieve information	8	21
Follow-up talks	9	24
Plan	9	24
Other follow-up parts	9	24
Evaluate incapacity for work	7	18
Decision by consensus	6	16
Search Offer	7	18
Make offers	32	84

3.8 - Applying guidance letter

PAKT13-FUD, PDF21, printed on page 18. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	29	76
No	9	24
Total	38	100

3.9 - Applicability of the letter

PAKT13-FUD, PDF21, printed on page 18. Names: 38. Annex 3.3.31 presses 3 / 8%; versions maintained.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	14	37
Someone.	20	53
Rings	3	7
None	1	3
Total	38	100

4.1 - Overall accuracy

PAKT13-FUD, PDF23, printed on page 20. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	24	96	1	100	17	77
No	1	4	0	0	5	23
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.2 - Information base

PAKT13-FUD, PDF24, printed on page 21. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
No missing	18	72	1	100	15	68
Less	7	28	0	0	6	27
Essential	0	0	0	0	1	5
Decisive	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.3 - Relevant of the offer

PAKT13-FUD, PDF25, printed on page 22. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
High	20	80	1	100	16	73

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Someone.	5	20	0	0	3	14
Rings	0	0	0	0	0	0
No	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not applicable	0	0	0	0	3	14
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.4 - Visitation

PAKT13-FUD, PDF25, printed on page 22. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	3	12	0	0	0	0
No	22	88	1	100	22	100
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.5 - Collection

PAKT13-FUD, PDF26, printed on page 23. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	5	20	0	0	5	23
No	20	80	1	100	17	77
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.6 - Follow-up talks

PAKT13-FUD, PDF26, printed on page 23. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	8	32	0	0	6	27
No	17	68	1	100	16	73
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.7 - Follow-up plan

PAKT13-FUD, PDF27, printed on page 24. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	8	32	0	0	6	27
No	17	68	1	100	16	73
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.8 - Offer search

PAKT13-FUD, PDF28, printed on page 25. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	1	4	0	0	1	5
No	24	96	1	100	21	95
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.9 - Organisation

PAKT13-FUD, PDF28, printed on page 25. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	24	96	1	100	15	68
No	1	4	0	0	7	32
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.10 - Working capacity

PAKT13-FUD, PDF30, printed on page 27. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	14	56	1	100	6	27
No	11	44	0	0	16	73
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.11 - Other

PAKT13-FUD, PDF32, printed on page 29. Names: 48. § 7 / 21 / 27 Associates 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	1	4	0	0	9	41
No	24	96	1	100	13	59
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.12 - Total accuracy - replicated original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF33, printed on page 30. Names: 48. Same data as 4.1; repeat no more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	24	96	1	100	17	77
No	1	4	0	0	5	23
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.13 - Basic information - Repeated original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF33, printed on page 30. Names: 48. The same data as 4.2; do not repeat any more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
No missing	18	72	1	100	15	68
Less	7	28	0	0	6	27
Essential	0	0	0	0	1	5
Decisive	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.14 - Relevant of the offer - Repeated original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF34, printed on page 31. Names: 48. Same data as 4.3; repeat no more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
High	20	80	1	100	16	73
Someone.	5	20	0	0	3	14
Rings	0	0	0	0	0	0
No	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not applicable	0	0	0	0	3	14
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.15 - Visitation - repeated original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF37, printed on page 34. Names: 48. Same data as 4.4; repeat no more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	3	12	0	0	0	0
No	22	88	1	100	22	100
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.16 - Collection - repeat original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF38, printed on page 35. Names: 48. Same data as 4.5; repeat no more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	5	20	0	0	5	23
No	20	80	1	100	17	77
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.17 - Follow-up conversations - repeat original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF38, printed on page 35. Names: 48. Same data as 4.6; repeat no more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	8	32	0	0	6	27
No	17	68	1	100	16	73
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.18 - Follow-up plan - replicated original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF39, printed on page 36. Names: 48. Same data as 4.7; repeat no more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	8	32	0	0	6	27
No	17	68	1	100	16	73
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.19 - Offer referral - replicated original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF39, printed on page 36. Names: 48. Same data as 4.8; repeat no more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	1	4	0	0	1	5
No	24	96	1	100	21	95
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.20 - Holding - Repeated original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF40, printed on page 37. Names: 48. Same data as 4.9; repeat no more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	24	96	1	100	15	68
No	1	4	0	0	7	32
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.21 - Working capacity - replicated original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF41, printed on page 38. Names: 48. Same data as 4.10; repeat no more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	14	56	1	100	6	27
No	11	44	0	0	16	73
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

4.22 - Other - Repeated original table

PAKT13-FUD, PDF42, printed on page 39. Names: 48. Same data as 4.11; repeat no more cases.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	1	4	0	0	9	41
No	24	96	1	100	13	59
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

5.1 - Resolution authority

PAKT13-FUD, PDF44, printed on page 41. Names: 48. Subordinate 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Municipality	24	96	1	100	18	82
Other actor	1	4	0	0	4	18
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

5.2 - Form

PAKT13-FUD, PDF46, printed on page 43. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
Written	30	63
Journal	18	38
Other	0	0
Total	48	100

5.3 - Reasons

PAKT13-FUD, PDF48, printed on page 45. Names: 48. Subordinate 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
High	18	72	1	100	19	86
Someone.	2	8	0	0	1	5
Rings	0	0	0	0	2	9
No	5	20	0	0	0	0
Not applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

5.4 - Complaint guidance

PAKT13-FUD, PDF50, printed on page 47. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	1	2
Someone.	28	58

Category	Number	Percentage
Rings	0	0
No	2	4
Not applicable	17	35
Total	48	100

5.5 - Consultation of the parties

PAKT13-FUD, PDF50, printed on page 47. Names: 48. Subordinate 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	4	16	1	100	15	68
No	0	0	0	0	1	5
Not applicable	21	84	0	0	6	27
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

5.6 - Second actor hearing of parties

PAKT13-FULD, PDF51,printed page 48. Denominator:48. 22 relevant versus 20 carried out in 5.5; classification difference retained.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	3	6
No	19	40
Not applicable	26	54
Total	48	100

5.7 - Second actor setting

PAKT13-FUD, PDF51, printed on page 48. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	5	10
No	43	90
Total	48	100

5.8 - § 7a Citizens' involvement

PAKT13-FUD, PDF52, printed on page 49. Names: 48. Subordinate 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
High	6	24	1	100	9	41
Someone.	1	4	0	0	1	5
Rings	0	0	0	0	2	9

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
No	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not applicable	18	72	0	0	10	45
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

5.9 - § 7 a others

PAKT13-FUD, PDF53, printed on page 50. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	17	35
Someone.	0	0
Rings	0	0
No	0	0
Not applicable	31	65
Total	48	100

5.10 - Second actor § 7a

PAKT13-FUD, PDF53, printed on page 50. Names: 48. Subordinate 25 / 1 / 22.

Category	7 Number	§ 7 Percent	§ 21 Quantity	§ 21 Percent	§ 27 Quantity	§ 27 Percent
Yes	0	0	0	0	4	18
No	7	28	1	100	7	32
Not applicable	18	72	0	0	11	50
Total	25	100	1	100	22	100

5.11 - § 21

PAKT13-FUD, PDF54, printed on page 51. Names: 1.

Category	Respondents	Percentage
High	1	100
Someone.	0	0
Rings	0	0
No	0	0
Not applicable	0	0
Total	1	100

5.12 - Resource Profile

PAKT13-FUD, PDF55, printed on page 52. Denomination: 22.

Category	Respondents	Percentage
High	19	86
Someone.	3	14
Rings	0	0
No	0	0
Not applicable	0	0
Total	22	100

5.13 - Profile of other actor

PAKT13-FUD, PDF55, printed on page 52. Denomination: 22.

Category	Respondents	Percentage
Yes	4	18
No	18	82
Total	22	100

5.14 - Information about the actor

PAKT13-FULD, PDF56, printed on page 53. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	13	27
Someone.	16	33
Rings	7	15
No	12	25
Total	48	100

6.1 - Actor distribution

PAKT13-FUD, PDF59, printed on page 56. Names: 48. Printed blank fields are blank. Actor occurrences 52, not 52 unique persons; several players in 6 cases. Kalundborg 6 / N5 and Nordfyn 8 / N5. No automatic union from row / column numbers.

Actor	Aalborg	Billund	Gentofte	Tray shoes v	Hedent ed	Horsens	Kalundb org	KHH Name	Norddju r	Nordfyn	Tot al
AS3	blank	2	blank	blank	blank	blank	1	blank	1	blank	4
Daghøj kolen Gri ndsted	blank	1	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	1
Falck Jo bservice	blank	blank	5	blank	blank	3	blank	blank	blank	blank	8
The house Gr insted	blank	2	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	2
Incentives	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	1	blank	blank	1

Actor	Aalborg	Billund	Gentofte	Tray shoes v	Hedent ed	Horsens	Kalundb org	KHH Name	Norddju r	Nordfyn	Tot al
Markma nn	blank	blank	blank	2	blank	blank	blank	blank	2	blank	4
Quick Care	4	blank	blank	3	blank	blank	5	blank	blank	5	17
Skerning house	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	3	3
Springbr Set	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	1	blank	blank	1
Developm ent shus	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	1	blank	blank	blank	blank	1
Varda	blank	blank	blank	blank	5	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	5
Center Job and Clarifi cation	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	1	blank	blank	blank	blank	1
Futureco m Training	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	1	blank	blank	1
Rehabce nter Flyg tninge	1	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	1
No other actor	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	2	blank	blank	2

6.2 - Contract paper

PAKT13-FUD, PDF60, printed on page 57. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Municipality	4	19
Actor	10	48
Unknown	7	33
Total	21	100

6.3 - Similar to others

PAKT13-FUD, PDF60, printed on page 57. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	6	29
No	15	71
Total	21	100

6.4 - Visitation

PAKT13-FUD, PDF64, printed on page 61. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	1	5
No	20	95
Total	21	100

6.5 - Collection

PAKT13-FUD, PDF65, printed on page 62. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	11	52
No	10	48
Total	21	100

6.6 - Follow-up

PAKT13-FUD, PDF65, printed on page 62. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	8	38
No	13	62
Total	21	100

6.7 - Plan

PAKT13-FUD, PDF67, printed on page 64. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	5	24
No	16	76
Total	21	100

6.8 - Offer search

PAKT13-FUD, PDF68, printed on page 65. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	2	10
No	19	90
Total	21	100

6.9 - Organisation

PAKT13-FUD, PDF70, printed on page 67. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	19	91
No	2	9
Total	21	100

6.10 - Working capacity

PAKT13-FUD, PDF73, printed on page 70. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	13	62
No	8	38
Total	21	100

6.11 - Other

PAKT13-FUD, PDF74, printed on page 71. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	5	24
No	16	76
Total	21	100

6.12 - Success criteria

PAKT13-FUD, PDF77, printed on page 74. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	13	62
No	8	38
Total	21	100

3.1.1 - Gender

PAKT13-FUD, PDF90, printed on page 87. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
Male	17	35
Women	31	65
Total	48	100

3.1.2 - Destination

PAKT13-FUD, PDF90, printed on page 87. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
§ 7	25	52
§ 21	1	2
§ 27	22	46
Total	48	100

3.1.3 - Authority

PAKT13-FUD, PDF91, printed on page 88. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
Municipality	43	90
Actor	5	10
Unknown	0	0
Total	48	100

3.1.4 - Municipalities

PAKT13-FUD, PDF91, printed on page 88. Names: 48.

Municipality	Number
Aalborg	5
Billund	5
Gentofte	5
Gribskov	5
Heath site	5
Horsens	5
Kalundborg	5
Copenhagen	5
Norddjurs	3
Nordfyn	5
Total	48

3.1.5 - Tasks

PAKT13-FUD, PDF91, printed on page 88. Names: 48. Multi-answer.

Zone	Yeah.	No.
Visitation	3	45
Collection	10	38
Conversations	14	34
Plan	14	34

Zone	Yeah.	No.
Offer search	2	46
Organisation	40	8
Working capacity	21	27
Other	10	38

3.1.6 - More players

PAKT13-FUD, PDF92, printed on page 89. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	6	13
No	42	88
Total	48	100

3.1.7 - Rightness

PAKT13-FUD, PDF92, printed on page 89. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	42	88
No	6	13
Total	48	100

3.1.8 - Grounds for error

PAKT13-FULD, PDF92,printed page 89. Denominator:6. Visually checked printing error in total 1/17. The cause entries overlap; not replaced with a guessed sum.

Category	Number	Percentage
§ 19	5	83
§ 7	0	0
§ 21	0	0
§ 27	2	33
Lack of information	0	0
Total, printed	1	17

3.1.9 - Information

PAKT13-FUD, PDF92, printed on page 89. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
None	34	71
Less	13	27

Category	Number	Percentage
Essential	1	2
Decisive	0	0
Total	48	100

3.1.10 - Material conditions

PAKT13-FUD, PDF93, printed on page 90. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	46	96
Someone.	1	2
Rings	0	0
No	1	2
Total	48	100

3.1.11 - Supply relevance

PAKT13-FUD, PDF93, printed on page 90. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	37	77
Someone.	8	17
Rings	0	0
No	0	0
Not applicable	3	6
Total	48	100

3.1.12 - Actor decision

PAKT13-FUD, PDF93, printed on page 90. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	5	10
No	43	90
Total	48	100

3.1.13 - Consultation of the parties

PAKT13-FUD, PDF93, printed on page 90. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	20	42
No	1	2

Category	Number	Percentage
Not applicable	27	56
Total	48	100

3.1.14 - Reasons

PAKT13-FUD, PDF94, printed on page 91. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	38	79
Someone.	3	6
Rings	2	4
No	5	10
Not applicable	0	0
Total	48	100

3.1.15 - Other formal comments

PAKT13-FUD, PDF94, printed on page 91. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	13	27
No	35	73
Total	48	100

3.1.16 - Message transmitter separated

PAKT13-FUD, PDF94, printed on page 91. Names: 48.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	21	44
Someone.	5	10
Rings	2	4
No	6	13
Unknown	14	29
Total	48	100

3.2.1 - Contract distribution

PAKT13-FUD, PDF95, printed on page 92. Names: 21.

Municipality	Number
Aalborg	2
Billund	3

Municipality	Number
Gentofte	1
Gribskov	2
Heath site	1
Horsens	3
Kalundborg	2
Copenhagen	3
Norddjurs	2
Nordfyn	2
Total	21

3.2.2 - Contract tasks

PAKT13-FUD, PDF95, printed on page 92. Names: 21. Multiple response; 19 / 2 visually controlled.

Zone	Yeah.	No.
Visitation	1	20
Collection	11	10
Conversations	8	13
Plan	5	16
Offer search	2	19
Organisation	19	2
Working capacity	13	8
Other	5	16

3.2.3 - Internal instruction

PAKT13-FUD, PDF96, printed on page 93. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	5	24
No	16	76
Total	21	100

3.2.4 - Subcontractor

PAKT13-FUD, PDF96, printed on page 93. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Whole	0	0
Parts	1	5
No	20	95

Category	Number	Percentage
Total	21	100

3.2.5 - Authorisation clearly

PAKT13-FUD, PDF96, printed on page 93. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	15	71
Someone.	6	29
Rings	0	0
No	0	0
Total	21	100

3.2.6 - Supervision delegated

PAKT13-FUD, PDF96, printed on page 93. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	0	0
No	21	100
Unknown	0	0
Total	21	100

3.2.7 - Information on procedures

PAKT13-FUD, PDF97, printed on page 94. Names: 5.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	2	40
Someone.	0	0
Rings	0	0
No	3	60
Total	5	100

3.2.8 - Classification other actor

PAKT13-FUD, PDF97, printed on page 94. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	20	95
No	1	5
Total	21	100

3.2.9 - Unique substitute

PAKT13-FUD, PDF97, printed on page 94. Names: 1.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	1	100
No	0	0
Total	1	100

3.2.10 - § 19 Legality

PAKT13-FUD, PDF97, printed on page 94. Names: 21.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	20	95
No	1	5
Total	21	100

3.3.13 - Use

PAKT13-FUD, PDF98, printed on page 95. Names: 92.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	38	41
No	54	59
Total	92	100

3.3.14 - Address

PAKT13-FUD, PDF98, printed on page 95. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	3	8
No	35	92
Total	38	100

3.3.16 - Standard contract

PAKT13-FUD, PDF99, printed page 96. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	12	32
No	26	68
Total	38	100

3.3.17 - Individual contract

PAKT13-FUD, PDF99, printed page 96. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	32	84
No	6	16
Total	38	100

3.3.18 - Guidelines

PAKT13-FUD, PDF99, printed page 96. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	22	58
No	16	42
Total	38	100

3.3.19 - Informers

PAKT13-FUD, PDF99, printed page 96. Denomination: 22.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	19	86
No	3	14
Total	22	100

3.3.20 - Temporary employment guidelines

PAKT13-FUD, PDF100, printed page 97. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	3	8
No	35	92
Total	38	100

3.3.21 - Visitation

PAKT13-FUD, PDF100, printed page 97. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	1	3
No	37	97
Total	38	100

3.3.22 - Collection

PAKT13-FUD, PDF100, printed page 97. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	8	21
No	30	79
Total	38	100

3.3.23 - Follow-up

PAKT13-FUD, PDF100, printed page 97. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	9	24
No	29	76
Total	38	100

3.3.24 - Plan

PAKT13-FUD, PDF101, printed on page 98. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	9	24
No	29	76
Total	38	100

3.3.25 - Follow-up action

PAKT13-FUD, PDF101, printed on page 98. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	9	24
No	29	76
Total	38	100

3.3.26 - Assessment

PAKT13-FUD, PDF101, printed on page 98. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	7	18
No	31	82
Total	38	100

3.3.27 - Decision by agreement

PAKT13-FUD, PDF101, printed on page 98. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	6	16
No	32	84
Total	38	100

3.3.28 - Offer search

PAKT13-FUD, PDF102, printed on page 99. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	7	18
No	31	82
Total	38	100

3.3.29 - Holding

PAKT13-FUD, PDF102, printed on page 99. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	32	84
No	6	16
Total	38	100

3.3.30 - Orientation letter

PAKT13-FUD, PDF102, printed on page 99. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	29	76
No	9	24
Total	38	100

3.3.15 - Option

PAKT13-FUD, PDF98, printed on page 95. Names: 38.

Category	Number	Percentage
Yes	19	50
No	5	13
Only one	14	37
Total	38	100

3.3.31 - Applicability

PAKT13-FUD, PDF102, printed on page 99. Names: 38. Same 3 person records as 3.9 with 7% printed. No addition.

Category	Number	Percentage
High	14	37
Someone.	20	53
Rings	3	8
None	1	3
Total	38	100

3.4.1 - Rightness of municipalities

PAKT13-FULD, PDF103, printed page 100. Names: 48.

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Total
Aalborg	5	0	5
Billund	5	0	5
Gentofte	5	0	5
Gribskov	5	0	5
Heath site	0	5	5
Horsens	5	0	5
Kalundborg	5	0	5
Copenhagen	4	1	5
Norddjurs	3	0	3
Nordfyn	5	0	5
Total	42	6	48

3.4.2 - Information for the municipalities

PAKT13-FULD, PDF103, printed page 100. Names: 48.

Municipality	None	Less	Essential	Decisive	Total
Aalborg	5	0	0	0	5
Billund	5	0	0	0	5
Gentofte	4	1	0	0	5
Gribskov	5	0	0	0	5
Heath site	4	1	0	0	5
Horsens	0	5	0	0	5
Kalundborg	2	3	0	0	5
Copenhagen	3	1	1	0	5

Municipality	None	Less	Essential	Decisive	Total
Norddjurs	1	2	0	0	3
Nordfyn	5	0	0	0	5
Total	34	13	1	0	48

B2 provider list - Printed provider names and employee ranges

PAKT13-FUD, PDF86-89, printed on page 83-86. Name: None. Intervalls and blank / unilluminated fields are not exact employee numbers. Two municipalities do not give names; no automatic similarity between listings and 75 contracts.

Municipality	Actor	Employee Interval	PDF
Aabenra	Quick Care	50-99	86
Aalborg	Arkade Physiotherapy	20-49	86
Aalborg	Region North Jutland	>1000	86
Albertslund	Vestegnens Voksenundervisningscenter	5-9	86
Billund	Grindsted Daghøjskole LOF	5-9	86
Billund	AS3Companies	5-9	86
Billund	Job care	10-19	86
Billund	House of Grindsted	Undisclosed	86
Frederiksberg	Contra	50-99	86
Frederikssund	Integro	50-99	86
Gentofte	ISS	>1000	86
Gentofte	Lars Damkjær Coaching	<10	86
Gentofte	Falck Job Service	50-99	86
Gladsaxe	ITK2	20-49	86
Golden Borgsund	Undisclosed	Undisclosed	86
Gribskov	Markmann	50-99	87
Gribskov	Quick Care	50-99	87
Rhinoceros	Quick Care	50-99	87
Heath site	TUCJob	50-99	87
Heath site	Ls.Physiotherapy	Single member	87
Heath site	Fund Hedensted Centre	<10	87
Heath site	Varda	<10	87
Herlev	Undisclosed	Undisclosed	87
Horsens	Falck Job Service	50-99	87
Horsens	Contra	50-99	87
Horsens	The development house	Undisclosed	87

Municipality	Actor	Employee Interval	PDF
Horsens	Xellentcare	Undisclosed	87
Hvidover	Ascend Fys vJesper Aggergaard	Single member	87
Kalundborg	Quick Care	50-99	87
Kalundborg	AS3Public	100-199	87
Kerteminde	Peter Damborg Hahn	Single member	87
Copenhagen	Markmann	50-99	87
Copenhagen	Ducas	10-19	87
Copenhagen	Servisio Trim	10-19	87
Copenhagen	AS3	100-199	87
Copenhagen	Springboard	Undisclosed	87
Copenhagen	Contra	50-99	87
Copenhagen	The House of Growth	Undisclosed	87
Copenhagen	Kofoeds School	20-49	87
Copenhagen	Hartmanns	200-499	87
Copenhagen	Incentives	50-99	87
Copenhagen	Plan and Action Allan Nielsen	Single member	88
Copenhagen	Hans Knudsen Instituttet	100-199	88
Lolland	AS3	blank	88
Lolland	MBAdvice Mette Bohnfeldt	Single member	88
Lyngby-Taarbæk	Falck Job Service	50-99	88
Mariners' fjord	Body	<10	88
Norddjurs	AS3Companies	5-9	88
Norddjurs	Markmann	50-99	88
Nordfyn	Quick Care	50-99	88
Nordfyn	The skerninghuset	Single member	88
Odsherd	Activity Action ApS	Undisclosed	88
Odsherd	SirculusApS	5-9	88
Odsherd	Quick CareAS	50-99	88
Randers	Jobdk	100-199	88
Roskilde	Quick Care	50-99	88
Skanderborg	Quick Care	50-99	88
Silkeborg	Trivselsgruppen AS Univers	10-19	88
Slaughter	Quick Care	50-99	88
Sunred	Quick Care	50-99	88

Municipality	Actor	Employee Interval	PDF
Sunred	Sirculus	5-9	88
Sunred	Bomi	5-9	88
Sunred	Contra	50-99	88
Sorø	Quick Care	50-99	89
Stevns	Quick Care	50-99	89
Stevns	AS3Public	100-199	89
Svendborg	Quick Care	50-99	89
Svendborg	PPClinic	<10	89
West Himmerland	Quick Care	50-99	89

M-kohort Bridge - Different populations and knowledge

PAKT13-FULD, PDF5-6/18-19/80-85, printed pages 2-3/15-16/77-82. Denominator: None. Stock/flow, estimates and contracts are not national counts of people affected by errors.48 cases are the same earlier PAKT13.

Measurement	Number	Limitation
Questionnaire mass, main	92	93 job centres
Questionnaire mass, summary / methodology	91	93 job centres
User actor	38	2012
Stack on sick leave	34753	31.3.2012 in 38 municipalities
Stock estimated municipalities	14	of 38
With operator	3558	1.1-31.3.2012
Actor number estimated municipalities	25	of 38
Contracts	75	survey
Municipality of contraa, main	33	PDF19
Contract municipalities, Annex / Summary	34	PDF6 / 84 / 86
Contracts forwarded	41	26 actors
Contracts examined	21	related to 48 cases
Cases forwarded	50	10 municipalities
Appealed cases excluded	2	no addition
Cases examined	48	31.3.2012 latest
Local units separately	2	not private actors in the general organisational sense,
Unique replacement	1	Nordfyn 2.1-30.3.2012

Individual processes and contract examples

Example numbers are not a unique person count. Contract examples 26-61 / 66-68 are terms and targets; not actual results. Hole numbers 24 / 25 / 62-65 are not designed.

Example or	Type	Original	Specific information provided by the source	Meaning and requirements
1	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF24	Disciplinary rascals; the letter of resignation lacks legal reference, the municipality has signed rascal.	Irregular reporting is a specific document; it is not automatically independent medical certificate of full ability to work.
2	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF26	The other actor shall obtain medical information after the signature of the mandate.	Consent for data collection does not prove consent to the termination of support.
3	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF29	Whipped tongue, sick name 2009; offer 12.4-1.6.2012.	Offer period, not decision/redress date.
4	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF29	Physical tests and spare requirements are part of the process.	The operator's test shall be tested against actual medical documentation.
5	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF29	ADHD and serious mental problems, career progression.	Health and progress described; actual healing / work not documented.
6	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF29	Stress / depression and return to work are included.	The objective and the plan must be kept separate from the actual return.
7	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF31	Status 24.9.2012 on chronic pain and limited resources; citizen says not to be able to return, player denotes assessment objective.	The term objective is the operator's statement, not independent proof of truth.
8	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF31	Status 23.3.2012: Protection against heavy lifting, knee / elbow / back.	Skagerrak information is concrete knowledge the municipality must include.
9	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF31	Status 6.9.2012: waiting for health services; continuation recommended to avoid break and decline.	Recommended continuity is not evidence of actual tender delivery.
10	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF32	Failure to attend makes it impossible, according to the other actor, to assess physical and mental ability to work.	Absence of an assessment does not prove capacity for work; AS assesses the section 21 decision against other criteria.
11	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF34-37	Party hearing 11.9.2012 / deadline 20.9; retirement stop 30.9.2012, over 80% absence after assault / threats. The municipality considers no clarification within 39 weeks from 31.1.2012; mentor / internship is judged necessary.	AS accepts the decision. Its own reproduction documents the unexplained ability and need for help. Whether lack of assistance contributed to absenteeism / cessation must be tested against the original; no automatic illegality derived from the summary.
12	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF38	Actor picks up information from employer and physiotherapist.	The self-examination and use of the municipality must be demonstrated.
13	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF39	Actor contributes data to the plan; the municipality makes the assessment.	Formal division of responsibility is not in itself proof of actual independent review.
14	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF41	Trainee in fish hall 20.2-29.4.2012.	Can overlap example 17; no secure personal union.
15	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF41	Actor will shift focus from disease identity to work identity.	The operator's interpretation is not a verified diagnosis or rejection of disease.
16	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF41	Actor is looking for an internship.	A search is not documented provision of an offer, a job or restoration of subsistence.
17	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF42	Fishery hall, asthma / allergy, actor indicates 5-30 minutes of effective work daily.	Specifically impaired function; possible overlap with 14, not new self-employed person demonstrated.

Example or	Type	Original	Specific information provided by the source	Meaning and requirements
18	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF44-45	Joint letter in five invalid delegation cases; the provider must also make a recommendation, non-attendance may lead to cessation under section 21. The letter denies decision-making competence, while the provider actually signs alone or with a manager.	The document chain shows a difference between declared role and actual decision; management co-signature and contract must be linked to knowledge / responsibility. The five are the same 5 / 48.
19	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF46	The municipality stops the service without a final decision and says at AS telephone contact that the consultation letter is the final decision.	Included in the five delegation cases; types of errors overlap, not extra seventh case.
20	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF47	Income support is stopped while the final decision is postponed pending a reply from the hospital/general practitioner. Approximately 9 months later, when AS makes contact, the municipality has still not made a decision.	In fact, there is a continuing lack of control, not just an abstract error of form. The post-payment, date of new decision and financial loss are not disclosed. Requirements: timeline, pay log, legal basis and restoration.
21	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF48-49	A letter of termination does not provide any legal basis or actual prior periods of benefit beyond 52 weeks within 18 months.	The citizen lacks verifiable grounds to challenge the expiry.
22	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF49	The alleged written basis is not available; general duration reference does not replace specific section 27 criteria.	Example 21 / 22 is also the two low § 7 involvement; no addition for four people.
23	Case-law / preliminary ruling	PDF56-57	Written reference and § 21 warning, AS assesses sufficient information.	A correct letter is not independent proof of actual ability to participate.
26	Contract / addition example	PDF61	Contract target group and offer defined.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
27	Contract / addition example	PDF61	Target group delimitation in contract.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
28	Contract / addition example	PDF61	The contract describes the target group.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
29	Contract / addition example	PDF61	Back disorders are broken down between 4 and 12 weeks and over 12 weeks.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
30	Contract / addition example	PDF61	Contract indicates target group.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
31	Contract / addition example	PDF62	One subcontractor contract for physical functional clarification.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.

Example or	Type	Original	Specific information provided by the source	Meaning and requirements
32	Contract / addition example	PDF63	The working procedures and the responsibilities of the parties shall be described.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
33	Contract / addition example	PDF63	Guidelines are described.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
34	Contract / addition example	PDF63	Contract to meet after 4 weeks with three parties.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
35	Contract / addition example	PDF64	Visitation contract.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
36	Contract / addition example	PDF64	Visitation and decision-making responsibilities are unclear.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
37	Contract / addition example	PDF65	Medical/employer information is obtained and sent to the municipality.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
38	Contract / addition example	PDF65	The operator shall send all relevant information collected to the municipality.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
39	Contract / addition example	PDF66	Follow-up mode is shown.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
40	Contract / addition example	PDF66	A lack of clarity about the follow-up task or the start of the course.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
41	Contract / addition example	PDF66	Follow-up every 4 weeks.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
42	Contract / addition example	PDF67	Three contracts in one municipality require municipal approval of the plan.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
43	Contract / addition example	PDF68	Job notes: 18-19 years within 4 weeks, over 19 years within 11 weeks.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
44	Contract / addition example	PDF69	780 DKK per week; 900 DKK KTH / unemployment benefit; 780 DKK for visitation reimbursed first month by actual course, intern search 780 DKK / week until appointment.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.

Example or	Type	Original	Specific information provided by the source	Meaning and requirements
45	Contract / addition example	PDF69	The municipality searches, the actor establishes an internship.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
46	Contract / addition example	PDF69	The operator shall establish and register an internship.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
47	Contract / addition example	PDF71	2 weeks of clarification and 11 weeks of internship.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
48	Contract / addition example	PDF71	Physical effort and stress / depression conversations.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
49	Contract / addition example	PDF71	Prolonged pain / stress.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
50	Contract / addition example	PDF71	Contract annexes describe the distribution of responsibilities.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
51	Contract / addition example	PDF72	Training / traineeship is part of the offer.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
52	Contract / addition example	PDF72	Training and training.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
53	Contract / addition example	PDF72	Coaching / progress.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
54	Contract / addition example	PDF72	12 weeks offer: 4 group and 8 internships.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
55	Contract / addition example	PDF72	Course / training course.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
56	Contract / addition example	PDF73	Function profile at end.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
57	Contract / addition example	PDF73	Continuous evaluation of resources.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.

Example or	Type	Original	Specific information provided by the source	Meaning and requirements
58	Contract / addition example	PDF73	Actor describes working function.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
59	Contract / addition example	PDF73	Labour assessment is included.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
60	Contract / addition example	PDF75	Physician and psychologist 2,5 hours each / week: 5 hours, 4125 kr exom per week started. Assessment within 10 working days 1150 DKK / hour, within 3 days 1600 DKK / time.3 psychological interviews 45-60 minutes, explicit employment, not diagnostic / treatment.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
61	Contract / addition example	PDF76	The contract 1.4.2011-30.6.2012 also transfers responses to appeals/casework, denies decision-making competence. No payment if AS/BAN amends/remits for reconsideration/invalidates.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
66	Contract / addition example	PDF77	Success target 55% healthy / partial.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
67	Contract / addition example	PDF77	12 weeks thereafter free group counselling until clarification.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.
68	Contract / addition example	PDF77	After 6 months: job / flexible / training 15%, healthy for A- Box 20%, external internship / wage subsidy 70%.	Contract terms, not documented actual person outcomes or paid cost. Incentives / prices are the basis for concrete accountability checks; no automatic proof of manipulation.

Knowledge, duty, follow-up and instruments

Consignor / date	Original	Documentary knowledge / duty	Follow-up
AMS → kommunern e; 17.1.2012	PDF105-107; Orientation letter, replaces 10.3.2011	Decision of principle 2010 / 11, invalid private power of decision. Points 2.1 to 2.3. Also resume other similar cases; inform the citizen, investigate case material, party hearing and take a new decision.	Point 2.4 consider the period / continued right / possible deduction; pay as soon as possible. Actual payment in 48 cases not documented.
AMS; 17.1.2012	PDF108-110; Point 2.5.1-2.5.4	Historical rule / practice interpretation of retroactivity, § 21 / § 24-27 / § 7.	No automatic material entitlement to benefit from any defect in competence, but that does not imply the legality of actual stoppages. Later legislation / practice will have to be tested separately.
AMS → kommunern e; 17.1.2012	PDF111-113; Point 3.1-3.3	Power to instruct, dual-employment/conflict-of-interest risk, the provider's account of the case. Actual municipal instruction of the temporary worker; independent verification of facts/information/statements; the municipality hears the parties and makes a recommendation.	The signature and the commune logo do not prove independent review.
Minister → AS → 10 municipalities; Consultation 2.5.2012; submission deadline 3.10.2012	PDF123-125; Call letter	Press reports about unlawful use of providers led to a request from the Ministry. All current contracts/instructions and the 5 most recent decisions; those already appealed/forwarded are excluded.	Expected publication mid-2013; shredding only submitted copies, not proof of municipal originals.

Instrument	Original	Actual measurement range	Limitation
Annex 7 survey	PDF126-136	2012 use, option, address, stock 31.3 and flow 1.1-31.3 with explicit beauty flags; CVR and contract forms, guidelines / tasks / orientation letter. Deadline 15.8.2012.	Empty response fields are not zero, and question options are not executed.
Annex 8	PDF137-163	Municipality / actor / date of birth / sex / date of decision / § 7 / 21 / 27, tasks / multiple actors, material accuracy / information, § 21 guidance / consultation, § 27 profile, § 7 involvement, FVL22-25 reason / complaint, operator recommendation / party consultation / information / letter transmitter.	48 controlled cases; no published date union or national CPRdedup.
Annex 9 Contract Eel Form	PDF164-180	One table per actor; letter paper / comparability / in struks / sub-contractor, 8 tasks, empowerment / successful / delegate supervision, actorvreelvicar and § 19 legality. Last page marked November 2012.	21 contracts; targets / prices / plans are not actually citizens' outcomes.

Errors, hypotheses and concrete residues

Documented criticisms are exceeding competence, cessation of income support without a final decision, insufficient reasons and information, and missing documentation of individual redress. Hedensted's five reviewed decisions and Copenhagen's one are in T3.4.1; this is not a national judgment or five named criminally liable officials. The binding duties must be examined for each municipality and each documented case.

Hypotheses concerning influenced assessment of medical evidence, abuse of financial incentives, harm from lost subsistence or further errors outside the sample require contemporaneous primary records. The contract's fee reduction upon remittal is a documented incentive, not proof of an actual withheld appeal or manipulation.

The prioritised evidential chain is: contract/instruction and AMS notification → actual sender/signature and basis for the decision → cessation date and payment records → municipal management's knowledge → new decision, payment and other redress. The strongest demands are reversal of actions exceeding competence, a lawful individual decision, prompt payment of arrears where entitlement continues, documented assessment of damages for loss and accountability for continuing known errors.

• Full individual files, CPRunion and overlap with other years of practice / complaint not published.

• In the event of actual reopening, post-payment, compensation, dependants and persons liable after the report have not been provided as a defaults register.

• T6.1 Actor occurrences 52 and several actors 6 cases are not sufficient to reconstruct the union.

• Historical precedent-decision summaries in PDF114-122 are the same legal references, not additional 2012 review cases.

BPA 2023: full original figures and concrete aid courses

BPA23F. All 83 original pages read in memory. 9 number / method blocks, 104 rows. All five analytical runs and the method annex checked; PDF14 / 16 / 17 actually visually.

Limitation and local original deviations

16 award cases from 8 municipalities; most recent new applications. Pending complaints are excluded, previously appealed closed cases are allowed. Five case trajectories selected from 16. Refusals and actual follow-up are not covered by this case cohort. The review does not test compliance with the law; some findings were sent to municipal supervision without a public count/outcome statement (PDF81-83).

Fredericia's selection of appropriations recognized the error. T2.3: 2020 heading towards 2021 prose. T0.1: 2021 in title without 2021 column. F2.1: § 95 remittal for reconsideration 2021 without number label. PDF29 uses remittal for reconsideration as population for 72 / 81%, where T0.2 includes all the surrounding. Casual initiation § 95 against, in fact, § 96.
Kurt: § 96- Decision is missing. Peter: replacement application without documented treatment. Martin: 168 / 50-hour relationship unfounded. Kasper: employer's responsibility not disclosed. Louise: 70-hour discharge missing (PDF25-27 / 47 / 51 / 69 / 73).

T2.2: Full-time services and approach

BPA23F PDF14; denominator 93; unit municipalities / full-time benefits. Not people. Two months count as 0,17 full-time. Inflow figures from a separate ministerial reply;2020/2021 not stated.

Year	§ 95 full-time	§ 96 full-time	Total full-time	§ 95 approach	§ 96 approach
2018	475.4	1544.4	2019.8	50	70
2019	445.9	1530.7	1976.6	40	70
2020	408.3	1510.1	1918.4	-	-

T2.3: Interview municipalities, grants

BPA23F PDF14; denominator 5; unit municipalities / grant measure. Heading quarter 4 of 2020 versus prose quarter 4 of 2021. Fredericia’s § 95 selection data later acknowledged as erroneous, PDF81. Not error statistics.

Municipality	§ 95	§ 96
Aabenra	17	18
Fredericia	15	15
Horsens	5	21
Odense	15	59
Viborg	7.2	26

T0.1: Real-time complaints

BPA23F PDF16; mentions separate case denominators per year; unit appeals. Heading 2018- 2021, but the 2021column does not exist. Ongoing post-registration; not automatically the same version as other series.

Year	§ 95	§ 96
2018	94	178
2019	79	171
2020	82	161

F2.1: Complaint result, printed percentage

BPA23F PDF16; mentions all reality complaints in each category / year; unit percent. Visually controlled. § 95 remittal for reconsideration 2021 has no number label; 27,6 would be calculated remainder, not printed figures. N 2021 not disclosed; rounded percentages are not translated into exact case numbers.

Destination	Year	Stable%	Modified / repealed%	Remitted %
§ 95	2018	54.3	5.3	40.4
§ 95	2019	44.3	11.4	44.3
§ 95	2020	52.4	4.9	42.7
§ 95	2021	68.1	4.3	No number label
§ 96	2018	70.2	6.2	23.6
§ 96	2019	59.6	9.4	31
§ 96	2020	65.2	8.7	26.1
§ 96	2021	76	1.7	22.3

T0.2: Reasons for alteration/remittal 2019-2021

BPA23F PDF17; denominator {'§ 95': 113, '§ 96': 167}; unit reason markers / decisions altered or remitted. Several reasons per case.135/191 does not represent people. PDF29 calls 72/81% remittals, but the original table's population is all decisions altered or remitted.

Reason	§ 95 number	§ 95 printed%	§ 96	§ 96 printed%
Other proceedings	3	3	3	2
New information	3	3	2	1
Information / justification	81	72	135	81
The parties' complaints	18	16	20	12
Legal use	30	27	31	19
Total Causes	135	-	191	-
Cases dealt with	113	-	167	-

M1: Analysis of grant cases, type

BPA23F PDF18; mentions 16; progress of unit appropriations. § 8 95 + § 8 96. Five cases have been selected from 16, not extra cases.

Type	Case
Transition	4
Progressive disorder	5
Change of municipality	2
Accident	1
Other	4
Total	16

M2: Methodology and case review

BPA23F PDF30-43; 81-83; denominator 16; unit cases / municipalities / interviews / years. N varies by row. 47/88 is a secondary reference to another survey, not an additional case cohort. The review is not a lawfulness assessment.

Measurement	Counter	Denomination	PDF
Called / reviewed	16	16	81
Municipalities	8	-	81
Interview municipalities	5	8	82
Interest organisations	4	-	83
Analytical course of case	5	16	82
§ 83 previous aid	8	16	35
Health information	10	16	32
Observation	2	16	36
Apparent health legislative tasks allocated	5	16	43
The same section § 95 / 96, interview	3	5	12
The same department, second investigation	47	88	12
Visitation via selection	2	5	13
Early transition conversation	4	5	20
Advice experience, span year	2-15	-	33
Cash reproductions per interview	2-3	5	83

C1: Five analytical citizens' programmes: all separate target figures

BPA23F PDF25-27; 46-51; 67-75; mentions 5; unit case course / hours / duration / DKK. Anonymous names, same five from 16. Relative times are the approximate indications of the report; no exact calendar dates or Union number are derived.

Local name	PDF	Measurement	Value	Unit
Kurt	25-27	§ 95 / § 96 application	8	hours / day desired
Kurt	25-27	Paragraph 95 (2)	25	hours / week
Kurt	25-27	Application → Home visits	2	weeks

Local name	PDF	Measurement	Value	Unit
Kurt	25-27	Visit → Meeting of the Parties	3	months
Kurt	25-27	Consultation → meeting	2	weeks
Kurt	25-27	Meeting → Decision	2	weeks
Kurt	25-27	Staff / staff meetings	1.5	hours / year
Peter.	46-48	Age on transition	18	year
Peter.	47	Weeks with school / day offers	90 t 35 m	hours / week
Peter.	47	Weeks at home	85 t 55 m	hours / week
Peter.	48	Night surveillance	8	hours / night
Peter.	48	Scheme → offers / termination	3	months
Martin	49-51	Application → Authorisation	2	approximately months
Martin	50	Aid granted	168	hours / week
Martin	50	Assessed practical / personal needs	50	hours / week
Martin	51	Intended follow-up after printing	3	months
Kasper	68-69	Application → Start-up conversation	2	approximately months
Kasper	69	Application → Authorisation	just over 6	months
Kasper	69	Funding → actual start	2	months
Kasper	69	Total aid	77 t 30 m	hours / week
Kasper	69	Personal / practical	35	hours / week
Kasper	69	Accompanying measures	31 t 45 m	hours / week
Kasper	69	Space	10 t 45 m	hours / week
Kasper	69	Staff meetings	16	hours / year
Kasper	69	MUS	3	hours / year
Kasper	69	Training	16	hours / year
Louise.	72	First appropriation § 83	24	hours / week
Louise.	72	Complaint → Confirmation	5	months
Louise.	72	First → new application	approx. 1	year
Louise.	73	Increased needs of former municipalities	60	hours / week
Louise.	72	New appropriation	70	active hours / week
Louise.	72	Active hours	10	hours / day
Louise.	72	Health and safety at work	36	Pulley hours / year
Louise.	72	Introduction / Training	30	Pulley hours / year
Louise.	72	Support expenditure	500	DKK / month

Local name	PDF	Measurement	Value	Unit
Louise.	72	Courses	2387	DKK / year
Louise.	72	Movements → meeting	3	approximately weeks
Louise.	72	Meeting → interdisciplinary meeting	1	approximately month

I1: Interview objectives and time standards

BPA23F PDF12-15; 36-46; 66; 70; 77-80; mentions 5; device interview statements / illustrative times. Unmeasured national errors or new people. Individual illustrations cannot be deduced from the 16 case cohort.

Measurement	Value	Unit	PDF
Horsens visitators	12	staff	12
Horsens teams	3	teams;	12
Horsens specialists + cohorts	3+1	Functions	12
Fredericia focus advisors	2	staff	12
Viborg § 95 / § 96	2/2	staff	12
Aabenra	2	staff	13
Fredericia application estimate	5	approximately / year	15
Transitional interview	16	age	20
The circle of the horse	17.5	age	20
Odense illustrative requirement / assessment	20/4	hours	36
Illustrative meal time	2 h / 20 min	time	40-41
Aabenraa morning aid	90	minutes	45
Home care morning help	14	minutes	46
Accompanying mechanism	15	hours / month	57
Aabenraa refusal → later authorisation	2	year	66
Fredericia own goal	4	weeks	70
Recommended new follow-up	3-6	months	77
Annual follow-up declared	5	municipalities	77
Employer/working environment problems	2	municipalities	80

Own evidence and impact assessment

Award statistics do not answer whether the citizen's need for assistance was met. The decisive evidence is the difference between the decision date, start date and task-specific allocation. Kasper's decision process of just over six months is followed by a further two months before the actual start. A case-processing-time figure alone therefore overlooks a documented part of the period without the new assistance. A national duration cannot be inferred from this single case.

The five local deficiencies above must be linked to the original applications, justifications and record tracks. A failure to reach a decision on a maintained application requires an independent review; an authorisation under another provision does not automatically determine the untreated application. Unexplained hourly differences require a task-wise reconstruction and verification of the actual individual assessment. Not enough aid can be declared on the sole basis of a positive authorisation.

Parents' and partners' unpaid efforts may conceal unmet need and a transferred burden of care. Clinical tasks and social assistance must also be linked to the authority that actually delivers the support; a delimitation of competence does not prove that other necessary assistance was delivered. A traceability demand covers the decision, actual assistance, family consequences, any reopening/back payment and the notification of the supervisory authority already made.

Documented deficiencies and verified methodological exclusions are stated locally. Suspicion of unmet need or generally unlawful standards-based management requires task-specific original records. Interviewees' statements do not automatically become verified citizen case trajectories. Known readable pages have been fully reviewed; individual redress, supervisory outcomes and links to individuals have not been invented.

Generation 2023: full original numbers and constructed programmes

HER23F / HER23BF. All 43 + 27 pages actually read in memory; 5 register / method blocks and 47 rows. Main Report PDF43 visually controlled.

Limitation

24 caught up, 2 aged people, 12 selected among 22. Complex municipal selected cases; correctness not tested. Previous AS processing is avoided if possible; 1 complaint is included. Five annexes summarise 2-4 cases each. Age cells 5 + 4 + 6 = 15 versus 12 are original conflict, not person enlargement.

The annex is illustrative and does not provide deduplicated error counts or actual individual redress processes. All public measured figures are below; missing raw concern-report/placement denominators are not replaced with estimates.

M1: Selection and waiver

HER23F PDF6-7; 40-43; mentions 12; unit cases / interviews / constructions. Complex cases selected by the municipalities. If possible, no previous AS complaint / notification; not absolute exclusion. Five mergers are not five extra cases or five identifiable single children. No accuracy / national error rate.

Measurement	Counter	Denomination	PDF
Expert interview	2	-	40
Expert facilities	2	-	40
Local authorities / interviews	6	-	40
Participants per interview	4-6	-	41
Team interview	1	6	41
Cases brought	24	-	42
Municipality of Pr.kommune	4	6	42
Deleted: age>17	2	24	42
Criteria	22	24	42
Selected	12	22	42
Not selected, calculated	10	22	42
Review period	May-June 2022	-	40
Previous complaint	1	12	43
Constructed cycle	5	12	43
Original cases per design	2-4	-	7

M2: Distribution of cases

HER23F PDF42-43; mentions 12; unit cases. Printed age cells summer 15 modN12; PDF43 actually visually controlled. No harmonisation or assumption of 15 unique children.

Category	Number	N
Immigration	3	12
Survivors	9	12
Temporary residence permit child / parent	4	12
Permanent child	1	12
Status of stay unknown	7	12
Placement decision	7	12
Of which without consent	1	7
0 - 5 years	5	12
6 to 11 years	4	12
12 to 17 years	6	12

S1: Background reference 2019

HER23F PDF5; does not mention printed raw; unit approximate ratio of two population populations. No number of notifications per child, no cohort course from each notification to decision and no causal effect.

Generation	Notified children / children placed;	Age	Primary level
Danish	8	0 - 5 years	Secondary reference to Ministry 2021 analysis
MENAP + Turkey	34	0 - 5 years	Same secondary reference
Other non-Western	21	0 - 5 years	Same secondary reference

C1: Annex 2: all five designed runs

HER23BF PDF5-24; denotes 5; unit combined illustrations. Legal / children's expert assessments. Not five actual person IDs; family / child numbers shall not be summed up to national persons or linked to 12 single acts.

No	Local name	PDF	Age / Children	Control find
1	Abdul.	5-8	5 → 11 years	Plans missing; notifications / follow-up unsystematic
2	Daviti	9-12	13 years; family 3 children	BFU>1 year; professional network omitted
3	Faisal	13-16	1 → 5 years; family 2 children	2 non-notifications; plan + 3 md
4	Yosef	17-20	16 years; family 3 children	BFU>4 md without justification; offers do not match support needs
5	Ahmad.	21-24	4 years; family 3 children	BFU>4 md without preliminary assessment; acute assessment missing

C2: Annex 2: printed time and contact dimensions

HER23BF PDF5-24; mentions five constructions; unit time measure in constructed illustrations. No exact calendar dates or documented chaos chain for one identified person. BFU deadline 4 months in the Annex; not all waiting times are automatic breaches of law.

Progress	Measurement	Value	PDF
Abdul.	Notification → placement	8	months; PDF6
Abdul.	Follow-up	2/4	months; PDF7
Daviti	BFU	more than 1	years; PDF10 / 12
Daviti	Dad's conversation.	Button 2	weeks; PDF10
Daviti	The child's conversation	good 2	weeks; PDF10
Daviti	Notification → relief	2.5	months; PDF11
Faisal	Notification → placement	almost 5	months; PDF15 / 16
Faisal	Action plan by decision	3	months; PDF15
Faisal	Forced → optional	1	years; PDF13
Yosef	BFU	just over 4	months; PDF18
Yosef	Follow-up interval	6	months after 3 months follow-up; PDF19
Ahmad.	Violence notification → location	1	week; PDF23
Ahmad.	Interview	1	hour / week; PDF23
Ahmad.	Revocated consent → Assignment	3	months; PDF23

Own evidence and impact assessment

A constructed narrative can document what a control authority recognises as a legal problem, but cannot only prove the timeline of a particular person. This is why the Annex's lack of action plans, excessive deadlines and inadequate offers are used as control themes with original sidelocators. An inventory of children affected requires the 12 underlying records and a key between the records and the designs; without this key, the same facts may have been used in several places.

The documented methods also limit the discrimination examination. Interviews about prejudice and mistranslations are authority statements that must be linked to contemporaneous concern reports, recordings, interpreter bookings and decisions. A cultural explanation is not in itself documentation of harm or lack of parenting capacity. Each factual assertion must be examined independently, and consent requires understanding of the specific intervention. The presence of an interpreter does not prove that understanding has been secured.

A strong sustainable requirement includes the initial calls, 22 criteria-appropriate acts, the 12 analytical tables and the deductive connection to the structure of the annex. Then you can try information, party consultation, valid consent, timely help, actual contact, any language loss and responsibility. Suspects of stereotypes or uncovered protection are marked as investigation requirements; they are not inserted as a breach of the Convention already concluded. Known readable main / attachment pages have been fully reviewed.

Equal treatment: outcome, end-of-life and restoration

The Board of Equal Treatment's statistics document discrimination considered and the limits of access to complaints. Respondents may be municipalities, regions, the State, public employers, organisations or private businesses. An overall board count therefore cannot be called unlawful acts by public employees. That requires specific classification of each respondent and the circumstances actually established by the decision.

1. Latest series, delimited as the original figure 2

Year	Consignee t	Name including: The President	Secretary atsafvisn ed	Figure 2 Total	José Manuel Barroso , already include a	Handica p without for work, delamyn gde	Source
2018	341	285	7	292	52	11	2025-original, physical PDF pages 43, 44 and 48
2019	374	133	34	167	22	21	2025-original, physical PDF pages 43, 44 and 48
2020	657	195	38	233	36	34	2025-original, physical PDF pages 43, 44 and 48
2021	486	183	46	229	52	80	2025-original, physical PDF pages 43, 44 and 48
2022	511	413	149	562	116	187	2025-original, physical PDF pages 43, 44 and 48
2023	551	198	131	329	62	51	2025-original, physical PDF pages 43, 44 and 48
2024	504	319	204	523	101	112	2025-original, physical PDF pages 43, 44 and 48
2025	554	362	169	531	122	109	2025-original, physical PDF pages 43, 44 and 48

This series is registered by: 13 January 2026. It does not automatically include all the reasons for closure. Figure 2 shows 63 "2024 'cases omitted, in particular the cause of closure or the refusal of resumption. Figure 5 of the same report shows 63 "second outages" without a separate season title, the total categories of which give 594 against Figure 2's 531 for 2025. Both original information shall be retained; the year and context of the note must be reconciled with the source before the omission is attributed to one particular year.

The note to figure 3 gives a data extraction date of 13. January 2025,but the figure also contains 122 chair's decisions in 2025. This internal date discrepancy is recorded; it is not rewritten as a verified different date. In figure 1,the bar for 2020 is 657,whereas the note says 658; 222 approaches concern the same housing-eviction complex. This is a counting difference and a documented case complex requiring person deduplication.

2. Original annual outage: all categories are included

Year	Name fencing	Secretary riatsafvi injection	Not law strife;	Execute ed	Violation of law • • • provide evidence; ed	Other outcome	Category isum	Source
2020	48	38	78	54	9	43	270	Annual original, physical PDF page 38
2021	77	47	55	40	11	95	325	Annual original, physical PDF page 34
2022	166	150	143	90	12	95	656	Annual original, physical PDF page 29
2023	108	132	52	33	5	43	373	Annual original, physical PDF page 27
2024	163	201	74	73	8	43	562	Annual original, physical PDF page 36
2025	163	169	117	79	3	63	594	Annual original, physical PDF page 44

2019 has a different breakdown of outcomes:board dismissal 29; secretariat dismissal 33; lapsed following settlement 23; not unlawful 61; compensation 35; unlawful without compensation seven; discontinued 29; access to records four. Category total 221. 2019 original, physical PDF page 35. Shorter lists containing only board decisions omit several of these courses.

Rejection is not a decision that the citizen has not been discriminated against. Rejection may be due, inter alia, to jurisdiction, legal interest, the need for oral explanations of parties and witnesses or a manifestly unfounded complaint. The concrete grounds for refusal determine what kind of review the citizen has actually received.

3. Source voting and Time Accounts

The 2024 foreword states 519 cases decided. The year's figure 2 has 318 board decisions and 201 secretariat dismissals = 519; figure 5 adds 43 other outcomes = 562. The later 2025 figure revises the board to 319 and the secretariat to 204 = 523. The four additional entries are a revision difference, and none of the totals can uncritically be used as a total of different people. 2024 original, physical PDF pages 3, 34 and 36.

The 2023 foreword/figure 2 has 197 +132 =329. The year's outcome figure has 198 board outcomes +132 secretariat dismissals +43 others =373. The difference of one in board categories is in the original. The latest 2025 series has 198 +131 =329. 2023 original, physical PDF pages 3, 25 and 27.

The 2022-foreword / Figure 2 indicates 629 Board Decisions and 150 Secretariat Decisions = 779, but the exit categories give 656, and the latest 2025-revision gives 413 + 149 = 562 before any other outcome. The greater difference has not yet been explained by the definition of the original. The 2021 original Board decisions are 183 and the six exit categories give 325 with 95 "other" and 47 Secretariat refusals, while Figure 2 has 53 Secretariat refusals. The differences are marked; the report does not choose the most convenient version. 2022 -original, pp. 3, 27 and 29; 2021 -original, p. 3, 32 and 34.

The 2020 original's average processing time is approximately 9½ months, and the 2021/2022 originals' approximately nine months. There is substantial variation between case types. An overall average does not document the time to actual compensation, reinstatement or other redress. Annual accounts of consequences and payments and the full historical time series are not published in the annual figures checked.

4. Concrete public intervention: origin and actual restoration

The 2019 report reviews a municipal case from 2009: the municipality refused a Danish citizen social assistance on the assumption that asylum residence had lapsed, even though citizenship appeared in the case record. The board found racial discrimination on 13. August 2010 and awarded 2.000 kroner; the District Court on 6. May 2013 and the High Court on 18. December 2014 maintained the amount. CERD found on 13. December 2018 that the compensation did not satisfy Article 6 of the Convention. In 2019, the board states that it considered reopening on its own initiative but refrained because the courts had determined the amount and the board found no new factual information. Annual Report 2019, physical PDF pages 30–31.

The original of the CERD decision and its follow-up shall be the main proof of the breach of the Convention. The Board's own report here is the direct proof of the Board's knowledge and failed to resume. The citizen has one municipal case through several bodies, not a new person at each control point. The restoration refusal of the panel must not be described as a quick original correction of the CERD breach.

The original is **S.A., CERD/C/97/D/58/2016**, adopted on 13. December 2018. § 8 finds a breach of Articles 5(d)(iii) and 6. The follow-up overview checked against the original in **A/78/18 (2023), chapter IX, the table after § 70**, assesses the action as partly satisfactory and the dialogue as open. This is a historical oversight status in 2023, not a documented new compensation payment or an updated closure in 2026. Original Views; the Committee's original follow-up report. The same person's case is recorded in the UN corpus and must not be counted as an additional victim when combined with the equal treatment chapter.

The 2024 original, p. 32, refers to one person with more than 430 complaints submitted, more than 280 pending cases and 176 complaints processed without relief: 166 rejected as manifestly without prospects of success, four outside jurisdiction and six concerning matters already examined. On 20. September 2024 the board decided on a two-year restriction, including closure of cases not admitted without a separate decision. The annual review reproduces the board's assessment of abuse of process; the correctness of each rejected complaint is not examined in these statistics. The example directly documents why complaints cannot be equated with distinct citizens and why closed cases must have their own category.

5. Historical predecessors and remnants

Bill L 41 in the 2007-08 session, in its explanatory notes on financial consequences, reproduces Ligestillingsnævnet's 2006 annual figures: 63 incoming cases and 42 requests for guidance not considered at a meeting. Klagekomitéen for Etnisk Ligebehandling simultaneously had 75 specific enquiries. These are different incoming categories that do not document established breaches or the same scope of individuals. Original bill. The original predecessor reports for 2006-08 and Ligebehandlingsnævnet's reports for 2009-18 have not yet been substantively reconciled. The board's newer originals refer to the old editions; link trails have been saved as compact metadata. New retrospective annual figures do not replace checking the original denominators and exclusions.

Environmental and planning complaints: amended decisions, waiting time and actual legalisation

Review of public authorities documents both decisions set aside and long waiting times. Annulment or remittal does not necessarily end noise, pollution, unlawful construction or loss of a protected natural condition. For each specific sequence of events, it must therefore be investigated when the intervention began, when the appeal was examined and when physical or financial redress actually occurred.

1. Referral to the Board of Appeal and denominators

Year	Received	Completed	Verserend End of period	Verserend ed mslitsalds, days	Completeds through cut, days	Source
2019	932	843	923	406	-	Plan report 2022, p.9; departure s.9; time in 2023 / 2024 report p.12; holding 2023 p.9-10 or NH 2024 p.12
2020	964	1071	815	243	472	Plan report 2023, p.8; departure p.8; time in 2023 / 2024 report p.12; holding 2023 p.9-10 or NH 2024 p.12
2021	1084	1401	495	127	300	Plan report 2024, p.8; departure p.9; time in 2023 / 2024-report p.12; holding 2023 p.9-10 or NH 2024-12
2022	1202	1312	385	93	137	Plan report 2024, p.8; departure p.9; time in 2023 / 2024-report p.12; holding 2023 p.9-10 or NH 2024-12
2023	1056	958	486	128	150	Plan report 2024, p.8; departure p.9; time in 2023 / 2024-report p.12; holding 2023 p.9-10 or NH 2024-12
2024	1046	1024	-	171	179	Plan report 2024, p.8; departure p.9; time in 2023 / 2024-report p.12; holding 2023 p.9-10 or NH 2024-12

The time shall be counted from the transmission of the first instance to the Board to the transmission of the Board's decision. The procedure of the Court of First Instance, the time before transmission and subsequent legalisation are outside. "-" does not mean zero. Plan 2024, p.11-12.

Year	Names: all cleared	Rejected,%	Withdrawal, %	Stated , %	Set aside, %	Source
2022	1312	21	7	48	24	Annual report, physical PDF page 10; visually controlled
2023	958	26	6	49	19	Annual report, physical PDF page 9; visually controlled
2024	1024	23	6	48	23	Annual report, physical PDF page 9; visually controlled

The percentages are rounded. Multiplication does not give exact category counts. The 2024 original defines setting aside as full or partial amendment. It also states that upheld decisions may contain partial amendments. The proportion set aside therefore does not fully count courses affected by errors, and each decision must be classified by its specific reasoning. Dismissed or lapsed appeals do not prove that the matter appealed was lawful.

2. The waiting period of the Environment and Food Complaints Board

Year	Completed cases average	Verserende average age, days	pending End of proceedings	Source
2021	8.3 months	-	-	NH Annual Report, p.7; Retrospective 2022-original; closed cases
2022	7.6 months	-	-	NH Annual Report, p.7; Completed cases
2023	298 days	413	-	NH Annual Report, p.10; Completed cases; age of verserer separately
2024	325 days	398	1201	NH Annual Report, p.12; Completed cases; number of stocks retrospectively 2025-original p.6
2025	366 days	219	1066	NH Annual Report, p.6; Completed cases; age of verserer separately

The 2025 average of 366 days is for closed cases. The age of the pending cases is 219 days; the two sizes must not be exchanged. Both leave out the citizen's time at first instance and for actual implementation after the complaint. NH 2025, p.6.

3. Historical outcomes and concrete omissions

The NMKN 2016 original shows 124 remittals in 2016 and retrospectively 193 in 2015 and 194 in 2014. They are subsets of closed cases. The table states 1.823 received/1.412 closed in 2016, 1.450 pending and an average of 232 days. Nine closed coastal protection cases are excluded from the time measure; they had been transferred with already high case ages. The 62 transferred cases are included in intake/backlog. For 2015, table 1 has 2.269/2.037 received/closed, table 2. b/c 2.226/2.031. The difference is retained. Original, pp.6,8–9.

4. The overall authority is broader than environmental complaints

Year	NH-afll utninger	Average	Limitation	Original
2017	6459	223 days	No way. 1.599 mental patients' complaints and 215 previously repressed air bankruptcy cases. 2016-retrospective: 6.589 and 184 days.	Annual report, physical PDF page 6
2018	-	190 days	Barely 6.000; a further barely 2.000 psychiatric patients' complaints. Only rounded totals on the controlled side.	Annual report, physical PDF page 6
2019	-	107 days	Barely 8.000; excluding separately settled old environmental / planning holdings, also in the time calculation.	Annual report, physical PDF page 6
2020	11205	141 days	11.205 closures; time calculation p.12 omits old environmental / planning inventory.	Annual report, physical PDF page 6
2021	11829	4.6 months	Findings s.6; 4,6 months retrospectively in 2022-original p.7.	Annual report, physical PDF page 6
2022	10742	3.7 months	2022-original p.7: all completed. 2023 -original s.7 represents 5,0 months for the case of the name and the case of construction in 2022; boundaries are kept separate.	Annual report, physical PDF page 9
2023	10525	5.8 months	Name and construction cases, time s.7; 11.333 received and 4.588 pending. No person delusion.	Annual report, physical PDF page 6
2024	9948	- not recorded here	All secretarial committees; not just public authority decisions.	Annual report, physical PDF page 9
2025	10252	181 days	All endings; 3.526 pending, average age 179 days. Private disputes are also included.	Annual report, physical PDF page 6

NH includes both reparation of regulatory decisions, private disputes and disciplinary boards. All totals are case records, and plan / environmental figures are already sub-quantities. They're not added to the total again.

5. State Knowledge, Priorities and Restoration

NH 2019 describes an old environmental/planning backlog of 1.921 cases received before 1. July 2018, including cases from predecessor bodies. They were excluded from the ordinary average of 107 days. The backlog was reduced to 1.260 at the end of 2019 and 402 at the end of 2020; NH 2021 reports complete clearance. Separately, the Building Appeals Unit took over 685 old cases on 1. January 2019; the last were decided in May 2021. Decided does not mean that unlawful construction or other actual consequences had been remedied. NH 2019, pp.6,11–12; NH 2020, pp.6,11–12; NH 2021, p.6.

NH 2023 states that the boards set aside approximately every fifth first-instance decision as non-compliant with the law. The statement concerns the board review described; it is not a precise environmental count and cannot be converted into a national error rate. The same original documents that a planned quality panel and knowledge sharing with the Ombudsman were not implemented because staff resources were prioritised for the government's green initiative. The source documents the choice and the authority's knowledge. It does not alone prove specific individual responsibility for subsequent harm. NH 2023, pp.7,10,13.

NH 2025 justifies high quality by stating that under 1% proceed to the courts and 0,06% of all decisions are set aside. A small selected court proportion does not examine the legality of the rest. Time, finances, the action deadline and absence of suspensive effect must be examined as possible access barriers in specific cases. Zero errors in decisions not brought before the courts have not been documented. NH 2025,p.6.

Plan 2024 itself describes the risk of irreparable damage to protected species / natural areas and that realisation impedes physical regularisation. It is therefore essential to register provisional protection and actual legalisation separately. A later abrogated permit is not proof that the original condition was restored. Plan 2024, p.6-7.

6. Precise Residues

The current official NH list contains all nine annual reports for 2017-25, and Plan has three annual reports for 2022-24. They have been located and their statistics sections read; this is not a full review of individual decisions. The predecessors' original annual tables for 2006-13/2014-15, the Environment and Food Appeals Board's sector-specific annual outcomes for 2017-25 and Plan 2017-21/2025 remain separate investigative tasks. Accounts of citizens, households, properties and physical restoration do not exist in these aggregate tables.

Disability area: continued data gap and closure without documented direct effect

Conclusion. The National Audit Office's follow-up in 2026 documents that implemented initiatives and a new supervisory concept lead to closure of parts of the review case while a direct effect on overturnings has not yet been demonstrated. The Ministry has still not established data on municipal applications and decisions in either the child or adult disability area. This is a specific current source of the report's data limitation and the demand for an account of consequences and redress.

Original: Rigsrevisionen, *Follow-up to the disability management case (Report No 13 / 2021)*, **26 May 2026**, CAS RN C109 / 26. The cover is dated June 2026. All nine physical PDFs pages are read in the original; Figure 1 on physical page 6 is also visually controlled. Original note; the official control history of the case;. The date of publication and the date of note shall be kept separately.

1. Knowledge, responsibility and follow-up by the authorities

Paragraph 1-3 of the original describes an investigation initiated with the 2022 report and follow-up 22 June 2022 and 27 May 2024. The municipalities are responsible for the individual citizen's offer and support; the Ministry is responsible for monitoring and follow-up. The State auditors' criticism concerns both unsatisfactory supervision and local administration, which in many cases did not comply with the service law. These are the documented assessments of the control bodies within the scope of the study, not a new census of all municipal decisions. Original: physical p. 2, § 1-3.

§ 12 reproduces criticism that the Ministry did not follow up its knowledge of problems for several years and that the monitoring was based on incomplete and incomplete data. § 13 reproduces the Minister's subsequent commitment to examine the possibility of national application and decision data. Article 14 continues to document the absence of this data in 2026. This makes the knowledge chain concrete: previous criticism → ministerial commitments → ex post verification of what is actually established. Original: Physical p. 7-8, § 12-14.

According to Section 6, the follow-up is based on ministerial statements, document reviews and the statistics of the Appeal Board. It is not a new review of the full original documents of every citizen. Article 17 states that a new supervisory concept records inadequacies and attitudes to handling; Rigsrevisionen expect ex post verification of whether the problems are actually solved. The expectation is not already evidence that the problems have been solved. Original: physical pp. 4 and 8.

2. Status of the five control points

Control Point	Reported status in the 2026 note	What status measures
Legal safeguards initiatives and additional-expense rules	To be completed; initiatives implemented 2022-2025 and new rules from 1.9.2025	Implementation of initiatives, not documented redress for all citizens
Loss of earnings and documentation requirements	Continued follow	Models and any changes not completed
Quality data base	Continued follow	Application / decision data missing for children and adults
New illegitimate supervisory concept	To be completed in this note	New registration / manager concept, subsequent effect must be followed
Social supervision / audit cooperation model and future design of specialised social area	Both completed in the note 27.5.2024	Historical endings, not new endings in 2026

Source: Physical p. 4, § 4, and p. 7-8, § 10-17. The original table has five main points; point 1 is broken down above because additional expenditure and loss of earnings have different status. Therefore, the presentation of five series with the last two main points is combined; it does not create six new control runs.

3. Overturnings: all the figure's percentages and the actual denominator

Year	Remitted for reconsideration, %	Amended / repealed,%	Sum of the rounded figure categories,%
2021	25	7	32
2022	31	8	39
2023	33	8	41
2024	40	5	45
2025	43	4	47

Source: Figure 1, physical p. 6 / printed p. 5, visually verified. The denominator is **all the merits of the appeal; Disability decisions** in the boundaries of the Appeal Board. The figure does not give exact numerators or denominators; the rounded percentages cannot be converted into exact numbers. They are also not error rates for all municipal disability decisions. It is the same complaint control trail as the relevant Appeals Board and may not be added as additional cases.

§ 9 separately states that a study of legal safeguards found that over a third of its disability decisions would have been overturned on appeal. This sample/assessment population differs from the figure's cases actually appealed. It must be linked to the original study's sample and denominator, not added to the appeal statistics. Original: physical p. 5, § 9.

In the memorandum, the Ministry acknowledges that the initiatives have not yet led to a fall in the alteration/remittal rate. Several were implemented only in 2025. Funding of **17,7 million kr. for 2026-2029** has been allocated for theme days, learning-team visits and learning programmes. The allocation is a planned resource/response figure, not a count of citizens actually helped or a documented effect. Original: physical p. 6.

4. The actual lack of registration

From 1. January 2025, certain adult reporting fields concerning assessment, functional capacity and intervention goals were introduced. These fields do not fill the gap in registration of applications received and decisions made. The Ministry reports substantial municipal variation, a need for new workflows and system adaptations, and expects a data/digitalisation strategy in summer 2026; the Ministry cannot state whether the strategy will have specific targets for case-processing data. This is the Ministry's documented statement at the review date, not evidence of a strategy published subsequently. Any such later strategy must be checked separately. Original: physical pp. 7-8, section 14 and its continuation.

5. Importance for the impact and responsibility chain

The continued absence of national application / decision data means that the control sources cannot follow all refusals, non-appeals or the full population of people who continue to lack help. Therefore, a completed own-initiative control cannot serve as evidence of an overall effective loss cessation.

The sustainable chain is: **conclusion concerning lack of documented effect → the memorandum's specific review and authority commitments → no established complete decision register → the relevant substantive support and supervisory duty → continuing failure to undertake the necessary documented follow-up in identified cases → specific continuing loss → the proper authority/management responsibility → demand for decision, time and redress data.** Whether the omission in a particular case also constitutes a Convention violation or a criminal breach of duty is examined by reference to the individual right, act, knowledge, culpability requirement and harm. The memorandum counts no personal criminal convictions or unique victims.

Residual control: The promised summer 2026 strategy and its possible concrete data targets have not been verified in this module. The new closure does not alter the continued open follow-up points on loss of earnings and

the data base of the quality. The original's Annex, physical page 9, shows the concrete statement by the Parliament, the committee, questions and consultations and can be used for the documented knowledge dates of responsible bodies.

Handicap: right of appeal, waiting period and the difference between a law and actual protection;

Documented main find

VIVE's evaluation from September 2024 documents a problem that is not apparent from a simple count of findings in the party's favour: it takes knowledge, effort and time to have a right examined. In the delimited series concerning the Disability Discrimination Act, 371 complaints were considered in 2018-2023. The average processing time increased from 6,2 weeks in 2018 to 54,8 weeks in 2023. The interviews describe how the work of making a complaint and the waiting time can deter affected citizens from having matters examined. The number of complaints therefore cannot be used as the number of persons subjected to discrimination in Denmark. Source: VIVE 2024, pp. 37-48 and 79-84, original report.

The study also provides a specific test of the evidential value of authority statements: school and daycare representatives say that they already make the necessary adjustments, while the report's comparison with parents' perspectives shows that needs are not always met. The institutions' description is a statement about their own practice, not a verified account that each child has actually received support. Source: same original, pp. 70-77.

Source, method and read material

Pernille Skovbo Rasmussen, Maliina Grønvold Olsen, Maria Røgskov, Ea Wulf Nielsen and Agnete Nygård Jensen: *Non-discrimination on the grounds of disability - Evaluation from a citizens' and society perspective*. VIVE, 2024, ISBN 9788775823727. Published 19 September 2024. The checked original has 96 PDFs pages. The figures and method are checked in the original pages 31-48 and 79-84; the citizens' consequences are checked in pages 49-50, 55-56 and 59-63; the institutions' statements and school / day supply analysis in pages 64-77. Table 4.2-4.4 is also visually controlled for years, empty fields and column location. This is a check of the listed sections, not a declaration of full reading of all 96 pages.

The evaluation shall have three different data bases, which shall be kept separate:

Data base	Actual number and demarcation	What it can document	Original locator
Complaint system	371 complaints considered under the Disability Discrimination Act in 2018-2023; data extracted May 2024	Complaints, processing time and annual number of complainants; mixed public and private sector complaints	S. 38-41, Table 4.1-4.4; p. 83
Publication of decisions	232 decisions, including 90 decisions by the President;	Content of the published denominator; not the content of all 371 complaints	S. 39 and 42-45
Qualitative interview	55 informants: 27 citizens/relatives, 12 municipal administration/school/daycare representatives, 9 organisation representatives, 3 agency/board representatives and 4 service-sector representatives	Specific experience, barriers and institutional statements; no national prevalence or individual legal decision	S. 79-82, Box 8.1
Organisational survey	36 organizations invited; 23 answered large parts, about 64%; questions sometimes have only 21 or 15 answers	Assessment by the corresponding organisations; not a citizens' survey	S. 82-83

The interviews were conducted August 2023-March 2024. The school and day contracts cover seven municipalities; ten were originally contacted and some were replaced after unsuccessful contact attempts. Recruitment through organisations, networks and social media means that all groups of people with disabilities are not covered. VIVE itself states that the qualitative analysis does not determine the legal validity of the experiences. The approximately 400.000 people represented by the organisations as a whole are not respondents to the study. Source: original p. 79 -83.

All annual complaints in the controlled evaluation

Year	Denomination juice see	Secretariat Decisions	Dismissed / he Intended etc.	Treated Total complaints	Average, weeks	Original locator and source
2018	2	0	7	9	6,2	S. 39-40, Tables 4.1 and 4.3, VIVE
2019	9	3	9	21	18,5	Same table and original
2020	24	2	7	33	29,9	Same table and original
2021	49	17	12	78	39,3	Same table and original
2022	119	53	14	186	56,5	Same table and original
2023	29	7	8	44	54,8	Same table and original
Sum of complaints	**232**	**82**	**57**	**371**	**Not Summerable**	Annual extract from May 2024

The 90 chairperson decisions are a subset of the 232 and must not be added. The 57 in the broad discontinued category include the 13 refusals to reopen below, 36 discontinued/shelved cases and 8 special closures. There are thus no further 57 complaints beyond the outcome table's 371. The series is a subset of Ligebehandlingsnævnet's total annual statistics and must not be added to those either.

Year	Successful complaint with compensation	Finding in the party's favour without compensation	Not me. dhold	Rejected by name	Rejected by secretariat	Genoptaed refused	Disposal / set aside	Special closure;	Sum	Original locator and source
2018	0	0	0	2	0	0	7	0	9	S. 41, Table 4.4, VIVE
2019	2	0	1	6	3	1	8	0	21	Same table and original
2020	5	1	4	14	2	2	4	1	33	Same table and original
2021	11	1	11	26	17	3	6	3	78	Same table and original
2022	12	1	35	71	53	5	5	4	186	Same table and original
2023	6	0	11	12	7	2	6	0	44	Same table and original
Sum	**36**	**3**	**62**	**131**	**82**	**13**	**36**	**8**	**371**	Balanced against Table 4.1

Blank fields in table 4.4 are reproduced as zero following visual checking and reconciliation of row and column totals. Favourable findings number 39, of which 36 include compensation. An award does not in itself document payment, changed access or support actually received by the child. These effects are not systematically followed in the evaluation's complaints table.

Internal discrepancies in the original: Box 4.1 on p. 37 states 37 favourable findings. Table 4.4 on p. 41 shows 36 + 3 = 39; pp. 42 and 44 also use 39. The body text on p. 41 states 191 complaints without favourable findings or dismissed by the board, but its own figures are 62 + 131 = 193; p. 42 uses 193. The report's count follows the reconciled tables and makes the differences visible. None of the conflicts justifies downplaying the separately documented barriers to complaints.

Complaints and persons: annual breakdown and deduplication

Year	Citizens with one case	With 2 -5 cases	With 6-30 cases	With more than 30 cases	Year complainants, calculated sum	Complaints in the year	Original locator and source
2018	7	1	0	0	8	9	S. 40, Table 4.2, VIVE
2019	11	4	0	0	15	21	Same table and original
2020	25	3	0	0	28	33	Same table and original
2021	42	1	0	1	44	78	Same table and original
2022	97	16	0	1	114	186	Same table and original
2023	27	4	1	0	32	44	Same table and original
Sum of years Osteonecrosis	**209**	**29**	**1**	**2**	**241**	**371**	Annual occurrences are not unique persons during the six-year period

The 241 are calculated as the sum of the categories of persons in the table for each year. The source does not provide a personal base that allows deduplication between years, and the same complainants can go again. Therefore, if the categories in the original are mutually exclusive within each year, the total number of complainants registered is between 114 and 241. This range describes registered complainants, not all persons directly and indirectly concerned. A child may be the person concerned while a parent lodges the complaint; the two roles must be recorded separately when the original facts of the decision can be verified.

VIVE's review assesses that around 30 % of the 193 board decisions without relief or rejected by the board probably originate from the same person. This is based on similarities in anonymised decisions, not a published identity key. No exact complaint count is therefore calculated from this percentage, and it does not replace the complaint system's annual person count. Source: pp. 42-43.

Knowledge of redress and further inquiries

Find	Counter / denominator or number	Limitation and meaning	Original locator; and source
Organizations know the existence of the law	21/23	Organisational worker; not share of citizens	S. 34, VIVE
Have high or any knowledge about regulations	16/23	The remaining 7 have superficial knowledge or no knowledge.	S. 34, same original
Does the members know the Board's right of appeal	2 / 23 agree; 18 / 23 disagree or very disagree	Assessment of members by organisations	S. 46, same original
Will recommend a complaint to the Board	12 / 21; 1 / 21 will not	The denominator of the question is 21, not 23	S. 47, same original
Believes to be able to guide complainants	13 / 21; 5 / 21 uncertain or disagreed	The last 3 are not classified in the reproduced bread text	S. 47, same original
First recommend contact with the respondent	9 / 21 agreed; 7 / 21 neutral; 5 / 21 don't know	Organisations, non-documented case outcomes	S. 48, same original
Helps with complaint / contact	8 / 21 agree; 9 / 21 uncertain or disagreed; 4 / 21 do not know	Self-assessed organisational practices	S. 48, same original
Disability requests for IMR, 2022	135 of 310 cases of discrimination	Requests, non-referrals, persons or alleged breaches	S. 47, same original
Disability approaches to IMR, 2023	129 of 301 discrimination	Possible overlap with the Board's complaints; no merger	S. 47, same original
Health as a frequent problem area	9 / 15 organisations	Only 15 replied to this question; not 60% of patients	S. 60, same original

VIVE finds in 2024 that the legislation was not followed by central application guidance or specific central dissemination measures beyond publication in Lovtidende. This is a dated implementation finding. It must not be rewritten without an updated check to claim that no guidance exists in October 2026. Source: pp. 34-35.

Concrete citizens' consequences and authorities' knowledge

Complaint and long wait. The interviews describe that the very formulation of an event, documentation and a long process can be incalculable, especially in the case of cognitive difficulties, mental illness or developmental disabilities. A formal right of appeal does not automatically mean that the citizen can actually use it. The documented average time of 54,8 weeks in 2023 shows the time to end in the defined series; it does not tell when access, support or payment was restored. Source: pp. 40-41 and 45-46.

Exclusion from a service. In one successful complaint described, a mother complained on behalf of her three-year-old son after a municipal leisure service had expelled them because of disruption. The board's criticism was that, after learning of the child's disability, the municipality did not try to resolve the problem. This is a specific finding concerning the authority's knowledge and subsequent omission, but the evaluation does not state the case number, decision date, compensation or actual resumption of participation. The underlying original has now been identified and read in full: KEN no. 9536 of 17. June 2021, case no. 19-16769, award of 5.000 kr.; expulsion 30. October 2018→decision 961 days and receipt by the board 24. March 2019→decision 816 days. Actual payment/access is still missing. See handicap-barn-musikalsk-legestue-tid-og-ansvar.md. Original decision, printed pp.1-6 and 12-14. Source for VIVE's account: p.45.

Lack of actual access to treatment. Interviews with individuals and relatives describe physical pain attributed to psychological difficulties; insufficient examination; deterioration; loss of trust; and a course of chemotherapy that had to be interrupted because the treatment setting did not accommodate a disclosed mental impairment. These are documented interview statements about consequences and information received by the authority, not individual compensation decisions verified against medical records. The descriptions establish which records, functional information, treatment choices and timelines a specific investigation must secure. Source: pp. 59-61.

Isolation and cut-off. Citizens and relatives describe inaccessible public buildings, limited cultural and leisure participation, and lack of staff to accompany accommodation. The consequence is that the right to

participation cannot be exercised in everyday life. Where the specific legal obligation and the specific needs of the aid are demonstrated, the analysis shall identify the decision, the responsible authority, its knowledge and the period of inaccessibility. Source: pp. 55-56 and 61-63.

The child's support and the institution's own description. VIVE reproduces that the participating school and day-care providers consider to make adjustments in advance and that many had not been informed of the change in the law. At the same time, VIVE shows the discrepancy with parents' experience and research on lack of support, unclear responsibilities and lengthy procedures. The strongest point of criticism is not that all the institutions interviewed have been proven to act illegally: it is that the institution's own declaration of practice does not demonstrate that the child's individual needs have been examined, the aid decided and the aid actually provided. Source: pp. 71-77.

Importance of the final analysis of the report and the necessary requirements

The source chain is: dated complaint system data → matching decision and person categories → actual waiting time → interview and document-based description of access barriers → separate control of the specific legal obligation and the loss of the citizen. This will avoid a refusal being treated as proof that there was no discrimination or that a compensation is treated as documented payment and terminated exclusion.

The documented study strengthens the requirements for available guidance and support for the complaint, registration of grounds for refusal, separate statement of public and private respondent, and follow-up on time for effective access, provided support and payment. An assessment of EMRK/ CRPD must then be linked to the specific right, the proven need for protection, the state's knowledge and the option of action it failed to use. The 371 complaints do not in themselves constitute 371 breaches of the Convention.

Remaining investigative gaps: Actual payment and access consequences in the case of the three-year-old boy whose original has now been identified; full person deduplication across years; public/private distribution; and updates after 2023 on processing time, payment of compensation and actual change in practice. The subsequent seventh report on the Act is identified as SOU 2025-26,annex 24,received June 2026; its time windows and main tables must be checked separately before comparison with the calendar-year series here.

A three-year child excluded from municipal offers: documented discrimination, 961 days and lack of recovery data;

Conclusion and source status

The municipality’s exclusion of a child aged approximately three from a musical playgroup breached the Disability Discrimination Act. The Board of Equal Treatment found this on 17. June 2021 in KEN no. 9536, case no. 19-16769. The municipality had maintained the exclusion after receiving information about the child’s disability and suggestions from the mother on creating a calmer environment. The board found that the municipality had not discharged the burden of proving that exclusion was necessary. The child was awarded 5.000 kroner, but the decision documents neither actual payment nor resumed participation. Original decision, printed pp. 1 and 12-14, physical PDF pp. 2 and 13-15.

The entire public decision of 15 physical PDFs pages has been read. The simultaneous material that the decision reproduces includes e-mails and a pedagogical psychological assessment. The original mail files, the separate original of the assessment and the Ombudsman's original letter have not been provided separately. Where the report uses this information, it is therefore indicated as documents reproduced in the original decision of the Board. The child is the same case as VIVE's example of p. 45 in the evaluation from 2024 and must not be added to the evaluation complaint count as an additional case.

Documented time programme

Time	Action, knowledge or control	The citizen's actual position	Original locator
25. May 2018	Educational-psychological assessment:long-standing communication and interaction difficulties; a support educator attached and referral to relevant professionals	The child had documented support needs for participation and development	Printed pp. 7-9 and 12; PDF pp. 8-10 and 13
17 August 2018	The child enrolled in the municipality's musical playroom	About three-year-old child participates with her mother	Printed p. 2; PDF p. 3
3, 10 and 17 September and 29 October 2018	Four courses are provided in the case-file and in the case-file.	The family participated in the community; the mother describes the last time as successful	Printed pages 2, 10 and 12; PDF pages 3, 11 and 13
30. October 2018	The music teacher reports that the child and mother are causing anxiety and must stop. On the same day, the mother replies to the question of professional participation and the possibility of creating more calm.	The child and mother are excluded from the offer	Printed p. 2-3; PDF p. 3-4
1 November 2018	The department manager refers to lack of specialist pedagogical skills / resources	No documented testing of mother's solution proposal	Printed p. 3-4; PDF p. 4 -5
5 November 2018	The mother asks for cooperation, access to documents and a decision before today's education; the manager replies that he cannot handle the case that day	New teaching path can pass without access	Printed p. 4-5; PDF p. 5-6
9 November 2018	The retention of the cultural school director is dated in the reproduced ombudsman's letter; the e-mail itself is undated in the case-file of the Board. The manager has spoken to staff and the legal department of the municipality and refers to the institutional relationship	The removal is maintained; announced reimbursement of course payments does not document actual payment	Printed p. 5 -6; PDF p. 6-7
12 January 2019	The mother complains to the Ombudsman	The case is being tried	Printed p. 6; PDF p. 7
24 March 2019	The Board of Equal Treatment receives the complaint	Child discrimination complaint recorded	Printed p. 6; PDF p. 7
8 April 2019	The Ombudsman chooses not to investigate the case; he refers to the institution's particular assumptions and considers that an inquiry could not help to achieve a different result.	No ombudsman inquiry or restoration through this track	Printed p. 6-7; PDF p. 7-8
17 June 2021	The name establishes illegal discrimination and grants the child DKK 5.000, payment within 14 days	The child has won the complaint; actual payment and access has not been documented	Printed pp. 1 and 13-14; PDF pp. 2 and 14-15

All information in the table comes from KEN no. 9536 of 17. June 2021. Time differences are the report's calculations: **961 days** from expulsion to the board's decision; **816 days** from the board's receipt of the complaint to the decision; **801 days** from the Ombudsman's closure to the later decision granting relief. They measure time to a formal decision, not a documented 961 days of uninterrupted exclusion from all leisure services or time to actual redress.

Verification of concrete statements of authority and source conflicts

The municipality’s reliance on its institutional authority did not withstand the discrimination-law assessment. The head of the cultural school referred to the institution’s authority to make necessary decisions about users. The reproduced letter shows that the municipality had consulted its legal department and maintained the exclusion. The Board’s later assessment required specific necessity after information about the disability and proposed solutions had been received. The municipality had not attempted to solve the problem and could not prove that exclusion was necessary. The departure actually established is unlawful indirect discrimination; the public material provides no basis for converting it into a criminal conviction of named employees. Source: printed pp. 5-6 and 12-14.

The Ombudsman's resignation was not evidence of legality. The reproduced letter places emphasis on the special experience and balancing of the cultural school and refrains from examining. The Board subsequently established a concrete infringement of the Discrimination Act. This demonstrates that the absence of ombudsman criticism in a closed file case cannot be used as a general counter to the law. The reproduced ombudsman's letter is the only source of this

closure; the report does not claim that the later Board alone documents all legal or factual errors in the Ombudsman's handling. Source:printed pp. 6-7 and 12-14.

Dates have been changed in the account of the reasons. The statement of facts and reasons on printed pp. 2, 4 and 12 reproduce the mother's emails from 30. October and 5. November **2018**. In the subsequent necessity examination on printed p. 13, the two dates appear as **2019**. This is an internal date discrepancy in the original. The timeline uses 2018, supported by the overall enrolment, teaching, exclusion and appeal process. The error does not in itself change the documented favourable finding.

The number of teaching sessions is shortened in the summary. The initial summary indicates that the mail came after three teaching sessions. The case-making and the grounds list four, including 29 October 2018. The report uses the four specific dated times. Source: printed pp. 1-2 and 12.

Consequences of the child and the family

The documented intervention was exclusion from a municipal children's community which the mother says was chosen with professional support to promote the child's interaction and language development. The child's short developmental window is specific: during the complaint process, the mother states that he will soon turn four, when the parents will no longer be able to participate in the same way. A finding in the party's favour several years later therefore cannot, without separate redress, restore the lost opportunity to participate as a three-year-old. Source: printed pp. 10-11; the assessment's recommendations printed pp. 7-9.

The mother describes short-term sick leave for both parents, family therapy, financial consequences and influence on the child's linguistic and mental development. The decision reproduces this as the complainant's pleas in law. There are no separate records, supporting documents of income or medical examinations, which determine the amount of the loss. The evidence of exclusion and infringement is independent; further losses require the specific supporting documents. Source: printed p. 10 -11.

Responsibilities and concrete follow-up

The respondent found responsible is the municipality. The Board awarded compensation under Disability Discrimination Act § 11 with a shared burden of proof under § 10, the prohibition in § 5 and the necessity/proportionality assessment in § 7. The rules applied are stated in the original, printed p. 14. The municipality's specific chain of knowledge and decision-making includes a music educator, department manager, head of the cultural school and consultation with the legal department; the text identifies neither personal criminal culpability nor a disciplinary decision.

The strongest documented demands are documentation of actual payment of the 5.000 kroner; access actually offered and implemented or an appropriate restorative offer; checks on changed procedures following the municipality's receipt of knowledge; and a separate account of the child's lost time and the family's documented expenses. If personal or criminal responsibility is to be assessed, contemporaneous emails and advisory records must be obtained and the conditions for each act examined under the relevant rules of responsibility. A general institutional legal basis cannot replace examination of the specific prohibition of discrimination found to have been breached.

Documented errors, concrete hypotheses and lack of evidence

Documented: unlawful indirect discrimination; maintaining the position after knowledge of disability without attempting a specific solution; 816 days recorded until the board decision; the original's conflicts over years and teaching sessions; no Ombudsman investigation despite a subsequently established breach of law.

Requires further proof: full individual loss, compensation paid, actual resumption of participation or alternative offers, systematic municipal practice and individual disciplinary / criminal liability. None of these is recorded as zero simply because they are not shown in the public decision.

Necessary original documents: the email threads, the educational-psychological assessment of 25. May 2018,legal advice/handling of access to records, the Ombudsman's letter and case material, payment records, the subsequent municipal offer and the family's loss documentation. The decisive breach of law and calculated time differences can be traced directly to the public primary decision; a full account of loss and redress cannot yet be traced in this way.

Handicapbil 2006-2010: original appropriations and separate versions

Result: The five annual originals have been obtained and their specific flow/award tables checked in memory. The outstanding missing annual vehicle awards have been covered at aggregate level. Awards, full refusals, altered reconsiderations and board decisions are different counting populations. They are not a national count of unique citizens or unlawful decisions.

A. Sources and actual reading delineation

ID	Original	Locally actually read
HB06	Annual statistics 2006, Aid for the purchase of cars etc., SEL § 99	Selected flow / allocation tables and method; PDFs, 11 visually controlled, not the entire report
HB07	Annual statistics 2007, Aid to disabled cars, SEL § 114	Tables 2,1 to 2,3 and their delimitation notes text read in RAM, not the whole report
HB08	Annual statistics 2008, Aid to disabled cars, SEL § 114	Table 2,1-2,3 and notes text read; PDFs, 6 visually controlled, not the whole report
HB09	Annual statistics 2009, Support for disabled cars, SEL § 114	Tables 2,1 to 2,3 and delimiting notes text read in RAM, not the whole report
HB10	Annual statistics 2010, Aid to disabled cars, SEL § 114	Table 2,1-2,4,3,1-3,2,4,2-4,3 and Annex 2 PDFs, 37-39 text read in RAM; delimited extract, not the whole report

B. Initial purchase appropriations

The figures under one year are overlapping sub-totals. 2006-table 2.4; 2007-2009-table 2.3; precise pages in source field / JSON. County 2006, Municipality 2007-09.

Category	2006	2007	2008	2009
New: common	694	568	506	437
New: extended	616	546	455	302
New: total	1310	1114	961	739
Previously on Ordinary Replacement...	967	523	476	259
Former: early replacement	209	108	116	51
Previous: second new purchase	470	734	696	824
Previously on "Total..."	1646	1365	1288	1134
Total appropriations	2956	2479	2249	1873

C. The broad initial decision populations

All forms of aid within the meaning of the originals; case-law of the Court of First Instance overlaps. Re-assessment includes a change in result; not all re-assessments. Thinking line is original empty field.

2006, HB06 original - Table 2.1 PDF -s.6

Category	County / municipality	Name	Printed total
Without previous aid	2737	125	2862
Disclaimer	98	31	129
Modified reassessment	58	-	58
With previous support	2914	92	3006
Undisclosed	10	160	170
Total	5817	408	6225

2007, HB07 original - Table 2.1 PDFs -s.7

Category	County / municipality	Name	Printed total
Without previous aid	2504	207	2711
Disclaimer	86	15	101
Modified reassessment	199	-	199
With previous support	2323	117	2440
Undisclosed	37	66	103
Total	5149	405	5554

2007, HB08 post-reporting - Table 2.1 PDFs -s.6

Category	County / municipality	Name	Printed total
Without previous aid	2638	211	2849
Disclaimer	86	15	101
Modified reassessment	210	-	210
With previous support	2427	120	2547
Undisclosed	39	59	95
Total	5400	405	5802

2008, HB08 original - Table 2.1 PDF-s.6

Category	County / municipality	Name	Printed total
Without previous aid	2586	210	2796
Disclaimer	149	36	185
Modified reassessment	275	-	275
With previous support	2439	143	2582
Undisclosed	25	66	91
Total	5474	455	5929

2009, HB09 original - Table 2.1 PDF-s.8, printed p.7

Category	County / municipality	Name	Printed total
Without previous aid	2192	225	2417
Disclaimer	183	29	212
Modified reassessment	215	-	215
With previous support	2367	156	2523
Undisclosed	37	77	114
Total	4994	487	5481

Own imputation, not correction of original: HB08's later 2007 has 5400 + 405 = 5805, but printed 5802. Unstated 39 + 59 = 98, but printed 95. Both printing errors are visually controlled on HB08 PDF-p.6. The original HB07 has 5149 + 405 = 5554; later reporting should not be added as an additional population. HB07 gives 6 municipalities and estimates 300-350 missing decisions; the estimate is not attributed to the actual figures.

D. HB10: reworked historical purchase series

Table 2.1 PDF-s.6 / printed 4. New car purchase delimitation, interrunning and validation: this version does not replace silent B / C. Percentage is the source's rounded figure.

Year	Disclaimer	%	Refusal	%	Authorisation	%	Denominatio n
2005	56	2	878	24	2795	75	3729
2006	72	2	1036	25	2964	73	4072
2007	49	1	997	27	2699	72	3745
2008	86	2	1182	33	2309	65	3577
2009	103	3	1113	36	1916	61	3132
2010	68	2	1310	40	1898	58	3276

2010: new and former applicants

Group	Disclaimer	%	Refusal	%	Authorisation	%	Denominati on
New	0	-	1017	58,1	732	41,9	1749
Previous	68	4,5	293	19,2	1166	76,4	1527
All	68	2,1	1310	40,0	1898	57,9	3276

Time in weeks, separate HB10 version

Table 3.1 PDF-p.17 / printed 15. Old dates: day 01; same month set to 2 weeks. Discrepancies are reported.

Year	New	Previous
2005	37,1	27,5
2006	43,3	31,7
2007	41,4	34,8
2008	39,0	34,4

Year	New	Previous
2009	39,1	34,5
2010	39,5	31,3

Name outturn 2010

Table 4.3 PDF-p.33 / printed 31. The columns are the result of the board; the row is the decision of the municipality.

Municipality	Common	Extended	Replacement	No loan	Disclaimer	Denomination	% change
Common	9	-	-	1	-	10	10
Replacement	-	-	11	-	-	11	0
No loan	-	-	3	323	-	326	1
Disclaimer	3	1	-	-	13	17	24
All	12	1	14	324	13	364	2

Our reconciliation:382=364+17 remitted+1 unspecified;66 further board decisions excluded without municipal data, thus 448 known decisions. Matrix changes 8=1+3+4; diagonal 356. These figures overlap other board statistics. The printed 2% does not include the 17 remittals.

E. Demarcation, consistency and concrete remainder

HB06 PDF-p.31-32: several decisions relating to the same person in the same year are recorded separately; simultaneous forms of aid are grouped together. From 1.1.2007 the municipality took over the power of decision; HB06 PDF-p.22.

HB06-09 Table 2.2: Full refusal partially omits refusal, e.g. rejected car purchase combined with allocated special features. Therefore, the different refusal denominators should not be used as a joint refusal / person series.

HB10 Annex 2 PDF-p.37-39: Only car purchase in new form; other § 114 such as special arrangement is omitted. Co-operation 1997-2009 and prioritisation of loan types change earlier / first time and loan categories. Disqualification / rejection validation may remain uncertain. Name time starts with a municipal decision and includes the period of appeal.

Our inference: The data document the scale of awards, recorded refusals and citizens' reported waiting time. They do not in themselves document unlawfulness or how many unique individuals lost a legal entitlement. One person may pass through municipality, reconsideration and board. Effective delivery, actual access to a vehicle and time from an erroneous decision to redress require separate linkage.

Precise remaining gap: other disability-benefit curves for 2006-17 and de-identified person/decision linkage. Historical register leads: National Archives 12705,2005–06, BIL_AMT/STAT, 12706,2007–09, BIL_KOM/STAT. Metadata have been checked; the register data have not been extracted. According to the archive description, the statistics transferred to DST in 2016. Necessary inquiry to DST/Appeals Board:version date, reporting/exclusion list and de-identified citizen ID with municipality, amended reassessment, board and implementation dates; separate purchase/adaptation and legal outcome. No inquiry has been sent.

7. The boundaries of children's and disabled barometers

Controlled in original annual reports 7 October 2026. The main objectives, methodology and all published municipal annex figures of five reports have been checked; all annexes to the case 2021-24 have been examined separately. The Pilot 2019 original is still being sought, the practice check requires independent accounting, and the official 2026 plan describes a new model after the release window. See the children barometric -municipal annex -2020-2024.md and the children barometric -pause- and -new -control.md.

Population and time displacement

Publication	Case	Municipalities	Family treatment g / others	Installation a	Of which: consent;	Settlement / measurement period a	Methodology page
2020	735	37	380	355	13	25 March 2016-25 March 2019	49
2021	708	27	429	279	21	8 January 2017-8 January 2020	51-52
2022	697	31	375	322	15	11 March 2017- 11 March 2020	53-54
2023	765	37	468 of which 37 others	297	11	Decisions 2021; proceedings 2020- 2021	41-43
2024	724	27	448 of which 45 others	276	7	Decisions 2022; proceedings 2021-2022	42-44

All exclude cases previously appealed to/considered by the Appeals Board. The most recent methodologies also specify cases considered following notifications. 2020-2022 mainly selects the most recent cases, but a third of placements must be at least one year old for the follow-up measurement. 2022 avoids the period of special Covid legislation. Absolute numbers submitted/excluded cannot be reconstructed from the instruction to provide 15-20 per cent additional cases.

The 2023 report, p. 5, documents the opt-out of three free municipalities with continued exemptions from certain procedural requirements. "All municipalities every three years' cannot therefore be continued as a literal coverage of all 98 municipalities. Differences between years can also reflect different municipalities and case types.

Controlled law-breakers

Each cell is **count/denominator (original page)**. “Assessment” counts a missing or not updated current child welfare assessment. “Interview” counts a breached requirement, not merely the absence of an interview. Lawful grounds for absence have been deducted from the error counts shown.

Publication	Investigation	Four-month-free t	Speech before Decision	Action plan	Three Months leaking,	Notification n
2020	215/731 (18)	219/330 (20)	322/717 (28)	152/735 (30)	58/118 (34)	95/203 (45)
2021	187/692 (21)	146/367 (22)	273/699 (31)	87/708 (33)	49/87 (37)	121/268 (47)
2022	252/687 (22)	185/284 (23)	309/691 (32-33)	161/697 (35)	46/102 (39)	103/219 (49)
2023	209/744 (20)	208/314 (21)	294/746 (28)	127/765 (33)	144/475 (36)	116/204 (39)
2024	143/709 (21)	187/371 (22)	248/708 (29-30)	120/724 (34)	118/473 (37)	83/168 (40)

The two composite counters shown are derived explicitly: study = not updated + none; re-evaluation = not performed + result missing. All components can be found in the compact JSON annex. There is no published union here that allows the sum of these columns as the number of failed children.

Follow-up and supervision prior to change of definition

Publication	Deficient six-month follow-up	Deficiently personalised supervision;	Original page
2020	50/103	27/101	35, 37
2021	38/76	24/74	38-39
2022	48/81	30/78	40-41

From 2023, three-month follow-up is measured in all relevant case types, not only the older placement sub-sample. Operationalization is changing at the same time. Therefore, raw falls or increases in percentages are not in themselves evidence of changed municipal law compliance.

What "met" covers

Publication	Conversation requirements	Actual prior interview on action	The Board of Appeal's own emissary reason for opt-out without municipal documentation;
2020	395/717	245	94
2021	426/699	278	51
2022	382/691	201	58
2023	452/746	250	78
2024	460/708	260	74

The last two columns are subsets of the first column. The rest includes, for example, documented opt-out, interview as part of investigation and child rejection. The reasons for the abstention are the assessments of the Ankestyrelsen; they do not prove a concurrently documented municipal statement of reasons. The criticism of the method is to preserve this difference in reporting legal certainty.

Reproduction and status checks

The compact annex boernesagsbarometre-2020-2024.json contains the actual component figures, URL, pages, SHA256 and local status. Figures for 2020 and 2023 without usable text values have been read visually; temporary checking images have been deleted. The 2024 details in praksisundersoegelser-kompakt.json repeat the same report and must not be added again.

Years refer to publication. No five-year-old case is a number of unique children. The three-year report on 2020-2022 repeats those years of data and shall not be added as a new sample. Links with unique children / parents, actual duration of placement and termination require identifiers and subsequent procedures.

Pilot 2019: documented errors in uncontested child cases

The first pilot of the Child Case Barometer documents serious failures in municipal fact-finding, involvement and follow-up, including in cases never appealed to Ankestyrelsen. The November 2019 report has now been recovered together with both original annexes. All 42 main pages, 6 methodology pages and 20 municipal-annex pages have been read in memory. The raster figures not reproduced by text extraction have been read visually, including all 17 municipal figures. No public original PDF, full text or original page image has been saved locally. Our numerical records contain the values of all 18 actual main figures, with figure 2.5 split into two denominators: 19 table extracts/67 category rows, the methodology municipality table's 12 rows and the municipal annex's 204 rows. Figure 1.1 in the main report is a reading illustration, not another study population. [BBP19, physical 4-7; BBP19M, 4-6; BBP19K, 4-20]

Selection: 228 cases are not 228 errors, places or different children

The 12 municipalities contributed 228 cases: 115 family-treatment cases and 113 placement cases. Four were compulsory placements, and 109 voluntary placements are the documented difference 113−4. The municipalities were selected for variation in size and geography; contribution size followed municipality size and socioeconomic index. Allerød 10, Esbjerg 47, Frederikshavn 24, Greve 16, Hillerød 15, Langeland 9, Lolland 27, Odsherred 14, Rebild 10, Rudersdal 13, Silkeborg 29, Skanderborg 14. Langeland's nine are an express exception to the methodology's minimum of ten. [BBP19, 5; BBP19M, 4-5,table 1.1; BBP19K, 4,figure 1.1]

The municipalities were to submit the latest decisions within 7 November 2015- 7 November 2018. One third of the accommodation cases had to be at least one year old in order to check the follow-up; the Annex indicates the decision by 7 December 2017. This separate printed date is not retained and is not replaced by an estimated November date. The proceedings were not to be appealed against Ankestyrelsen. The municipalities were instructed not to select any more. The population already complained of is thus excluded from the call and the errors of the pilot must not disappear in the overall coverage of the report because the complaint statistics do not contain them. At the same time, the exclusion does not in itself provide a controlled personal union with other investigations or subsequent complaints. [BBP19M, 5]

Each municipality was asked for 15-20% more cases than the planned number. All submitted more than were ultimately reviewed, and unsuitable cases were excluded. The precise submitted quantity and absolute exclusion count are not published in the originals read.15-20% is a requirement in the request for cases, not an actually counted exclusion account. Consultation with the municipalities led to some changes in results in two cases; the category and direction of the changes are not stated. [BBP19M, 4,footnotes 1-2; 6]

The Appeals Board assessed only the records submitted and actions within the review period. The methodology annex rejects the proposition that each municipality's sample is representative of all its cases and provides no basis for ranking the municipalities' overall lawfulness. The combined material is described as a better basis for illuminating overall practice; no nationally weighted representative error rate is documented here. Nor are there individual identifiers to count distinct children, parents or families. [BBP19, 5-7; BBP19M, 6]

Errors with the actual denominators

Test requirements	Documented non-compliance;	Limitation and original
Current child welfare assessment/update	70 / 228: 48 not updated and 22 without survey	100 current studies, 45 updates and 13 legal exceptions; BBP19, 15-16, Figure 2.1
Four-month deadline	64/100	Only first-time studies; none of the 64 had documented special circumstances as justification; 16-17, Figure 2.2
Reasoned position on the measure	5/145	All five were new studies; 18, Figure 2.4
Investigation / update completed before decision	19 / 145: 11 / 100 new and 8 / 45 updates	Legal acute / provisional exceptions 11 + 14 are omitted by the malfunction counter; 19-20, Figure 2.5
The child's interview in the study	8/137	145 minus 8 unborn; 22-23, Figure 3.1
Pre-decision children's interview	99/226	228 minus 2 unborn; 25- 26, Figure 3.3
Current action plan with the necessary effort	52/228	172 satisfied and 4 legitimate exceptions; 7 out of 52 had a plan without indicating the necessary effort; 28-29, Figure 4.1
Three-month follow-up	20/36	38 older placement cases minus 2 terminated before appropriate checks; 30-32, Figure 5.1
Six-month follow-up	20/33	36 minus 3 without relevant six-month period; 32-33, Figure 5.2
Two annual interviews during personal supervision	9/33	Location with relevant duration; 33-34, Figure 5.3
24-hour notification assessment	32 / 248 notifications	Lack of documented evaluation; 198 cases, not 248 children; 35-37, Figure 6.1
Re-assessment following new notification	25 / 57 notifications: 8 without visible result and 17 without visible reassessment	Initial notification only after decision; 40-41, Figure 6.5

All tables refer to BBP19. They are overlapping sections of error and investigation. The largest directly documented error sample is 99 cases with 48 errors, but no case-front union is published across all types of errors. Therefore, it has been demonstrated that at least 99 of the 228 cases of the sample have that failure; a precise total number of cases or children failed cannot be calculated by adding up the rows. The 33 or 36 follow-up cases are a committee from the placement cases and cannot be made a control of all 113 locations. [BBP19, 25-26; 30-34]

The 64 deadline overruns comprised 34 exceeding a further three months, 14 exceeding one and up to three months, 14 between one week and one month, and two under one week.34 cases thus had a total duration exceeding seven months from the point that triggered the four-month deadline; this is our own time inference from two documented intervals, not published individual dates. The report does not provide actual completion dates, a deduplicated child count or follow-up on harm for the 34. [BBP19, 17,fig 2.3]

The 99 errors in the child interview were 49 without a completed or legally diselected interview, 26 with a conversation about anything other than the specific measure and 24 with the conversation after the decision. The 127 lawfulcases were 95 with timely concrete interviews, 13 with a documented legal opt-out and 19 where Ankestyrelsen on the basis of the information provided in the case, it was subsequently considered that the opt-out could be justified even if it did not appear in the documents. At the time of the interview during the investigation, 129 cases of law were similarly 117 committed, nine documented diselected and three on the grounds of subsequent action by the Appeal Board. The skeleton shows that compliance in the barometer does not always mean that the child was actually heard or that the municipality documented the reason for the aberration. [BBP19, 23, footnote 2; 26]

Among the 20 errors in three-month follow-up, 16 lacked timely follow-up, of which ten received it later, three lacked a position on reassessment of the action plan and one lacked a position on changing the intervention. Among the 20 errors in six-month follow-up, 19 lacked timely follow-up, of which 12 received it later, and one lacked a position on

review of the action plan. A later check is not timely and the information does not establish that the child was repatriated, the effort corrected or the effect restored. [BBP19, 31- 33]

Notifications: 248 incidents in 198 cases

In 141 cases, there was only a controlled notification before the decision, in 50 both before and after, and in seven only after. This gives 191 before + 57 after = 248 notifications in 198 cases; the last 30 of 228 cases are not included in this notification section. Only the last before and the first after the decision was examined, and only the file information which the municipality had designated as notification.248 is therefore neither all the notifications in the cases nor 248 different children. [BBP19, 35-36]

At 30 notifications, the municipality had assessed urgent needs and responded. The municipal annex allocates these to 28 before and two after the decision.100% response among these 30 does not say that all other information received was correctly identified as notifications, that all needs assessments were correct or that timely action is documented for all 228 cases. The 32 undocumented 24-hour assessments and 25 reassessment errors must be independent. [BBP19, 35-37; BBP19K, 18 / 20, Figure 6.2 / 6.4]

Following the most recent concern report before the decision, the municipality had, within two months, contacted a holder of parental responsibility for 154/191 reports, spoken to the child for 87/191 and decided on an assessment/update for 52/191. Six had no visible action after the 24-hour assessment, while 15 were in process without a particular case step. Following the first concern report after the decision, the figures were 38/57 with parental contact and 21/57 with a child interview; six had no visible action after the 24-hour assessment and four were in process without particular case steps. All other category counts appear in the reading annex. Several actions may concern the same report. Neither contact nor being in process is in itself redress for an earlier error. [BBP19, 38-39,fig 6.3/6.4]

Benchmarks of the municipal annex and round-off of the main report

The municipal annex is now fully numbered: 17 figures × 12 municipalities = 204 rows. There are no 204 new cases. It also contains various control sections, which are grouped together in the main report: 179 existing action plans are tested for the indication of effort, as opposed to 228 for the actual existence and legal exception of the plan itself. The 52 plan errors of the main report contain the seven existing plans without sufficient indication of effort. [BBP19, 28-29; BBP19K, 12-13]

The main report breaks down parental responsibility information across 145 assessments: 129 with information from the relevant holders, two with unresolved parental responsibility, 12 from only one of two holders, and two without information. The municipality annex's binary yes/no figure has 143 as its overall denominator; Silkeborg's 17 in the assessment extract is 15 here. This is consistent with excluding the two unresolved cases, but is not an additional assessment population. The main report describes this as an involvement indicator rather than the separate statutory requirement being measured. The 14 missing/partial parental information entries therefore cannot, without further legal examination, be labelled as 14 independently established breaches of law. [BBP19, 23-24,fig 3.2; BBP19K, 7/10,fig 2.3/3.2]

The 69% compliance of the main barometer in the current investigation includes the 13 legal exceptions. The rounded percentages 44 + 20 + 6 give 70%, while the actual legal category counters 100 + 45 + 13 = 158 of 228 give approximately 69%. Both original figures are preserved. Similarly, 87% total compliance before decision is a total sample of 145 and cannot be reconstructed by adding rounded percentage labels from the 100 / 45 subsections. [BBP19, 8 / 15 / 19]

Importance for children, time and responsibility

The material documents that municipalities could initiate measures without the safeguards examined for a current factual basis, the child's participation, a usable plan or timely assessment of continued intervention. In the placement subset, missing follow-up may mean that a necessary change or termination is not assessed in time while the child and parents remain separated. This is the specific protective function that the former Social Services Act §§ 50, 48, 52, 140, 70, 148 and 155 a were intended to secure. The errors' precise significance for legal authority, validity, duration and actual loss must then be examined in the specific cases. The pilot report does not in itself document that all 113 placements lacked legal authority, or how many children actually returned home after the review. [BBP19, 14/19/25/27/31/33/36/40]

The strongest valid requirement of these findings is a control account linking each error point to the specific decision, the child and rightholders, the authority's date of designation, correction, possible repatriation, reunification, support, financial loss and actual liability. The consultation shows that the municipalities were provided with their case results; the originals do not give the date of each municipality or subsequent legal restoration. The error rate must therefore be supplemented by the authority's knowledge and actual action rather than producing the publication as the end of responsibility. [BBP19M, 6]

After the addition, the study volume for 2019-2024 is 228+3.629=3.857 case occurrences in six annual/pilot publications. The consolidated report for 2020-2022 adds no new cases. There is no verified union of individuals or error cases for the 3.857, and the pilot's different selection and decision period must be retained. The outstanding retrieval work is complete for the three 2019 originals and all printed figure values. Remaining substantive data needs are the precise submission/exclusion counts, stable case/person identifiers, the direction of change following consultation on two cases, and the actual redress/accountability trajectory. No external request has been sent.

Pilot of the Children's Day Barometer 2019: original figures and rows of municipalities

All figures come from the November 2019 version. The main report, the methodology annex and the municipal annex are fully read in RAM. The figures are translated into own reading tables. Physical page number is also printed page number. - means no printed percentage / no shown category column; the zero denominator is only written where the original shows 0. The percentages are rounded and the exact category counters of the municipality are not constructed. The rows are several sections of the same 228 cases and 248 notifications. They must not be summed up as different children, misguided citizens or decisions.

Table 1.1 of the Annex to the Methodology: municipal contribution

BBP19M, Physical 5

Municipality	Number of cases in judicial review
Allerred	10
Esbjerg	47
Frederikshavn	24
Count	16
Hillerød	15
Langeland	9
Lolland	27
Odsherd	14
Rebild	10
Rudersdal	13
Silkeborg	29
Skanderborg	14

Figure 2.1 of the main report

BBP19, Physically 15. Names: 228 cases. The main barometer on page 8 gives 69% total compliance including exceptions; rounded percentages cannot be summed up to this proportion.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Current first-time assessment	100	44
Current update	45	20

Category	Number	Printed percentage
No, but legal reason.	13	6
Unupdated survey	48	21
No investigation	22	10

Figure 2.2 of the main report

BBP19, physical 16. Denominator: 100 cases. Initial assessments only, no updates.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	36	36
No	64	64

Figure 2.3 of the main report

BBP19, Physically 17. Names: 64 cases.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
More than three months past	34	53
Over one and up to three months	14	22
Between a week and a month	14	22
Less than one week	2	3

Figure 2.4 of the main report

BBP19, Physically 18. Names: 145 cases. 100 new surveys and 45 updates. All five flaws are in new investigations.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	140	97
No	5	3

Figure 2.5 a of the main report

BBP19, Physically 19. Denomination: 100 cases.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes, completed before decision	78	78
No, but legal reason.	11	11
No	11	11

Figure 2.5 b of the main report

BBP19, Physically 19. Names: 45 cases. Together with 2.5 a: main barometer 87% compliance; 19 errors of 145, not the sum of rounded partial percentages.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes, update completed before decision	23	51
No, but legal reason.	14	31
No	8	18

Figure 3.1 of the main report

BBP19, Physical 22. Names: 137 cases. 145 current studies minus 8 unborn children. Yes contains 117 completed, 9 explicitly rejected and 3 subsequently legally rejected after the AS assessment, p. 23.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes, requirements met	129	94
No	8	6

Main Report Figure 3.2

BBP19, Physically 23. Names: 145 cases. Indicator, not in itself the tested separate legal requirement. The binary division of the municipality annex has 143, omits 2 open.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Information from relevant holders	129	89
Parental authority open	2	1
Only from one of two holders	12	8
No information from holders	2	1

Figure 3.3 of the main report

BBP19, Physically 25. Names: 226 cases. 228 minus 2 unborn by decision. Yes = 95 timely concrete conversations + 13 documented legal opt-outs + 19 opt-outs AS estimates could be justified. No = 49 no conversation + 26 wrong subject + 24 after decision, p 26.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	127	56
No	99	44

Figure 4.1 of the main report

BBP19, Physically 28. Names: 228 cases. Only current plan and necessary effort tested; 7 out of 52 have plan without necessary effort, p 29. Non-submitted plans classified as unseen.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	172	75
No, but legal reason.	4	2
No	52	23

Figure 5.1 of the main report

BBP19, Physically 31. Names: 36 cases. 38 older placement cases minus 2 terminated before three months.20 errors = 16 not timely (10 later) + 3 no plan assessment + 1 no effort assessment, s 31-32.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	16	44
No	20	56

Figure 5.2 of the main report

BBP19, Physical 32. Names: 33 cases. 36 minus 3 where not gone six months.20 errors = 19 lack of timeliness (12 later) + 1 no plan evaluation, p 33.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	13	39
No	20	61

Figure 5.3 of the main report

BBP19, Physically 34. Names: 33 cases. Personal supervision: requirement for two annual calls; 3 for short placement periods omitted, p. 33.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	24	73
No	9	27

Figure 6.1 of the main report

BBP19, Physically 36. Names: 248 notifications. 198 cases, 191 last before and 57 first after decision. Only records-marked notifications.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	216	87
No, assessment not documented	32	13

Figure 6.2 of the main report

BBP19, Physically 37. Names: 30 notifications. Only recognised acute needs; 28 before and 2 after in municipal annexes. No full control of all notifications' needs assessment.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	30	100

General Report Figure 6.3

BBP19, Physical 38. Names: 191 notifications. Two months after the last notification before the decision. Several steps may occur in the same case, so rows overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Contact with the holder of parental responsibility	154	81
Children's interview	87	46
Decision on investigation / update	52	27
Decision on measure	43	23
Further information	30	16
Other action taken	27	14
Provisional measure	19	10
Part of the investigation initiated	17	9
In process without special case steps	15	8
Nothing after 24-hour evaluation	6	3
Article 11 (3) offers	4	2

Figure 6.4 of the main report

BBP19, Physical 39. Names: 57 notifications. Two months after the first notification following a decision. Rows overlap.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Contact with the holder of parental responsibility	38	67
Children's interview	21	37
No change necessary	13	23
Nothing after 24-hour evaluation	6	11
Investigation / Update	5	9
In process without special case steps	4	7
Further information	4	7
Second measure	3	5
Part of initiated investigation / update	1	2
Other action taken	14	25

Figure 6.5 of the main report

BBP19, Physical 40. Names: 57 notifications.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
Yes	32	56
Reassessment without visible result	8	14
No visible reassessment	17	30

Figure 6.6 of the main report

BBP19, Physically 41. Names: 32 notifications.

Category	Number	Printed percentage
No need to amend measure	23	72
Basis of the second measure	2	6
Need for more information	2	6
Other	5	16

Figure 1.1 of the Annex to the municipality: Type of decision

BBP19K, Physically 4. Sum of printed denominators: 228. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Family treatment	Optional placement	Forced housing
Allerred	10	50	50	-
Esbjerg	47	51	49	-
Frederikshavn	24	50	50	-
Count	16	50	50	-
Hillerød	15	53	40	7
Langeland	9	44	56	-
Lolland	27	41	59	-
Odsherd	14	50	43	7
Rebild	10	50	40	10
Rudersdal	13	62	38	-
Silkeborg	29	55	41	3
Skanderborg	14	50	50	-

Municipal annex figure 2.1: Current child welfare assessment or update

BBP19K, Physically 5. Sum of printed denominators: 228. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No, but legal reason.	No.
Allerred	10	70	-	30
Esbjerg	47	72	6	21
Frederikshavn	24	79	4	17
Count	16	38	-	63
Hillerød	15	53	-	47
Langeland	9	44	11	44
Lolland	27	78	4	19
Odsherd	14	64	-	36
Rebild	10	70	10	20

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No, but legal reason.	No.
Rudersdal	13	46	15	38
Silkeborg	29	59	14	28
Skanderborg	14	50	-	50

Municipal annex's figure 2.2: Four-month deadline

BBP19K, Physically 6. Sum of printed denominators: 100. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	6	17	83
Esbjerg	20	50	50
Frederikshavn	17	41	59
Count	3	67	33
Hillerød	5	60	40
Langeland	3	33	67
Lolland	9	11	89
Odsherd	6	-	100
Rebild	6	50	50
Rudersdal	6	50	50
Silkeborg	15	27	73
Skanderborg	4	25	75

Figure 2.3 of the Annex to the municipality: Reasoned position

BBP19K, Physically 7. Sum of printed denominators: 145. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	7	86	14
Esbjerg	34	97	3
Frederikshavn	19	95	5
Count	6	83	17
Hillerød	8	100	-
Langeland	4	100	-
Lolland	21	100	-
Odsherd	9	100	-
Rebild	7	100	-
Rudersdal	6	83	17
Silkeborg	17	100	-
Skanderborg	7	100	-

Figure 2.4 of the Annex to the municipality: Study completed before decision

BBP19K, Physical 8. Sum of printed denominators: 145. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No, but legal reason.	No.
Allerred	7	86	14	-
Esbjerg	34	79	15	6
Frederikshavn	19	74	21	5
Count	6	50	17	33
Hillerød	8	63	38	-
Langeland	4	50	25	25
Lolland	21	62	14	24
Odsherd	9	44	33	22
Rebild	7	86	14	-
Rudersdal	6	83	-	17
Silkeborg	17	65	12	24
Skanderborg	7	71	14	14

Figure 3.1 of the Annex to the municipality: Children's interview in the survey

BBP19K, Physical 9. Sum of printed denominators: 137. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	7	100	-
Esbjerg	33	97	3
Frederikshavn	18	94	6
Count	5	100	-
Hillerød	6	100	-
Langeland	4	100	-
Lolland	21	90	10
Odsherd	9	100	-
Rebild	6	100	-
Rudersdal	6	100	-
Silkeborg	15	80	20
Skanderborg	7	86	14

Municipality annex figure 3.2:Information from holder(s) of parental responsibility

BBP19K, Physical 10. Sum of printed denominators: 143. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	7	100	-
Esbjerg	34	94	6
Frederikshavn	19	89	11
Count	6	67	33
Hillerød	8	88	13
Langeland	4	100	-
Lolland	21	90	10
Odsherd	9	78	22
Rebild	7	86	14
Rudersdal	6	83	17
Silkeborg	15	93	7
Skanderborg	7	100	-

Figure 3.3 of the Annex to the municipality: Children's interview before decision

BBP19K, Physical 11. Sum of printed denominators: 226. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	10	40	60
Esbjerg	47	77	23
Frederikshavn	23	43	57
Count	16	50	50
Hillerød	15	53	47
Langeland	9	56	44
Lolland	27	56	44
Odsherd	14	50	50
Rebild	10	60	40
Rudersdal	13	46	54
Silkeborg	28	54	46
Skanderborg	14	50	50

Figure 4.1 of the Annex to the municipality: Action plan prepared

BBP19K, Physical 12. Sum of printed denominators: 228. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No, but legal reason.	No.
Allerred	10	80	-	20
Esbjerg	47	77	2	21
Frederikshavn	24	88	4	8

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No, but legal reason.	No.
Count	16	75	-	25
Hillerød	15	40	7	53
Langeland	9	56	-	44
Lolland	27	89	-	11
Odsherd	14	50	-	50
Rebild	10	100	-	-
Rudersdal	13	92	-	8
Silkeborg	29	93	-	7
Skanderborg	14	79	7	14

Figure 4.2 of the Annex to the municipality: Action plan indicates necessary action

BBP19K, Physical 13. Sum of printed denominators: 179. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	8	88	13
Esbjerg	36	94	6
Frederikshavn	21	95	5
Count	12	83	17
Hillerød	6	100	-
Langeland	5	100	-
Lolland	24	100	-
Odsherd	7	100	-
Rebild	10	100	-
Rudersdal	12	92	8
Silkeborg	27	100	-
Skanderborg	11	100	-

Figure 5.1 of the Annex to the municipality: Three-month follow-up

BBP19K, Physically 14. Sum of printed denominators: 36. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	1	100	-
Esbjerg	7	29	71
Frederikshavn	3	67	33
Count	3	33	67
Hillerød	2	50	50
Langeland	2	50	50

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Lolland	5	40	60
Odsherd	2	100	-
Rebild	2	50	50
Rudersdal	2	50	50
Silkeborg	5	20	80
Skanderborg	2	50	50

Figure 5.2 of the Annex to the municipality: Six Months follow-up

BBP19K, Physical 15. Sum of printed denominators: 33. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	1	-	100
Esbjerg	6	33	67
Frederikshavn	3	67	33
Count	2	50	50
Hillerød	2	100	-
Langeland	2	-	100
Lolland	4	-	100
Odsherd	2	50	50
Rebild	2	50	50
Rudersdal	2	100	-
Silkeborg	5	40	60
Skanderborg	2	-	100

Figure 5.3 of the Annex to the municipality: Two annual supervisory interviews

BBP19K, Physical 16. Sum of printed denominators: 33. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	1	100	-
Esbjerg	6	50	50
Frederikshavn	3	100	-
Count	2	50	50
Hillerød	2	100	-
Langeland	2	50	50
Lolland	4	100	-
Odsherd	2	100	-
Rebild	2	50	50

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Rudersdal	2	100	-
Silkeborg	5	60	40
Skanderborg	2	50	50

Figure 6.1 of the Annex to the municipality: 24-hour evaluation before decision

BBP19K, Physically 17. Sum of printed denominators: 191. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	8	75	25
Esbjerg	42	95	5
Frederikshavn	16	94	6
Count	14	100	-
Hillerød	15	100	-
Langeland	8	88	13
Lolland	24	92	8
Odsherd	12	67	33
Rebild	7	86	14
Rudersdal	12	92	8
Silkeborg	22	55	45
Skanderborg	11	100	-

Figure 6.2 of the Annex to the municipality: Response to recognised emergency needs prior to decision

BBP19K, physical 18. Sum of printed denominators: 28. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	1	100	-
Esbjerg	6	100	-
Frederikshavn	3	100	-
Count	2	100	-
Hillerød	1	100	-
Langeland	1	100	-
Lolland	5	100	-
Odsherd	1	100	-
Rebild	2	100	-
Rudersdal	3	100	-
Silkeborg	2	100	-
Skanderborg	1	100	-

Figure 6.3 of the Annex to the municipality: 24-hour assessment by decision

BBP19K, Physical 19. Sum of printed denominators: 57. Percentage columns are the original labels.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	1	-	100
Esbjerg	16	94	6
Frederikshavn	9	89	11
Count	1	100	-
Hillerød	3	100	-
Langeland	2	100	-
Lolland	9	100	-
Odsherd	4	75	25
Rebild	3	67	33
Rudersdal	1	-	100
Silkeborg	6	67	33
Skanderborg	2	100	-

Figure 6.4 of the Annex to the municipality: Response to recognised emergency needs by decision

BBP19K, Physically 20. Sum of printed denominators: 2.

Municipality	Denomination	Yeah.	No.
Allerred	0	-	-
Esbjerg	2	100	-
Frederikshavn	0	-	-
Count	0	-	-
Hillerød	0	-	-
Langeland	0	-	-
Lolland	0	-	-
Odsherd	0	-	-
Rebild	0	-	-
Rudersdal	0	-	-
Silkeborg	0	-	-
Skanderborg	0	-	-

Children's barometers 2021: all municipal and case type annexes

All 12 municipal tables with 324 municipal rows and all 16 case typtables are actually numbered. The local percentage cells and denominators are located in the children's barometric municipal annex. The Annexes repeat the main sample and give no new population. [BB21ANNEX]

Local government table	Measure	Published absolute total or visible denominator sum	PDF
2.1	Type of decision	702 public visible denominator; suppressed series missing	55
2.2	Investigation	687 public-visible denominator; suppressed series missing	56
2.3	Four-month deadline	335 public-visible denominator; suppressed series missing	57
2.4	Reasoned position	451 public-visible denominator; suppressed series missing	58
2.5	Pre-decision investigation	451 public-visible denominator; suppressed series missing	59
2.6	Study interview	436 publicly visible denominator sum; suppressed rows missing	60
2.7	Parental information	448 publicly visible denominator; suppressed rows missing	61
2.8	Prior to decision	693 public-visible denominator; suppressed series missing	62
2.9	Action plan	702 public visible denominator; suppressed series missing	63
2.10	Action of the plan	605 public-visible denominator; suppressed series missing	64
2.11	24 h last notification before decision	581 public visible denominator; suppressed series missing	65
2.12	24 h first notification after decision	231 public-visible denominator; suppressed rows missing	66

Case-type in order **placing / family treatment / overall**. The categories are rounded percentages.

Table; Objectives	Cists	Percentage categories	PDF
3.1 Investigation	279/413/692	New 36 / 64 / 53; updated 27 / 8 / 16; legal 6 / 3 / 4; unupdated 23 / 19 / 21; no 8 / 6 / 7	68
3.2 Four-month deadline	101/266/367	Yes 59 / 57 / 58; legal 0 / 3 / 2; no 41 / 39 / 40	68
3.3 Overrun	41/104/145	Less than 1 week 7 / 6 / 6; 1 week -1 m 12 / 19 / 17; over 1 m-3 m 27 / 36 / 33; over 3 m 54 / 39 / 43	69
3.4 Reasoned position	176/299/475	Yes 97 / 96 / 97; no 3 / 4 / 3	69
3.5 Pre-decision investigation	176/300/476	Yes 46 / 77 / 66; legal 35 / 17 / 24; no 19 / 6 / 11	69
3.6 Study interview	172/289/461	Yes 94 / 96 / 95; no 6 / 4 / 5	70
3.7 Parental information	176/300/476	All 93 / 97 / 96; kun 3 / 2 / 3; no 3 / 0 / 1; authority unknown 1 / 0 / 1	70
3.8 Speech before decision	279/420/699	Yes 75 / 51 / 61; no 25 / 49 / 39	71
3.9 Action plan	279/429/708	Yes 84 / 88 / 86; legal 4 / 0 / 2; no 12 / 12 / 12	72
3.10 Action of the plan	234/376/610	Yes 99 / 98 / 98; no 1 / 2 / 2	72
3.11 24 h notification assessment	354/509/863	Yes 89 / 88 / 88; no 11 / 12 / 12	73
3.12 Response to urgent needs	52/45/97	Yes 100 / 98 / 99; no 0 / 2 / 1	73

Table; Objectives	Cists	Percentage categories	PDF
3.13 Steps after last notification before decision	242/343/585	Parental contact 67/72/70; child interview 38/25/30; assessment 21/24/23; measure 56/20/35; information 8/15/12; existing assessment 5/6/6; process 12/8/9; none 2/6/4; § 11 offer 0/1/1; others 21/19/20	74
3.14 Steps after first notification after decision	112/166/278	Parental contact 32 / 67 / 53; child conversation 26 / 25 / 25; study 3 / 3 / 3; no change 9 / 19 / 15; second rate 3 / 1 / 2; information 2 / 6 / 4; location 9 / 0 / 4; process 39 / 13 / 24; none 13 / 8 / 10; § 11 offer 0 / 0 / 0; other 14 / 23 / 20	75
3.15 Re-evaluation	111/157/268	Yes 52 / 57 / 55; result defects 5 / 6 / 5; none 43 / 38 / 40	76
3.16 Reconsideration result	58/89/147	No change 79 / 75 / 77; second rate 14 / 18 / 16; information 2 / 6 / 4; second 5 / 1 / 3	76

Own source control: main figure 2.3 PDF23 indicates 146 deadlines, broken down by duration 9 / 26 / 48 / 63. Case Type Table 3.3 PDF69 has 41 + 104 = 145 and 17% in the 1 week-1 month range, compared with 18% in the main figure. Table 3.4 has 475 against 476 of the main measurement. These denominators are visually controlled in the original; no simultaneous explanation has been found. Require case allocation key and correction / version history rather than harmonising them.

Ærø and cells below 6 are hidden in publication and included in the overall sample. Municipality tables 2.11/2.12 concern, respectively, the last concern report before and the first after the decision; they are not the complete population of 863 concern reports.

Our methodological analysis: repeated questions may concern the same case; rounded percentages do not determine every integer cell. Missing documentation held by the reviewer must be distinguished from evidence that an action was never carried out. The identified procedural and documentation deficiencies must be checked separately against citizens' original case records, timelines and legal consequences. The tables do not provide unique children, parents, employees, return-home dates or total intervention duration.

Children's barometer 2022: all municipal and case type annexes

All 12 municipal tables with 372 municipal rows and all 16 case typtables are actually numbered. The local percentage cells and denominators are located in the children's barometric municipal annex. The Annexes repeat the main sample and give no new population. [BB22ANNEX]

Local government table	Measure	Published absolute total; or visible denominator sum;	PDF
2.1	Type of decision	307/15/375; n 697	57
2.2	Investigation	400/35/252; n 687	58
2.3	Four-month deadline	95/4/185; n 284	59
2.4	Reasoned position	394/6; n 400	60
2.5	Pre-decision investigation	258/65/77; n 400	61
2.6	Study interview	362/26; n 388	62
2.7	Parental information	380/19; n 399	63
2.8	Prior to decision	382/309; n 691	64
2.9	Action plan	520/16/161; n 697	65
2.10	Action of the plan	514/6; n 520	66
2.11	24 h last notification before decision	543/30; n 573	67

Local government table	Measure	Published absolute total; or visible denominator sum;	PDF
2.12	24 h first notification after decision	221/8; n 229	68

Case-type in order **placing / family treatment / overall**. The categories are rounded percentages.

Table; Objectives	Cists	Percentage categories	PDF
3.1 Investigation	319/368/687	New 27 / 54 / 41; updated 28 / 7 / 17; legal 6 / 4 / 5; unupdated 29 / 22 / 25; no 10 / 13 / 11	70
3.2 Four-month deadline	85/199/284	Yes 31 / 35 / 33; legal 1 / 2 / 1; no 68 / 64 / 65	70
3.3 Overrun	58/127/185	Less than 1 week 3 / 4 / 4; 1 week -1 m 10 / 13 / 12; over 1 m-3 m 26 / 31 / 30; over 3 m 60 / 51 / 54	71
3.4 Reasoned position	174/226/400	Yes 97 / 100 / 99; no 3 / 0 / 2	71
3.5 Pre-decision investigation	174/226/400	Yes 45 / 80 / 65; legal 22 / 12 / 16; no 33 / 9 / 19	71
3.6 Study interview	167/221/388	Yes 87 / 98 / 93; no 13 / 2 / 7	72
3.7 Parental information	174/226/400	All 90 / 99 / 95; only3 / 1 / 2; none 5 / 0 / 2; participation rejected 1 / 0 / 1; authority unknown 1 / 0 / 0	72
3.8 Speech before decision	322/369/691	Yes 68 / 44 / 55; no 32 / 56 / 45	73
3.9 Action plan	322/375/697	Yes 75 / 75 / 75; legal 5 / 0 / 2; no 20 / 25 / 23	74
3.10 Action of the plan	240/280/520	Yes 98 / 99 / 99; no 2 / 1 / 1	74
3.11 24 h notification assessment	405/397/802	Yes 96 / 94 / 95; no 4 / 6 / 5	75
3.12 Response to urgent needs	62/39/101	Yes 98 / 100 / 99; no 2 / 0 / 1	75
3.13 Steps after last notification before decision	276/297/573	Parental contact 64/71/68; interview with child 33/34/34; measure 46/22/33; assessment 14/22/18; information 11/9/10; process 10/6/8; existing assessment 7/6/6; section 11 service 0/1/1; none 5/3/4; other 44/40/42	76
3.14 Steps after first notification after decision	129/100/229	Parental contact 42 / 56 / 48; child interview 29 / 26 / 28; second rate 4 / 2 / 3; study 1 / 2 / 1; information 3 / 3 / 3; process 16 / 12 / 14; no change 16 / 10 / 14; location 19 / 1 / 11; § 11 offers 0 / 1 / 0; none 9 / 11 / 10; other 34 / 46 / 39	77
3.15 Re-evaluation	122/97/219	Yes 62 / 41 / 53; result defects 4 / 7 / 5; no 34 / 52 / 42	78
3.16 Reconsideration result	76/40/116	No change 78 / 75 / 77; second rate 8 / 10 / 9; information 8 / 13 / 9; second 7 / 3 / 5	78

Our source verification: municipality table 2.7 PDF63 gives the binary parental-information item for 399 cases, while detailed case-type table 3.7 PDF72 distributes 400. Table 3.4 publishes an overall 99% yes and 2% no; rounding can give 101%, and the absolute counts 394/6 in table 2.4 are retained. Allerød/Samsø and cells below 6 are publicly suppressed and included in the total sample. Municipality table 2.11/2.12 concerns notifications before/after the decision, not all 802 notifications.

Our methodological analysis: repeated questions may concern the same case; rounded percentages do not determine every integer cell. Missing documentation held by the reviewer must be distinguished from evidence that an action was never carried out. The identified procedural and documentation deficiencies must be checked separately against citizens' original case records, timelines and legal consequences. The tables do not provide unique children, parents, employees, return-home dates or total intervention duration.

Children's Day Barometer 2023: full annexes and internal deviations

PDF45-64 actually reviewed .12 municipal tables / 444 municipal rows, including suppressed Fanoe / Læsø rows, are registered in the children's barometric -municipal annex stal.json. The unity of local numbers is absolute; local categories are percentage. These tables repeat main sample 765 cases. [BB23ANNEX]

Local government table	Absolute categories in original order; denominator	PDF
2.1Decision	286 voluntary / 11 compulsion / 468 family -second; n 765	46
2.2Investigation	468 Yes / 67 Legality / 72 No; n 607	47
2.3Four-month deadline	100 yes / 6 lawmaking / 208 no; n 314	48
2.4Reasoned opinion	459 yes / 9 no; n 468	49
2.5Pre-decision investigation	303 Yes / 97 Legitimate grounds / 68 No; n 468	50
2.6Study interview	450 yes / 11 no; n 461	51
2.7Parental information	445 yes / 22 no; n 467	52
2.8Speech before decision	452 yes / 294 no; n 746	53
2.9Contact 3 m	259 yes / 74 grounds for absence / 166 no; n 499	54
2.10Action plan	628 yes / 10 lawgrounds / 127 no; n 765	55
2.11Action of the plan	623 yes / 5 no; n 628	56
2.12Follow-up 3 m	331 yes / 144 no; n 475	57

All case types below: **placement / family treatment and other / total**; rounded percentage.

Table; Objectives	Cists	Percentage categories in original order	PDF
3.1Study	293/451/744	New 20 / 57 / 42; updated 35 / 12 / 21; legal basis 8 / 10 / 9; unupdated 27 / 13 / 18; no 11 / 9 / 10	59
3.2Four-month deadline	59/255/314	Yes 44 / 29 / 32; Legal grounds 2 / 2 / 2; no 54 / 69 / 66	59
3.3Overrun	32/176/208	<1 week 9 / 6 / 7; 1 week -1 m 16 / 23 / 21;>1 m-3 m 28 / 35 / 34;>3 m 47 / 37 / 38	59-60
3.4Reasoned position	161/307/468	Yes 97 / 99 / 98; no 3 / 1 / 2	60
3.5Pre-decision investigation	161/307/468	Yes 46 / 75 / 65; ground 26 / 18 / 21; no 29 / 7 / 15	60
3.6Study interview	161/300/461	Yes 96 / 98 / 98; no 4 / 2 / 2	60
3.7Parental information	161/307/468	All 94/96/95; only one 2/3/3; none 3/1/2; participation refused 0/0/0; parental responsibility unknown 1/0/0	61
3.8Speech before decision	297/449/746	Yes 74 / 51 / 61; no 26 / 49 / 39	61
3.9Contact first 3 m	225/274/499	Yes 72 / 36 / 52; grounds for absence 7 / 21 / 15; no 21 / 43 / 33	61
3.10Action plan	297/431/765	Yes 81 / 83 / 82; Legal grounds 3 / 0 / 1; no 15 / 17 / 17	63
3.11Action of the plan	241/387/628	Yes 99 / 99 / 99; no 1 / 1 / 1	63
3.12Follow-up 3 m	209/266/475	Yes 75 / 65 / 70; no 25 / 35 / 30	63
3.13 Concern-report assessment 24 h	92/120/212	Yes 97 / 96 / 96; no 3 / 4 / 4	63-64
3.14Review	87/106/204	Yes 51 / 38 / 43; result defects 5 / 5 / 5; none 45 / 57 / 52	64

Table; Objectives	Cists	Percentage categories in original order	PDF
3.15 Reconsideration outcome	44/44/88	Amendment 89 / 73 / 81; second rate 0 / 7 / 3; additional information 2 / 7 / 5; second 9 / 14 / 11	64

Own source criticism: commune table 2.2 n 607 contradicts the main measurement and case type table 3.1's n 744. The table keeps the same 468 yes and 67 legal grounds as the main measurement, but only 72 no against the 209 main measurement. No simultaneous explanation has been identified. This cannot be solved by adding the different denominators, replacing one row or assigning the difference to sorted persons without proof. The specific request for authority is to provide version history, measurement scheme / cell counters and correction of Table 2.2.

Table 3.10 shows 297 + 431 = 728, while the total is 765. The basic population is 297 + 468 = 765, but the 431 of the original must be maintained as an unexplained source deviation. Table 3.14 shows 87 + 106 = 193 against total 204. The certified total denominator 765 / 204 of the same main tables shall not be used as proof of the type of case without a vote. It is a local delineation of the evidence value, not a justification for explaining away the other specific errors documented.

Fanoe / Læsø and categories under 6 are not published for reasons of discretion. Cases, decisions and return are not listed in the Annex. Percentage rounding does not allow unique absolute counters for all cells and 0% is not explicitly equal to 0 cases. There is no documented union of different procedural errors or of parents / children. Therefore, these tables are recorded with their own delimitation and repeat of the same sample marked.

Children's barometer 2024: all municipal and case type annexes

Original PDF46-66 actually reviewed. The 324 municipal rows (12 targets × 27 municipalities) and total rows are registered in the bonebarometric -municipal annex stal.json; table numbers 2.1 / 2.2 are mistakenly recycled in the original PDF57 / 58, so the physical side is the secure locator. The local authority distribution of information is not published here. The same 724 cases appear in the main findings, municipal and case-type annexes; no new sample. [BB24ANNEX]

All case types below: **placement / family treatment and other / total**. Percentage indications shall be kept rounded. The denominator varies per process requirement.

Table; Objectives	Cists	Percentage categories in order	PDF
3.1Study	271/438/709	New 23 / 70 / 52; updated 38 / 9 / 20; legal basis 9 / 6 / 7; unupdated 17 / 8 / 12; no 12 / 7 / 9	59
3.2Four-month deadline	63/308/371	Yes 54 / 44 / 46; Legal grounds 6 / 4 / 4; no 40 / 53 / 50	60
3.3Overrun	25/162/187	<1 week 0 / 8 / 7; 1 week -1 m 32 / 25 / 26;>1 m-3 m 40 / 33 / 34;>3 m 28 / 33 / 33	60
3.4Reasoned position	167/346/513	Yes 96 / 98 / 98; no 4 / 2 / 2	61
3.5Pre-decision investigation	167/346/513	Yes 41 / 68 / 60; Legal grounds 37 / 22 / 27; no 22 / 10 / 14	61
3.6Study interview	164/337/501	Yes 96 / 99 / 98; no 4 / 1 / 2	61
3.7Parental information	167/346/513	All 92/98/96;only one 2/1/2;none 3/0/1;participation refused 2/0/1;parental responsibility unknown 2/0/1	62
3.8Speech before decision	276/432/708	Yes 82 / 54 / 65; no 18 / 46 / 35	62
3.9Contact first 3 m	220/271/491	Yes 70 / 39 / 53; reasons for absence 10 / 20 / 15; no 20 / 41 / 32	63
3.10Action plan	276/448/724	Yes 81 / 82 / 82; Legal grounds 3 / 1 / 2; no 16 / 17 / 17	64
3.11Action of the plan	223/369/592	Yes 99 / 99 / 99; no 1 / 1 / 1	64
3.12Follow-up 3 m	204/269/473	Yes 75 / 75 / 75; no 25 / 25 / 25	65
3.13 Concern-report assessment 24 h	68/105/173	Yes 99 / 98 / 98; no 1 / 2 / 2	65

Table; Objectives	Cists	Percentage categories in order	PDF
3.14Review	68/100/168	Yes 46 / 54 / 51; no 53 / 43 / 47; results 1 / 3 / 2	66
3.15 Reconsideration outcome	31/54/85	Amendment No 81 / 81 / 81; second rate 0 / 4 / 2; additional information 6 / 9 / 8; second 13 / 6 / 8	66

Own source criticism: Table 3.1's summed mention 709 contradicted by its note 707. Table 3.14's summary mentions 168 contradicted by the note 204. The original's main numbers are 709 and 168. The deviations have been visually confirmed; no tacit correction of the source has been made. PDF46 says that no local authority figures under 6 cases appear; PDF49 still publishes Halsnæs 5 cases / 40% -0% -60%. Unpublished rows are null / missing, never 0 errors.

Percentages cannot simply recreate absolute numerators. Copenhagen has 256 basic cases, for example 249 cases in the case of a child conversation; rounded percentages can therefore fit several integers. Also total rows require the original absolute counters from the main report. Table 3.7 explicitly states that 0% may contain one case. A complete table register shall not confuse rounded 0% with proven absence.

A missing submitted study or action plan is included in the category of absence, even when AS considers that the document might exist. It is a lack of documentation and control; the concrete justification must be retained before it is given the same legal effect as documented failure to produce. Parents' information, contact and proceedings are not unique parents or children. According to the report's own method, the case types and local samples are too small for the generalisation indicated; this only limits the extrapolation, not the documented control findings.

Specific additional data required: absolute cell counts in annexes 2/3, public correction of note 707/204 and the suppression threshold 5/6, municipalities' complete learning notes and exclusion accounts. Later correction/return home is not documented by these tables.

Children's barometers 2020-2024: all published municipal annex number;

The tables show the controlled original cells with the municipality, category, denominator and physical PDF page. Commune rows are percentage, while a number of explicitly marked numbers are absolute category numbers. Hidden figures are "not published"; a published zero denominator means no relevant measurement basis. All subtargets recycle the main samples. There shall be no cross-reference to persons or separate cases.

Original deviations are retained: 2023-commune table 2.2 has n 607 and 72 no against the main / case type measurement n 744 and 209 no. 2024 reuses table numbers 2.1 / 2.2 on PDF57 / 58; physical page and subject identify them. Later years of hidden cells below 6 do not apply as an automatic rule for 2020, where, among others, denominators 1-5 are published.

2020: municipal tables

[BB20ANNEX] All of the rows below are actually numbered. Fanoe 7 / Læsø 3 is hidden in the commune view and is included in the main total 735.

2020, original Table 2.1: Type of decision

Municipality	Optional location;	Installation with consent;	Family bean dling / duck	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	47%	0%	53%	15	%; cases	53
Assens	40%	0%	60%	15	%; cases	53
Ballerup	48%	0%	52%	23	%; cases	53
Springby	50%	0%	50%	22	%; cases	53
Parsley leaves	42%	8%	50%	12	%; cases	53
Dragons	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	53
Egedal	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	53
Fredensborg	36%	14%	50%	14	%; cases	53
Fredericia	45%	5%	50%	22	%; cases	53
Frederiksberg	38%	0%	62%	34	%; cases	53
Haderslev	48%	0%	52%	23	%; cases	53
Helsingør	50%	0%	50%	24	%; cases	53
Herlev	46%	0%	54%	13	%; cases	53
Herning	38%	3%	59%	29	%; cases	53
Corner	50%	0%	50%	24	%; cases	53
Holstebro	47%	0%	53%	19	%; cases	53
Hvidover	43%	0%	57%	23	%; cases	53
Høj-Taastrup	50%	0%	50%	24	%; cases	53
Ishøj	43%	7%	50%	14	%; cases	53
Kerteminde	63%	0%	38%	8	%; cases	53
Cold	48%	0%	52%	31	%; cases	53
Køge	45%	9%	45%	22	%; cases	53
Leaflets	60%	0%	40%	10	%; cases	53
Lemvig	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	53
Lyngby-Taarbæk	38%	6%	56%	16	%; cases	53
Mariners' fjord	47%	0%	53%	15	%; cases	53
Norddjurs	50%	0%	50%	14	%; cases	53
Nyborg	50%	0%	50%	12	%; cases	53
Odense	49%	1%	50%	82	%; cases	53
Ringkøbing-Skjern	50%	0%	50%	20	%; cases	53
Ringsted	38%	8%	54%	13	%; cases	53
Slaughter	49%	0%	51%	35	%; cases	53

Municipality	Optional location;	Installation with consent;	Family bean dling / duck	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Tower	44%	0%	56%	16	%; cases	53
Viborg	44%	6%	50%	32	%; cases	53
Vordingborg	47%	0%	53%	19	%; cases	53

2020, original Table 2.2: Investigation

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	73%	0%	27%	15	%; cases	54
Assens	60%	0%	40%	15	%; cases	54
Ballerup	77%	0%	23%	22	%; cases	54
Springby	55%	14%	32%	22	%; cases	54
Parsley leaves	75%	0%	25%	12	%; cases	54
Dragons	80%	10%	10%	10	%; cases	54
Egedal	80%	0%	20%	10	%; cases	54
Fredensborg	93%	0%	7%	14	%; cases	54
Fredericia	68%	5%	27%	22	%; cases	54
Frederiksberg	58%	0%	42%	33	%; cases	54
Haderslev	52%	0%	48%	23	%; cases	54
Helsingør	25%	21%	54%	24	%; cases	54
Herlev	15%	0%	85%	13	%; cases	54
Herning	41%	21%	38%	29	%; cases	54
Corner	54%	8%	38%	24	%; cases	54
Holstebro	63%	5%	32%	19	%; cases	54
Hvidover	52%	13%	35%	23	%; cases	54
Høj-Taastrup	71%	0%	29%	24	%; cases	54
Ishøj	57%	7%	36%	14	%; cases	54
Kerteminde	75%	0%	25%	8	%; cases	54
Cold	67%	10%	23%	30	%; cases	54
Køge	64%	0%	36%	22	%; cases	54
Leaflets	80%	0%	20%	10	%; cases	54
Lemvig	100%	0%	0%	10	%; cases	54
Lyngby-Taarbæk	56%	19%	25%	16	%; cases	54
Mariners' fjord	79%	14%	7%	14	%; cases	54
Norddjurs	29%	7%	64%	14	%; cases	54
Nyborg	67%	8%	25%	12	%; cases	54
Odense	65%	20%	16%	82	%; cases	54
Ringkøbing-Skjern	90%	0%	10%	20	%; cases	54
Ringsted	54%	0%	46%	13	%; cases	54
Slaughter	60%	3%	37%	35	%; cases	54
Tower	56%	6%	38%	16	%; cases	54

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	84%	6%	9%	32	%; cases	54
Vordingborg	74%	5%	21%	19	%; cases	54

2020, original Table 2.3: Four-month deadline

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	13%	0%	88%	8	%; cases	55
Assens	25%	0%	75%	8	%; cases	55
Ballerup	15%	8%	77%	13	%; cases	55
Springby	50%	0%	50%	8	%; cases	55
Parsley leaves	40%	0%	60%	5	%; cases	55
Dragons	33%	0%	67%	6	%; cases	55
Egedal	57%	0%	43%	7	%; cases	55
Fredensborg	75%	0%	25%	12	%; cases	55
Fredericia	17%	0%	83%	12	%; cases	55
Frederiksberg	38%	0%	63%	16	%; cases	55
Haderslev	29%	14%	57%	7	%; cases	55
Helsingør	20%	0%	80%	5	%; cases	55
Herlev	100%	0%	0%	1	%; cases	55
Herning	33%	0%	67%	9	%; cases	55
Corner	20%	0%	80%	10	%; cases	55
Holstebro	43%	14%	43%	7	%; cases	55
Hvidover	40%	20%	40%	10	%; cases	55
Høj-Taastrup	7%	0%	93%	15	%; cases	55
Ishøj	33%	0%	67%	6	%; cases	55
Kerteminde	25%	0%	75%	4	%; cases	55
Cold	58%	0%	42%	12	%; cases	55
Køge	0%	0%	100%	9	%; cases	55
Leaflets	38%	0%	63%	8	%; cases	55
Lemvig	0%	0%	100%	8	%; cases	55
Lyngby-Taarbæk	11%	0%	89%	9	%; cases	55
Mariners' fjord	40%	0%	60%	5	%; cases	55
Norddjurs	0%	0%	100%	3	%; cases	55
Nyborg	50%	0%	50%	6	%; cases	55
Odense	50%	0%	50%	28	%; cases	55
Ringkøbing-Skjern	23%	0%	77%	13	%; cases	55
Ringsted	25%	0%	75%	4	%; cases	55
Slaughter	29%	0%	71%	14	%; cases	55
Tower	33%	0%	67%	6	%; cases	55

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	25%	0%	75%	20	%; cases	55
Vordingborg	44%	0%	56%	9	%; cases	55

2020, original Table 2.4: Reasoned position

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	100%	0%	11	%; cases	56
Assens	100%	0%	9	%; cases	56
Ballerup	94%	6%	17	%; cases	56
Springby	83%	17%	12	%; cases	56
Parsley leaves	89%	11%	9	%; cases	56
Dragons	88%	13%	8	%; cases	56
Egedal	63%	38%	8	%; cases	56
Fredensborg	77%	23%	13	%; cases	56
Fredericia	100%	0%	15	%; cases	56
Frederiksberg	95%	5%	19	%; cases	56
Haderslev	100%	0%	12	%; cases	56
Helsingør	83%	17%	6	%; cases	56
Herlev	100%	0%	2	%; cases	56
Herning	100%	0%	12	%; cases	56
Corner	92%	8%	13	%; cases	56
Holstebro	92%	8%	12	%; cases	56
Hvidover	83%	17%	12	%; cases	56
Høj-Taastrup	94%	6%	17	%; cases	56
Ishøj	100%	0%	8	%; cases	56
Kerteminde	100%	0%	6	%; cases	56
Cold	90%	10%	20	%; cases	56
Køge	93%	7%	14	%; cases	56
Leaflets	88%	13%	8	%; cases	56
Lemvig	100%	0%	10	%; cases	56
Lyngby-Taarbæk	78%	22%	9	%; cases	56
Mariners' fjord	100%	0%	11	%; cases	56
Norddjurs	100%	0%	4	%; cases	56
Nyborg	75%	25%	8	%; cases	56
Odense	96%	4%	53	%; cases	56
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	18	%; cases	56
Ringsted	57%	43%	7	%; cases	56
Slaughter	95%	5%	21	%; cases	56
Tower	89%	11%	9	%; cases	56

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	93%	7%	27	%; cases	56
Vordingborg	86%	14%	14	%; cases	56

2020, original Table 2.5: Pre-decision investigation

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	36%	27%	36%	11	%; cases	57
Assens	67%	0%	33%	9	%; cases	57
Ballerup	82%	18%	0%	17	%; cases	57
Springby	75%	8%	17%	12	%; cases	57
Parsley leaves	67%	11%	22%	9	%; cases	57
Dragons	63%	13%	25%	8	%; cases	57
Egedal	88%	13%	0%	8	%; cases	57
Fredensborg	54%	38%	8%	13	%; cases	57
Fredericia	73%	20%	7%	15	%; cases	57
Frederiksberg	74%	21%	5%	19	%; cases	57
Haderslev	67%	25%	8%	12	%; cases	57
Helsingør	17%	50%	33%	6	%; cases	57
Herlev	100%	0%	0%	2	%; cases	57
Herning	42%	42%	17%	12	%; cases	57
Corner	46%	38%	15%	13	%; cases	57
Holstebro	83%	17%	0%	12	%; cases	57
Hvidover	75%	8%	17%	12	%; cases	57
Høj-Taastrup	53%	29%	18%	17	%; cases	57
Ishøj	50%	13%	38%	8	%; cases	57
Kerteminde	50%	33%	17%	6	%; cases	57
Cold	75%	10%	15%	20	%; cases	57
Køge	57%	21%	21%	14	%; cases	57
Leaflets	50%	25%	25%	8	%; cases	57
Lemvig	70%	30%	0%	10	%; cases	57
Lyngby-Taarbæk	78%	22%	0%	9	%; cases	57
Mariners' fjord	73%	9%	18%	11	%; cases	57
Norddjurs	0%	25%	75%	4	%; cases	57
Nyborg	88%	13%	0%	8	%; cases	57
Odense	77%	17%	6%	53	%; cases	57
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	0%	18	%; cases	57
Ringsted	86%	0%	14%	7	%; cases	57
Slaughter	57%	19%	24%	21	%; cases	57
Tower	78%	11%	11%	9	%; cases	57

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	70%	26%	4%	27	%; cases	57
Vordingborg	71%	14%	14%	14	%; cases	57

2020, original Table 3.1: Study Interview

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	90%	10%	10	%; cases	58
Assens	89%	11%	9	%; cases	58
Ballerup	71%	29%	17	%; cases	58
Springby	100%	0%	12	%; cases	58
Parsley leaves	89%	11%	9	%; cases	58
Dragons	100%	0%	8	%; cases	58
Egedal	100%	0%	8	%; cases	58
Fredensborg	100%	0%	11	%; cases	58
Fredericia	93%	7%	14	%; cases	58
Frederiksberg	100%	0%	19	%; cases	58
Haderslev	89%	11%	9	%; cases	58
Helsingør	100%	0%	6	%; cases	58
Herlev	100%	0%	2	%; cases	58
Herning	100%	0%	12	%; cases	58
Corner	90%	10%	10	%; cases	58
Holstebro	82%	18%	11	%; cases	58
Hvidover	100%	0%	12	%; cases	58
Høj-Taastrup	94%	6%	17	%; cases	58
Ishøj	100%	0%	6	%; cases	58
Kerteminde	100%	0%	6	%; cases	58
Cold	100%	0%	19	%; cases	58
Køge	100%	0%	14	%; cases	58
Leaflets	100%	0%	7	%; cases	58
Lemvig	90%	10%	10	%; cases	58
Lyngby-Taarbæk	100%	0%	9	%; cases	58
Mariners' fjord	100%	0%	9	%; cases	58
Norddjurs	50%	50%	4	%; cases	58
Nyborg	100%	0%	7	%; cases	58
Odense	100%	0%	49	%; cases	58
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	18	%; cases	58
Ringsted	100%	0%	7	%; cases	58
Slaughter	95%	5%	21	%; cases	58
Tower	100%	0%	9	%; cases	58

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	100%	0%	25	%; cases	58
Vordingborg	86%	14%	14	%; cases	58

2020, Original Table 3.2: Parental Information

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	100%	0%	11	%; cases	59
Assens	89%	11%	9	%; cases	59
Ballerup	88%	13%	16	%; cases	59
Springby	100%	0%	12	%; cases	59
Parsley leaves	89%	11%	9	%; cases	59
Dragons	88%	13%	8	%; cases	59
Egedal	100%	0%	8	%; cases	59
Fredensborg	92%	8%	13	%; cases	59
Fredericia	87%	13%	15	%; cases	59
Frederiksberg	100%	0%	18	%; cases	59
Haderslev	83%	17%	12	%; cases	59
Helsingør	100%	0%	6	%; cases	59
Herlev	100%	0%	2	%; cases	59
Herning	100%	0%	11	%; cases	59
Corner	92%	8%	13	%; cases	59
Holstebro	92%	8%	12	%; cases	59
Hvidover	100%	0%	12	%; cases	59
Høj-Taastrup	100%	0%	16	%; cases	59
Ishøj	75%	25%	8	%; cases	59
Kerteminde	100%	0%	6	%; cases	59
Cold	89%	11%	19	%; cases	59
Køge	100%	0%	14	%; cases	59
Leaflets	100%	0%	8	%; cases	59
Lemvig	90%	10%	10	%; cases	59
Lyngby-Taarbæk	89%	11%	9	%; cases	59
Mariners' fjord	100%	0%	11	%; cases	59
Norddjurs	100%	0%	4	%; cases	59
Nyborg	88%	13%	8	%; cases	59
Odense	98%	2%	52	%; cases	59
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	18	%; cases	59
Ringsted	100%	0%	7	%; cases	59
Slaughter	90%	10%	21	%; cases	59
Tower	100%	0%	9	%; cases	59

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	100%	0%	27	%; cases	59
Vordingborg	93%	7%	14	%; cases	59

2020, original Table 3.3: Speech before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	40%	60%	15	%; cases	60
Assens	40%	60%	15	%; cases	60
Ballerup	39%	61%	23	%; cases	60
Springby	82%	18%	22	%; cases	60
Parsley leaves	58%	42%	12	%; cases	60
Dragons	60%	40%	10	%; cases	60
Egedal	20%	80%	10	%; cases	60
Fredensborg	64%	36%	14	%; cases	60
Fredericia	55%	45%	22	%; cases	60
Frederiksberg	50%	50%	34	%; cases	60
Haderslev	57%	43%	23	%; cases	60
Helsingør	54%	46%	24	%; cases	60
Herlev	31%	69%	13	%; cases	60
Herning	52%	48%	29	%; cases	60
Corner	79%	21%	24	%; cases	60
Holstebro	53%	47%	19	%; cases	60
Hvidover	61%	39%	23	%; cases	60
Høj-Taastrup	46%	54%	24	%; cases	60
Ishøj	43%	57%	14	%; cases	60
Kerteminde	75%	25%	8	%; cases	60
Cold	84%	16%	31	%; cases	60
Køge	68%	32%	22	%; cases	60
Leaflets	60%	40%	10	%; cases	60
Lemvig	50%	50%	10	%; cases	60
Lyngby-Taarbæk	75%	25%	16	%; cases	60
Mariners' fjord	67%	33%	15	%; cases	60
Norddjurs	43%	57%	14	%; cases	60
Nyborg	50%	50%	12	%; cases	60
Odense	61%	39%	82	%; cases	60
Ringkøbing-Skjern	45%	55%	20	%; cases	60
Ringsted	38%	62%	13	%; cases	60
Slaughter	54%	46%	35	%; cases	60
Tower	38%	63%	16	%; cases	60

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	69%	31%	32	%; cases	60
Vordingborg	47%	53%	19	%; cases	60

2020, original Table 4.1: Action plan

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	80%	0%	20%	15	%; cases	61
Assens	87%	0%	13%	15	%; cases	61
Ballerup	100%	0%	0%	23	%; cases	61
Springby	91%	0%	9%	22	%; cases	61
Parsley leaves	67%	0%	33%	12	%; cases	61
Dragons	90%	10%	0%	10	%; cases	61
Egedal	80%	0%	20%	10	%; cases	61
Fredensborg	93%	0%	7%	14	%; cases	61
Fredericia	77%	0%	23%	22	%; cases	61
Frederiksberg	74%	0%	26%	34	%; cases	61
Haderslev	74%	0%	26%	23	%; cases	61
Helsingør	54%	8%	38%	24	%; cases	61
Herlev	38%	0%	62%	13	%; cases	61
Herning	41%	3%	55%	29	%; cases	61
Corner	96%	0%	4%	24	%; cases	61
Holstebro	95%	0%	5%	19	%; cases	61
Hvidover	52%	0%	48%	23	%; cases	61
Høj-Taastrup	71%	0%	29%	24	%; cases	61
Ishøj	86%	0%	14%	14	%; cases	61
Kerteminde	75%	0%	25%	8	%; cases	61
Cold	87%	0%	13%	31	%; cases	61
Køge	91%	0%	9%	22	%; cases	61
Leaflets	100%	0%	0%	10	%; cases	61
Lemvig	100%	0%	0%	10	%; cases	61
Lyngby-Taarbæk	81%	0%	19%	16	%; cases	61
Mariners' fjord	100%	0%	0%	15	%; cases	61
Norddjurs	93%	0%	7%	14	%; cases	61
Nyborg	67%	0%	33%	12	%; cases	61
Odense	76%	4%	21%	82	%; cases	61
Ringkøbing-Skjern	85%	0%	15%	20	%; cases	61
Ringsted	85%	0%	15%	13	%; cases	61
Slaughter	83%	0%	17%	35	%; cases	61
Tower	88%	0%	13%	16	%; cases	61

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	91%	0%	9%	32	%; cases	61
Vordingborg	53%	0%	47%	19	%; cases	61

2020, original Table 4.2: Action of the plan

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	100%	0%	12	%; cases	62
Assens	100%	0%	13	%; cases	62
Ballerup	100%	0%	23	%; cases	62
Springby	95%	5%	20	%; cases	62
Parsley leaves	100%	0%	8	%; cases	62
Dragons	100%	0%	9	%; cases	62
Egedal	88%	13%	8	%; cases	62
Fredensborg	100%	0%	13	%; cases	62
Fredericia	100%	0%	17	%; cases	62
Frederiksberg	96%	4%	25	%; cases	62
Haderslev	100%	0%	17	%; cases	62
Helsingør	100%	0%	13	%; cases	62
Herlev	100%	0%	5	%; cases	62
Herning	100%	0%	12	%; cases	62
Corner	100%	0%	23	%; cases	62
Holstebro	100%	0%	18	%; cases	62
Hvidover	100%	0%	12	%; cases	62
Høj-Taastrup	94%	6%	17	%; cases	62
Ishøj	100%	0%	12	%; cases	62
Kerteminde	100%	0%	6	%; cases	62
Cold	100%	0%	27	%; cases	62
Køge	85%	15%	20	%; cases	62
Leaflets	100%	0%	10	%; cases	62
Lemvig	100%	0%	10	%; cases	62
Lyngby-Taarbæk	100%	0%	13	%; cases	62
Mariners' fjord	100%	0%	15	%; cases	62
Norddjurs	100%	0%	13	%; cases	62
Nyborg	100%	0%	8	%; cases	62
Odense	100%	0%	62	%; cases	62
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	17	%; cases	62
Ringsted	100%	0%	11	%; cases	62
Slaughter	93%	7%	29	%; cases	62
Tower	100%	0%	14	%; cases	62

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	93%	7%	29	%; cases	62
Vordingborg	100%	0%	10	%; cases	62

2020, original Table 5.1: Follow-up first three months

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	50%	50%	2	%; cases	63
Assens	50%	50%	2	%; cases	63
Ballerup	50%	50%	4	%; cases	63
Springby	100%	0%	4	%; cases	63
Parsley leaves	0%	100%	2	%; cases	63
Dragons	50%	50%	2	%; cases	63
Egedal	50%	50%	2	%; cases	63
Fredensborg	50%	50%	2	%; cases	63
Fredericia	25%	75%	4	%; cases	63
Frederiksberg	50%	50%	2	%; cases	63
Haderslev	50%	50%	4	%; cases	63
Helsingør	50%	50%	4	%; cases	63
Herlev	0%	100%	2	%; cases	63
Herning	40%	60%	5	%; cases	63
Corner	25%	75%	4	%; cases	63
Holstebro	67%	33%	3	%; cases	63
Hvidover	50%	50%	4	%; cases	63
Høj-Taastrup	33%	67%	3	%; cases	63
Ishøj	0%	100%	2	%; cases	63
Kerteminde	50%	50%	2	%; cases	63
Cold	83%	17%	6	%; cases	63
Køge	50%	50%	4	%; cases	63
Leaflets	33%	67%	3	%; cases	63
Lemvig	100%	0%	2	%; cases	63
Lyngby-Taarbæk	33%	67%	3	%; cases	63
Mariners' fjord	50%	50%	2	%; cases	63
Norddjurs	0%	100%	2	%; cases	63
Nyborg	100%	0%	2	%; cases	63
Odense	73%	27%	11	%; cases	63
Ringkøbing-Skjern	67%	33%	3	%; cases	63
Ringsted	0%	100%	2	%; cases	63
Slaughter	33%	67%	6	%; cases	63
Tower	67%	33%	3	%; cases	63

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	67%	33%	6	%; cases	63
Vordingborg	67%	33%	3	%; cases	63

2020, original Table 5.2: Follow-up no more than six months apart

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	100%	0%	2	%; cases	64
Assens	50%	50%	2	%; cases	64
Ballerup	50%	50%	4	%; cases	64
Springby	50%	50%	4	%; cases	64
Parsley leaves	100%	0%	2	%; cases	64
Dragons	100%	0%	2	%; cases	64
Egedal	50%	50%	2	%; cases	64
Fredensborg	100%	0%	1	%; cases	64
Fredericia	75%	25%	4	%; cases	64
Frederiksberg	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	64
Haderslev	50%	50%	4	%; cases	64
Helsingør	50%	50%	4	%; cases	64
Herlev	0%	100%	2	%; cases	64
Herning	33%	67%	3	%; cases	64
Corner	67%	33%	3	%; cases	64
Holstebro	67%	33%	3	%; cases	64
Hvidover	67%	33%	3	%; cases	64
Høj-Taastrup	0%	100%	1	%; cases	64
Ishøj	50%	50%	2	%; cases	64
Kerteminde	0%	100%	2	%; cases	64
Cold	83%	17%	6	%; cases	64
Køge	0%	100%	3	%; cases	64
Leaflets	67%	33%	3	%; cases	64
Lemvig	50%	50%	2	%; cases	64
Lyngby-Taarbæk	0%	100%	3	%; cases	64
Mariners' fjord	100%	0%	2	%; cases	64
Norddjurs	0%	100%	2	%; cases	64
Nyborg	100%	0%	2	%; cases	64
Odense	57%	43%	7	%; cases	64
Ringkøbing-Skjern	0%	100%	3	%; cases	64
Ringsted	0%	100%	2	%; cases	64
Slaughter	20%	80%	5	%; cases	64
Tower	33%	67%	3	%; cases	64

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	83%	17%	6	%; cases	64
Vordingborg	33%	67%	3	%; cases	64

2020, original Table 5.3: Personalised supervision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	50%	50%	2	%; cases	65
Assens	100%	0%	2	%; cases	65
Ballerup	100%	0%	4	%; cases	65
Springby	75%	25%	4	%; cases	65
Parsley leaves	100%	0%	2	%; cases	65
Dragons	100%	0%	2	%; cases	65
Egedal	50%	50%	2	%; cases	65
Fredensborg	100%	0%	1	%; cases	65
Fredericia	100%	0%	4	%; cases	65
Frederiksberg	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	65
Haderslev	75%	25%	4	%; cases	65
Helsingør	75%	25%	4	%; cases	65
Herlev	0%	100%	1	%; cases	65
Herning	100%	0%	3	%; cases	65
Corner	67%	33%	3	%; cases	65
Holstebro	67%	33%	3	%; cases	65
Hvidover	100%	0%	2	%; cases	65
Høj-Taastrup	100%	0%	1	%; cases	65
Ishøj	50%	50%	2	%; cases	65
Kerteminde	50%	50%	2	%; cases	65
Cold	83%	17%	6	%; cases	65
Køge	67%	33%	3	%; cases	65
Leaflets	67%	33%	3	%; cases	65
Lemvig	50%	50%	2	%; cases	65
Lyngby-Taarbæk	33%	67%	3	%; cases	65
Mariners' fjord	100%	0%	2	%; cases	65
Norddjurs	0%	100%	2	%; cases	65
Nyborg	100%	0%	2	%; cases	65
Odense	100%	0%	7	%; cases	65
Ringkøbing-Skjern	67%	33%	3	%; cases	65
Ringsted	50%	50%	2	%; cases	65
Slaughter	20%	80%	5	%; cases	65
Tower	67%	33%	3	%; cases	65

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	83%	17%	6	%; cases	65
Vordingborg	67%	33%	3	%; cases	65

2020, original Table 6.1: 24 h last notification before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	75%	25%	12	%; cases	66
Assens	85%	15%	13	%; cases	66
Ballerup	89%	11%	19	%; cases	66
Springby	100%	0%	20	%; cases	66
Parsley leaves	75%	25%	8	%; cases	66
Dragons	88%	13%	8	%; cases	66
Egedal	100%	0%	7	%; cases	66
Fredensborg	70%	30%	10	%; cases	66
Fredericia	100%	0%	18	%; cases	66
Frederiksberg	96%	4%	26	%; cases	66
Haderslev	94%	6%	16	%; cases	66
Helsingør	100%	0%	23	%; cases	66
Herlev	100%	0%	2	%; cases	66
Herning	96%	4%	24	%; cases	66
Corner	95%	5%	21	%; cases	66
Holstebro	90%	10%	10	%; cases	66
Hvidover	100%	0%	22	%; cases	66
Høj-Taastrup	95%	5%	19	%; cases	66
Ishøj	100%	0%	12	%; cases	66
Kerteminde	83%	17%	6	%; cases	66
Cold	93%	7%	29	%; cases	66
Køge	100%	0%	19	%; cases	66
Leaflets	100%	0%	5	%; cases	66
Lemvig	75%	25%	8	%; cases	66
Lyngby-Taarbæk	100%	0%	14	%; cases	66
Mariners' fjord	86%	14%	14	%; cases	66
Norddjurs	100%	0%	14	%; cases	66
Nyborg	100%	0%	11	%; cases	66
Odense	84%	16%	68	%; cases	66
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	18	%; cases	66
Ringsted	100%	0%	10	%; cases	66
Slaughter	93%	7%	29	%; cases	66
Tower	90%	10%	10	%; cases	66

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	97%	3%	30	%; cases	66
Vordingborg	100%	0%	17	%; cases	66

2020, original Table 6.2: Response to urgent needs upon notification before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Assens	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Ballerup	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Springby	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Parsley leaves	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	67
Dragons	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Egedal	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	67
Fredensborg	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	67
Fredericia	100%	0%	2	%; cases	67
Frederiksberg	100%	0%	4	%; cases	67
Haderslev	100%	0%	2	%; cases	67
Helsingør	100%	0%	8	%; cases	67
Herlev	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	67
Herning	100%	0%	3	%; cases	67
Corner	100%	0%	2	%; cases	67
Holstebro	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Hvidover	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Høj-Taastrup	100%	0%	5	%; cases	67
Ishøj	100%	0%	2	%; cases	67
Kerteminde	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	67
Cold	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Køge	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Leaflets	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	67
Lemvig	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Lyngby-Taarbæk	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Mariners' fjord	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	67
Norddjurs	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Nyborg	100%	0%	2	%; cases	67
Odense	100%	0%	8	%; cases	67
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Ringsted	100%	0%	1	%; cases	67
Slaughter	100%	0%	5	%; cases	67
Tower	50%	50%	2	%; cases	67

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	100%	0%	9	%; cases	67
Vordingborg	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	67

2020, original table 6.3: 24 h first notification following decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	83%	17%	6	%; cases	68
Assens	90%	10%	10	%; cases	68
Ballerup	67%	33%	6	%; cases	68
Springby	100%	0%	7	%; cases	68
Parsley leaves	100%	0%	4	%; cases	68
Dragons	100%	0%	5	%; cases	68
Egedal	100%	0%	2	%; cases	68
Fredensborg	50%	50%	2	%; cases	68
Fredericia	88%	13%	8	%; cases	68
Frederiksberg	100%	0%	10	%; cases	68
Haderslev	88%	13%	8	%; cases	68
Helsingør	100%	0%	4	%; cases	68
Herlev	100%	0%	3	%; cases	68
Herning	80%	20%	5	%; cases	68
Corner	100%	0%	5	%; cases	68
Holstebro	100%	0%	4	%; cases	68
Hvidover	100%	0%	3	%; cases	68
Høj-Taastrup	100%	0%	9	%; cases	68
Ishøj	33%	67%	3	%; cases	68
Kerteminde	100%	0%	3	%; cases	68
Cold	100%	0%	6	%; cases	68
Køge	93%	7%	14	%; cases	68
Leaflets	100%	0%	4	%; cases	68
Lemvig	100%	0%	4	%; cases	68
Lyngby-Taarbæk	100%	0%	7	%; cases	68
Mariners' fjord	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	68
Norddjurs	100%	0%	4	%; cases	68
Nyborg	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	68
Odense	86%	14%	21	%; cases	68
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	7	%; cases	68
Ringsted	100%	0%	3	%; cases	68
Slaughter	75%	25%	4	%; cases	68
Tower	100%	0%	4	%; cases	68

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	100%	0%	10	%; cases	68
Vordingborg	100%	0%	6	%; cases	68

2020, original Table 6.4: Response to urgent needs after notification by decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Assens	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Ballerup	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Springby	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Parsley leaves	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Dragons	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Egedal	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Fredensborg	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Fredericia	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Frederiksberg	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Haderslev	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Helsingør	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Herlev	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Herning	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Corner	100%	0%	1	%; cases	69
Holstebro	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Hvidover	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Høj-Taastrup	100%	0%	1	%; cases	69
Ishøj	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Kerteminde	100%	0%	1	%; cases	69
Cold	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Køge	100%	0%	1	%; cases	69
Leaflets	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Lemvig	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Lyngby-Taarbæk	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Mariners' fjord	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Norddjurs	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Nyborg	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Odense	100%	0%	1	%; cases	69
Ringkøbing-Skjern	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Ringsted	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Slaughter	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69
Tower	100%	0%	1	%; cases	69

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Viborg	100%	0%	1	%; cases	69
Vordingborg	Not applicable (n 0)	Not applicable (n 0)	0	%; cases	69

2021: municipal tables

[BB21ANNEX] All the rows below are actually numbered. Ærø and small subtargets are hidden; they are included in the main total 708.

2021, original Table 2.1: Type of decision

Municipality	Optional location;	Installation with consent;	Family bean dling / duck	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	40%	10%	50%	10	%; cases	55
Fax	38%	8%	54%	13	%; cases	55
Faaborg-Midtfyn	47%	0%	53%	19	%; cases	55
Glostrup	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	55
Gribskov	46%	8%	46%	13	%; cases	55
Rhinoceros	33%	17%	50%	12	%; cases	55
Heath site	38%	8%	54%	13	%; cases	55
Horsens	45%	3%	52%	33	%; cases	55
Hørsholm	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	55
Kalundborg	45%	5%	50%	20	%; cases	55
Copenhagen	20%	4%	76%	266	%; cases	55
Morsø	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	55
Næstved	48%	0%	52%	31	%; cases	55
Randers	49%	0%	51%	37	%; cases	55
Rødover	50%	0%	50%	18	%; cases	55
Disc	50%	0%	50%	18	%; cases	55
Sunred	50%	10%	40%	10	%; cases	55
Sorø	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	55
Struer	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	55
Thisted	41%	6%	53%	17	%; cases	55
Peas (without pods)	47%	0%	53%	17	%; cases	55
Vallensbæk	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	55
Road	40%	7%	53%	15	%; cases	55
Vejle	49%	0%	51%	41	%; cases	55
West Himmerland	50%	0%	50%	14	%; cases	55
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	55
Aabenra	48%	0%	52%	25	%; cases	55

2021, original Table 2.2: Investigation

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	50%	20%	30%	10	%; cases	56
Fax	38%	8%	54%	13	%; cases	56
Faaborg-Midtfyn	63%	5%	32%	19	%; cases	56
Glostrup	40%	0%	60%	10	%; cases	56
Gribskov	77%	0%	23%	13	%; cases	56
Rhinoceros	75%	8%	17%	12	%; cases	56
Heath site	62%	8%	31%	13	%; cases	56
Horsens	52%	3%	45%	33	%; cases	56
Hørsholm	60%	10%	30%	10	%; cases	56
Kalundborg	74%	11%	16%	19	%; cases	56
Copenhagen	79%	1%	20%	253	%; cases	56
Morsø	20%	0%	80%	10	%; cases	56
Næstved	74%	0%	26%	31	%; cases	56
Randers	81%	8%	11%	37	%; cases	56
Rødover	83%	6%	11%	18	%; cases	56
Disc	50%	6%	44%	18	%; cases	56
Sunred	40%	10%	50%	10	%; cases	56
Sorø	60%	20%	20%	10	%; cases	56
Struer	80%	10%	10%	10	%; cases	56
Thisted	47%	6%	47%	17	%; cases	56
Peas (without pods)	71%	12%	18%	17	%; cases	56
Vallensbæk	60%	0%	40%	10	%; cases	56
Road	60%	7%	33%	15	%; cases	56
Vejle	66%	5%	29%	41	%; cases	56
West Himmerland	57%	0%	43%	14	%; cases	56
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	56
Aabenra	54%	8%	38%	24	%; cases	56

2021, original Table 2.3: Four-month deadline

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Fax	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Faaborg-Midtfyn	67%	0%	33%	6	%; cases	57
Glostrup	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Gribskov	29%	0%	71%	7	%; cases	57
Rhinoceros	13%	0%	88%	8	%; cases	57
Heath site	50%	0%	50%	6	%; cases	57
Horsens	31%	0%	69%	13	%; cases	57
Hørsholm	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Kalundborg	9%	18%	73%	11	%; cases	57
Copenhagen	82%	1%	17%	174	%; cases	57
Morsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Næstved	19%	0%	81%	16	%; cases	57
Randers	36%	7%	57%	14	%; cases	57
Rødover	20%	0%	80%	10	%; cases	57
Disc	25%	25%	50%	8	%; cases	57
Sunred	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Sorø	33%	0%	67%	6	%; cases	57
Struer	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Thisted	67%	0%	33%	6	%; cases	57
Peas (without pods)	0%	0%	100%	6	%; cases	57
Vallensbæk	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Road	57%	14%	29%	7	%; cases	57
Vejle	60%	0%	40%	20	%; cases	57
West Himmerland	0%	14%	86%	7	%; cases	57
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Aabenra	40%	0%	60%	10	%; cases	57

2021, original Table 2.4: Reasoned position

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	58
Fax	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	58
Faaborg-Midtfyn	100%	0%	12	%; cases	58
Glostrup	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	58
Gribskov	100%	0%	10	%; cases	58
Rhinoceros	100%	0%	9	%; cases	58
Heath site	100%	0%	8	%; cases	58
Horsens	100%	0%	17	%; cases	58
Hørsholm	83%	17%	6	%; cases	58
Kalundborg	100%	0%	14	%; cases	58
Copenhagen	98%	2%	201	%; cases	58
Morsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	58
Næstved	100%	0%	23	%; cases	58
Randers	100%	0%	30	%; cases	58
Rødover	87%	13%	15	%; cases	58
Disc	100%	0%	9	%; cases	58
Sunred	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	58
Sorø	100%	0%	6	%; cases	58
Struer	100%	0%	8	%; cases	58
Thisted	88%	13%	8	%; cases	58
Peas (without pods)	100%	0%	12	%; cases	58
Vallensbæk	100%	0%	6	%; cases	58
Road	100%	0%	9	%; cases	58
Vejle	81%	19%	27	%; cases	58
West Himmerland	100%	0%	8	%; cases	58
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	58
Aabenra	92%	8%	13	%; cases	58

2021, original Table 2.5: Pre-decision investigation

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Fax	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Faaborg-Midtfyn	83%	8%	8%	12	%; cases	59
Glostrup	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Gribskov	70%	0%	30%	10	%; cases	59
Rhinoceros	78%	11%	11%	9	%; cases	59
Heath site	38%	38%	25%	8	%; cases	59
Horsens	65%	29%	6%	17	%; cases	59
Hørsholm	83%	0%	17%	6	%; cases	59
Kalundborg	36%	50%	14%	14	%; cases	59
Copenhagen	68%	30%	2%	201	%; cases	59
Morsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Næstved	65%	13%	22%	23	%; cases	59
Randers	50%	17%	33%	30	%; cases	59
Rødover	67%	20%	13%	15	%; cases	59
Disc	44%	11%	44%	9	%; cases	59
Sunred	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Sorø	100%	0%	0%	6	%; cases	59
Struer	88%	0%	13%	8	%; cases	59
Thisted	100%	0%	0%	8	%; cases	59
Peas (without pods)	50%	25%	25%	12	%; cases	59
Vallensbæk	33%	33%	33%	6	%; cases	59
Road	67%	22%	11%	9	%; cases	59
Vejle	70%	15%	15%	27	%; cases	59
West Himmerland	63%	0%	38%	8	%; cases	59
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Aabenra	77%	23%	0%	13	%; cases	59

2021, original Table 2.6: Study Interview

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Fax	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Faaborg-Midtfyn	92%	8%	12	%; cases	60
Glostrup	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Gribskov	80%	20%	10	%; cases	60
Rhinoceros	100%	0%	9	%; cases	60
Heath site	100%	0%	7	%; cases	60
Horsens	100%	0%	16	%; cases	60
Hørsholm	100%	0%	6	%; cases	60
Kalundborg	93%	7%	14	%; cases	60
Copenhagen	94%	6%	197	%; cases	60
Morsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Næstved	100%	0%	22	%; cases	60
Randers	92%	8%	26	%; cases	60
Rødover	93%	7%	15	%; cases	60
Disc	100%	0%	9	%; cases	60
Sunred	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Sorø	100%	0%	6	%; cases	60
Struer	100%	0%	7	%; cases	60
Thisted	100%	0%	8	%; cases	60
Peas (without pods)	100%	0%	12	%; cases	60
Vallensbæk	83%	17%	6	%; cases	60
Road	100%	0%	7	%; cases	60
Vejle	100%	0%	26	%; cases	60
West Himmerland	100%	0%	8	%; cases	60
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Aabenra	100%	0%	13	%; cases	60

2021, original Table 2.7: Parental Information

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Fax	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Faaborg-Midtfyn	75%	25%	12	%; cases	61
Glostrup	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Gribskov	100%	0%	10	%; cases	61
Rhinoceros	100%	0%	9	%; cases	61
Heath site	100%	0%	8	%; cases	61
Horsens	100%	0%	17	%; cases	61
Hørsholm	100%	0%	6	%; cases	61
Kalundborg	93%	7%	14	%; cases	61
Copenhagen	98%	2%	199	%; cases	61
Morsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Næstved	100%	0%	23	%; cases	61
Randers	87%	13%	30	%; cases	61
Rødover	86%	14%	14	%; cases	61
Disc	100%	0%	9	%; cases	61
Sunred	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Sorø	100%	0%	6	%; cases	61
Struer	88%	13%	8	%; cases	61
Thisted	100%	0%	8	%; cases	61
Peas (without pods)	100%	0%	12	%; cases	61
Vallensbæk	83%	17%	6	%; cases	61
Road	100%	0%	9	%; cases	61
Vejle	96%	4%	27	%; cases	61
West Himmerland	100%	0%	8	%; cases	61
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Aabenra	92%	8%	13	%; cases	61

2021, original Table 2.8: Speech before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	60%	40%	10	%; cases	62
Fax	54%	46%	13	%; cases	62
Faaborg-Midtfyn	79%	21%	19	%; cases	62
Glostrup	70%	30%	10	%; cases	62
Gribskov	62%	38%	13	%; cases	62
Rhinoceros	75%	25%	12	%; cases	62
Heath site	85%	15%	13	%; cases	62
Horsens	64%	36%	33	%; cases	62
Hørsholm	40%	60%	10	%; cases	62
Kalundborg	74%	26%	19	%; cases	62
Copenhagen	61%	39%	263	%; cases	62
Morsø	50%	50%	10	%; cases	62
Næstved	58%	42%	31	%; cases	62
Randers	74%	26%	35	%; cases	62
Rødover	44%	56%	18	%; cases	62
Disc	78%	22%	18	%; cases	62
Sunred	50%	50%	10	%; cases	62
Sorø	70%	30%	10	%; cases	62
Struer	60%	40%	10	%; cases	62
Thisted	53%	47%	17	%; cases	62
Peas (without pods)	47%	53%	17	%; cases	62
Vallensbæk	30%	70%	10	%; cases	62
Road	54%	46%	13	%; cases	62
Vejle	55%	45%	40	%; cases	62
West Himmerland	43%	57%	14	%; cases	62
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	62
Aabenra	68%	32%	25	%; cases	62

2021, original Table 2.9: Action plan

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	80%	10%	10%	10	%; cases	63
Fax	92%	0%	8%	13	%; cases	63
Faaborg-Midtfyn	100%	0%	0%	19	%; cases	63
Glostrup	70%	0%	30%	10	%; cases	63
Gribskov	85%	0%	15%	13	%; cases	63
Rhinoceros	92%	8%	0%	12	%; cases	63
Heath site	92%	0%	8%	13	%; cases	63
Horsens	79%	0%	21%	33	%; cases	63
Hørsholm	80%	0%	20%	10	%; cases	63
Kalundborg	85%	5%	10%	20	%; cases	63
Copenhagen	90%	2%	8%	266	%; cases	63
Morsø	60%	0%	40%	10	%; cases	63
Næstved	81%	0%	19%	31	%; cases	63
Randers	92%	0%	8%	37	%; cases	63
Rødover	67%	6%	28%	18	%; cases	63
Disc	78%	0%	22%	18	%; cases	63
Sunred	60%	0%	40%	10	%; cases	63
Sorø	60%	0%	40%	10	%; cases	63
Struer	90%	0%	10%	10	%; cases	63
Thisted	94%	0%	6%	17	%; cases	63
Peas (without pods)	71%	6%	24%	17	%; cases	63
Vallensbæk	100%	0%	0%	10	%; cases	63
Road	87%	0%	13%	15	%; cases	63
Vejle	90%	2%	7%	41	%; cases	63
West Himmerland	86%	0%	14%	14	%; cases	63
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	63
Aabenra	88%	4%	8%	25	%; cases	63

2021, original Table 2.10: Plan effort

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	100%	0%	8	%; cases	64
Fax	92%	8%	12	%; cases	64
Faaborg-Midtfyn	100%	0%	19	%; cases	64
Glostrup	100%	0%	7	%; cases	64
Gribskov	100%	0%	11	%; cases	64
Rhinoceros	100%	0%	11	%; cases	64
Heath site	100%	0%	12	%; cases	64
Horsens	88%	12%	26	%; cases	64
Hørsholm	100%	0%	8	%; cases	64
Kalundborg	100%	0%	17	%; cases	64
Copenhagen	98%	2%	240	%; cases	64
Morsø	100%	0%	6	%; cases	64
Næstved	100%	0%	25	%; cases	64
Randers	97%	3%	34	%; cases	64
Rødover	100%	0%	12	%; cases	64
Disc	100%	0%	14	%; cases	64
Sunred	100%	0%	6	%; cases	64
Sorø	100%	0%	6	%; cases	64
Struer	100%	0%	9	%; cases	64
Thisted	100%	0%	16	%; cases	64
Peas (without pods)	100%	0%	12	%; cases	64
Vallensbæk	100%	0%	10	%; cases	64
Road	100%	0%	13	%; cases	64
Vejle	97%	3%	37	%; cases	64
West Himmerland	100%	0%	12	%; cases	64
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	64
Aabenra	100%	0%	22	%; cases	64

2021, original Table 2.11: 24 h last notification before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	89%	11%	9	%; notifications	65
Fax	15%	85%	13	%; notifications	65
Faaborg-Midtfyn	81%	19%	16	%; notifications	65
Glostrup	90%	10%	10	%; notifications	65
Gribskov	64%	36%	11	%; notifications	65
Rhinoceros	100%	0%	12	%; notifications	65
Heath site	82%	18%	11	%; notifications	65
Horsens	8%	92%	25	%; notifications	65
Hørsholm	86%	14%	7	%; notifications	65
Kalundborg	100%	0%	12	%; notifications	65
Copenhagen	93%	7%	223	%; notifications	65
Morsø	100%	0%	9	%; notifications	65
Næstved	100%	0%	24	%; notifications	65
Randers	91%	9%	33	%; notifications	65
Rødover	87%	13%	15	%; notifications	65
Disc	93%	7%	14	%; notifications	65
Sunred	100%	0%	6	%; notifications	65
Sorø	100%	0%	7	%; notifications	65
Struer	100%	0%	7	%; notifications	65
Thisted	100%	0%	14	%; notifications	65
Peas (without pods)	93%	7%	15	%; notifications	65
Vallensbæk	71%	29%	7	%; notifications	65
Road	100%	0%	15	%; notifications	65
Vejle	94%	6%	33	%; notifications	65
West Himmerland	100%	0%	12	%; notifications	65
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	65
Aabenra	100%	0%	21	%; notifications	65

2021, original table 2.12: 24 h first notification after decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Fax	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Faaborg-Midtfyn	83%	17%	6	%; notifications	66
Glostrup	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Gribskov	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Rhinoceros	100%	0%	7	%; notifications	66
Heath site	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Horsens	20%	80%	10	%; notifications	66
Hørsholm	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Kalundborg	100%	0%	7	%; notifications	66
Copenhagen	95%	5%	146	%; notifications	66
Morsø	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Næstved	100%	0%	7	%; notifications	66
Randers	93%	7%	15	%; notifications	66
Rødover	88%	13%	8	%; notifications	66
Disc	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Sunred	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Sorø	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Struer	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Thisted	100%	0%	8	%; notifications	66
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Vallensbæk	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Road	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Vejle	94%	6%	17	%; notifications	66
West Himmerland	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66
Aabenra	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	66

2022: municipal tables

[BB22ANNEX] All of the rows below are actually numbered. Allerød / Samsø and small subtargets are hidden; they are included in the main total 697.

2022, original Table 2.1: Type of settlement

Municipality	Optional location;	Installation with consent;	Family bean dling / duck	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Bornholm	56%	0%	44%	18	%; cases	57
Esbjerg	47%	2%	51%	47	%; cases	57
Favrskov	50%	0%	50%	12	%; cases	57
Frederikshavn	46%	4%	50%	24	%; cases	57
Frederikssund	43%	7%	50%	14	%; cases	57
Furesø	42%	0%	58%	12	%; cases	57
Gentofte	39%	6%	56%	18	%; cases	57
Count	50%	0%	50%	16	%; cases	57
Hillerød	47%	0%	53%	15	%; cases	57
Holbæk	48%	0%	52%	27	%; cases	57
Jammerbug	38%	8%	54%	13	%; cases	57
Langeland	40%	10%	50%	10	%; cases	57
Lolland	48%	0%	52%	27	%; cases	57
Medium speed	40%	0%	60%	10	%; cases	57
Nordfyn	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	57
Oats	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	57
Odsherd	45%	0%	55%	11	%; cases	57
Rebild	40%	0%	60%	10	%; cases	57
Roskilde	42%	8%	50%	26	%; cases	57
Rudersdal	43%	7%	50%	14	%; cases	57
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Silkeborg	45%	3%	52%	29	%; cases	57
Skanderborg	50%	0%	50%	14	%; cases	57
Stevns	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	57
Svendborg	36%	5%	59%	22	%; cases	57
South Djurs	23%	8%	69%	13	%; cases	57
Sønderborg	42%	6%	52%	33	%; cases	57
Product	47%	0%	53%	17	%; cases	57
Aalborg	49%	0%	51%	76	%; cases	57
Aarhus	41%	1%	58%	127	%; cases	57

Municipality	Optional location;	Installation with consent;	Family bean dling / duck	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Total	307	15	375	697	Number; cases	57

2022, original table 2.2: Investigation

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	58
Bornholm	44%	6%	50%	18	%; cases	58
Esbjerg	64%	11%	26%	47	%; cases	58
Favrskov	58%	8%	33%	12	%; cases	58
Frederikshavn	79%	8%	13%	24	%; cases	58
Frederikssund	57%	0%	43%	14	%; cases	58
Furesø	73%	18%	9%	11	%; cases	58
Gentofte	78%	0%	22%	18	%; cases	58
Count	50%	0%	50%	16	%; cases	58
Hillerød	47%	7%	47%	15	%; cases	58
Holbæk	62%	4%	35%	26	%; cases	58
Jammerbug	85%	0%	15%	13	%; cases	58
Langeland	44%	0%	56%	9	%; cases	58
Lolland	81%	0%	19%	27	%; cases	58
Medium speed	88%	0%	13%	8	%; cases	58
Nordfyn	70%	0%	30%	10	%; cases	58
Oats	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	58
Odsherd	45%	9%	45%	11	%; cases	58
Rebild	100%	0%	0%	10	%; cases	58
Roskilde	73%	0%	27%	26	%; cases	58
Rudersdal	57%	7%	36%	14	%; cases	58
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	58
Silkeborg	48%	22%	30%	27	%; cases	58
Skanderborg	64%	0%	36%	14	%; cases	58
Stevns	40%	10%	50%	10	%; cases	58
Svendborg	77%	0%	23%	22	%; cases	58
South Djurs	15%	8%	77%	13	%; cases	58
Sønderborg	66%	3%	31%	32	%; cases	58
Product	6%	0%	94%	17	%; cases	58
Aalborg	41%	3%	56%	75	%; cases	58
Aarhus	56%	6%	38%	126	%; cases	58
Total	400	35	252	687	Number; cases	58

2022, original Table 2.3: Four-month deadline

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Bornholm	14%	0%	86%	7	%; cases	59
Esbjerg	21%	0%	79%	24	%; cases	59
Favrskov	71%	0%	29%	7	%; cases	59
Frederikshavn	25%	0%	75%	12	%; cases	59
Frederikssund	14%	0%	86%	7	%; cases	59
Furesø	0%	17%	83%	6	%; cases	59
Gentofte	73%	0%	27%	11	%; cases	59
Count	25%	0%	75%	8	%; cases	59
Hillerød	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Holbæk	31%	0%	69%	16	%; cases	59
Jammerbug	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Langeland	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Lolland	8%	0%	92%	12	%; cases	59
Medium speed	17%	0%	83%	6	%; cases	59
Nordfyn	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Oats	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Odsherd	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Rebild	44%	0%	56%	9	%; cases	59
Roskilde	53%	0%	47%	15	%; cases	59
Rudersdal	50%	17%	33%	6	%; cases	59
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Silkeborg	33%	0%	67%	6	%; cases	59
Skanderborg	71%	0%	29%	7	%; cases	59
Stevns	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Svendborg	29%	0%	71%	14	%; cases	59
South Djurs	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Sønderborg	40%	0%	60%	15	%; cases	59
Product	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	59
Aalborg	14%	5%	81%	21	%; cases	59
Aarhus	44%	0%	56%	39	%; cases	59
Total	95	4	185	284	Number; cases	59

2022, original table 2.4: Reasoned position

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Bornholm	88%	13%	8	%; cases	60
Esbjerg	100%	0%	30	%; cases	60
Favrskov	100%	0%	7	%; cases	60
Frederikshavn	100%	0%	19	%; cases	60
Frederikssund	100%	0%	8	%; cases	60
Furesø	100%	0%	8	%; cases	60
Gentofte	100%	0%	14	%; cases	60
Count	100%	0%	8	%; cases	60
Hillerød	100%	0%	7	%; cases	60
Holbæk	100%	0%	16	%; cases	60
Jammerbug	100%	0%	11	%; cases	60
Langeland	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Lolland	100%	0%	22	%; cases	60
Medium speed	100%	0%	7	%; cases	60
Nordfyn	86%	14%	7	%; cases	60
Oats	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Odsherd	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Rebild	90%	10%	10	%; cases	60
Roskilde	100%	0%	19	%; cases	60
Rudersdal	100%	0%	8	%; cases	60
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Silkeborg	100%	0%	13	%; cases	60
Skanderborg	100%	0%	9	%; cases	60
Stevns	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Svendborg	100%	0%	17	%; cases	60
South Djurs	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Sønderborg	100%	0%	21	%; cases	60
Product	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	60
Aalborg	97%	3%	31	%; cases	60
Aarhus	97%	3%	70	%; cases	60
Total	394	6	400	Number; cases	60

2022, original table 2.5: Investigation before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Bornholm	25%	25%	50%	8	%; cases	61
Esbjerg	73%	0%	27%	30	%; cases	61
Favrskov	86%	14%	0%	7	%; cases	61
Frederikshavn	68%	21%	11%	19	%; cases	61
Frederikssund	100%	0%	0%	8	%; cases	61
Furesø	63%	25%	13%	8	%; cases	61
Gentofte	86%	0%	14%	14	%; cases	61
Count	50%	38%	13%	8	%; cases	61
Hillerød	57%	14%	29%	7	%; cases	61
Holbæk	44%	44%	13%	16	%; cases	61
Jammerbug	55%	0%	45%	11	%; cases	61
Langeland	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Lolland	73%	14%	14%	22	%; cases	61
Medium speed	86%	14%	0%	7	%; cases	61
Nordfyn	57%	29%	14%	7	%; cases	61
Oats	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Odsherd	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Rebild	50%	30%	20%	10	%; cases	61
Roskilde	95%	5%	0%	19	%; cases	61
Rudersdal	88%	13%	0%	8	%; cases	61
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Silkeborg	46%	31%	23%	13	%; cases	61
Skanderborg	56%	44%	0%	9	%; cases	61
Stevns	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Svendborg	76%	6%	18%	17	%; cases	61
South Djurs	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61
Sønderborg	71%	29%	0%	21	%; cases	61
Product	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	61

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Aalborg	52%	13%	35%	31	%; cases	61
Aarhus	51%	19%	30%	70	%; cases	61
Total	258	65	77	400	Number; cases	61

2022, original table 2.6: Study interview

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	62
Bornholm	100%	0%	8	%; cases	62
Esbjerg	97%	3%	30	%; cases	62
Favrskov	100%	0%	7	%; cases	62
Frederikshavn	100%	0%	19	%; cases	62
Frederikssund	100%	0%	7	%; cases	62
Furesø	100%	0%	8	%; cases	62
Gentofte	100%	0%	14	%; cases	62
Count	100%	0%	7	%; cases	62
Hillerød	100%	0%	7	%; cases	62
Holbæk	100%	0%	16	%; cases	62
Jammerbug	100%	0%	10	%; cases	62
Langeland	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	62
Lolland	95%	5%	22	%; cases	62
Medium speed	100%	0%	6	%; cases	62
Nordfyn	86%	14%	7	%; cases	62
Oats	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	62
Odsherd	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	62
Rebild	100%	0%	9	%; cases	62
Roskilde	100%	0%	17	%; cases	62
Rudersdal	100%	0%	8	%; cases	62
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	62
Silkeborg	85%	15%	13	%; cases	62
Skanderborg	100%	0%	9	%; cases	62
Stevns	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	62
Svendborg	100%	0%	16	%; cases	62
South Djurs	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	62
Sønderborg	95%	5%	20	%; cases	62
Product	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	62
Aalborg	97%	3%	30	%; cases	62
Aarhus	74%	26%	70	%; cases	62
Total	362	26	388	Number; cases	62

2022, original Table 2.7: Parental Information

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	63
Bornholm	100%	0%	8	%; cases	63
Esbjerg	97%	3%	30	%; cases	63
Favrskov	100%	0%	7	%; cases	63
Frederikshavn	89%	11%	19	%; cases	63
Frederikssund	100%	0%	8	%; cases	63
Furesø	100%	0%	8	%; cases	63
Gentofte	100%	0%	14	%; cases	63
Count	88%	13%	8	%; cases	63
Hillerød	100%	0%	7	%; cases	63
Holbæk	100%	0%	16	%; cases	63
Jammerbug	91%	9%	11	%; cases	63
Langeland	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	63
Lolland	95%	5%	22	%; cases	63
Medium speed	100%	0%	7	%; cases	63
Nordfyn	86%	14%	7	%; cases	63
Oats	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	63
Odsherd	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	63
Rebild	90%	10%	10	%; cases	63
Roskilde	100%	0%	19	%; cases	63
Rudersdal	88%	13%	8	%; cases	63
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	63
Silkeborg	77%	23%	13	%; cases	63
Skanderborg	100%	0%	9	%; cases	63
Stevns	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	63
Svendborg	100%	0%	17	%; cases	63
South Djurs	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	63
Sønderborg	95%	5%	21	%; cases	63
Product	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	63
Aalborg	97%	3%	31	%; cases	63
Aarhus	94%	6%	69	%; cases	63
Total	380	19	399	Number; cases	63

2022, original Table 2.8: Speech before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	64
Bornholm	47%	53%	17	%; cases	64
Esbjerg	62%	38%	47	%; cases	64
Favrskov	58%	42%	12	%; cases	64
Frederikshavn	54%	46%	24	%; cases	64
Frederikssund	50%	50%	14	%; cases	64
Furesø	75%	25%	12	%; cases	64
Gentofte	61%	39%	18	%; cases	64
Count	63%	38%	16	%; cases	64
Hillerød	47%	53%	15	%; cases	64
Holbæk	44%	56%	27	%; cases	64
Jammerbug	67%	33%	12	%; cases	64
Langeland	60%	40%	10	%; cases	64
Lolland	67%	33%	27	%; cases	64
Medium speed	60%	40%	10	%; cases	64
Nordfyn	50%	50%	10	%; cases	64
Oats	60%	40%	10	%; cases	64
Odsherd	36%	64%	11	%; cases	64
Rebild	60%	40%	10	%; cases	64
Roskilde	84%	16%	25	%; cases	64
Rudersdal	79%	21%	14	%; cases	64
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	64
Silkeborg	54%	46%	28	%; cases	64
Skanderborg	64%	36%	14	%; cases	64
Stevns	30%	70%	10	%; cases	64
Svendborg	73%	27%	22	%; cases	64
South Djurs	46%	54%	13	%; cases	64
Sønderborg	48%	52%	33	%; cases	64
Product	47%	53%	17	%; cases	64
Aalborg	55%	45%	76	%; cases	64
Aarhus	45%	55%	126	%; cases	64
Total	382	309	691	Number; cases	64

2022, original table 2.9: Action plan

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	65
Bornholm	78%	0%	22%	18	%; cases	65
Esbjerg	62%	9%	30%	47	%; cases	65
Favrskov	50%	0%	50%	12	%; cases	65
Frederikshavn	88%	8%	4%	24	%; cases	65
Frederikssund	100%	0%	0%	14	%; cases	65
Furesø	75%	0%	25%	12	%; cases	65
Gentofte	78%	0%	22%	18	%; cases	65
Count	94%	0%	6%	16	%; cases	65
Hillerød	60%	7%	33%	15	%; cases	65
Holbæk	78%	4%	19%	27	%; cases	65
Jammerbug	100%	0%	0%	13	%; cases	65
Langeland	80%	0%	20%	10	%; cases	65
Lolland	89%	0%	11%	27	%; cases	65
Medium speed	100%	0%	0%	10	%; cases	65
Nordfyn	90%	0%	10%	10	%; cases	65
Oats	10%	0%	90%	10	%; cases	65
Odsherd	45%	9%	45%	11	%; cases	65
Rebild	90%	0%	10%	10	%; cases	65
Roskilde	81%	0%	19%	26	%; cases	65
Rudersdal	64%	0%	36%	14	%; cases	65
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	65
Silkeborg	69%	10%	21%	29	%; cases	65
Skanderborg	64%	0%	36%	14	%; cases	65
Stevns	90%	0%	10%	10	%; cases	65
Svendborg	82%	0%	18%	22	%; cases	65
South Djurs	46%	8%	46%	13	%; cases	65
Sønderborg	64%	0%	36%	33	%; cases	65
Product	6%	0%	94%	17	%; cases	65
Aalborg	84%	1%	14%	76	%; cases	65
Aarhus	79%	2%	20%	127	%; cases	65
Total	520	16	161	697	Number; cases	65

2022, original table 2.10: Plan effort

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	66
Bornholm	100%	0%	14	%; cases	66
Esbjerg	100%	0%	29	%; cases	66
Favrskov	100%	0%	6	%; cases	66
Frederikshavn	100%	0%	21	%; cases	66
Frederikssund	100%	0%	14	%; cases	66
Furesø	100%	0%	9	%; cases	66
Gentofte	100%	0%	14	%; cases	66
Count	100%	0%	15	%; cases	66
Hillerød	100%	0%	9	%; cases	66
Holbæk	100%	0%	21	%; cases	66
Jammerbug	85%	15%	13	%; cases	66
Langeland	100%	0%	8	%; cases	66
Lolland	100%	0%	24	%; cases	66
Medium speed	100%	0%	10	%; cases	66
Nordfyn	100%	0%	9	%; cases	66
Oats	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	66
Odsherd	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	66
Rebild	100%	0%	9	%; cases	66
Roskilde	100%	0%	21	%; cases	66
Rudersdal	100%	0%	9	%; cases	66
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	66
Silkeborg	90%	10%	20	%; cases	66
Skanderborg	100%	0%	9	%; cases	66
Stevns	100%	0%	9	%; cases	66
Svendborg	100%	0%	18	%; cases	66
South Djurs	83%	17%	6	%; cases	66
Sønderborg	100%	0%	21	%; cases	66
Product	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	66
Aalborg	100%	0%	64	%; cases	66
Aarhus	100%	0%	100	%; cases	66
Total	514	6	520	Number; cases	66

2022, original table 2.11: 24 h last notification before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	67
Bornholm	100%	0%	15	%; notifications	67
Esbjerg	100%	0%	41	%; notifications	67
Favrskov	100%	0%	9	%; notifications	67
Frederikshavn	100%	0%	22	%; notifications	67
Frederikssund	91%	9%	11	%; notifications	67
Furesø	91%	9%	11	%; notifications	67
Gentofte	100%	0%	13	%; notifications	67
Count	100%	0%	14	%; notifications	67
Hillerød	86%	14%	7	%; notifications	67
Holbæk	96%	4%	25	%; notifications	67
Jammerbug	100%	0%	10	%; notifications	67
Langeland	100%	0%	8	%; notifications	67
Lolland	87%	13%	23	%; notifications	67
Medium speed	100%	0%	8	%; notifications	67
Nordfyn	100%	0%	9	%; notifications	67
Oats	100%	0%	7	%; notifications	67
Odsherd	100%	0%	10	%; notifications	67
Rebild	89%	11%	9	%; notifications	67
Roskilde	100%	0%	23	%; notifications	67
Rudersdal	100%	0%	12	%; notifications	67
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	67
Silkeborg	69%	31%	16	%; notifications	67
Skanderborg	100%	0%	14	%; notifications	67
Stevns	63%	38%	8	%; notifications	67
Svendborg	100%	0%	19	%; notifications	67
South Djurs	80%	20%	10	%; notifications	67
Sønderborg	83%	17%	29	%; notifications	67
Product	100%	0%	15	%; notifications	67
Aalborg	100%	0%	63	%; notifications	67
Aarhus	93%	7%	104	%; notifications	67
Total	543	30	573	number; notifications	67

2022, original table 2.12: 24 h first notification after decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Allerred	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Bornholm	100%	0%	11	%; notifications	68
Esbjerg	100%	0%	17	%; notifications	68
Favrskov	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Frederikshavn	100%	0%	7	%; notifications	68
Frederikssund	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Furesø	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Gentofte	100%	0%	6	%; notifications	68
Count	100%	0%	6	%; notifications	68
Hillerød	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Holbæk	100%	0%	12	%; notifications	68
Jammerbug	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Langeland	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Lolland	100%	0%	11	%; notifications	68
Medium speed	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Nordfyn	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Oats	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Odsherd	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Rebild	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Roskilde	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Rudersdal	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Samsø	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Silkeborg	89%	11%	9	%; notifications	68
Skanderborg	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Stevns	not published	not published	not published	%; notifications	68
Svendborg	100%	0%	7	%; notifications	68
South Djurs	83%	17%	6	%; notifications	68
Sønderborg	80%	20%	15	%; notifications	68
Product	100%	0%	6	%; notifications	68
Aalborg	100%	0%	26	%; notifications	68
Aarhus	91%	9%	35	%; notifications	68
Total	221	8	229	number; notifications	68

2023: municipal tables

[BB23ANNEX] All of the rows below are actually numbered. Small sub-targets are hidden; they are not zero registrations.

2023, original Table 2.1: Type of settlement

Municipality	Optional location;	Installation with consent;	Family bean dling / duck	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	45
Assens	26%	0%	74%	19	%; cases	45
Ballerup	47%	0%	53%	19	%; cases	45
Springby	50%	4%	46%	24	%; cases	45
Parsley leaves	50%	0%	50%	14	%; cases	45
Dragons	20%	0%	80%	10	%; cases	45
Egedal	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	45
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	45
Fredensborg	20%	0%	80%	15	%; cases	45
Fredericia	46%	0%	54%	24	%; cases	45
Frederiksberg	19%	0%	81%	31	%; cases	45
Haderslev	44%	0%	56%	25	%; cases	45
Helsingør	32%	0%	68%	25	%; cases	45
Herlev	29%	0%	71%	14	%; cases	45
Herning	48%	3%	48%	31	%; cases	45
Corner	46%	4%	50%	24	%; cases	45
Holstebro	20%	5%	75%	20	%; cases	45
Hvidover	42%	8%	50%	24	%; cases	45
Høj-Taastrup	50%	0%	50%	26	%; cases	46
Ishøj	13%	0%	87%	15	%; cases	46
Kerteminde	40%	10%	50%	10	%; cases	46
Cold	40%	0%	60%	35	%; cases	46
Køge	22%	4%	74%	23	%; cases	46
Leaflets	20%	0%	80%	10	%; cases	46
Lemvig	40%	10%	50%	10	%; cases	46
Lyngby-Taarbæk	50%	0%	50%	16	%; cases	46
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	46
Mariners' fjord	50%	0%	50%	16	%; cases	46
Norddjurs	56%	0%	44%	16	%; cases	46
Nyborg	31%	0%	69%	13	%; cases	46
Odense	36%	1%	63%	87	%; cases	46

Municipality	Optional location;	Installation with consent;	Family bean dling / duck	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Ringkøbing-Skjern	26%	0%	74%	19	%; cases	46
Ringsted	21%	7%	71%	14	%; cases	46
Slaughter	46%	0%	54%	39	%; cases	46
Tower	24%	0%	76%	17	%; cases	46
Viborg	49%	0%	51%	35	%; cases	46
Vordingborg	33%	0%	67%	21	%; cases	46
Total	286	11	468	765	Number; cases	46

2023, original Table 2.2: Investigation

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	46
Assens	73%	0%	27%	15	%; cases	46
Ballerup	60%	0%	40%	15	%; cases	46
Springby	86%	9%	5%	22	%; cases	46
Parsley leaves	58%	25%	17%	12	%; cases	46
Dragons	86%	0%	14%	7	%; cases	46
Egedal	100%	0%	0%	8	%; cases	46
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	46
Fredensborg	77%	15%	8%	13	%; cases	46
Fredericia	84%	5%	11%	19	%; cases	46
Frederiksberg	100%	0%	0%	29	%; cases	46
Haderslev	75%	13%	13%	16	%; cases	46
Helsingør	75%	5%	20%	20	%; cases	46
Herlev	89%	11%	0%	9	%; cases	46
Herning	58%	29%	13%	24	%; cases	46
Corner	90%	5%	5%	21	%; cases	47
Holstebro	59%	6%	35%	17	%; cases	47
Hvidover	89%	11%	0%	18	%; cases	47
Høj-Taastrup	65%	24%	12%	17	%; cases	47
Ishøj	90%	10%	0%	10	%; cases	47
Kerteminde	71%	0%	29%	7	%; cases	47
Cold	96%	0%	4%	28	%; cases	47
Køge	79%	5%	16%	19	%; cases	47
Leaflets	100%	0%	0%	8	%; cases	47
Lemvig	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	47
Lyngby-Taarbæk	70%	10%	20%	10	%; cases	47
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	47
Mariners' fjord	79%	14%	7%	14	%; cases	47
Norddjurs	69%	15%	15%	13	%; cases	47
Nyborg	92%	0%	8%	12	%; cases	47
Odense	62%	29%	9%	79	%; cases	47

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Ringkøbing-Skjern	75%	19%	6%	16	%; cases	47
Ringsted	75%	8%	17%	12	%; cases	47
Slaughter	68%	13%	19%	31	%; cases	47
Tower	64%	14%	21%	14	%; cases	47
Viborg	78%	0%	22%	23	%; cases	47
Vordingborg	100%	0%	0%	17	%; cases	47
Total	468	67	72	607	Number; cases	47

2023, original Table 2.3: Four-month deadline

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	47
Assens	20%	0%	80%	10	%; cases	47
Ballerup	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	47
Springby	14%	0%	86%	7	%; cases	47
Parsley leaves	33%	0%	67%	6	%; cases	47
Dragons	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	47
Egedal	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	47
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	47
Fredensborg	33%	0%	67%	9	%; cases	47
Fredericia	36%	0%	64%	11	%; cases	47
Frederiksberg	41%	0%	59%	17	%; cases	47
Haderslev	33%	0%	67%	9	%; cases	47
Helsingør	13%	0%	87%	15	%; cases	47
Herlev	13%	0%	88%	8	%; cases	47
Herning	17%	17%	67%	6	%; cases	47
Corner	42%	0%	58%	12	%; cases	47
Holstebro	38%	13%	50%	8	%; cases	47
Hvidover	55%	0%	45%	11	%; cases	47
Høj-Taastrup	25%	13%	63%	8	%; cases	47
Ishøj	17%	0%	83%	6	%; cases	48
Kerteminde	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	48
Cold	76%	6%	18%	17	%; cases	48
Køge	20%	0%	80%	10	%; cases	48
Leaflets	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	48
Lemvig	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	48
Lyngby-Taarbæk	83%	0%	17%	6	%; cases	48
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	48
Mariners' fjord	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	48

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Norddjurs	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	48
Nyborg	25%	0%	75%	8	%; cases	48
Odense	44%	0%	56%	27	%; cases	48
Ringkøbing-Skjern	11%	0%	89%	9	%; cases	48
Ringsted	50%	0%	50%	6	%; cases	48
Slaughter	17%	11%	72%	18	%; cases	48
Tower	17%	0%	83%	6	%; cases	48
Viborg	17%	0%	83%	12	%; cases	48
Vordingborg	20%	0%	80%	15	%; cases	48
Total	100	6	208	314	Number; cases	48

2023, original Table 2.4: Reasoned position

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	48
Assens	100%	0%	11	%; cases	48
Ballerup	100%	0%	9	%; cases	48
Springby	100%	0%	19	%; cases	48
Parsley leaves	100%	0%	7	%; cases	48
Dragons	67%	33%	6	%; cases	48
Egedal	88%	13%	8	%; cases	48
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	48
Fredensborg	100%	0%	10	%; cases	48
Fredericia	100%	0%	16	%; cases	48
Frederiksberg	100%	0%	29	%; cases	48
Haderslev	100%	0%	12	%; cases	48
Helsingør	100%	0%	15	%; cases	48
Herlev	100%	0%	8	%; cases	48
Herning	93%	7%	14	%; cases	48
Corner	95%	5%	19	%; cases	48
Holstebro	100%	0%	10	%; cases	48
Hvidover	100%	0%	16	%; cases	48
Høj-Taastrup	100%	0%	11	%; cases	48
Ishøj	100%	0%	9	%; cases	48
Kerteminde	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	48
Cold	100%	0%	27	%; cases	49
Køge	93%	7%	15	%; cases	49
Leaflets	100%	0%	8	%; cases	49
Lemvig	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Lyngby-Taarbæk	100%	0%	7	%; cases	49
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Mariners' fjord	100%	0%	11	%; cases	49
Norddjurs	100%	0%	9	%; cases	49
Nyborg	100%	0%	11	%; cases	49
Odense	98%	2%	49	%; cases	49
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	12	%; cases	49
Ringsted	100%	0%	9	%; cases	49

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Slaughter	100%	0%	21	%; cases	49
Tower	89%	11%	9	%; cases	49
Viborg	100%	0%	18	%; cases	49
Vordingborg	94%	6%	17	%; cases	49
Total	459	9	468	Number; cases	49

2023, original table 2.5: Investigation before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Assens	73%	0%	27%	11	%; cases	49
Ballerup	44%	33%	22%	9	%; cases	49
Springby	95%	0%	5%	19	%; cases	49
Parsley leaves	29%	43%	29%	7	%; cases	49
Dragons	67%	0%	33%	6	%; cases	49
Egedal	100%	0%	0%	8	%; cases	49
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Fredensborg	50%	20%	30%	10	%; cases	49
Fredericia	69%	19%	13%	16	%; cases	49
Frederiksberg	76%	10%	14%	29	%; cases	49
Haderslev	83%	17%	0%	12	%; cases	49
Helsingør	87%	13%	0%	15	%; cases	49
Herlev	88%	13%	0%	8	%; cases	49
Herning	43%	29%	29%	14	%; cases	49
Corner	68%	32%	0%	19	%; cases	49
Holstebro	90%	0%	10%	10	%; cases	49
Hvidover	75%	13%	13%	16	%; cases	49
Høj-Taastrup	27%	36%	36%	11	%; cases	49
Ishøj	100%	0%	0%	9	%; cases	49
Kerteminde	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Cold	63%	26%	11%	27	%; cases	49
Køge	47%	27%	27%	15	%; cases	49
Leaflets	88%	13%	0%	8	%; cases	49
Lemvig	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Lyngby-Taarbæk	43%	57%	0%	7	%; cases	50
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	50
Mariners' fjord	36%	36%	27%	11	%; cases	50
Norddjurs	67%	33%	0%	9	%; cases	50
Nyborg	55%	18%	27%	11	%; cases	50
Odense	63%	22%	14%	49	%; cases	50

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Ringkøbing-Skjern	83%	0%	17%	12	%; cases	50
Ringsted	100%	0%	0%	9	%; cases	50
Slaughter	24%	57%	19%	21	%; cases	50
Tower	78%	22%	0%	9	%; cases	50
Viborg	50%	22%	28%	18	%; cases	50
Vordingborg	35%	41%	24%	17	%; cases	50
Total	303	97	68	468	Number; cases	50

2023, original table 2.6: Study interview

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	51
Assens	100%	0%	11	%; cases	51
Ballerup	100%	0%	9	%; cases	51
Springby	94%	6%	18	%; cases	51
Parsley leaves	86%	14%	7	%; cases	51
Dragons	83%	17%	6	%; cases	51
Egedal	100%	0%	8	%; cases	51
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	51
Fredensborg	100%	0%	10	%; cases	51
Fredericia	100%	0%	16	%; cases	51
Frederiksberg	97%	3%	29	%; cases	51
Haderslev	100%	0%	12	%; cases	51
Helsingør	93%	7%	15	%; cases	51
Herlev	100%	0%	8	%; cases	51
Herning	100%	0%	14	%; cases	51
Corner	100%	0%	19	%; cases	51
Holstebro	90%	10%	10	%; cases	51
Hvidover	94%	6%	16	%; cases	51
Høj-Taastrup	100%	0%	11	%; cases	51
Ishøj	100%	0%	9	%; cases	51
Kerteminde	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	51
Cold	100%	0%	27	%; cases	51
Køge	93%	7%	15	%; cases	51
Leaflets	100%	0%	7	%; cases	51
Lemvig	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	51
Lyngby-Taarbæk	100%	0%	7	%; cases	51
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	51
Mariners' fjord	91%	9%	11	%; cases	51
Norddjurs	100%	0%	9	%; cases	51
Nyborg	100%	0%	11	%; cases	51
Odense	100%	0%	47	%; cases	51
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	11	%; cases	51
Ringsted	100%	0%	9	%; cases	51

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Slaughter	100%	0%	20	%; cases	51
Tower	100%	0%	8	%; cases	51
Viborg	94%	6%	18	%; cases	51
Vordingborg	100%	0%	17	%; cases	51
Total	450	11	461	Number; cases	51

2023, original Table 2.7: Parental Information

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	52
Assens	100%	0%	11	%; cases	52
Ballerup	89%	11%	9	%; cases	52
Springby	84%	16%	19	%; cases	52
Parsley leaves	100%	0%	7	%; cases	52
Dragons	100%	0%	6	%; cases	52
Egedal	100%	0%	8	%; cases	52
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	52
Fredensborg	100%	0%	10	%; cases	52
Fredericia	100%	0%	16	%; cases	52
Frederiksberg	100%	0%	29	%; cases	52
Haderslev	92%	8%	12	%; cases	52
Helsingør	87%	13%	15	%; cases	52
Herlev	100%	0%	8	%; cases	52
Herning	93%	7%	14	%; cases	52
Corner	95%	5%	19	%; cases	52
Holstebro	100%	0%	10	%; cases	52
Hvidover	94%	6%	16	%; cases	52
Høj-Taastrup	100%	0%	11	%; cases	52
Ishøj	100%	0%	9	%; cases	52
Kerteminde	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	52
Cold	96%	4%	27	%; cases	52
Køge	93%	7%	15	%; cases	52
Leaflets	100%	0%	8	%; cases	52
Lemvig	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	52
Lyngby-Taarbæk	100%	0%	7	%; cases	52
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	52
Mariners' fjord	91%	9%	11	%; cases	52
Norddjurs	100%	0%	9	%; cases	52
Nyborg	100%	0%	11	%; cases	52
Odense	94%	6%	48	%; cases	52
Ringkøbing-Skjern	92%	8%	12	%; cases	52
Ringsted	100%	0%	9	%; cases	52

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Slaughter	90%	10%	21	%; cases	52
Tower	100%	0%	9	%; cases	52
Viborg	94%	6%	18	%; cases	52
Vordingborg	88%	12%	17	%; cases	52
Total	445	22	467	Number; cases	52

2023, original Table 2.8: Speech before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	56%	44%	9	%; cases	52
Assens	47%	53%	19	%; cases	52
Ballerup	63%	37%	19	%; cases	52
Springby	78%	22%	23	%; cases	52
Parsley leaves	79%	21%	14	%; cases	53
Dragons	20%	80%	10	%; cases	53
Egedal	80%	20%	10	%; cases	53
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	53
Fredensborg	67%	33%	15	%; cases	53
Fredericia	67%	33%	24	%; cases	53
Frederiksberg	68%	32%	31	%; cases	53
Haderslev	80%	20%	25	%; cases	53
Helsingør	64%	36%	25	%; cases	53
Herlev	57%	43%	14	%; cases	53
Herning	62%	38%	29	%; cases	53
Corner	65%	35%	23	%; cases	53
Holstebro	42%	58%	19	%; cases	53
Hvidover	50%	50%	24	%; cases	53
Høj-Taastrup	50%	50%	26	%; cases	53
Ishøj	21%	79%	14	%; cases	53
Kerteminde	80%	20%	10	%; cases	53
Cold	77%	23%	35	%; cases	53
Køge	52%	48%	23	%; cases	53
Leaflets	33%	67%	9	%; cases	53
Lemvig	50%	50%	10	%; cases	53
Lyngby-Taarbæk	56%	44%	16	%; cases	53
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	53
Mariners' fjord	75%	25%	16	%; cases	53
Norddjurs	50%	50%	16	%; cases	53
Nyborg	46%	54%	13	%; cases	53
Odense	64%	36%	85	%; cases	53
Ringkøbing-Skjern	56%	44%	18	%; cases	53
Ringsted	50%	50%	14	%; cases	53

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Slaughter	72%	28%	32	%; cases	53
Tower	75%	25%	16	%; cases	53
Viborg	60%	40%	35	%; cases	53
Vordingborg	38%	62%	21	%; cases	53
Total	452	294	746	Number; cases	53

2023, original Table 2.9: Contact first three months

Municipality	Yeah.	Justified absence	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	43%	14%	43%	7	%; cases	53
Assens	57%	7%	36%	14	%; cases	53
Ballerup	59%	0%	41%	17	%; cases	53
Springby	53%	7%	40%	15	%; cases	53
Parsley leaves	55%	9%	36%	11	%; cases	53
Dragons	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	53
Egedal	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	54
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	54
Fredensborg	56%	11%	33%	9	%; cases	54
Fredericia	53%	12%	35%	17	%; cases	54
Frederiksberg	41%	26%	33%	27	%; cases	54
Haderslev	42%	21%	37%	19	%; cases	54
Helsingør	33%	22%	44%	18	%; cases	54
Herlev	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	54
Herning	69%	0%	31%	16	%; cases	54
Corner	61%	0%	39%	18	%; cases	54
Holstebro	17%	0%	83%	12	%; cases	54
Hvidover	64%	21%	14%	14	%; cases	54
Høj-Taastrup	55%	23%	23%	22	%; cases	54
Ishøj	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	54
Kerteminde	63%	13%	25%	8	%; cases	54
Cold	75%	13%	13%	32	%; cases	54
Køge	35%	29%	35%	17	%; cases	54
Leaflets	57%	14%	29%	7	%; cases	54
Lemvig	33%	22%	44%	9	%; cases	54
Lyngby-Taarbæk	58%	0%	42%	12	%; cases	54
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	54
Mariners' fjord	50%	40%	10%	10	%; cases	54
Norddjurs	50%	0%	50%	6	%; cases	54
Nyborg	50%	0%	50%	12	%; cases	54

Municipality	Yeah.	Justified absence	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Odense	67%	10%	23%	30	%; cases	54
Ringkøbing-Skjern	40%	10%	50%	10	%; cases	54
Ringsted	63%	0%	38%	8	%; cases	54
Slaughter	47%	34%	19%	32	%; cases	54
Tower	30%	50%	20%	10	%; cases	54
Viborg	58%	8%	33%	24	%; cases	54
Vordingborg	56%	6%	38%	16	%; cases	54
Total	259	74	166	499	Number; cases	54

2023, original table 2.10: Action plan

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	90%	0%	10%	10	%; cases	54
Assens	84%	0%	16%	19	%; cases	54
Ballerup	63%	0%	37%	19	%; cases	54
Springby	83%	0%	17%	24	%; cases	54
Parsley leaves	71%	7%	21%	14	%; cases	54
Dragons	70%	0%	30%	10	%; cases	54
Egedal	70%	0%	30%	10	%; cases	54
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	54
Fredensborg	93%	0%	7%	15	%; cases	55
Fredericia	79%	0%	21%	24	%; cases	55
Frederiksberg	97%	0%	3%	31	%; cases	55
Haderslev	76%	4%	20%	25	%; cases	55
Helsingør	60%	4%	36%	25	%; cases	55
Herlev	100%	0%	0%	14	%; cases	55
Herning	68%	0%	32%	31	%; cases	55
Corner	92%	4%	4%	24	%; cases	55
Holstebro	95%	0%	5%	20	%; cases	55
Hvidover	79%	8%	13%	24	%; cases	55
Høj-Taastrup	85%	0%	15%	26	%; cases	55
Ishøj	87%	0%	13%	15	%; cases	55
Kerteminde	80%	0%	20%	10	%; cases	55
Cold	100%	0%	0%	35	%; cases	55
Køge	91%	0%	9%	23	%; cases	55
Leaflets	60%	0%	40%	10	%; cases	55
Lemvig	80%	10%	10%	10	%; cases	55
Lyngby-Taarbæk	38%	0%	63%	16	%; cases	55
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	55
Mariners' fjord	88%	0%	13%	16	%; cases	55
Norddjurs	88%	0%	13%	16	%; cases	55
Nyborg	85%	0%	15%	13	%; cases	55
Odense	91%	0%	9%	87	%; cases	55
Ringkøbing-Skjern	89%	0%	11%	19	%; cases	55

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Ringsted	86%	0%	14%	14	%; cases	55
Slaughter	74%	3%	23%	39	%; cases	55
Tower	65%	6%	29%	17	%; cases	55
Viborg	83%	0%	17%	35	%; cases	55
Vordingborg	86%	5%	10%	21	%; cases	55
Total	628	10	127	765	Number; cases	55

2023, original table 2.11: Plan effort

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	100%	0%	9	%; cases	55
Assens	100%	0%	16	%; cases	55
Ballerup	100%	0%	12	%; cases	55
Springby	100%	0%	20	%; cases	55
Parsley leaves	100%	0%	10	%; cases	55
Dragons	86%	14%	7	%; cases	55
Egedal	100%	0%	7	%; cases	55
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	55
Fredensborg	100%	0%	14	%; cases	55
Fredericia	100%	0%	19	%; cases	55
Frederiksberg	100%	0%	30	%; cases	56
Haderslev	100%	0%	19	%; cases	56
Helsingør	100%	0%	15	%; cases	56
Herlev	100%	0%	14	%; cases	56
Herning	90%	10%	21	%; cases	56
Corner	100%	0%	22	%; cases	56
Holstebro	100%	0%	19	%; cases	56
Hvidover	100%	0%	19	%; cases	56
Høj-Taastrup	100%	0%	22	%; cases	56
Ishøj	100%	0%	13	%; cases	56
Kerteminde	100%	0%	8	%; cases	56
Cold	100%	0%	35	%; cases	56
Køge	95%	5%	21	%; cases	56
Leaflets	100%	0%	6	%; cases	56
Lemvig	100%	0%	8	%; cases	56
Lyngby-Taarbæk	100%	0%	6	%; cases	56
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	56
Mariners' fjord	100%	0%	14	%; cases	56
Norddjurs	100%	0%	14	%; cases	56
Nyborg	100%	0%	11	%; cases	56
Odense	100%	0%	79	%; cases	56
Ringkøbing-Skjern	100%	0%	17	%; cases	56
Ringsted	100%	0%	12	%; cases	56

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Slaughter	100%	0%	29	%; cases	56
Tower	100%	0%	11	%; cases	56
Viborg	97%	3%	29	%; cases	56
Vordingborg	100%	0%	18	%; cases	56
Total	623	5	628	Number; cases	56

2023, original table 2.12: Follow-up first three months

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Albertslund	33%	67%	6	%; cases	56
Assens	62%	38%	13	%; cases	56
Ballerup	67%	33%	15	%; cases	56
Springby	73%	27%	15	%; cases	56
Parsley leaves	60%	40%	10	%; cases	56
Dragons	50%	50%	6	%; cases	56
Egedal	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	56
Fanoe	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	56
Fredensborg	83%	17%	6	%; cases	56
Fredericia	65%	35%	17	%; cases	56
Frederiksberg	88%	12%	26	%; cases	56
Haderslev	72%	28%	18	%; cases	56
Helsingør	59%	41%	17	%; cases	57
Herlev	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Herning	69%	31%	16	%; cases	57
Corner	76%	24%	17	%; cases	57
Holstebro	27%	73%	11	%; cases	57
Hvidover	85%	15%	13	%; cases	57
Høj-Taastrup	68%	32%	19	%; cases	57
Ishøj	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Kerteminde	71%	29%	7	%; cases	57
Cold	84%	16%	32	%; cases	57
Køge	69%	31%	16	%; cases	57
Leaflets	83%	17%	6	%; cases	57
Lemvig	56%	44%	9	%; cases	57
Lyngby-Taarbæk	83%	17%	12	%; cases	57
Læsø	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Mariners' fjord	91%	9%	11	%; cases	57
Norddjurs	67%	33%	6	%; cases	57
Nyborg	73%	27%	11	%; cases	57
Odense	83%	17%	29	%; cases	57
Ringkøbing-Skjern	80%	20%	10	%; cases	57
Ringsted	50%	50%	8	%; cases	57

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Slaughter	53%	47%	30	%; cases	57
Tower	78%	22%	9	%; cases	57
Viborg	75%	25%	24	%; cases	57
Vordingborg	44%	56%	16	%; cases	57
Total	331	144	475	Number; cases	57

2024: municipal tables

[BB24ANNEX] All the rows below are actually numbered. Small sub-targets are hidden; they are not zero registrations.

2024, original Table 2.1: Type of settlement

Municipality	Optional location;	Installation with consent;	Family bean dling / duck	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	27%	0%	73%	11	%; cases	46
Fax	50%	0%	50%	14	%; cases	46
Faaborg-Midtfyn	47%	0%	53%	19	%; cases	46
Glostrup	45%	0%	55%	11	%; cases	46
Gribskov	36%	14%	50%	14	%; cases	46
Rhinoceros	50%	0%	50%	12	%; cases	46
Heath site	43%	0%	57%	14	%; cases	46
Horsens	50%	0%	50%	36	%; cases	46
Hørsholm	30%	0%	70%	10	%; cases	46
Kalundborg	10%	0%	90%	21	%; cases	46
Copenhagen	36%	0%	64%	256	%; cases	46
Morsø	40%	0%	60%	10	%; cases	46
Næstved	37%	3%	60%	35	%; cases	46
Randers	17%	0%	83%	42	%; cases	46
Rødover	42%	0%	58%	19	%; cases	46
Disc	33%	0%	67%	18	%; cases	46
Sunred	10%	0%	90%	10	%; cases	46
Sorø	50%	0%	50%	12	%; cases	46
Struer	50%	0%	50%	10	%; cases	46
Thisted	41%	0%	59%	17	%; cases	47
Peas (without pods)	44%	0%	56%	16	%; cases	47
Vallensbæk	40%	0%	60%	10	%; cases	47
Road	31%	6%	63%	16	%; cases	47
Vejle	47%	2%	51%	43	%; cases	47
West Himmerland	40%	7%	53%	15	%; cases	47
Peas (without pods)	13%	0%	88%	8	%; cases	47
Aabenra	52%	0%	48%	25	%; cases	47
Total	37%	1%	62%	724	%; cases	47

2024, original Table 2.2: Investigation

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	82%	0%	18%	11	%; cases	48
Fax	31%	0%	69%	13	%; cases	48
Faaborg-Midtfyn	89%	0%	11%	18	%; cases	48
Glostrup	100%	0%	0%	10	%; cases	48
Gribskov	79%	0%	21%	14	%; cases	48
Rhinoceros	75%	0%	25%	12	%; cases	48
Heath site	57%	0%	43%	14	%; cases	48
Horsens	36%	25%	39%	36	%; cases	48
Hørsholm	60%	10%	30%	10	%; cases	48
Kalundborg	71%	5%	24%	21	%; cases	48
Copenhagen	81%	10%	9%	249	%; cases	48
Morsø	60%	0%	40%	10	%; cases	48
Næstved	76%	15%	9%	34	%; cases	48
Randers	81%	2%	17%	42	%; cases	48
Rødover	37%	5%	58%	19	%; cases	48
Disc	83%	0%	17%	18	%; cases	48
Sunred	88%	0%	13%	8	%; cases	48
Sorø	92%	0%	8%	12	%; cases	48
Struer	80%	0%	20%	10	%; cases	48
Thisted	94%	0%	6%	17	%; cases	48
Peas (without pods)	94%	0%	6%	16	%; cases	48
Vallensbæk	89%	0%	11%	9	%; cases	48
Road	81%	0%	19%	16	%; cases	48
Vejle	35%	14%	51%	43	%; cases	48
West Himmerland	87%	7%	7%	15	%; cases	48
Peas (without pods)	38%	0%	63%	8	%; cases	48
Aabenra	58%	13%	29%	24	%; cases	48
Total	72%	7%	20%	709	%; cases	48

2024, original Table 2.3: Four-month deadline

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	50%	17%	33%	6	%; cases	49
Fax	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Faaborg-Midtfyn	40%	20%	40%	10	%; cases	49
Glostrup	14%	0%	86%	7	%; cases	49
Gribskov	38%	0%	63%	8	%; cases	49
Rhinoceros	40%	0%	60%	5	%; cases	49
Heath site	57%	0%	43%	7	%; cases	49
Horsens	31%	8%	62%	13	%; cases	49
Hørsholm	0%	17%	83%	6	%; cases	49
Kalundborg	8%	15%	77%	13	%; cases	49
Copenhagen	59%	2%	39%	162	%; cases	49
Morsø	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Næstved	21%	0%	79%	19	%; cases	49
Randers	55%	0%	45%	20	%; cases	49
Rødover	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Disc	10%	0%	90%	10	%; cases	49
Sunred	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Sorø	13%	13%	75%	8	%; cases	49
Struer	67%	17%	17%	6	%; cases	49
Thisted	0%	17%	83%	6	%; cases	49
Peas (without pods)	25%	0%	75%	8	%; cases	49
Vallensbæk	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Road	14%	0%	86%	7	%; cases	49
Vejle	73%	9%	18%	11	%; cases	49
West Himmerland	44%	0%	56%	9	%; cases	49
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	49
Aabenra	67%	11%	22%	9	%; cases	49
Total	46%	4%	50%	371	%; cases	49

2024, original Table 2.4: Reasoned position

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	89%	11%	9	%; cases	50
Fax	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	50
Faaborg-Midtfyn	100%	0%	16	%; cases	50
Glostrup	100%	0%	10	%; cases	50
Gribskov	82%	18%	11	%; cases	50
Rhinoceros	100%	0%	9	%; cases	50
Heath site	100%	0%	8	%; cases	50
Horsens	100%	0%	13	%; cases	50
Hørsholm	83%	17%	6	%; cases	50
Kalundborg	100%	0%	15	%; cases	50
Copenhagen	99%	1%	201	%; cases	50
Morsø	83%	17%	6	%; cases	50
Næstved	100%	0%	26	%; cases	50
Randers	94%	6%	34	%; cases	50
Rødover	100%	0%	7	%; cases	50
Disc	93%	7%	15	%; cases	50
Sunred	100%	0%	7	%; cases	50
Sorø	100%	0%	11	%; cases	50
Struer	100%	0%	8	%; cases	50
Thisted	100%	0%	16	%; cases	50
Peas (without pods)	100%	0%	15	%; cases	50
Vallensbæk	100%	0%	8	%; cases	50
Road	100%	0%	13	%; cases	50
Vejle	93%	7%	15	%; cases	50
West Himmerland	100%	0%	13	%; cases	50
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	50
Aabenra	93%	7%	14	%; cases	50
Total	98%	2%	513	%; cases	50

2024, original table 2.5: Investigation before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	67%	22%	11%	9	%; cases	51
Fax	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	51
Faaborg-Midtfyn	69%	19%	13%	16	%; cases	51
Glostrup	60%	30%	10%	10	%; cases	51
Gribskov	55%	36%	9%	11	%; cases	51
Rhinoceros	44%	11%	44%	9	%; cases	51
Heath site	38%	38%	25%	8	%; cases	51
Horsens	38%	38%	23%	13	%; cases	51
Hørsholm	83%	17%	0%	6	%; cases	51
Kalundborg	53%	40%	7%	15	%; cases	51
Copenhagen	54%	33%	13%	201	%; cases	51
Morsø	50%	17%	33%	6	%; cases	51
Næstved	65%	19%	15%	26	%; cases	51
Randers	79%	18%	3%	34	%; cases	51
Rødover	29%	43%	29%	7	%; cases	51
Disc	73%	7%	20%	15	%; cases	51
Sunred	43%	43%	14%	7	%; cases	51
Sorø	64%	9%	27%	11	%; cases	51
Struer	75%	13%	13%	8	%; cases	51
Thisted	75%	19%	6%	16	%; cases	51
Peas (without pods)	53%	13%	33%	15	%; cases	51
Vallensbæk	38%	63%	0%	8	%; cases	51
Road	77%	15%	8%	13	%; cases	51
Vejle	73%	27%	0%	15	%; cases	51
West Himmerland	77%	15%	8%	13	%; cases	51
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	51
Aabenra	71%	14%	14%	14	%; cases	51
Total	60%	27%	14%	513	%; cases	51

2024, original table 2.6: Study interview

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	100%	0%	9	%; cases	52
Fax	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	52
Faaborg-Midtfyn	93%	7%	15	%; cases	52
Glostrup	100%	0%	10	%; cases	52
Gribskov	82%	18%	11	%; cases	52
Rhinoceros	100%	0%	9	%; cases	52
Heath site	100%	0%	8	%; cases	52
Horsens	100%	0%	13	%; cases	52
Hørsholm	100%	0%	6	%; cases	52
Kalundborg	100%	0%	13	%; cases	52
Copenhagen	98%	2%	197	%; cases	52
Morsø	100%	0%	6	%; cases	52
Næstved	100%	0%	25	%; cases	52
Randers	97%	3%	34	%; cases	52
Rødover	100%	0%	7	%; cases	52
Disc	93%	7%	15	%; cases	52
Sunred	100%	0%	7	%; cases	52
Sorø	100%	0%	11	%; cases	52
Struer	83%	17%	6	%; cases	52
Thisted	93%	7%	15	%; cases	52
Peas (without pods)	100%	0%	15	%; cases	52
Vallensbæk	100%	0%	8	%; cases	52
Road	100%	0%	13	%; cases	52
Vejle	100%	0%	14	%; cases	52
West Himmerland	100%	0%	13	%; cases	52
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	52
Aabenra	100%	0%	14	%; cases	52
Total	98%	2%	501	%; cases	52

2024, original Table 2.7: Parental Information

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	100%	0%	9	%; cases	53
Fax	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	53
Faaborg-Midtfyn	100%	0%	16	%; cases	53
Glostrup	90%	10%	10	%; cases	53
Gribskov	100%	0%	11	%; cases	53
Rhinoceros	100%	0%	9	%; cases	53
Heath site	100%	0%	7	%; cases	53
Horsens	100%	0%	13	%; cases	53
Hørsholm	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	53
Kalundborg	100%	0%	15	%; cases	53
Copenhagen	95%	5%	199	%; cases	53
Morsø	100%	0%	6	%; cases	53
Næstved	100%	0%	26	%; cases	53
Randers	94%	6%	34	%; cases	53
Rødover	100%	0%	7	%; cases	53
Disc	93%	7%	15	%; cases	53
Sunred	100%	0%	7	%; cases	53
Sorø	100%	0%	11	%; cases	53
Struer	100%	0%	8	%; cases	53
Thisted	100%	0%	16	%; cases	53
Peas (without pods)	100%	0%	15	%; cases	53
Vallensbæk	88%	13%	8	%; cases	53
Road	100%	0%	13	%; cases	53
Vejle	100%	0%	15	%; cases	53
West Himmerland	100%	0%	13	%; cases	53
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	53
Aabenra	86%	14%	14	%; cases	53
Total	97%	3%	509	%; cases	53

2024, original Table 2.8: Speech before decision

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	55%	45%	11	%; cases	54
Fax	57%	43%	14	%; cases	54
Faaborg-Midtfyn	67%	33%	18	%; cases	54
Glostrup	91%	9%	11	%; cases	54
Gribskov	43%	57%	14	%; cases	54
Rhinoceros	58%	42%	12	%; cases	54
Heath site	64%	36%	14	%; cases	54
Horsens	64%	36%	36	%; cases	54
Hørsholm	50%	50%	10	%; cases	54
Kalundborg	53%	47%	19	%; cases	54
Copenhagen	73%	27%	249	%; cases	54
Morsø	89%	11%	9	%; cases	54
Næstved	57%	43%	35	%; cases	54
Randers	43%	57%	42	%; cases	54
Rødover	37%	63%	19	%; cases	54
Disc	67%	33%	18	%; cases	54
Sunred	40%	60%	10	%; cases	54
Sorø	75%	25%	12	%; cases	54
Struer	56%	44%	9	%; cases	54
Thisted	65%	35%	17	%; cases	54
Peas (without pods)	69%	31%	16	%; cases	54
Vallensbæk	40%	60%	10	%; cases	54
Road	75%	25%	16	%; cases	54
Vejle	69%	31%	39	%; cases	54
West Himmerland	80%	20%	15	%; cases	54
Peas (without pods)	38%	63%	8	%; cases	54
Aabenra	76%	24%	25	%; cases	54
Total	65%	35%	708	%; cases	54

2024, original Table 2.9: Contact first three months

Municipality	Yeah.	Justified absence	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	43%	29%	29%	7	%; cases	55
Fax	22%	33%	44%	9	%; cases	55
Faaborg-Midtfyn	67%	22%	11%	9	%; cases	55
Glostrup	57%	14%	29%	7	%; cases	55
Gribskov	40%	10%	50%	10	%; cases	55
Rhinoceros	60%	20%	20%	10	%; cases	55
Heath site	67%	0%	33%	9	%; cases	55
Horsens	57%	13%	30%	23	%; cases	55
Hørsholm	50%	25%	25%	8	%; cases	55
Kalundborg	56%	11%	33%	9	%; cases	55
Copenhagen	55%	19%	26%	182	%; cases	55
Morsø	50%	17%	33%	6	%; cases	55
Næstved	28%	16%	56%	25	%; cases	55
Randers	78%	17%	4%	23	%; cases	55
Rødover	25%	8%	67%	12	%; cases	55
Disc	47%	7%	47%	15	%; cases	55
Sunred	43%	14%	43%	7	%; cases	55
Sorø	11%	22%	67%	9	%; cases	55
Struer	44%	0%	56%	9	%; cases	55
Thisted	55%	0%	45%	11	%; cases	55
Peas (without pods)	50%	0%	50%	12	%; cases	55
Vallensbæk	89%	11%	0%	9	%; cases	55
Road	45%	9%	45%	11	%; cases	55
Vejle	64%	8%	28%	25	%; cases	55
West Himmerland	60%	30%	10%	10	%; cases	55
Peas (without pods)	57%	0%	43%	7	%; cases	55
Aabenra	64%	12%	24%	17	%; cases	55
Total	53%	15%	32%	491	%; cases	55

2024, original table 2.10: Action plan

Municipality	Yeah.	Legal ground	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	64%	0%	36%	11	%; cases	56
Fax	64%	0%	36%	14	%; cases	56
Faaborg-Midtfyn	68%	0%	32%	19	%; cases	56
Glostrup	82%	0%	18%	11	%; cases	56
Gribskov	86%	0%	14%	14	%; cases	56
Rhinoceros	83%	0%	17%	12	%; cases	56
Heath site	64%	7%	29%	14	%; cases	56
Horsens	72%	6%	22%	36	%; cases	56
Hørsholm	70%	0%	30%	10	%; cases	56
Kalundborg	71%	5%	24%	21	%; cases	56
Copenhagen	82%	2%	16%	256	%; cases	56
Morsø	90%	0%	10%	10	%; cases	56
Næstved	89%	0%	11%	35	%; cases	56
Randers	100%	0%	0%	42	%; cases	56
Rødover	63%	0%	37%	19	%; cases	56
Disc	94%	0%	6%	18	%; cases	56
Sunred	80%	0%	20%	10	%; cases	56
Sorø	67%	0%	33%	12	%; cases	56
Struer	100%	0%	0%	10	%; cases	56
Thisted	76%	0%	24%	17	%; cases	56
Peas (without pods)	100%	0%	0%	16	%; cases	56
Vallensbæk	80%	0%	20%	10	%; cases	56
Road	81%	0%	19%	16	%; cases	56
Vejle	91%	0%	9%	43	%; cases	56
West Himmerland	93%	7%	0%	15	%; cases	56
Peas (without pods)	38%	0%	63%	8	%; cases	56
Aabenra	88%	4%	8%	25	%; cases	56
Total	82%	2%	17%	724	%; cases	56

2024, original table 2.11: Plan effort

The original presses Table 2.1; here is the order specified according to the subject.

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	86%	14%	7	%; cases	57
Fax	100%	0%	9	%; cases	57

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Faaborg-Midtfyn	100%	0%	13	%; cases	57
Glostrup	100%	0%	9	%; cases	57
Gribskov	92%	8%	12	%; cases	57
Rhinoceros	100%	0%	10	%; cases	57
Heath site	100%	0%	9	%; cases	57
Horsens	88%	12%	26	%; cases	57
Hørsholm	100%	0%	7	%; cases	57
Kalundborg	100%	0%	15	%; cases	57
Copenhagen	100%	0%	210	%; cases	57
Morsø	100%	0%	9	%; cases	57
Næstved	100%	0%	31	%; cases	57
Randers	100%	0%	42	%; cases	57
Rødover	100%	0%	12	%; cases	57
Disc	100%	0%	17	%; cases	57
Sunred	100%	0%	8	%; cases	57
Sorø	100%	0%	8	%; cases	57
Struer	100%	0%	10	%; cases	57
Thisted	100%	0%	13	%; cases	57
Peas (without pods)	100%	0%	16	%; cases	57
Vallensbæk	100%	0%	8	%; cases	57
Road	100%	0%	13	%; cases	57
Vejle	100%	0%	39	%; cases	57
West Himmerland	100%	0%	14	%; cases	57
Peas (without pods)	not published	not published	not published	%; cases	57
Aabenra	100%	0%	22	%; cases	57
Total	99%	1%	592	%; cases	57

2024, original table 2.12: Follow-up first three months

The original presses Table 2.2; here is the order specified according to the subject.

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Billund	57%	43%	7	%; cases	58
Fax	67%	33%	9	%; cases	58
Faaborg-Midtfyn	90%	10%	10	%; cases	58
Glostrup	50%	50%	6	%; cases	58
Gribskov	30%	70%	10	%; cases	58

Municipality	Yeah.	No.	Denomination	Cell unit	PDF
Rhinoceros	70%	30%	10	%; cases	58
Heath site	86%	14%	7	%; cases	58
Horsens	80%	20%	20	%; cases	58
Hørsholm	75%	25%	8	%; cases	58
Kalundborg	86%	14%	7	%; cases	58
Copenhagen	85%	15%	172	%; cases	58
Morsø	43%	57%	7	%; cases	58
Næstved	64%	36%	25	%; cases	58
Randers	100%	0%	25	%; cases	58
Rødover	27%	73%	11	%; cases	58
Disc	46%	54%	13	%; cases	58
Sunred	83%	17%	6	%; cases	58
Sorø	22%	78%	9	%; cases	58
Struer	78%	22%	9	%; cases	58
Thisted	82%	18%	11	%; cases	58
Peas (without pods)	67%	33%	12	%; cases	58
Vallensbæk	78%	22%	9	%; cases	58
Road	60%	40%	10	%; cases	58
Vejle	70%	30%	27	%; cases	58
West Himmerland	90%	10%	10	%; cases	58
Peas (without pods)	83%	17%	6	%; cases	58
Aabenra	76%	24%	17	%; cases	58
Total	75%	25%	473	%; cases	58

Children's Day Barometer: pilot, break and new populations

Original information	Year; numerator / denominator or delimitation	Locator
Pilot	2019: 228 uncontested cases / 12 municipalities; 115 family treatment and 113 places	BBP19, physical 5; BBP19M, 4-6, now all three originals read
Collector report	2020-22: 2.140 cases; pilot 2019 omitted; 3 free municipalities excluded	BBSAM22, PDF4, footnotes 1-2
New Barometer	2026: 385 cases per year; first new edition according to the child's law	BBPLAN26, section Children's Day Barometer
Legal review	2026-28: 330 unchallenged accommodation cases / 60 municipalities	BBPLAN26, Section Legal Service Oversight
VIVE evaluation	2026-29:≈1.000 cases planned	BBPLAN26 Title Contribution to the VIVE evaluation
Implementation status	2024-25:up to 10 cases in approximately half the municipalities;9 municipalities' special processes separately	BBPLAN26, Direct aid
Task Force Capacity	4 children's courses per year; 2 years / years	BBPLAN26, Task Force Children

AS's full current publication catalogue shows barometers 2020-24 and not a release marked 2025. The dated 2026 plan describes the new edition as the first under the child's law. This documents a series and method break; therefore, an unread 2025 barometer should not stand as a known available original. It is still necessary to have the Authority's publication register confirm the full historical publication status. The 2026 figures are plans and capacities, not evidence of completed samples or breaches of law.

Own counting check:735+708+697=2.140, precisely the same three studies. The combined report adds no new cases. Adding 2023/24 yields 3.629 case entries in five publications; with the 2019 pilot now checked against the original, the result is 3.857=3.629+228 in six publications. Without identifiers, this is not a count of unique children or cases affected by error. The plan's initial≈1.000 cases and≈1.000 VIVE cases have not been documented as separate from one another; they must not be added together. Checking implementation status requires actual numbers of municipalities and cases submitted/reviewed. A maximum of 10 is not an actual 10 in every municipality. Unappealed placements are selected review populations and must be linked to the appeal population through stable case IDs before forming a union.

The pilot's original AS address still returns 404, but the official original and both separate annexes have now been rediscovered in the public archive and read in full in RAM:42+6+20 pages. All main figures' numbers, the methodological municipality table and 17 municipality figures/204 rows are included in boernesagsbarometer-pilot2019-originalkontrol.md and the reading annex. The outstanding task of obtaining the 2019 originals is therefore closed. Still required are the exact submission/exclusion counts, identifiers, the direction of the two outcome changes arising from consultation, actual redress/accountability follow-up and a publication/annex register for 2025-26. No external request has been sent.

The four handicap barometers: actual source control

Control 7 October 2026. Unit: measured municipal decision-making cases; neither unique citizens nor national errors. The four samples represent 1.540 case measurements. Individual overlap has not been published. Figures below are actual numerators of the originals, not conversions of rounded percentages. Several types of errors may occur in the same case.

Code / area	Barometer / Release / selection of decisions;	Case / k omune r	Legal deficiency	Would be overturned	Stadstis, of which with deficiency
HB23, escort § 97	2023 / April 2024 / latest 2019-20.12.2022; some later substitutes	385 / 98	198/385	180 / 385, total; no breakdown	205 / 385; derived 18 with deficiency
HB24B, additional expenditure children § 41	2024 / March 2025 / latest before 6.10.2023; some subsequent replacements	385 / 98	193/385	175/385 = 170 remitted for reconsideration + 5 amended	210 / 385; derived 18 with deficiency

Code / area	Barometer / Release / selection of decisions;	Case / k omune r	Legal deficiency	Would be overturned	Stadstis, of which with deficiency
HB24V, additional costs for adults § 100	2024 / March 2025 / latest before 1.12.2023; some subsequent replacements	385 / 97	50/385	39/385 = 33 remitted for reconsideration + 5 amended + 1 annulled	346 / 385; derived 11 with deficiency
HB25, lost earnings § 87	2025 / 2025 / latest around 6.7.2024; 11 later decisions	385 / 98	206/385	186/385 = 151 to be remitted + 29 amended + 6 annulled	199 / 385; derived 20 with deficiency

The derived numerators in the last column are deficiency counts minus overturning counts. In HB25, 206 is also 385 minus 179 without deficiencies in table 3.1. A full machine-readable record of the checked component figures is in handicapsagsbarometre-2023-2025.json.

Control Point	HB23	HB24B	HB24V	HB25
Insufficient information; substantial part in brackets	165/385 (162)	155/385 (150)	32/385 (26)	157/385 (157)
Absence of justification; substantial part	21/92 (18)	69/283 (57)	16/310 (7)	85/250 (67)
Wrong assessment; substantial part	91/385 (90)	17/385 (9)	18/385 (14)	14/385 (13)
Estimates under rule; major part	1/385 (0)	6/385 (4)	5/385 (1)	1/385 (1)
Absence of residence; substantial part	27/385 (16)	29/385 (22)	6 / 385 (not exact number here)	33/385 (32)
Party consultation deficit	0/385	12 / 385 (9 essential)	0/385	1 / 385 (0 significant)
Forecast / measurable cases	101/313	102/220	114/222	122/255
Average exceedance	11,5 weeks	13 weeks	20 weeks	10,5 weeks
Without a new deadline for exceeding	does not exactly count registered	89/220	83/222	107/255
Complaint guidance missing / required	7/92	18/283	1/308	6/249
Insufficient guidance given	27 / 92 also includes 7 missing persons.	18/265	0/307	49/243
Overall assessment missing / can be assessed	157 / 299; 86 unknown by 385	40 / 385; 15 unknown	5 / 385; 56 unknown	12 / 385; 3 unknown

HB23:293 awards, 92 full/partial refusals; appealed decisions excluded. 14 municipalities had no suitable refusal that had not been appealed. Excluded decisions lacked decision documentation, were outside the period or had been appealed; the number is not stated. Additional request 15-20 %. Action plan:58 offered, 26 not offered among 84 assessable award cases; 227 of 311 unknown. Locator:pp. 4-8, 10-19, 21-23.

HB24B: 102 full awards, 218 full/partial refusals/awards, 65 mixed partial decisions. Appealed cases concerning the same additional expense and repayment cases excluded; exclusion count not stated. Extra 15-20 %. Deadline: 123 irrelevant, 42 unknown. Six cases could give rise to supervision; three from the same municipality led to one referral. Locator: pp. 6-12, 15-21, 24-33. The deadline-overrun heading »two out of three« on p. 25 does not match 102/220 on p. 27.

HB24V: 75 full appropriations, 193 total / partial refusals / appropriations, 117 mixed; one municipality without available cases. Appeals against the same additional expenditure are excluded, previous complaints may be made; number not disclosed. Deadline: 134 irrelevant, 29 unknown. Three cases from one municipality led to supervisory contact. Locator: p. 6-12, 14-18, 23-33. The 2025 file name is not the barometric year.

HB25: 135 full appropriations, 143 full refusals, 107 partial. 80 excluded: after the cut-off date, appealed or without a proper decision; causation not disclosed. The same alleged facts are excluded, previous complaints about other permitted. 102 follow-up; 28 unknown deadlines. 317 decided after 1.4.2024. Child involvement, descriptive measurement: 109 direct, 47 indirect, 194 none, 2 unknown / 352. This is not registered as 194 breaches of law. Party consultation provided that the documents did not show otherwise. Locator: p. 11-17, 38-50, 52-61.

Independent method assessment

The publication does not indicate a CPR-based register that can link case measurements to unique children, parents and adults across the reports. Deficiencies in one decision must also not be added together as multiple cases of error. Measurements shall be subject to submission of documentation. The Board of Appeal's statement on generalisability must be tested against the selection, distribution and separation of municipalities; the national error rates of the reports are not a total count.

Required additional extraction from Ankestyrelsen: all cases submitted and withdrawn by report and cause, anonymous decision and person keys, the outcome matrix, all subtabular counters, and the municipal measurement plan. The municipalities are the registries authority for the total population of their decisions; HB25 p. 52 documents the absence of a common national database and the lack of access of the Appeal Board to municipal professional systems.

Use of force 2018: the practice review's actual population

The original's preface, method and Table 1 are checked; Table 1 also visually. 46 interviews in seven municipalities, completed 2017. 15 preliminary interviews concern § 129: 9, § 125: 5, § 126 a: 2, § 126: 1, § 127: 4; categories overlap. The municipalities chose care centres / accommodation and facilitated contact with relatives. [PTMAGT18, PDF3-4 / 62-65]

Municipality	Management	Head care	Residential manager	Employee care	Employee other services;	Pears
Aalborg	4	0	2	0	3	3
Ballerup	3	1	1	2	3	3
Hillerød	4	2	2	3	2	4
Holbæk	4	2	0	2	0	0
Cold	5	2	1	3	3	3
Medium speed	5	2	1	4	3	1
Rudersdal	4	1	1	3	3	1

Table 1 indicates the number of participants, not the number of interviews or documented unique persons. The own sum is 96; role columns 29 / 10 / 8 / 17 / 17 / 15. Zero reproduces the dash of the table, not the absence of the problem. [PTMAGT18, PDF63 / print61]

The source describes locked exits with a single lift that not all residents can operate and the use of monitoring sensors; it fails to make a legal decision on the legality of each practice description. There is no public fault counter here. [PTMAGT18, PDF23-27]

Own analysis: It is concrete descriptions that require investigations into freedom interventions, consent and legal basis. The descriptive form of the report is not evidence of legality. Each course must be documented by the original report, decision, consent review, duration and access to the site; the number of interviews cannot be used as the number of illegal detention exercises. A separate control of public / private operations and responsible employees is required. The Ministry's subsequent service review is a source of its own, which is not counted as a new population of 46 interviews.

K05 remaining work: publication of the 2019 pilot barometer is documented, but the full original has not yet been located on the current public website. Its 228 cases cannot be replaced by the 2020 report’s 735 cases or the 2022 compilation’s 2140.2019 figures reproduced by Børns Vilkår remain secondary until checked against the original. There is not yet evidence that the practice-check list is exhaustive.

Use of force 2018: full verification against originals and safeguard problems

MAG18F. All 85 pages actually read in memory. 5 number / method blocks / 67 rows. PDF63 and 66- 85 visually read.

Limitation

46 interviews, seven selected municipalities, 15 interviews with relatives. A descriptive survey without a lawfulness assessment. Statutory-provision groups overlap. Municipalities provide contact with institutions/relatives. Figures measure interviews/participation/statements; no national error rate or union of persons. The methodology period is the 2nd+3rd quarter of 2017; the summary's 2nd quarter is retained separately.

M1: Method and demarcation

MAG18F PDF62-65; mentions 46; unit interviews. Descriptive; no quality / legality assessment. Municipality selection geographical / technological variation; administration selects institutions and communicates relatives. Selective transcription; quotes edited; institutions anonymised.

Measurement	Figures	N / unit
Municipalities	7	selectively selected
Interviews	46	Group / Single Interviews
Early interviews	15	interviews;
§ 129	9	15
§ 125	5	15
§ 126 a	2	15
§ 126	1	15
§ 127	4	15
Paragraftalker, sum	21	overlap; not 21 persons
Management groups	3-5	informants per group,
Data collection	2. + 3rd quarter 2017	PDF62; Summary 2nd quarter

T1: All original municipal cells, visually read

MAG18F PDF63; mentions 7; unit participants in role groups. No number of interviews or citizens concerned. The pear deceller sums up 16; method PDF64 indicates 15 interviews. Participants → interviews; no automatic error correction or personal union.

Municipality	Management	Head nursing centre;	Residential manager	Employee nursing centre;	Employee other services;	Pears
Aalborg	4	-	2	-	3	3
Ballerup	3	1	1	2	3	3
Hillerød	4	2	2	3	2	4
Holbæk	4	2	-	2	-	-
Cold	5	2	1	3	3	3
Medium speed	5	2	1	4	3	1
Rudersdal	4	1	1	3	3	1

I1: All interview guides: instrument structure

MAG18F PDF66-85; denominator 4; unit interview instruments. All 20 raster-annex pages 66-85 actually read visually in memory. Question numbers are not observed events. Follow-up, registration, consent and alternatives are asked about; some table lines in the original touch the right border.

Guide	Question Numbers	PDF	Selection branch
Management	1-21	66-69	§ 126 / 126 a / 127 / 128 only if the informant himself mentions
Management	1-40	70-74	Maintenance / retention / belt only if self-mentioned
Employees	1-34	75-80	Technology / movement if conductor indicates use; other interventions if self-mentioned
Pears	1-49	80-85	Movement / technology / retention / hygiene / belts

Q1: All concrete speech / time statements in qualitative findings

MAG18F PDF13-60; denominator unknown; unit qualitative statements with various local denominators. No national time series, law breaker or transversal personal union. Time / population statements may overlap.

PDF	Measurement	Value	Unit / status
13	Preventive day offers	2	offers; statements
16	Visitor waiting time	6-8	months; statements
16	Other waiting period	4	months; statements
16	Subsequent § 129	2	months; statements
16	Home care before reloading	14	days; statements
17	Empty accommodation	2-3	months; statements
17	Daughter as a guardian process	6	months; statements
18	Preventive planning	6	months; statements
18	Spouse became guardian	2	years before interview
19	Needs example	24	hours / day; hypothetical
20	Uncompleted process of peers	18-24	months; statements
22	Planned renovation relocation	29	citizens; not 29 illegal movements;
22	Planned date of relocation	1 January	years not necessary specified
25	Residential offers with sensor mentioned	1	offers
27	Baby alarm centres	2	centres; one example of disease each;
28	Reassessment example	3	years; normative illustration
31	Conflict between residents	2	citizens; statements
33	Partition example	6	residents
33	Remaining staff conditions	1:5	in the case of individual escorts;
33	Wanted coverage	7-19	time; wish
35	GPS Error	1	km; statements
36	Alarm capacity	5-6	wish; 10 too many

PDF	Measurement	Value	Unit / status
37	GPS Decision	3-4	months; statements not examined in detail
37	Vapour warning device	1	years after moving; statements
38	Alarm citizens in example	3	citizens
38	Repeated alarm clearance	8	months; local statements
47	Historical categories of hygiene	7	Box; non-occurrence;
51	Sanitary period	3→6	months; historical rule
52	Development of skills	9-12	months; statements
52	Proposed longer time	1-2	year; wish
53	Evening leveling	3→2	employees; statements
54	Approval of detention	14	days; local statements
55	Admissions before the decision on the belt	2	events; statements
56	Deleting periods	3/6/9	months; wish
56	Review	1	years; statements
60	Discussion cycle	2	actions; non-deductive case register;

B1: Compact original statements on guarantees

MAG18F PDF10-58; denominator unknown; unit qualitative observations. Not independently tested case files or criminal convictions; no reported national crime share.

PDF	Determined control findings	Certificate status
10	§ 129knowledge inadequate in two administrations; responsibility unallocated one year	Interview statements
12	First hand signature despite capacity failure	Interview statements
13	Consent accepted despite lack of understanding	Employee statements
30	Locks locked with recognized rule problem	Employee statements
39-40	Non-registered assets	Employee statements
44	Returning is referred to as illegal	Employee statements
46	Management proposes action without legal approval	Employee statements
49	Illegal action and non-reporting are referred to directly;	Employee statements
58	Child-like development is used in the desire for increased coercion	Interview statements; non-legal consent

Own evidence and impact assessment

The limited investigative method is not a defence of the actions the informants describe. When employees themselves discuss unlawful action, inadequate consent or missing registration, this is specific documentation that such problems were put before a State oversight authority. It supports a sustainable demand to investigate the underlying actions and the authorities' subsequent response. It does not on its own provide a precise national scope or evidence of a particular employee's criminal culpability.

The strongest documented criticism is the difference between known risk and lack of concrete response accounts. A consent based on a led hand or a lack of understanding shall be tested for effective decision-making and voluntary. Care needs do not replace the legal basis for freedom intervention. Technology can both limit freedom and make movement possible; its actual use must therefore be tested individually. Failure to register may, at the same time, prevent complaints, independent checks and subsequent documentation of the duration of the action.

Each claim should be linked to the original file, consent assessment, decision, registration, activation and possible complaint. The requirements are the cessation of illegal interference, effective participation, necessary less intrusive alternatives, independent investigation and appropriate repair. The trajectories cannot be deduced without the anonymised coupling keys and underlying acts. Suspicion of unregistered interventions, repetition after 2018 and lack of responsibility require precisely these concrete evidence.

All known readable pages and instrument attachments in this original have been reviewed. The remains are individual acts, full recordings / notes, switching keys and actual reaction / follow-up; no known unread table page stands as completed. Historical rule boxes are not reproduced as applicable 2026 law.

Source

MAG18F — Ankestyrelsen March 2018, main report and annex. SHA256: c440304ce7c9071dcfbff1b8c691d54634dbb260a0d0d42371e39b211385409b.

Task Force 2012- 2024: the central forerunner list and report coverage check

The official list contains 43 courses of 42 municipal names; Odense is divided into two administrations. Parentheses are expected dates on 7.5.2024, not completed. The PDF text has been read; available image control is still being sought. The list is a search base, not a substitute for the content of the analysis and final reports.

No	Local authority / administration	Start, original	End original	PDF Page	Material document control in this project
1	Rebild	2012	2014	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
2	Esbjerg	2012	2014	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
3	Corner	2013	2015	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
4	Rhinoceros	2013	2015	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
5	Aabenra	2013	2015	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
6	Ringsted	2014	2016	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
7	Norddjurs	2014	2017	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
8	Ballerup	2015	2017	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
9	Vejle	2015	2017	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
10	Randers	2015	2017	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
11	Ikast-Brand	2015	2017	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
12	Peas (without pods)	2016	2018	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought

No	Local authority / administration	Start, original	End original	PDF Page	Material document control in this project
13	Nyborg	2016	2018	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
14	Glostrup	2017	2019	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
15	Oats	2017	2019	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
16	Faaborg-Midtfyn	2017	2020	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
17	Copenhagen	2017	2020	1	taskforce -materialcontrol.md
18	Svendborg	2017	2019	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
19	Morsø	2018	2021	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
20	Stevns	2018	2020	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
21	Product	2018	2020	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
22	Disc	2019	2021	1	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
23	Frederikssund	2019	2021	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
24	Sønderborg	2019	2020	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
25	Medium speed	2019	2022	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
26	Odense 1	2020	2022	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
27	Nordfyn	2020	2022	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
28	Slaughter	2020	2022	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
29	Frederiksberg	2020	2023	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
30	Jammerbug	2020	2023	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
31	Odsherd	2021	2023	2	taskforce -materialcontrol.md
32	Fredericia	2021	2023	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
33	Sunred	2021	2024	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
34	Odense 2	2022	2024	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
35	Golden Borgsund	2022	2024	2	taskforce -goldborgsun2022.md

No	Local authority / administration	Start, original	End original	PDF Page	Material document control in this project
36	Road	2022	(2024)	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
37	Langeland	2022	(2025)	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
38	Tower	2023	(2025)	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
39	Næstved	2023	(2025)	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
40	Rudersdal	2023	(2026)	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
41	Herning	2024	(2026)	2	Primary analytical / final reports are sought
42	Sorø	(2024)	(2026)	2	taskforce -materialcontrol.md
43	Fax	(2024)	(2026/2027)	2	taskforce-fakate2025.md

Odense 1: Centre for Families and Young People and the Youth Advisory Service of the Employment and Social Services. Odense 2: Children and Family Counselling under the Children's and Youth Administration. Egedal's disability and other disability courses belong to another scheme and may not be required to fit in with this list. 43

Award rows 2012-2024

Year	Social / Housing Manager ed	Ankestyrelsen	Reinforcing, Board of Directors	Strengthening, Ankestyrelsen	Total, million DKK
2012	1	1	Not specified	Not specified	2
2013	2,3	1,9	Not specified	Not specified	4,2
2014	2,3	1,9	Not specified	Not specified	4,2
2015	2,8	1,9	Not specified	Not specified	4,7
2016	2,8	1,9	Not specified	Not specified	4,7
2017	2,8	1,9	Not specified	Not specified	4,7
2018	2,8	1,9	Not specified	Not specified	4,7
2019	2,8	1,9	Not specified	Not specified	4,7
2020	2,8	1,9	Not specified	Not specified	4,7
2021	2,8	1,9	Not specified	Not specified	4,7
2022	2,8	1,9	1,2	0,3	6,2
2023	2,8	1,9	1,7	0,3	6,7
2024	2,8	1,9	1,7	0,3	6,7

The source's amount is the initial appropriations without price / wage adjustment. Some appropriations cover other expenditure; therefore, the sum is not evidence of the actual accounting consumption of the task force. Strengthening the means of Ankestyrelsen is awarded via the Board of Directors. Empty fields are maintained as not specified.

Original versions not harmonised

Measure	Original 2018	Original 2024	Consequences for the financial statements
Annual financing	4,5 million DKK in ministerial replies 6.12.2018, page 1	Table 1 gives 4,7 million DKK for 2018	Different declarations of authority; no tacit correction
New trajectories 2018	Morsø, Sønderborg, Varde and Skive, page 2	Sønderborg and Skive have started 2019; Morsø / Varde 2018	Original delimitation / version breach; registration of undertakings cannot be assumed to be effective start
Fax	Not on the 2018 list	Expected start 2024	The read Faxe 2025 original describes the deferral until March 2025; the anticipated year is not the year of implementation

Independent coverage analysis and necessary data request

The central list makes a proven difference between identified progress and actually read reports possible. A start in 2012 does not prove an analytical report dated 2012; an end in 2024 does not prove that the children concerned actually received help, came home or received compensation. Each course shall be balanced against analysis, mid-term status, final measurement and follow-up.

Social and Housing Authority and Ankestyrelsen shall provide the list updated by 7.10.2026, all analytical / final report titles, publication addresses, phase / data periods and anonymised selection accounts. Concrete municipalities must provide restoration programmes. A lack of a central publication link does not prove that the municipality's original does not exist.

Task Force: historical children's courses 2012- 2018, first 13 municipalities

Randers 2015 (72 pages) and Ikast-Brand 2015 (79 pages) are fully text controlled in RAM with separate visual control of the key figures. To this end, five related municipal primary sources have actually been read: Ringstedpressen 2014, Nyborgskab notat 2023, Ballerup 2017's children's section, Vejlebudget 2019's 4-sided children's section and Vejlekning 2016's family section. The 13 series individual original searches and exact original / personal remains are aligned at the bottom. Related sources have not been implicitly replaced with the missing Task Force reports.

Randers 12.11.2015 [TFRAN15]

Original report, public copy * 72 pp. · SHA256 cdf024cb1d6ebd1d9424038fb3aed302fbd89952670f49dea211a558cc2cd4b8.

20 legal cases:14 section 52 decisions,3 section 11 cases,3 safeguarding-notification cases; VISO5 is a subsample,6 interviewed children are separate. The municipality selected backwards before 15.4.2015, decisions from the most recent year and cases where it was the responsible municipality; cases already appealed/examined by Ankestyrelsen, including section 65, were excluded. Physical disability alone excluded. The same child may have several decisions; the latest/most intrusive is measured. Case trajectories are examined for the latest 2 years (PDF67-68).

Original deviation: PDF59 indicates the 12 / 20 course of criticism, PDF64 text of bread / Table 3.1 indicates 14 / 20. Both are preserved; 14 are visually confirmed. The deficiency tables overlap and shall not be added together to persons.

Table 2.1: shortcomings in the latest decision

PDF60; Unit: cases. 14 recent § 52 decisions; deficiencies overlap.

Deficiency	Co-deficiency	Sole deficiency
Article 50 is missing	2	0
§ 50 supplement deficiencies	6	0
§ 50 over 4 months	4	0
§ 50 content	3	0
Action plan deficiencies	7	0

Deficiency	Co-deficiency	Sole deficiency
Action plan content	3	0
Action plan after decision	5	0
Child amnesia	8	0
Absence of consent	5	0
Legal requirements not met	13	-
Legal requirements	1	-

§ 50 Status

PDF61; Unit: cases. Rander's 20-case legal sample.

Status	Number	Denomination
Study / supplement available	6	14
Investigation / Complementary Deficiencies	8	14
Content satisfactory	3	6
This is a very important point.	1	6
Here's some degree.	2	6
Content insufficient	3	6
No reasoned position on intervention	2	6

Exceeding the 4-month time limit

PDF61; unit: months. 4 studies; additional time beyond the legal deadline.

Case	Extras
1	1
2	1,5
3	4
4	22

Action plan content

PDF62; Unit: cases. Rander's 20-case legal sample.

Status	Number	Denomination
Satisfactory	4	7
This is a very important point.	1	7
Here's some degree.	3	7
Insufficient	3	7

Children's conversation

PDF62; Unit: cases. Rander's 20-case legal sample.

Status	Number	Denomination
Crawled	5	14
Unborn; relevant exception	1	14
Not met	8	14
No conversation.	5	14
Of these, not concerning the proposed intervention	3	14

Consent

PDF63; Unit: cases. Rander's 20-case legal sample.

Status	Number	Denomination
All documented	9	14
Lack of documentation	5	14
Of which 15 + day of placement	1	14
Of these, the other parent with parental responsibility	2	14

Other cases

PDF63; Unit: cases. Rander's 20-case legal sample.

Type	Criticism	Denomination
§ 11 Burdegarden § 50	2	3
§ 11 no § 50 basis	1	3
Notification should have led to § 50	3	3

Table 3.1: Overall cycle

PDF64; Unit: cases. 20 cases, separate review from the late decision; PDF59 has 12 / 20.

Criticism	Number
Repeated breach of the law	2
Response to a notification	1
Inability / non-effectiveness	2
Missing professional assessment	9
Original table sum	14

Table 6.1: Type of case

PDF67; Unit: cases. Rander's 20-case legal sample.

Type of action	Number
Installation	5
Family treatment	3
Relief	3
Contact person	3
§ 11 consultancy services	3
Concern report without intervention	3
Total	20

Table 7.1: versing

PDF69; Unit: cases. Rander's 20-case legal sample.

Year	Number
0	6
1-2	9
3-4	3
Exceeding 5	2
Total	20

Table 7.2: Age

PDF69; Unit: cases. Rander's 20-case legal sample.

Year	Number
0-3	2
4-7	2
8-14	13
15-17	3
Total	20

Interview Committee

PDF70; unit: interviewed children. 6 children 12-17 ½ years; separate interview population.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Girls	4	6
Boys	2	6
Morved conversation	2	6
Frequent changes of caseworker	4	6
Good contact	2	6
Family Adviser	1	6

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Family Consultant + Relief	1	6
MST	1	6
Family care	1	6
Institution	2	6

Interview outage

PDF71; Unit: Interviewed children. Rander's 20-case legal sample.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Person in care; informed decision	2	3
Placed person not involved in choosing the placement	1	3
Does not recall involvement under section 50	6	6
Opts out of a follow-up meeting	2	6
Unfamiliar with the rights of those in care	2	3

VISODIC

PDF65; Unit: cases. 5 out of 20 cases; children 4 to 15; not new 5 cases.

Type of action	Number
No effort	1
§ 11	1
Family treatment	1
Contact person	1
Installation	1

VISO Study

PDF66; Unit: cases. 5 of 20; last 2 action plans about 1 ½ months after the decision.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
§ 50 available	3	5
Article 50	5	5
Material actively used	2	3
Action plan not before the decision	2	3

Local population sample

PDF53; unit: mixed original populations. Local figures; DSTlevel caen third is disputed by the municipality; types overlapping, not error population.

Unit	2013	2014
Prevention for children/young people, municipal count	848	978
Discharge	123	119
Practical CPR	3	5
Contact children / young people / families	249	300
§ 11 Cases	63	179

Other explicit time / population cells

PDF [49, 50, 51, 55, 56]; unit: designated sample. Local reports without sick persons' families; work of a seasonal nature; not national fault persons.

Relationship	Figures	Unit
Average per social worker 2013	52	cases
Average per social worker, spring 2015	35	cases
Full-year equivalents of measures, foster care 2014	156	year work;
Share of family care 2014	70	%
Family Pledge 2017	58	%
Network share 2014	5	%
Networks 2017	12	%
Ownership share 2014	5	%
Own room size 2017	14	%
Placement outside the municipality 2013	25	ca.%
Not § 50 rettidigFeb 2013	10	over-%
Not § 50 timely 2015	2	%

Consequences, causality and restoration

PDF63 describes a placement decision concerning a young person over 15 without informed consent; the mother’s subsequent email does not replace the young person’s consent. This is a specific legal-authority/consent issue in the case examined. The report does not state a compulsory decision, duration of intervention or actual return home for that case.

PDF65-67 describes the closure of the VISA Committee despite untreated notifications, repeated case-handling changes, up to 2 months of meeting waiting and a lack of investigation of violence / abuse. PDF72 reflects a young person's experience that late help contributed to later placement; it is the youth's causality statement, not an independently clarified individual causality assessment.

Own personal analysis: The 20 cases, 14 decisions, 5VISO and 6 interviews are different / overlapping units. No key for dedup between them is published; one unborn child is included in the decision-making committee. The percentage of errors cannot be multiplied by the population of children or the population of appropriations in the municipality. No registered individual restoration, repatriation or reunification is apparent from this baseline extraction.

Precise residues

- Case keys / personal dedup between legal sample, VISO and interviews not published
- Baseline analysis does not actually indicate individual resumption / return / reunification / replacement

• Randers key number figures without precise point labels: original back data required for exact graph cells

• Review / Final Report 2017 not yet obtained

Further discrepancy in the Randers original: Action plan only after the decision: PDF30/60 states 5 of 7, PDF61 states 4 of 7. Both original values are retained. Main text PDF24 calls the interview group 6 children in care, while methodology/detail PDF69-71 describes 6 interviewees, including 3 in care; the interview population is not homogenised.

Ikast-Brand 22.6.2015 [TSEK15]

Municipal original in a public archive ·79 pages ·SHA256 c5e134333558db447a8ffb23921f22da16ba52bfb9f6143f896cfcdc0be84867.

The sample is 20 cases, actually 14 under § 52/2 under § 11/4 concern reports. Overview PDF61 has 14/3/3, while detail/measurement PDF66-67/72-73 has 14/2/4. Most recent/most intrusive decision; the process is examined for the most recent year. Cut-off 1.11.2014; appealed/AS § 65 excluded. PDF73 specifically states 2 already appealed cases, 2 sibling cases in which only the oldest is measured, 2 cases opened after the cut-off and 1 decision after the cut-off; replacement cases are submitted, count not stated. These exclusion categories must not be assumed to be disjoint.

Table 1.1: overlap and overall criticism

PDF61; Unit: cases. Legal 20 cases.

Outcome	Number
No criticism	6
Union with criticism	14
Only last decision	6
Both decision and progress	4
Only further progress	4
All	20

Table 2.1: Decision deficiencies

PDF63; Unit: cases. 14 § 52 decisions; deficiencies overlap.

Deficiency	Number	Sole deficiency
§ 50 supplement missing	4	2
Children's conversation	4	0
§ 50 over 4 months	3	1
§ 50 content	2	0
Action plan after decision	2	1
Action plan content	2	0
Article 50 is missing	1	0
Decision with deficiency	10	-
Decision without deficiency	4	-
Total decisions	14	-

§ 50 Status

PDF63; Unit: cases. Legal 20 cases.

Status	Number	Denomination
Study / supplement available	8	14
Lack of investigation / supplement	5	14
Acute pre-examination effort	1	14
Content satisfactory	6	8
Of which some degree	6	8
Insufficient content	2	8

Assessment delay

PDF64; Unit: months. The original's 3 temptations; total time 4 + exceedance matches the original 7-17 months.

Case	Overrun	Total time
1	3	7
2	11	15
3	13	17

Action plan

PDF64; Unit: cases. 2 delayed every 2 ½ weeks after a decision.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Available	14	14
Only after a decision	2	14
Content satisfactory	12	14
Of which high	5	14
Of which some degree	7	14
Insufficient content	2	14

Children's conversation

PDF65; Unit: cases. Legal 20 cases.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Accompanied	8	14
Relevant omission	2	14
Requirements not met	4	14
Of which no interview	2	14
Of which not on action	2	14

Consent

PDF66; Unit: cases. Legal 20 cases.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Collection	13	14
Decision by the Presidency without consent	1	14

Other actual cases

PDF66; Unit: cases. See PDF61 version 3 + 3 versus actual 2 + 4; a short case 1 ½ month should be reported / child interview, second 3 days.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
§ 11 in fact	2	20
§ 11 try not need § 50	2	2
Notifications	4	20
Of which current § 50	1	4
Of which should be supplemented	1	4
No § 50 but agree	2	4

Parental involvement

PDF67; Unit: cases. Legal 20 cases.

Grade	Number	Denomination
High / Some	16	20
Rings	3	20
None	1	20

Child involvement

PDF68; Unit: cases. Legal 20 cases.

Grade	Number	Denomination
High / Some	7	20
Rings / none	9	20
Not applicable	4	20

Table 3.1: progress

PDF68; Unit: cases. Progress later years; overlap 4 with 10 decision errors see Table 1.1.

Criticism	Number
Professional assessment	6
Repeated offence	1

Criticism	Number
Response to a notification	1
Union criticism	8

Table 6.1: actual case type

PDF72; Unit: cases. Legal 20 cases.

Type	Number
Installation	6
Family treatment	3
Relief	2
Contact person	3
§ 11	2
Informing without effort	4
All	20

Table 7.1: versing

PDF75; Unit: cases. A case of 11 years and 9 years, not equal to documented error / placement duration.

Year	Number
0	5
1-2	7
3-4	3
Exceeding 5	5
All	20

Table 7.2: Age

PDF75; Unit: cases. Legal 20 cases.

Year	Number
0-3	3
4-7	3
8-14	6
15-17	8
All	20

VISO Sub-Committee

PDF69; Unit: cases. 5 of 20, case numbers 2 / 4 / 9 / 14 / 20; age 2-17 years.

Type	Number
Network location	2
Contact person	1
Family treatment	1
Home supervision without § 52 / § 11	1

VISO Basis

PDF70; Unit: cases. PDF71: Both placement cases § 54 person assisted and work against possible return / contact; no actual return registered.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
§ 50 at some point	5	5
§ 50 on the current measure	1	5
§ 50 on current supervisory decision	1	5
Other not on current measures	3	5
Current action plan in the decision-making process	4	4
Parental action plan in place	2	2

Interview Group

PDF76; unit: interviewing children. 6 children aged 12-17; separately from 20 trials.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Girls	5	6
Boy	1	6
Placed	3	6
Preventive	3	6
Positive continuous contact	4	6
Less positive contact placed	2	6
By how to obtain contact	3	6
Unknown number but can obtain	2	6

Interview outage

PDF77; unit: interviewing children. An ordered follow-up every 6 weeks without solo conversation; not representative national persons.

Relationship	Number	Denomination
No experienced § 50 involvement	6	6
Enlightened bet before start	4	6
Missing explanation for acute placement	2	6

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Very New Bet	3	6
Systematic follow up	2	6
Only a conversation after about 8 months	1	6
Conversation alone	2	6
Know the three-house method	2	6
Child conversation positive	5	6
Know Action Plan	4	6
Form of action plan	2	6
Unknown Action Plan	2	6
Undisclosed age rights	6	6

Own-initiative vote:10 decision errors + 8 preliminary criticism − 4 overlap = 14 criticized cases; 6 without criticism. It is an actual published case union, not 14 unique children / parents. VISO5 is a subcommittee; 6 interviewing children have not published the coupling key to the trial.

Consequences and redress: PDF69-72 describes records under the mother's CPR/shared sibling records that conceal the individual child's information, and changed interventions without an updated assessment. PDF71 states work towards return home/contact in 2 placement cases, but no actual return home, reunification date or compensation. PDF77 reproduces 2 placed children's lack of understandable reasons and 1 child's first follow-up interview after approximately 8 months; these are interview statements, not durations verified against case records for all placed children.

Concrete residues: PDF1-79 is now text read. Final 2017 report, underlying graph data, individual repair and dedup required separately.

Ikast-Brand, local original conflict: PDF28 calls the two late action plans urgent cases without any pre-decision requirement. Legal Table PDF63 at the same time counts two late plans as missing, of which one is missing. PDF64 indicates 2 ½ weeks waiting time. Both statements are maintained; the material does not explain the conflict.

Additional Material Information: Ikast-Fire [TTEK15]

Source

Key figures: population and administrative units · PDF47 · Mixed units

PDF30 / 38 / 40 / 47 / 50; family cases are registered at Mom's CPR, not unique children. Oversight 26 is a population other than the legal test.

Year / ratio	Figures	Unit
Population 1.1.2015	40598	persons
Children under 18 end 2014	9312	persons
Children under 18 2007	24,5	percentage of inhabitants
Children under 18 2014	23	percentage of inhabitants
Oversight 2011	26	young
Youth team	7	staff
Family cases per case handler approx. 2009- 2013	35	family cases;
Management Payout Sample Monthly	5	%

Year / ratio	Figures	Unit
College supervision annually	2	times
Mentoring period for new employees	5	months

Development of notification and prevention · PDF49 · development percentage

PDF49/53; no back-calculated counts. Municipal contact-person statistics 2012/2013 are less than half the DST register figures; both version populations are retained

Period / ratio	Amendment	Unit
Notifications 2009-2012	143	% increase
Notifications 2012-2013	-20	%
Notifications by individuals 2012-2013	-47	%
Notifications by other regulatory groups 2012-2013	9	%
Implemented prevention 2010-2013	-41	%
Country traineeships / reference 2013	85	%

Placement and termination: published limited figures · PDF55 · Mixed units

PDF54-57. Return and termination are combined; zero forced decisions 2013 are register information, not the absence of unlawful interference. The original's municipal / ASTM stock is different

Relationship	Figures	Unit
Launched locations 2008-2013	4-14	Annual spread, not annual series
Network Care 2013 Municipality	13,6	%
Network Care 2013 country	7	%
Network Management 2013 reference	7,2	%
Decisions without consent 2013 AST	0	decisions
Decisions 2013 location before the municipality	17	%
Return and other termination 2013	20-25	percentage of places placed, depends on the denominator
Local population of employment 2010-2013	23	% increase
Oversight 2013 Contact person § 76.2	52	%
Oversight 2013 Contact person § 76.3.2	22	%

Economic governance decisions and version deviations · PDF58 · Mixed units

PDF58-60. Budget 2010 decided cheaper and shorter placements; no published individual effect. The municipality's statement on five years of budgetary compliance is locally contradicted by DST overruns 2008 / 2009

Relationship	Figures	Unit
Planned annual savings at least	1	%
Budget outturn 2008 DST	3	%
Budget overrun 2009 DST	5	%
Purchased saving 2011	2150000	DKK

Relationship	Figures	Unit
Further intentional saving 2012	2199000	DKK
Prevention share budget 2007	22	%
Preventive share budget 2014	40	%
Prevention share actual consumption 2007-2014 approx.	40	%
Daily institution price per full-year person 2008-2013	64	% increase

Additional Material Information: Ringsted [TFRIN14P]

Source

The municipality's own published test information • PDF1 cases

Press release 15.12.2014; not automatically 18 invalid decisions or 18 unique children. Committee handling 17.12.2014 scheduled at the time

Relationship	Number	Denomination
Cases examined	20	20
Cases with errors according to the municipality	18	20

Additional material information: Nyborg [TFNYB23N]

Source

Documented orientation and follow-up chain · PDF1 · Knowledge events

Two samples of 20 cases cannot total 40 unique children; the final survey uses a different selection. Missing redress figures are a specific gap in the public source chain

Date	Event / statement in the original note	Number / demarcation	PDF Page
2015-11-09	Political approval of the application	Task Force	1
2016-12-05	Committee receives analysis; insufficient BFU, quality and involvement	20 cases	1
2017-01-2018-08	Development period	20 calendar months concerned including start / end month, own calculation; not duration of person	1
2018-12-03	Management supervision: continued BFU- / Action Plan / Follow-up / Discussion errors	about 1 / 3 of the staff member dismissed	2
2019-01-15/16	Final results presented to politicians / employees	20 cases, new sample	2
2019-02-04	Committee receives final report: no increase in the number of wholly lawful section 52 cases	No precise error in the note	2
2019-08-12	New BFU- / Action Plan deadline; still inclusion / decision error	BFU1H 2020, Action Plan 2019-finished	3
2020-03-20	Administration provides information on the examination of placement cases	No countable repair result	3
2022-01-10	2019-2021 plan ends with persistent BFUs break	CaHALF DEPARTMENT; not specified	4
2022-11-30	Mid-2023 follow-up announced	According to the note, it was not given	4

Date	Event / statement in the original note	Number / demarcation	PDF Page
2023-01-04	Component presents directors; political presentation announced	According to the note not given	4

The above additional tables have separate populations. No economic development, closure of proceedings, return / other cessation or access problem has in itself been converted into several proven errors. Individual repair requires anonymised case keys, tried action dates and actual termination / release dates.

Visual graph control and Ballerup 2017 follow-up

Randers key figures PDF47-57 are visually read in RAM. PDF57 has 24 exactly printed label cells below; the line figures have no precise point labels. Ikast-BranddePDF48-59 is visually read; PDF55 has different original populations and two circles, both dated 2012.

Randers: GraphPDF57: accurately printed spending cells · original · PDF57 · 1.000 DKK net operating per 0-22 years

Visually read original labels; social reasons, not disability. Other line figures PDF47-57 without precise labels are not recalculated

Type of placement	Randers 2012	Randers 2014	6 cities 2012	6 cities 2014
Residential families	1,9	2,33	1,49	1,56
Network management	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,09
Location	1,0	0,54	0,91	0,83
Other	0,22	0,13	0,24	0,18
Daily institution	0,91	0,67	1,62	1,56
Secure institution	0,06	0,21	0,11	0,16

Ikast-Brande: GrafPDF55: both originally referred to as deployed locations 2012 · original · PDF55 ·%

Both original headings have 2012, source reference total AST / municipality; left / right is not tacitly redated. Right 0 is own reading of absent segment and sum 75 + 25 = 100, not printed 0 label

Age group	Left Circle	Right Circle
0 - 5 years	8	75
6 to 11 years	8	0
12 to 17 years	84	25

Ikast-Brand: GrafPDF55: age range planted · original · PDF55 ·%

The title is 0-23 years old. Age categories change; over the 18-category 2012 do not necessarily include 18-year-olds. Unhomogeneous carried over

Original category	2012	2013
0 - 6 years	23	24
7-12 years	18	28
13 to 17 years	34	non-autonomous 2013 category
More than 18 years	25	non-autonomous 2013 category
13 to 23 years	not separate 2012 category	48

Ballerup: Task Force follow-up and indeed other action information · original · PDF126 · Mixed units

No final test without any particularly critical conditions shall be coded to all legal requirements. Decrease 5 is not automatic return to parents; the offer to return to Ballerup 2018 is not registered actual reunion

Relationship	Number	Name / Unit
Final test with particularly critical conditions	0	cases; size of sample not specified;
Development period	2	year, not individual error duration
Targets achieved 2017: children moved down the strand	5	children / adolescents according to the accounting PDF13;

Ballerup: Table 4: units 31 December with original estimates · original · PDF131 · Action units, not unique children

* = original assumes 2017 equals 2016 because valid activity figures cannot be extracted. Own sum shows 1 unit deviation 2015 and 6 units 2017; original totals are retained. Several units may belong to the same child

Category	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preventive	140	136	133	133*
Preregriving	895	714	774	774
Intruder	145	146	145	145*
Support for young children / special	62	55	57	57*
Original total	1242	1052	1109	1115
Individual sum of printed categories	1242	1051	1109	1109

Ballerup: Table 3: Price per activity · original · PDF130 · 1.000 DKK

* pressure placement before 2017 cell and notePDF131: assumptions for unvalid activity figures; amount is not compensation or estimated loss by illegality

Category	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preventive	67	73	80	61
Preregriving	55	70	66	69
Intruder	571	664	678	633
Support for young children / special	364	419	434	434*

The ballerup source is the municipal accounts 2017, the children's section PDF124-131 and PDF13; not the original Task Force analysis / final report. The annual accounts indicate zero cases particularly open to criticism, but no tests or total legal errors. The absence of original target forms must therefore be obtained before further aggregate / person conclusion. The original total 1115 units 2017 and category sum 1109 are both retained.

Vejle: actually read municipal information [TFVEJ19B]

Original · Original municipal budget children's section; not Task Force analysis / final report

Family area: historical data and separate budgetary assumptions · PDF3 · PDF3-4 / Physical 55-56. Collaboration with Task Force and visitation introduced 2014 continues. Neither legal error tests, exclusions nor actual recoveries published here

Relationship	Figures	Population / status
Notifications 2014	858	notifications;

Relationship	Figures	Population / status
Notifications 2017	2002	notifications;
Arbitration / infringement cases 2014	1	average per week
Arbitration / infringement cases 2017	5-7	per week
Children with offers 2014- 2017	23	% increase
Preventive share budget 2013	28	%
Preventive share at the time of document	44	%, year not clearly stated
Budget base 2019	280	budget assumptions, not actual error population;
Institutional	24	percentage of budgetary assumptions,
Non-institutional	67	percentage of budgetary assumptions,
Network	9	percentage of budgetary assumptions,

Vejle: actually read municipal information [TFVEJ16R]

Original · Municipal annual report, relevant family sections alone

Area of family and regulatory framework · PDF24 · 2014 conversion plan and Task Force cooperation are specified as a management link. These economic figures are not legal counters or compensation for families.

Relationship	Figures	Unit
Net consumption 2016	9	DKK million
Money bags less consumption 2016	2	DKK million
Authority framework extra consumption 2016	11	DKK million
Authority Framework more consumption 2014	24	DKK million
Estimated annual economic improvement 2014- 2016	13	DKK million

Completed original search for this tranche: 13 individually identified residual tracks

This tranche provides two Task Force analyses read in full as text and five related municipal primary sources. An official press release, budget text or retrospective briefing is not an original legal measurement. Public addresses'404 responses, timeouts or empty archive filters are specific availability status; they do not prove that the authority never published the report.

No	Kommun e / progress	Actual control	Public track tested	Specific absence of original
1	Rebild 20 12-2014	No Task Force original provided	tracks: Accurate 2014 status address and nearest archive replay gave 404; acccdX gave timeout, availability 503. No disqualification from publication.	Status Report 21.8.2014, Preliminary 2012 analysis and legal annexes, final target forms
2	Esbjerg 2 012-2014	Only exact original tracks, non-autonomous original reading	tracks: Index 27 pages of text copy has original title and 26.10.2012; HTML download 403, web opening inaccessible, archive copy not retrievable. CDX esbjerg.dk 25 matches concern other areas.	Task Force analysis 26.10.2012 and end 2014, legal measurement forms and exclusion list; title of text copy misnamed

No	Kommun e / progress	Actual control	Public track tested	Specific absence of original
3	Corner 2 013-2015	Original residue by municipal / archive tracks	tracks: Precise searches analysis report / Task Force 2013; municipal CDX task / analysis report gave no relevant child report. Social Annual Report 2014 bibliography identifies the Task Force 2013 but not retrievable original. Deloitte is a separate investigation.	Social Agency/Appeals Board Task Force report 2013 and final report 2015,not Deloitte 2013 alone
4	Hallnæs 2013-201 5	Original residue; development plan identified	tracks: Masterplan text tracks retrieval 403; municipal CDX29 matches were other master plans and no relevant 2013-2015 children's PDF. Report 19 / 20 is not original measurement here.	Analysis from end September 2013, master plan from 1.10.2013 and final report 2015 with legal annexes
5	Aabenraa 2013-201 5	Original residue after precise local / archive searches	routes: Municipal CDX task/analysis report,3 matches, no relevant original; precise site/title-year searches did not produce the report. A political article of 12.8.2014 mentions an analysis/development plan but is not the original measurement form.	Analysis early 2014 and development plan published by 12.8.2014, end 2015 and target / exclusion schedules
6	Ringsted 2014- 201 6	Municipal press original 15.12.2014 all 2 pages read; 18 / 20 cases with error	tracks: Presseoriginal actually 200PDF; kommunaltCDX relevant press address but not independent analysis report; precise track joint committee 17.12.2014.	Analysis published 15.12.2014, Joint Committee 17.12.2014 Annex and end 2016; 18 / 20 definition, exclusions and individual repair
7	Norddjurs 2014-201 7	Children's originals; disabled originals separated	tracks: KommunaltCDX46 matches; concrete 2017 originals are disability report 21.4.2017 and are not included as the children's course 2014- 2017. Precise children / exposed 2014- 2017 searches did not give birth originals.	Analysis 2014 / 2015 and end 2017 on children with disabilities, not disabled task force
8	Ballerup 2 015-2017	Accounting 2017 children's section read, end critical table 0 unknownN; original analysis / finish continued remainder	tracks: Three known agman PDF addresses 1270/783/1358 returned 404; migrated agenda address 404; availability 503/connection interruption. Current annual accounts for 2017 actually retrieved, PDF124-131 read.	Initial analysis 2015, final report June 2017 and precise legal / exclusion measurement forms; 7 / 20 from 1270 is index information only
9	Vejle 2015 - 2017	Budget 2019 children's section 4 pages as well as accounts 2016PDF24 read; no legal error table	routes: Strategy 2017 old URL unavailable; availability connection interrupted; budget 2019 retrievable web original, all 4 pages actually read; accounts 2016 relevant PDF24 read as web text.	Analysis 2015 referred to 23.3.2015 and end 2017 with legal / exclusion measurement forms; economy improvement not legal test
10	Randers 2 015-2017	Analysis 12.11.2015 all 72PDFpages text read; graph PDF47-57 / 64 visually read	tracks: Original copy actually downloaded 200PDF / hash; warranty tables and method read; 12 / 14 pre-race conflict and 5 / 4 late action plans retained.	End 2017, underlying unlabeled graph data, anonymous case / child coupling and actual repair / repatriation
11	Ikast-Bran de 2015-2 017	Analysis 22.6.2015 all 79PDFsider text read; graph PDF48-59 visually read	tracks: KommunalactuelURL404; archive id _ 404 men if _ actually 200PDF / hash. 14 / 20 Union and 14 / 3 / 3 against 14 / 2 / 4 maintained; exactly 2 appeals were reconsidered.	End 2017; table's 2 late action plans versus acute derogation PDF28; 2 graphs both 2012 clarified; exact unlabelled graph data and person repair
12	Tønder 20 16-2018	Original residue; precise policy processing chain identified	tracks: KendtTaskForce _ overall reportPDF404; CDXonly 2024HTML404 page; nearestarchive 2016 also 404. KommunalTV28.4.2016 paragraph 10 actually refers to DAPH290416.pdf, also 404; availability 503.	Analysis April 2016, KB28.4.2016 paragraph 10 + Annex DAPH290416.pdf and end 2018 as well as measurement / exclusion schedules

No	Kommun e / progress	Actual control	Public track tested	Specific absence of original
13	Nyborg 20 16-2018	Local knowledge note 13.12.2023 all 6 pages read; 2016 / 2018 original measurements missing	lead: memorandum from the original municipal sender, case S 2018-23721,but retrospective; contemporaneous annexes 5.12.2016/4.2.2019 not obtained. The newer tfh-lfb-nyborg concerns the disability area, not this child welfare process.	Analysis presented 5.12.2016 and final report presented 4.2.2019;20+20 samples, precise legal n/N, contemporaneous briefings and actual redress

Registry responsibility and specific document ordering: For each of the above series, the appropriate municipality is responsible for the child / family administration and political secretariat, as well as the Legal Task Force section and the archives of the National Social and Housing Authority. The order is the named analysis / final report with version date, legal measurement form, originally offered / replacement / excluded cases and grounds for exclusion. The personal and impact accounts require anonymised case key linked to the start of the decision / action, the date of correction, actual termination / return and any compensation. No external enquiries have been sent.

Task Force: four courses 2018- 2021, material originals

Four concrete Task Force-children courses Morsø, Varde, Skive and Sønderborg. Originals are only read in RAM; own facts, source identification and deviations are saved.

Actual reading status

- TFSON19A - Sønderborg: 61 / 61 physical PDFs pages read. Task Force Analysis Report, February 2019.
- TFSON20S - Sønderborg: 50 / 50 physical PDFs pages read. Task Force Status Report, October 2020.
- TFSKI20P - Disc: 12 / 12 physical PDFs pages read. Development plan, January 2020.
- TFSKI20K - Disc: 2 / 2 physical PDFs pages read. Municipal presentation 15.1.2020.
- TFSKI21K - Disc: 2 / 2 physical PDFs pages read. Presentation of the final report 12.5.2021.
- TFSKI19O - Disc: 1 / 1 physical PDFs pages read. Orientation point 14.8.2019.
- TFVAR21K - Varde: 2 / 2 physical PDFs pages read. Implementation status 21.9.2021.
- TFMOR20K - Morsø: 2/2 physical PDF pages read. Half-year status 21.10.2020.
- TFMOR21O - Morsø: 1 / 1 physical PDFs pages read. Estimation 21.4.2021.
- TFVAR19A - Varde: 61 / 61 physical PDFs pages read. Task Force Analysis Report, 12 April 2019.
- TFVAR20S - Varde: 43 / 43 physical PDFs pages read. Task Force Status Report, September 2020.
- TFMOR18A - Morsø: 59 / 59 physical PDFs pages read. Task Force Analysis Report, November 2018.

TFSON19A - Task Force Analysis Report, February 2019

Measurement period 1.8.2016-30.7.2018. Pending municipally selected cases concerning ages 0-17; not solely physical disability, responsible municipality for at least 1 year, no multiple cases from the same family. Already appealed/AST-processed or section 65-processed cases excluded. Physical PDF page equals printed page+1. VISO8 is a subset of AST20. Not a representative consolidated register of individuals.

Source: Task Force Analysis Report, February 2019; SHA-256 b1f5f758c93ea386ace463ac9c292fd99644b5645f13699e7bcb5fc9764132ef.

Actual sample - physical PDF page 32

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Current § 52decisions	13

Cell	Original number
Previous decision, follow-up only	4
Article 11 (3)	3
Total	20

Table 1: actual case type - physical PDF page 32

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Installation	5
Installation and follow-up	1
Family treatment	2
Relief	2
Contact person	3
Article 11 (3)	3
Follow-up only	4
Total	20

Table 2: Age - Physical PDFs page 32

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
0-3 years	4
4 to 7 years	1
8 to 14 years	13
15 to 17 years	2
Total	20

Table 3: overlapping decision gaps - physical PDF page 34

Unit: cases. Denomination: 13.

Cell	Original number
BFU missing	0
Current BFU update missing	5
BFU4 month deadline broken	3
Reasoned position missing	1
BFU / update not finished before decision	2
Action plan missing	0

Cell	Original number
Action plan not before decision	5
§ 48 conversation broken	8

Involvement - Physical PDF page 34

Unit: cases. Names: 13; child 12 relevant.

Cell	Original number
Child: age makes assessment irrelevant	1
Child to some extent	3
Small children	8
Child not at all	1
Parents relevant and adequate	9
Parents' rings	4
Both sufficient	3
Neither of the parties is sufficient	4
Only parents sufficient	5
Adequate parents, child old age exemption	1

§ 48 Interview - Physical PDF page 35

Unit: cases. Names: 13 / 11 / 8.

Cell	Original number
Age exemption	2
Relevant cases	11
Rule respected, of 11	3
Rule broken, of 11	8
No conversation	3
Do not talk about the measure	2
Address by decision	3
Special insignificance among 8 fractures	0

BFU: actual needs and content - physical PDF page 36

Unit: cases. Denomination: 13.

Cell	Original number
Current requirements	12
Acute, no current prior requirement	1
Current BFU or Update	7

Cell	Original number
New BFU	3
Current update	4
Update should be available	5
Special insignificance of 5 deficiencies	0

BFUs deadlines - physical PDFs page 36

Unit: cases / months up to 4 months. Names: 3.

Cell	Original number
4-month deadline respected	0
Broken	3
First exceedance	2
Other exceedance	3
Third exceedance	9

BFU: justification / closure - physical PDF page 37

Unit: cases. Names: 7.

Cell	Original number
Reason for new BFU	3
Reasons for updating	3
Deficiencies of reasons	1
BFU / update completed before decision	5
Not done, should be	2
Special insignificance in the absence of justification	0
Special insignificance in late 2 studies	0

Information on decision time - physical PDF page 38

Unit: cases. Denomination: 13.

Cell	Original number
High degree	1
Some degree	9
Low degree	3

Action plan - Physical PDF page 38

Unit: cases. Names: 13 / 12 / 6 / 5.

Cell	Original number
Available	12
Acute, not claim at end of period	1
Before decision, of 12	6
By decision of 12 December	6
Of which legal emergency derogation	1
Time break	5
Late: placement	2
Too late: family care	1
Too late: relief	2

Action plan: materiality - physical PDF page 39

Unit: cases. Names: 5.

Cell	Original number
Special insignificance in 5 breaks	0

Main Text Deviation: Action Plan - Physical PDF page 28

Unit: cases. Names: main text 5 / 11 against Annex 6 / 12 including legal emergency exception.

Cell	Original number
Plan by decision	5
Denomination	11

Current aid, not original legality of decision - Physical PDF page 39

Unit: cases. Names: 20.

Cell	Original number
Relevant and sufficient support	17
Unsure support	2
Not applicable / sufficient	1
Created § 65 own-account case	3
Of which § 11 offers	2
Of which § 52- measure	1

Follow-up: actual subpopulations - physical PDF page 39

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Current decision and follow-up	1

Cell	Original number
Follow-up only	4
Of which location	3
Of which relief	1
Total follow-up cases	5

Follow-up and personalised supervision - Physical PDF page 40

Unit: cases. Names: follow-up 5, personalised supervision 4 placement cases.

Cell	Original number
3 months: appropriate correct	1
3 months: not applicable during the period	4
6 months: appropriate correct	1
6 months: non-regulatory interval	4
Special insignificance in 4 fractures	0
Personal supervision achieved	0
Personal supervision not complied with	4

§ 11 aid - Physical PDF page 40

Unit: cases. Names: 3.

Cell	Original number
Can meet needs	1
Not delimited, requires BFU	2

Overall progress - Physical PDF page 41

Unit: cases. Names: 20.

Cell	Original number
Special Forces	1
Attention points	8
Longitude	6
Wrong professional assessment	2

VISO subpopulation - Physical PDF page 43

Unit: cases. Names: 8 of 20; § 11 and cases without current BFU excluded.

Cell	Original number
Total VISO	8
Current BFU	5

Cell	Original number
Follow-up	3

VISO: Parental / Follow-Up Plans - Physical PDF page 49

Unit: cases / finding; precise location not specified in this section. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Follow-up proceedings	3
Parental action plans in accommodation cases examined	none

Interview take-off - Physical PDF page 51

Unit: persons / interview. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Receipt	4
Youth team	7
Children's team	5
Intermediate managers	5
Senior management	2
Suppliers	6
Childhood / youth counselling services	6
General area	5
Total persons	40
Interview	8

Requested sample, not actual distribution - physical PDF page 52

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
§ 52	17
§ 11	3
Installation	8
Relief	3
Contact person	3
Family treatment	3
Old placement decisions for follow-up	3

Method deviation - Physical PDF page 57

Unit: cases. Denominator: template counts versus an actual 6 current placement decisions+3 placement follow-ups only.

Cell	Original number
Referral cases	5
Of which, old decisions sought	3

Concrete documented times - physical PDF page 41

Unit: year / month; anonymised examples, not new cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Contact person: notification of decision	1
Contact person: decision in favour of actual support	6
Installation: decision for performance	barely 3 months
First family consultant after birth	2
The next course after birth	approx. 1 year

Management supervision, interview information - physical PDF page 11

Unit: months / hours / months; not power / legality outages. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Individual range of supervision	1
Time per employee, minimum	0.5
Time per employee, maximum	0.75
Planned Thematic Supervisory Interval	3

Prevention and method, interview information - physical PDF page 12

Unit: employees / conversations; conversation limitation actually referred to PDF18. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
ICS superusers	5
§ 11 (2) maximum conversations	3

Method, deviations and consequences

• No total deduced legality union print.8 Interface breaks + 5 update gaps + 3 deadlines + 1 justification + 2 late BFU + 5 late schedules + 4 follow-ups + 4 supervision overlaps. 17 / 20 currently appropriate support is not lawfulness review at decision time; method PDF56 does not test whether the specific measure is appropriate.

• PDF34: Mother is told that silence for 14 days is considered consent to BFU and future measures; no subsequent consent documented in the report. The source reproduces anonymous proceedings; original documents are not available here. This concrete proof of consent must not be converted into a national Union of convictions.

• PDF35/37:a 9-year-old's placement decision 15.9.2017; interview only approximately 2,5 months later and immediately before implementation. BFU update valid 29.11.2017, but also contains December information. The report calls the delay at least 1,5 months, while the stated dates give at least 75 days; the difference is retained without shifting the original's figures.

• PDF35 / 42: 12 years of violence notification awaited police / video interrogation over 2 months; the municipality had not documented the grounds for postponing child interview or seeking the guidance of the Children's House. November 2016 → June 2017- BFU example PDF37 and November 2017- police track PDF42 shall not be automatically identified as the same child.

• PDF36-37: all 3 new child welfare assessments exceed the 4-month deadline by 2/3/9 months; no special immateriality. The specific 12-year-old's source concerning violence 17.11.2016→child welfare assessment 23.6.2017. PDF41: contact person decision 1 year after a concern report, actual support only 6 months later; alternative assistance during the wait not assessed.

• PDF39-40: two 13-year-old § 11 offers despite serious suspicion / psychiatric concern; 3 actual § 65 self-handling cases are described, but new decision, actual support and termination date not published. PDF49 refers to estimated location basis January 2017, actual location almost 8 months later; this is a different time concept than decision → effectiveness.

• PDF28/38:5/11 plans in the main text against 6/12 plans after decisions in the annex, where 1 is a lawful urgent exception and 5 breach the rules. PDF52 requested 17 decision cases, actually 13 current+4 follow-up only. PDF57 methodology 5 placements against actually 9 placement-related cases. Original delimitations are retained.

• PDF49:no parental action plans in the placement cases examined; PDF46:a § 54 support person is offered, but recipient count or effect is not stated. No actual return-home/reunification date, duration of all interventions or follow-up on compensation. VISO is based on AST's event overview, not an independent person population.

TFSON20S - Task Force Status Report, October 2020

Development period May 2019-May 2020, October 2020 report. COVID changes method: 4 municipal cases with BFU / Action Plan instead of usual 20 cases. Not random, not representative or identity panel. General rules of service law tested, not COVID exceptions. State cases include 3 decision cases + 1 follow-up; the same cases are examined by AST / VISO.

Source: Task Force Status Report, October 2020; SHA-256 b818f2f4d5618of8ad72a06b157acd2731deef4a65543f955bea356f66a25f4.

Sample and methodological change - physical PDF page 4

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Actual final measurement	4
Normal final measurement, unselected	20

Final Case Distribution - Physical PDF page 40

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Family care / mother-child stay	1
Contact person	1
New-born placement	1
Only placement follow-up	1
Total	4

Case 1: time / consent track - Physical PDF page 40

Unit: age / day / month / finding. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Age of child	less than 1 year
Consultation prior to business meeting	6
Continued mother-child stay for home support	1
Consent for proposed placement	no.
Forced base according to visitation	not found

Case 1: assessment/intervention - physical PDF page 41

Unit: months / weeks / weeks / days / finding. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Notification of BFU decision	2
BFU- start before period	7
Birth before period	3.5
Massive home support per week	5
Family treatment plan at the time of the decision	Not available

Case 2: BFU and lack of effectiveness - Physical PDF page 42

Unit: date. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
First relevant notification	start April 2019
Consent to BFU	13.5.2019
BFU Decision	start July 2019
BFU finished	end January 2020

Case 2: Legal and material outcomes - Physical PDF page 43

Unit: months / weeks / finding / case. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
BFU deadline exceeded	5.5
BFUs start after consent	7
Actual support at end of review	none
Notification to the Technical Service of the European Communities	1
§ 65 own-account case actually created	not documented,
Contact person start-up meeting	not held

Case 3: new birth - Physical PDF page 44

Unit: notifications / months / finding / targets. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Notifications prior to mother involvement	4
Time for Mom's first involvement	2
BFUs time	barely 4 months
Installation	voluntarily immediately after birth;
Action plan	3

Case 3: end of observation - Physical PDF page 45

Unit: date / finding. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Installation	end April 2020
Acts submitted	end May 2020
Follow-up requirements at end of measurement	not yet entered

Case 4: Placing / Follow-up - Physical PDF page 45

Unit: date / follow-up / visit / finding. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Decision	September 2017
Actual placement	November / December 2017
6-Months Follow-Up 2019-20	2
Conversations at location 2019-20	2
3-month follow-up	outside the measurement period;
Action plan	similar from 2017, superior

Cross-cutting appendix conclusions, overlap - physical PDF page 46

Unit: cases. Names: 4.

Cell	Original number
Action plan in cases reviewed	4
Plan by decision	1
4-month period expired	1
Parents late / inadequately involved	2
Never put in place	1

Local authority's internal training and management supervision - Physical PDF page 23

Unit: cases / date / employees / date / months; not independent final measurement. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Specific level 2 cases compared with AST	3
Learning Day	January 2020
New Heads of Government	2
The leaders will join	1.7.2020
Level 2 interval	6

Actual reported activities of the programme - Physical PDF page 47

Unit: date/cases/meetings; section 11 sample PDF49. Denominator: follows from the scope of the rows.

Cell	Original number
Final day of learning	18.8.2020
2019 learning team concerning § 11 subsection 3, separate sample	4
Status meetings	7

Implementation and waiting times - physical PDF page 23

Unit: date/finding; waiting-time information PDF30. Denominator: follows from the rows' scope.

Cell	Original number
Final implementation of case procedures	end 2020, original deadline exceeded
Return / follow-up / change of location	procedure still missing
Waiting lists for internal bets	continued; no number
Need analysis	Not yet started

Method, deviations and consequences

• No generalisable before / after error percentage. Four final cases, three internal level 2 learning cases and four separate 2019 § 11 learning team cases do not have a public identity vote; shall not be counted as 11 unique children. The municipality's statement claims enhanced legality, but itself announces incomplete implementationPDF23 / 30 / 36 / 38.

• PDF40-41:case 1, the parents learn of the placement recommendation by telephone 6 days before the meeting, receive the material a few days before and are then notified of a meeting the very next day. The parents do not consent; the assessment finds no basis for compulsory placement. The family remains for a month in a mother-and-child home until home support. The actual calendar date of return home and the entire stay duration are missing; this is not documented as an enforced compulsory placement.

• PDF43: Case 2 exceeded the period 5,5 months; the child does not want contact person after authorisation, no alternative family / parental support or consideration documented. AST sends notification to the specialist office to assess § 65; this is not the same outcome as baseline 2019 s 3 created § 65 cases.

• PDF44:case 3, the parents are described as having intellectual disabilities; the mother is involved only after 2 months/four safeguarding notifications. The report's assumption that a contact person at the residential facility acted as an intermediary is not independent documentation that the mother was heard as a party. The placement is described as voluntary; actual capacity to consent and original consent have not been verified against documents here.

• PDF42- 45 repeatedly states that the AST only controls follow-up in case 1 and introduces case 4 as a review of case 1. The other concrete information shows that the historical post-placement follow-up is case 4. The original numbering error is preserved and no additional cases are created.

• Case 4PDF45: two legislative 6 months follow-up and two personal visits in May 2019-May 2020. The original 2017 decision shall not be tested in the status selected. The 2017 targets are applied unchanged despite broad wordings; VISO recommends revision. No public return, cessation of action, restoration or compensation after baseline error.

• PDF23: The municipality provides information on the lack of separate procedures for repatriation, maintenance and change of location; new workflows are expected only at the end of 2020. Organisational development does not demonstrate that each previous infringement has been remedied. The change of leadership / co-decision explanation is reproduced as the municipality's statement, not as a derogation from civil rights.

TFSKI20P - Development plan, January 2020

Additional municipal original, non-autonomous Task Force-legal final / baseline measurement. The same thing's recollection doesn't create any new children.

Source: Development plan, January 2020; SHA-256 89a798b74b544764582cd73dbfa2e37926c3f03fb773df495c8b475d69876d8f.

Pre-run plan - Physical PDF page 3

Unit: year / period of plan. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Time horizon of the plan	3
Internal procedures	2019-2020
Interdisciplinary cooperation	2020-2021
Policy / strategy / practice	2021-2022

Management and supervision, planned - physical PDF page 5

Unit: weeks / supervision. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Status Meetings Minimum Range	6
Status meetings maximum interval	8
Management supervision per year	2

Planned notification milestones - physical PDF page 6

Unit: date / target%; NOT actual result. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Clarification template / procedure	1.11.2019
Aim of hearings	50% of new cases as at 1.2.2020

Planned reassessment / BFU milestones - Physical PDF page 7

Unit: date / target%; NOT actual result. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Reconsideration template	1.10.2019
Documented use	All, except dental care per 1.2.2020
Leadership	at least 50% per 1.2.2020;
Comfortable information / guidelines	1.1.2020
Provisional investigation plan	1.6.2020

Planned BFUs - Physical PDFs page 8

Unit: month / target%; NOT actual result. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Notify before deadline	1
Timely BFUs milestone	50% as at 1.12.2020
Final target	time limits are respected in all cases;

Clause 11 / Action Plan - Physical PDF page 9

Unit: target percent / date / meetings; NOT actual result. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
§ 11 / § 50 Statement of reasons	30% of new cases as of 1.3.2020
Ach-learning team course	before 1.6
Timely action plan	50% of new cases as at 30.11.2020
Follow-up Agenda	50% of relevant cases as at 1.6.2020
SOS course	1.12.2019
Role in Action Plan	30% as at 1.11.2020
Team meetings on objectives	6

Planned Network / Supervisory Targets - Physical PDFs page 10

Unit: target / target / date; last 3 rows PDF11. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Family involvement in action plan	75% as at 30.11.2020
Foster-care consultant/network mapping	5 cases as at 1.11.2020
Annual wheel / case file	1.1.2020
Initiation of proceedings	1.3.2020
Monitoring periods	February-April and September-November 2020

Further development tracks - physical PDF page 12

Unit: scheduled time; no target completion. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Revised preparedness	end 2020
Interdisciplinary meetings	summer 2020
Open anonymous advice	summer 2020

Method, deviations and consequences

• The plan sets an interim target of 50% timely BFUs/action plans by the end of 2020; this is a political/administrative implementation target, not legal authority to disregard time limits in the other cases. There is no legal outcome table or public count of actual redress.

• Physical 12 pages, but table of contents and page count on pages 1-11 of 12. No extra unseen page is deduced. Baseline / final report cannot be replaced by this development plan.

TFSKI20K - Municipal presentation 15.1.2020

Additional municipal original, non-autonomous Task Force-legal final / baseline measurement. The same thing's recollection doesn't create any new children.

Source: Municipal presentation 15.1.2020; SHA-256 4a728ae305125d586444ad4eed55b49c527a18f53b020c6a95a107a5e9094c59.

Document chain and prelude time - physical PDF page 1

Unit: identification / date / year. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Case	779-2019-26375
Document	779-2019-257833
Development plan Annex	779-2019-260467
Application	beginning 2018
Start of cooperation	end 2018
TFs follow-up	throughout 2020
Local government plan	3

Method, deviations and consequences

• The development plan was not yet finally approved by the Task Force at submission; approval expected January 2020. The decision of 15.1.2020 takes note of the information, without a legal outcome table. The municipality states that a review of § 11 cases has begun, but without n/N or redress outcomes.

TFSKI21K - Presentation of final report 12.5.2021

Additional municipal original, non-autonomous Task Force-legal final / baseline measurement. The same thing's recollection doesn't create any new children.

Source: Presentation of the final report 12.5.2021; SHA-256 bd058062712c9adfd4f1840cd9a4c60232b05d9b39e35775d7d8aaf133b60290.

Final measurement referred to by the municipality - physical PDF page 1

Unit: cases / date / identification. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Final cases examined by AST	20
Baseline submitted	14.8.2019
Final presentation	12.5.2021
Case	NATURE -2019 -26375

Method, deviations and consequences

• The entire original presentation has been read; a separate final report is missing as an annex in this portal result. The wording same format as baseline does not document the n/N distribution or a panel of individuals. The final report's criticism/follow-up outcomes cannot be inferred from 20 cases.

TFSKI19O - Orientation item 14.8.2019

Additional municipal original, non-autonomous Task Force-legal final / baseline measurement. The same thing's recollection doesn't create any new children.

Source: Orientation point 14.8.2019; SHA-256 8c6d2769e748352076c3036ffcf5418f0a92c5b186ddda22c24811a52820eb8b.

Method, deviations and consequences

• All 1PDFside is read. The resolution refers to the forthcoming December thematic meeting of the regional symposium; no Task Force report or legal measurement table. It shall not be marked as read 2019 analysis.

TFVAR21K - Implementation status 21.9.2021

Additional municipal original, non-autonomous Task Force-legal final / baseline measurement. The same thing's recollection doesn't create any new children.

Source: Implementation status 21.9.2021; SHA-256 3d3404b81e45757649428cb530d04896b6140347cf9d5c479fa1292092caafb5.

Subsequent policy orientation - Physical PDF page 1

Unit: date / months. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Initial final presentation	22.9.2020
Continued policy range	6
New orientation	21.9.2021

Method, deviations and consequences

• The administration reports continuing implementation problems and improvements, but no error/reparation outcomes or actual reunification series. The attached 2020 status at the new URL is SHA-identical to the original already read in full; the copy is not counted as a new measurement.

TFMOR20K - Half-year status 21.10.2020

Additional municipal original, non-autonomous Task Force-legal final / baseline measurement. The same thing's recollection doesn't create any new children.

Source: Half-year status 21.10.2020; SHA-256 6930a5b89f98555f53074af67d9fc7f5489a70206676f405c093ded9368fedcb.

Actual and expected lead times - physical PDF page 1

Unit: identification / date / meetings / week / PLANT cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Case	773-2018-9498
First political status	April 2020
Latest 6-month meetings	2
Cooperation extended to:	January 2021
Future meeting interval	every 3-4 weeks
Expected final submission	January / February 2021
Planned closing case roof	3-5

Method, deviations and consequences

• The development process continued in 2020 despite the originally expected end in 2019/early 2020. A final measurement of the planned 3-5 cases is not documented as completed. No n/N lawfulness results or individual redress in the municipality’s status statement.

TFMOR21O - Orientation 21.4.2021

Additional municipal original, non-autonomous Task Force-legal final / baseline measurement. The same thing's recollection doesn't create any new children.

Source: Estimation 21.4.2021; SHA-256 0eb8000cee63fc831ae29860f5f552de341a6ae2ab44d74e48e8efca23e72f22.

Method, deviations and consequences

• All 1 page read. Decision on intelligence includes oral Task Force status, but no report documents or results. This is not material reading of final 2021 report.

TFVAR19A - Task Force Analysis Report, 12 April 2019

Case processing 2.10.2016-1.10.2018. Municipally selected pending cases; ages 0-17,not solely physical disability, the municipality responsible for action in the most recent year. No cases from the same family. Already appealed/considered by Ankestyrelsen or considered under§65 excluded. VISO is a subset, not a nationally representative sample.

Source: Task Force analysis report, 12. April 2019; SHA-256 bbc5f7ee97a6b9aae646983f7f86cb4361d57ac3e54f256a33f49f487fe7565e.

Actual Case Distribution - Physical PDF page 35

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Current § 52decisions	16
Only former § 52decision / follow-up	1
Article 11 (3)	3
Total	20

Table 1: Type of case - Physical PDF page 35

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Installation	6
Installation and follow-up	3
Only follow-up placement	1
Family treatment	1
Relief	2
Contact person	4
Article 11 (3)	3
Total	20

Table 2: Age of decision / offer (follow-up only: period of time) - Physical PDF page 35

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
0-3 years	6
4 to 7 years	2
8 to 14 years	7
15 to 17 years	5
Total	20

Table 3: missing, overlapping categories - physical PDF page 36

Unit: cases. Names: 16.

Cell	Original number
Child welfare assessment missing	1
Update missing	9
4-month deadline exceeded	2
Reasoned position missing	0
Investigation not completed before decision	1
Action plan missing	5
Action plan only after decision	8
§ 48 child interview not met	6

Involvement, actual subpopulations - Physical PDF page 37

Unit: cases. Names: child: 11 of 16; parents: 16.

Cell	Original number
Child not relevant due to age	5
Child relevant and sufficient	6
Child rings	5
Parents high degree	1
Parents relevant and adequate	11
Parents' rings	4
Both children and parents sufficient, of 11	3
Not both enough, of 11	8

§ 48 - Physical PDF page 38

Unit: cases. Names: 16.

Cell	Original number
Rule fulfilled	10
Of which without conversation due to age	5
Rule Broken	6
Brief: first conversation after decision	1
Bride: no conversation	2
Brief: not on the measure	3
Brief with particular insignificance	0

Current BFU § 50 - Physical PDF page 39

Unit: cases. Names: 16.

Cell	Original number
BFU / update requirement	14
Acute / temporary without current requirements	2
Current BFU available	4
BFU missing	1
Update missing	9
10 deficiencies with particular insignificance	0

BFU: specific deadlines - physical PDF page 39

Unit: months beyond the 4-month deadline. Names: 2 of 4 current BFU.

Cell	Original number
First	2.5
Other	3

BFU: time limit and decision time - physical PDF page 40

Unit: cases. Names: 4.

Cell	Original number
4-month deadline respected	2
Dismissed	2
Of which, in particular, immateriality	1
Reasoned position	4
Completed before decision	2
Uncompleted, provisionally lawful derogation	1
Not completed, should have been	1

Information at the time of decision - Physical PDF page 40

Unit: cases. Names: 16.

Cell	Original number
High degree	1
Some degree	10
Low degree	5

Action plan: Annex Counters - Physical PDFs page 41

Unit: cases. Names: 16.

Cell	Original number
Available	10
Acute, no claim at end of period	1
Should be available, deficiencies	5
Absence: placement	2
Absence: relief	2
Missing contact person	1
5 shortcomings with particular insignificance	0
Plan before decision, of 10	2
Plan by decision of 10	8
For late: placement	6
too late: family treatment	1
For late: contact person	1

Action plan: main text, maintained separately - physical PDF page 26

Unit: cases. Names: 16 / 11; Annex PDF41 says 10 present.

Cell	Original number
Plan missing, of 16	5
Plan by decision of 11	8

Action plan: materiality - physical PDF page 42

Unit: cases. Names: 8.

Cell	Original number
Late plans	8
Special insignificance	1
No particular insignificance	7

Current support and self-service - physical PDF page 42

Unit: cases. Names: § 11: 3; current support: 20.

Cell	Original number
§ 11 can meet needs	3
Relevant and sufficiently topical	19
Unsure, § 65 -own operation	1

Follow-up: Case Subpopulation - Physical PDF page 42

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Decision and follow-up	3
Follow-up only	1
Total	4

Follow-up: actual annexes - physical PDF page 43

Unit: cases. Names: 3 months: 3 relevant; others: 4.

Cell	Original number
3 months: not applicable during the period	1
3 months: timely relevant	1
3 months: missing	2
Of which, in particular, immateriality	2
6 months: relevant	1
6 months: missing	3

Cell	Original number
Of which, in particular, immateriality	0
Personal supervision proper location	3
2 annual conversations, wrong place	1

Follow-up: main text - physical PDF page 28

Unit: cases. Names: 4; Annex PDF43 only 3 relevant at 3 months.

Cell	Original number
3-month shortage, of 4	2
6-month deficiency, of 4	3

Overall progress - physical PDF page 44

Unit: cases. Names: 20.

Cell	Original number
Special Forces	3
Attention points	5
Only slow	1
Slow and lack of overall assessment	4

VISO: actual subpopulations - physical PDF page 45

Unit: cases. Names: overlap; 7 of 20.

Cell	Original number
Completed	7
Current BFU	4
Update missing	2
Follow-up	4

VISO: method deviation - physical PDF page 58

Unit: cases. Denomination: actual results PDF34 / 45 say 7.

Cell	Original number
Number of sections of method	8

Interview Groups - Physical PDFs page 51

Unit: interviewer / interviewer. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Receiving team	2

Cell	Original number
Youth team	6
Children's team	5
Intermediate managers	3
Senior management	3
Suppliers	6
General area	10
Total persons	35
Specified number of interviews	6

Requested sample, not actual distribution - physical PDF page 52

Unit: cases. Names: desired 20; actually table PDF35.

Cell	Original number
52cases	17
§ 11 cases	3
Installation	8
Relief	3
Contact person	3
Family treatment	3

Method section: Follow-up - Physical PDF page 57

Unit:cases. Denominator:methodological discrepancy, actually 10 placement-related cases, 4 follow-ups.

Cell	Original number
For placement, please specify	5
Of which decision over 1 year	3

Method, deviations and consequences

• Discrepancies retained:8/11 late action plans in the main text versus 8/10 in the annex;2/4 missing 3-month follow-up in the main text versus 2/3 relevant cases in the annex; VISO8 in the methodology versus 7 actual; desired sample categories are not realised categories.

• PDF51 indicates 6 interviews, but 7 named interview groups; the group's personal elements summer 35.

• Rule breaks can be essential without the source publishing a total deductive union. 19 / 20 actuarial aid is a test other than the lawfulness of the intervention; the method PDF56 does not examine whether the specific measure was appropriate.

• PDF37/44:11-year-old child without previous respite care for 1 year 5 months; a contact person after 10 months for 8 hours/week insufficient. PDF38:12-year-old child placed without a lawful interview, implementation almost 3 months after the decision. PDF39:7-year-old child placed on the basis of a 2012BFU without an update.

• PDF40:concern report July 2016,birth/placement February 2017,child welfare assessment not until May 2017; no special immateriality. PDF41:emergency placement action plan only after 7 months(requirement 4). PDF42:separate provisional infant placement, plan after 1 week, AST specifically assesses immateriality. These are the source's assessments, not independent examination of anonymised case records.

• PDF45: 17 years ago 2015, concerns September 2017, contact person January 2018, private accommodation September 2018; no precise action / termination dates. PDF48-49: Specific period of placement childhood → youth with conflict about participation / repatriation and lack of parental action plan; actual reunification and correction not documented. PDF49: Another release process ends at target reached, no date or duration.

• No printed aggregate union of legality findings or actual reunification/compensation follow-up. Safeguard deficiencies must not be added together as unique children. The absence of an anonymous case register prevents identity linkage to the appeals register.

TFVAR20S - Task Force Status Report, September 2020

Development phase May 2019-September 2020. COVID methodology change:4 municipally selected cases with a child welfare assessment and action plan, solely under the Social Services Act and not COVID rules; neither random nor representative. The usual 20-case status measurement was not used. Baseline 20 and closure 4 are different samples, not a panel of people.

Source: Task Force Status Report, September 2020; SHA-256 4633f147b4eb73475c73829b36e6a3eb2e9011a1a6caea2c403d2d60649509f0.

Status sample versus usual sample - physical PDF page 4

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Actual	4
Normal, unselected measurement	20
Requested placement decision	1
Wanted placement with follow-up	1
Preventive decisions requested	2

Development plan - Physical PDF page 5

Unit: action. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Implementation measures	13

Local quality management supervision, unpublished outcomes - physical PDF page 18

Unit: cases; statement by the municipality. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Sample per supervision	15
Team Leader	5

ICS responsible - Physical PDF page 19

Unit: employees. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Responsible	4

BFU management supervision - Physical PDF page 23

Unit: sample cases, not unique children. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Pr district	5
Head supervision of team leader supervision	5

Commune informed BFU updates - Physical PDF page 24

Unit: investigation / employee; undocumented unique persons. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
2018	15
2019	110
ICS ambassadors	1

Education and Practice Plan - Physical PDFs page 25

Unit: cases / days / months; planned practices, not legal outcomes. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Action plan examples per trade union meeting	2
Interval	14
Period of practice	3

Education and practice plan: involvement - physical PDFs page 29

Unit: days / cases / days / months; not legal outcomes. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Course duration	3
Examples of involvement per professional meeting	2
Interval	14
Period of practice	3

Case 1: established times - Physical PDF page 32

Unit: date / month / finding; 1 anonymous case. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Notification	September 2019

Cell	Original number
BFU and decision concerning a family consultant	February 2020
BFU deadline overrun	1
Legal § 48 conversation in advance	deficiencies

Case 2: documented course of action - Physical PDF page 34

Unit: date / hours per day; 1 anonymous case. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Notification	May 2019
Initial aid	24
Networking	March 2020
Installation and operation	June 2020

Case 3: documented course of action - Physical PDF page 36

Unit: date / hours per day / day; 1 anonymous case. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Intermediate municipal information	March 2019
Aid	24
Aid is being increased again	mid-November 2019
New announcement of violence later	14
BFU update decided	the day following the notification of violence;
BFU update finished	April 2020

Case 3: Action plan and follow-up - Physical PDF page 37

Unit: months / date / finding; 1 anonymous case. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Urgent deadline for action	4
Emergency action plan	complied with
3-month follow-up	complied with
6-month deadline	after examination;
Surveillance visits	May 2020
Inspection of location	not documented,

Case 4: Reasoned Time - Physical PDF page 38

Unit: date; 1 anonymous case. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Notification	March 2019
BFU finished	June 2019

Case 4: Date of the action - Physical PDF page 39

Unit: day; 1 anonymous case, provisional support described. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Plan after the contact-person decision	1

Completed activities - physical PDF page 40

Unit: meetings / date. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Physical development meetings	9
Telephone meetings	a pair
Systematic course	December 2018 and Spring 2019
Inclusion course	Autumn 2019

Final Learning Day - Physical PDF page 41

Unit: date. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Date	2.7.2020

Method, deviations and consequences

• PDF20: the municipality’s own statement establishes continuing legal procedural errors/deficiencies; full target achievement has not been attained. PDF30: parental action plans are assessed as implemented in new cases, but the municipality has not mapped all placement cases. Implementation of involvement is not expected until summer 2020. These self-reports are not independent error rates.

• Case 1PDF32-33:no lawful prior child interview and a 1-month breach of the child welfare assessment deadline. PDF33 mentions both a family consultant and a placement decision on the same day; the wording discrepancy is retained and no additional placement case is inferred.

• Case 2PDF34-35: aid is reduced despite notifications; 2 months without relevant observation, late identification of parental skills, slowness and incorrect professional assessments. Expected duration of placement is missing from the action plan. Case 3PDF36-38: The ability to care of new partners not uncovered; aid downgraded despite notifications. The same anonymised case may not be counted once per point of criticism.

• The case summaries document 4 cases, but there is no overall independent legality union and the material is selected for learning. Names 4 should not be compared as representative before / after rate versus 20 baseline.

• No date of actual return, termination of placement, actual replacement or restoration after the errors identified published in this original. Organisational change is not evidence of correction of each previous case.

TFMOR18A - Task Force Analysis Report, November 2018

Case processing 29.5.2016-28.5.2018. Municipally selected pending cases concerning ages 0-17, not solely physical disabilities; responsible municipality during the preceding year; no cases from the same family and none already appealed/AST-processed or section 65-processed. Baseline 20, VISO9 of 20; not a representative or complete national register of individuals.

Source: Task Force Analysis Report, November 2018; SHA-256 43a0f2b4e2820c70495f2a36cf1935d6db7d3726c5a5a7a9d6f711e1ccb71ebe.

Pre-run schedule, not actual end date - physical PDF page 6

Unit: date / year. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Undertakings	May 2018
Start	June 2018
Expected duration	1.5
Expected end	end 2019 / beginning 2020

Management and sparring, self-reported practice - physical PDF page 12

Unit: months / days / hours. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Management oversight interval	3
Saving: fixed weekdays	3
Admission to justice per week	5

Concern-report processing, interview information - physical PDF page 16

Unit: months; interviews, not personpanel. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Minimum period of treatment specified	1
Maximum specified treatment time	6

Actual Case Findings - Physical PDFs page 34

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Current § 52decisions	15
Only previous decision / follow-up	2
Article 11 (3)	3
Total	20

Table 2: actual case type - physical PDF page 35

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Installation	6
Installation and follow-up	2
Only follow-up placement	2
Family treatment	2
Relief	2
Contact person	2
Practical / educational / other support	1
Article 11 (3)	3
Total	20

Table 3: Age - Physical PDFs page 35

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
0-3 years	7
4 to 7 years	0
8 to 14 years	10
15 to 17 years	3
Total	20

Table 3: overlaps - physical PDF page 36

Unit: cases. Names: 15.

Cell	Original number
BFU missing	3
BFU update missing	3
BFU4 month deadline broken	3
Reasoned position missing	0
BFU not completed before decision	1
Action plan missing	3
Action plan not before decision	7
§ 48 -child call broken	6

Involvement - Physical PDF page 36

Unit: cases. Names: parents 15; both 9 relevant children.

Cell	Original number
Parents relevant and adequate	9

Cell	Original number
Parents' rings	6
Children and parents both adequate, of 9	2
Not both sufficient, of 9	7

§ 48 child interview - Physical PDF page 37

Unit: cases. Names: 15 / 9 / 6, depending on row.

Cell	Original number
Age exemption	6
Conversation relevant	9
Rule fulfilled, of 9	3
Rule break, of 9	6
No conversation	4
Only after a decision	2
Special insignificance	0

BFU and Updates - Physical PDF page 37

Unit: cases. Names: 15.

Cell	Original number
Requirements	15
Current BFU / update available	9
Of which acute decision with BFU	1
New BFU available	5

BFU: shortcomings and deadlines - physical PDF page 38

Unit: cases. Names: 15 / 6 / 5, depending on row.

Cell	Original number
Update available	4
BFU or update missing	6
Of which acute decision without BFU at end of period	3
BFU missing, all placement	3
Update missing	3
Special insignificance	0
4-month deadline met, of 5	2
4-month period broken, by 5	3

BFU: deadline overruns - physical PDF page 38

Unit: months beyond the 4-month time limit; 3 cases. Denominator: given by the scope of the rows.

Cell	Original number
First	4
Other	10
Third	14

BFU: justification and closure - physical PDF page 39

Unit: cases. Names: 9.

Cell	Original number
Reasoned position, BFU	5
Reasoned position, updates	4
Completed before decision	7
Not closed before decision	2
of which temporary derogation	1
Of which should be closed	1

Information at the time of decision - Physical PDF page 40

Unit: cases. Names: 15.

Cell	Original number
High	1
Someone.	9
Rings	5

Action plan: occurrence and actual order - physical PDF page 40

Unit: cases. Names: 15.

Cell	Original number
Available	12
Missing	3
Absence: relief	1
Absence: interim family treatment	1
Absence: acute placement after 4 months	1
3 shortcomings with particular insignificance	0
Plan before decision, of 12	3
Plan by decision of 12	9
Of which: urgent legal ex post plan	2

Action plan: Annex shown for late sub-categories - Physical PDF page 41

Unit: cases. Names: scopedeviation versus PDF40, retained.

Cell	Original number
Total time requirements not met	7
Acute placement after 4 months	1
Plan by decision	6
Of which location	4
of which contact person	1
Of which Family Adviser	1
Special insignificance	0

Current aid - Physical PDF page 41

Unit: cases. Names: § 11: 3; current 20.

Cell	Original number
§ 11 meets needs	3
Currently relevant and sufficient	18
Uncertain, § 65-own operation	2

Follow-up proceedings - Physical PDF page 42

Unit: cases. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Decision and follow-up	2
Follow-up only	2
Total	4

Follow-up and supervision - physical PDF page 42

Unit: cases. Names: 4; 3 months relevant in 3.

Cell	Original number
3 months: relevant	1
3 months: not applicable during the period	1
3 months: missing	2
Of which, in particular, immateriality	1
6 months: relevant	1
6 months: missing	3
Supervision at the correct location 2 times annually	1

Cell	Original number
Conversations but wrong place	1
Undocumented 2 annual conversations	2
3 supervisory deficiencies with particular insignificance	0

Overall progress - physical PDF page 43

Unit: cases. Names: 20.

Cell	Original number
Special Forces	2
Attention points	6

VISO: sub-populations - Physical PDF page 44

Unit: cases. Names: VISO9 of 20; 8 + 3 overlaps.

Cell	Original number
Completed	9
Current BFU	8
Follow-up	3
§ 11 outside VISO	3

Interview take-off - Physical PDF page 49

Unit: interviewer / interviewer. Names: shown in rows delineation.

Cell	Original number
Receipt	2
Family Advisers	5
Head of Division	1
Center Leader	1
Suppliers	4
General area	4
Total persons	17
Interview	6

Requested sample, not actual case type - physical PDF page 50

Unit: cases. Names: desired 20, actually PDF34-35.

Cell	Original number
§ 52	17
§ 11	3

Cell	Original number
Installation	8
Relief	3
Contact person	3
Family treatment	3
Old placement decisions requested	3

Method, deviations and consequences

• PDF31 / 36-37: nine-year-old child is placed without BFU and conversation; only 14 months after the decision. Father has joint custody, is hardly involved; only mother's consent signature is documented in the report. This is a concrete material proof of consent if the original case is obtained, not documented national union of abductions.

• PDF38-39: 3BFUs break 4 / 10 / 14 months, no particular insignificance. The BFU of eight years by 29.9.2016 is first reviewed 14.8.2017; closing date is missing. three month-old child's removal decision fixed at 5.7.2017 on the basis of contract orientation; BFU's latest note 4.12.2017, at least 5 months after decision. The report does not document precise dates on all interventions.

• PDF40:a one-month-old child is placed with a network carer without sufficient investigation; breakdown after a few days, then a foster family. AST assesses that a prior assessment of the network could probably have prevented the breakdown. PDF41-42:2 own-initiative cases without a current holistic assessment; documented concern, but actual implementation/new respite care unspecified.

• PDF43-44:a 14-year-old in care is exposed to contact with a concerning partner; the municipality carries out neither a documented 24-hour assessment nor a second opinion; an 11-year-old's school case is marked inactive 2 times despite safeguarding notifications. These are different consequences and criticisms, not additional children for each mention.

• PDF24 / 45-47: accommodation parents are not systematically offered § 54-grants or separate action plans. The lack of targets / parental support actually complicates the reunification and testing of alternative support; the report does not provide any reunion dates or deductive parental numbers. PDF28: Head of Division states that closed cases are not counted.

• Cell deviation is preserved: PDF40 says 9 plans after decision, of which 2 legal emergency exceptions, but PDF41 distributes 7 breaks of 1 exceeded acute + 6 others. The acute lack of plan is also below 3 deficiency plans. No new Union is being reconstructed on the basis of these conflicting descriptions.

• PDF51/53 methodology mentions 17 decision cases; actually 15 in the measurement period+2 follow-up only. The methodology template's 17 must not be used as the result denominator. PDF54 describes a requested 3 of 8 placements for follow-up; actually 4 follow-ups out of 10 placement-related cases.

• 18 / 20 at present sufficient aid is not aggregate legality by decision; method PDF54 excludes verification of the appropriateness of the specific measure. AST and VISO re-use the same cases and VISO build on the ASTM event overview; the two assessments are not independent people populations.

Identical republications

• TFVAR20S, additional public address: RAM-retrieved hashidentic; no new measurement or new persons; SHA-256 4633f147b4eb73475c73829b36e6a3eb2e9011a1a6caea2c403d2d60649509f0.

• TFMOR18A, additional public address: RAM-retrieved hashdentical; no new measurement or new persons; SHA-256 43a0f2b4e2820c70495f2a36cf1935d6db7d3726c5a5a7a9d6f711e1ccb71ebe.

Precise remnants and tested access tracks

Disc

The 2019 analysis and 2021 final report exist as a specific link in municipal knowledge, but the original reports have not been obtained here. PortalAPI Task Force/Taskforce 2018-2021; complete 2019 meeting metadata, 136 meetings and 12 children's committee entries,14.8.2019 metadata for all 9 items and 1-page briefing read;15.1.2020 plan 12+presentation 2 read in full;12.5.2021 presentation 2 read in full without annexes.6.11.2019 one meeting variant 500, alternative on the same day metadata read. CDXskive.dk exact filename filter 4 findings, all irrelevant job/image. Precise web search phrases Skive+TaskForce+analyserapport/statusrapport yielded no retrievable original. Responsibility for records: Skive Kommune/Familiesektionen and Social- og Boligstyrelsen/Ankestyrelsen. Precise outstanding material: Case 779-/EMN-2019-26375: analysis report presented 14.8.2019, final report presented 12.5.2021, AST legal measurement forms and sampling/exclusions for 20 final cases, baseline sample, union of errors, section 65 decisions and actual reparation/return-home dates. No external request sent.

Morsø

2018 analysis read in full; final 2021 report/learning cases not obtained. PortalAPI Task Force/Taskforce 2018-2021,2021 a further 5 children’s committees and 20.1.2021 metadata for all items. 21.10.2020 submission of 2 pages and 21.4.2021 information item of 1 page read in full. CDX mors.dk/morsoe.dk exact task/analyserapport/slutrapport filter: 0 finds each; a search for Morsø TaskForce statusrapport 2021 yielded no retrievable original. Responsibility for records: Morsø Municipality/Centre for Children and Families and the Social and Housing Agency/Appeals Board. Precise outstanding material: case 773-2018-9498 and S 2020-6044: final 2021 status report/reporting, the 3-5 learning cases actually carried out and legal annexes, departures from the 2018 baseline, all follow-up/§ 65 outcomes and actual return-home/redress dates. A planned sample must not be treated as completed. No external inquiry sent.

Product

2019 analysis + 2020 status and 2021 presentation fully read

Responsibility for records: Varde Municipality and AST/SBST. Precise outstanding material: case 19/10568 and anonymised 2019/2020 cases: identity deduplication, actual correction of deficiencies in safeguards, return home/cessation of intervention and compensation. No overall legal union in the original. No external inquiry sent.

Sønderborg

2019 analysis + 2020 status fully read

Register responsibility: Sønderborg Municipality and AST/SBST. Specific outstanding material: cases 19/7180 and 19/27198: original records on assumed consent/14 days of inactivity and dating of a child welfare assessment for a 9-year-old, 3 baseline § 65 outcomes and final case 2 concern-report follow-up, actual support/reparation/reunification, identity linkage between 20 baseline/4 final/other learning samples. No external request sent.

Search results without relevant findings only document the tested access tracks. They do not document that the originals were never published. The metadata lists only its own compact document identifiers; the original content was kept in RAM.

Final source control

Sønderborg2019 PDF34 error table and consent section have also been visually checked in RAM. The Morsø2018 PDF40-41 action-plan conflict is visually confirmed:9 plans after the decision, 2 lawful emergency exceptions; the next page has 7 missed deadlines divided into 1 emergency deficiency+6 others. All three original image pages were processed in RAM without a file copy. This check changed none of the recorded original figures.

Task Force: actual content control against 43 key events

The official 2024 directory records 43 courses / 42 municipal names in the scheme exposed children and young people. 28 now has partial or full control of an analysis / status original; 15 no one has provided such original. These are not 28 fully completed runs: each phase's reading and residue are shown separately. Five other schemes are listed below and are not counted into 43.

No	Kommun a	Width bår	Actual material checks	Module	Concrete residues
1	Rebild	2012–2014	No Task Force original provided	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Status Report 21.8.2014, Preliminary 2012 analysis and legal annexes, final target forms
2	Esbjerg	2012–2014	Only exact original tracks, non-autonomous original reading	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Task Force analysis 26.10.2012 and end 2014, legal measurement forms and exclusion list; title of text copy misnamed
3	Corner	2013–2015	Original residue by municipal / archive tracks	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Social Agency/Appeals Board Task Force report 2013 and final report 2015,not Deloitte 2013 alone
4	Rhinoceros	2013–2015	Original residue; development plan identified	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Analysis from end September 2013, master plan from 1.10.2013 and final report 2015 with legal annexes
5	Aabenra	2013–2015	Original residue after precise local / archive searches	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Analysis early 2014 and development plan published by 12.8.2014, end 2015 and target / exclusion schedules
6	Ringsted	2014–2016	Municipal press original 15.12.2014 all 2 pages read; 18 / 20 cases with error	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Analysis published 15.12.2014, Joint Committee 17.12.2014 Annex and end 2016; 18 / 20 definition, exclusions and individual repair
7	Norddjurs	2014–2017	Children's originals; disabled originals separated	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Analysis 2014 / 2015 and end 2017 on children with disabilities, not disabled task force
8	Ballerup	2015–2017	Accounting 2017 children's section read, end critical table 0 unknownN; original analysis / finish continued remainder	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Initial analysis 2015, final report June 2017 and precise legal / exclusion measurement forms; 7 / 20 from 1270 is index information only
9	Vejle	2015–2017	Budget 2019 children's section 4 pages as well as accounts 2016PDF24 read; no legal error table	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Analysis 2015 referred to 23.3.2015 and end 2017 with legal / exclusion measurement forms; economy improvement not legal test
10	Randers	2015–2017	Analysis 12.11.2015 all 72PDFpages text read; graph PDF47-57 / 64 visually read	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	End 2017, underlying unlabeled graph data, anonymous case / child coupling and actual repair / repatriation
11	Ikast-Brande	2015–2017	Analysis 22.6.2015 all 79PDFsider text read; graph PDF48-59 visually read	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	End 2017; table's 2 late action plans versus acute derogation PDF28; 2 graphs both 2012 clarified; exact unlabelled graph data and person repair
12	Peas (without pods)	2016–2018	Original residue; precise policy processing chain identified	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Analysis April 2016, KB28.4.2016 paragraph 10 + Annex DAPH290416.pdf and end 2018 as well as measurement / exclusion schedules
13	Nyborg	2016–2018	Local knowledge note 13.12.2023 all 6 pages read; 2016 / 2018 original measurements missing	taskforce-historical-feb-2012-2018. md	Analysis presented 5.12.2016 and final report presented 4.2.2019;20+20 samples, precise legal n/N, contemporaneous briefings and actual redress
14	Glostrup	2017–2019	Status 2019 all 49PDFpages fully read; 10 / 10 current decisions with legal shortcomings, 20 cases in total. 2016 start measurement only later reproduction	taskforce -glostrup-odander-fmk-svendborg -originer.md	Original 2016 analysis and sorting number; persondedup / § 65 outages and actual repair / reunion

No	Kommun a	Width bår	Actual material checks	Module	Concrete residues
15	Oats	2017-2019	Analysis 2017 all 48PDFpages and Status 2019 all 39PDFpages fully read; every 20 cases. Baseline a.k.a. Hashidentic; Slutalias only sidenumre / bulletcoding changed	taskforce -glostrup-odander-fmk-svendborg -originer.md	5 final § 65 outcomes, case overlap and actual redress/return home
16	Faaborg-Midtfyn	2017-2020	Analysis 2017 all 47PDFpages, status 2020 all 43PDFpages and consultation 2 pages fully read; 20 cases each. Timetable shapes visually RAMcontrolled	taskforce -glostrup-odander-fmk-svendborg -originer.md	2 baseline/3 final § 65 outcomes, person deduplication and individual redress course; no overall return-home population
17	Københavnn	2017-2020	Final January 2020 original all 48 pages fully RAM text read; Table 1 / 2PDF20 visually vetted .72 factorows / 5 local front chains; 19 legal cases, 10VISO recycled and 4 follow-up cases recycled.	taskforce-koebenhavn2020-full-original control.md	Initial April 2018 Task Force analysis not obtained; a separate 2017 Borgerrådgiveren study has been substantively checked, but does not replace this original. Self-measurements without N; actual case-by-case redress and a union of individuals missing.
18	Svendborg	2017-2019	Analysis 6.2.2018, all 81 PDF pages, and status September 2019, all 52 PDF pages, read fully as text; 20 cases each, separate sample/methodology. Baseline 4 § 65/final 2 § 65; final 3 points for attention are a different category	taskforce -glostrup-odander-fmk-svendborg -originer.md	§ 65 final outcome, persondedup and concrete individual repair; baseline return summer 2017 autumn series without documented professional basis, no full reunion / durability series
19	Morsø	2018-2021	Preliminary 2018 analysis all 59PDFpages as well as 2020 / 2021 municipal follow-up 2 + 1 page full read; finish 2021 report not provided	taskforce -forloeb-2018-2021original. md	Final 2021 report and actual learning take-offs; politically planned 3-5 cases have not been measured. § 65 Outcome, personal dedup and actual repair / repatriation missing
20	Stevns	2018-2020	Final 2020 -original all 52 pages textual and PDF22-23 tables visually RAM-controlled; 87 factorial rows / 17 time series	taskforce-stevns2020.md	Initial 2018 original not independently obtained; specific baseline 2017 figures reproduced in the 2020 original read;§ 65 outcomes/person linkage and actual redress missing
21	Product	2018-2020	Analysis 2019 all 61PDFpages and status 2020 all 43 pages fully read; 2021 municipal presentation 2 pages fully read	taskforce -forloeb-2018-2021original. md	No printed aggregate union of legal errors; VISO7/8 and conflicting plan/follow-up denominators are retained. The 4 selected COVID cases cannot be compared directly with the 20 baseline cases. Actual redress/person deduplication missing
22	Disc	2019-2021	Local development plan 2020 all 12PDFpages, references 2020 / 2021 every 2 pages and orientation 2019 one page full-read; report originals remain	taskforce -forloeb-2018-2021original. md	Analysis submitted 14.8.2019 and final report 12.5.2021, case EMN-2019-26375, with legal n/N/exclusion forms. 20 final cases are discussed only in the municipal submission; error outcomes/individual redress missing
23	Frederiksund	2019-2021	Central run metadata only; analytical / final originals not obtained	No material analyte original	Ankestyrelsen/ Social and Housing Board and the municipality: analysis, legal annexes, measurement / sorting schedules and final report
24	Sønderborgg	2019-2020	Analysis 2019 all 61PDFpages and status 2020 all 50 pages fully read; 20 baseline / 4COVID learning cases with delimitations and original deviations	taskforce -forloeb-2018-2021original. md	No union of legal errors or actual redress/return home. Outcomes of 3 baseline section 65 cases and follow-up on the notification in final case 2 are missing; original consent/BFU records and identity linkage required

No	Kommun a	Width bår	Actual material checks	Module	Concrete residues
25	Medium speed	2019-2022	Initial June 2020 all 69 pages and municipal development plan 2020 all 13 pages full text; PDF44 / 46 / 60 visual RAM controlled; 110 factor rows / 27 time series / 15 plan rows; final presentation 2022 read separately	taskforce -middle speed 2020-original.md	Final 2022 report not attached in read 14.6.2022 paragraph 33; five actually created notification cases end result, journal keys, actual dates of release and repair missing
26	Odense 1	2020-2022	Central run metadata only; analytical / final originals not obtained	No material analyte original	Ankestyrelsen/ Social and Housing Board and the municipality: analysis, legal annexes, measurement / sorting schedules and final report
27	Nordfyn	2020-2022	Introductory 2020-Child original all 58 pages text read; PDF34 / 48 tables visually RAM-controlled; 75 factor rows / 11 time series	taskforce-northfyn2020.md	Final 2022 original, separate quarterly briefings 155/143/116/103 and § 65 outcomes/actual redress are missing; different population slices from the 20 sample cases
28	Slaughter	2020-2022	Analysis 2020 all 61 pages and municipal status 2021 all 15 pages full text; nine table / figure pages visually aligned in RAM; 111 factor rows / 20 municipal target rows	taskforce slaughter 2020-2021original. md	Later actual final report not identified; individual decision tests, return and liability not personlinked. Current attachments Ider replaces previous empty / failed portal reproductions
29	Frederiksberg	2020-2023	Introductory 2021 -original all 69 pages text read; PDF42 / 43 / 59 tables visually RAM-controlled; 69 factor rows / 18 time series	taskforce-frederiksberg2021.md	The final 2022 original, the redress review of 1000 cases, actual return home/reparation and individual responsibility are missing; VISO10 versus 8 and plan 8 versus 9 discrepancies retained
30	Jammerbugt	2020-2023	Central run metadata only; analytical / final originals not obtained	No material analyte original	Ankestyrelsen/ Social and Housing Board and the municipality: analysis, legal annexes, measurement / sorting schedules and final report
31	Odsherd	2021-2023	Final 2023 original, all 44 pages read fully as RAM text;37 factual rows/4 case chains.3×3 learning-case reviews are not 9 deduplicated children or a new final legal cohort.	taskforce -odsherred 2023-full-originalkopel .md	Initial September 2021 analysis not obtained. Earlier 2017/2019 audits and 2020KLK are later accounts, not verification against originals. Exact deadline denominators, actual case-by-case support/redress and a union of individuals are missing.
32	Fredericia	2021-2023	Final October 2023 report all 47 pages and 22.8.2024 follow-up annexes all 4 pages actually read; references 26.1.2022 / 12.10.2023 all 4 pages. New model 3 reviews / 9 cases; own measurement 163BFU / 71 exceedances / 3 declared valid ground. Baseline 20 cases only late rendering and contact details	taskforce-fredericia-vejen-taarnby-herningoriginer.md	Baseline 2021 / 2022 original with full 20 s annual / 10VISOudtag / exclusions; gf-IDfc 7 cfda 4-f 598-ec 11-a 3 ae-00505688 ca 1 d iarchive page, currently 404 / exaktCDX0. Passenger coupling / § 65 outages / individual repair and actual reunification
33	Sunred	2021-2024	All 65 + 49 pages in analysis 2022 / status 2024 as well as baseline 2 / consultation 19 actually read; additional main text and final checks in two specific modules	taskforce -sunroot -ode nse -end2024-originalkontroll.md	342 is the municipality's preparation reports; no status cases with effort selection / follow-up / completion read; individual repair requires records
34	Odense 2	2022-2024	All 67 + 39 pages in analysis 2022 / status 2024 actually read; funnel 72 / 92 visually aligned; additional main text widget in special module	taskforce -sunroot -ode nse -end2024-originalkontroll.md	18 against 9 cases, 10 against 8VISO and 72 against 92 per cent retained; crude figures for management supervision and individual repair not published

No	Kommun a	Width bår	Actual material checks	Module	Concrete residues
35	Guldborgs und	2022-2024	Introductory 2022-original all 68 pages read, 64 factorial rows and 4 calculated times	taskforce goldcastle und2022.md	Final 2024 original and case-by-case actual restoration must be provided
36	Road	2022-(2024)	Baseline 10.3.2023 all 43 pages, end 2024 all 26 pages, mid 2024 all 3 pages, own summer 2023 supervision all 12 + 12 pages and all graph cells actually read. TF12 cases / 9 cases; BFU8 / 9 temptation error, § 48 8 / 9,2 notifications. Municipal 10 / 3 control and source conflicts preserved.	taskforce-fredericia-vejen-taarnby-herningoriginer.md	Person deduplication across four samples, outcomes of 2 concern reports to the Children’s Office, actual return home/individual reparation and responsibility.
37	Langeland	2022-(2025)	Introductory 2023-original all 41 pages and Ministry 2026-follow-up all 16 pages checked; 42 factor rows / 10 time series	taskforce -langeland 2023-2026.md	Task Force memoranda 28.5.2024/5.5.2026 cited in the Ministry's original, not independently obtained;2026 renewed supervisory processing ordered by the Ministry and actual redress/accountability outstanding
38	Tower	2023-(2025)	Mid-2024 all 4 pages, slutazapine 2025 all 23 pages, May 2026 follow up all 9 pages actually read. Development 3 reviews / 9 cases; 2026 three new cases, 2 inadequate closures / 1 notification. 2023 baseline only later reproduction; 2026RR level of knowledge documented.	taskforce-fredericia-vejen-taarnby-herningoriginer.md	September 2023 baseline full original/methodology; person deduplication, outcome of 1 children’s office notification and actual return home/individual redress/responsibility.
39	Næstved	2023-(2025)	Introductory 2023 -original all 42 pages text read; 38 factor rows / 5 time series, interview table PDF40 visual RAM-controlled	taskforce-naestved2023-2025.md	Final 2025 original and 4 referred children's offices / actual repairs not provided; final news is not final
40	Rudersdal	2023-(2026)	Introductory June 2024 all 40 pages and five later original annexes all 41 pages read: Final Report 2026, hearing 2026, mid / extra 2025 and 25-point municipal matrix; 14 rows / 25 series of matrix	taskforce-rudersdal2024-2026 original. md	Initial analysis in taskforce-rudersdal 2024-initiated -origin.md; slutPDF22 shows 3 / 3 lack of planning; case union, type of effort and actual repair not published
41	Herning	2024-(2026)	Baseline 2024 all 40 pages, interim 2025 all 4 pages, end of May 2026 all 25 pages actually read in RAM.12 baseline,9 support/3 prevention; all 3 preventive cases incorrectly delimited. Development 3×3 cases 2025/26; continuing deficiencies in concern reports, child contact, decisions and follow-up.2026 separate.	taskforce-fredericia-vejen-taarnby-herningoriginer.md	ICS81%/up to half, question/respondent basis; deduplication 12/9; actual return home/individual reparation/responsibility and later follow-up result.
42	Sorø	(2024) -(2026)	Children's analysis 2024 all 42 pages and closing 2026 status all 27 pages fully RAM text read; 70 factorows / 5 local front chains. Baseline 12 = 9 support + 3 preventative; development phase 3 × 3 case readings are not 9 unique children.	taskforce -soro- boern2024-2026-fulde-originaler.md	Actual delivery/redress by case and union of people; own unlawful eligibility-assessment arrangements acknowledged in 2026, a change in spring 2025 is not proof of reparation for earlier harm. Planned supervision in autumn 2026 has not been carried out.
43	Fax	(2024) -(2026 /2027)	Initial 2025 material 45PDFsidetals read	taskforce-fakate2025. md	End year 2026 / 27 was expected in 2024 catalog; completion and actual restoration not documented here

Tried access tracks and current source control

A historical first entry attempt is not the current status if the original page has been found. The column on actual control above and the exact URL / locator of the modules take precedence. CDX metadata are neither original text nor evidence of non-publication.

No	Municipality	Current concrete source / lead	Current control	Documented archive tracks
1	Rebild	https://rebild.dk/sites/default/files/centre/hr_og_udvikling/statusrapport_rebild_kommune_endelig_2014_0.pdf	Exactly 2014 status address and nearest archivreplay gave 404; koppeCDX gave timeout, availability 503. No disqualification from publication.	; not specified metadata;
2	Esbjerg	https://abcdocz.com/doc/3330681/morten-frydenberg-version-dato--04-02-2014-statistik	Indexed 27 pages text copy has original title and 26.10.2012; HTML download 403, web opening inaccessible, archive copy not retrievable. CDX esbjerg.dk 25 matches concern other areas.	; not specified metadata;
3	Corner	https://hjoerring.dk/	Precise searches analysis report / Task Force 2013; municipal CDX task / analysis report gave no relevant child report. Social Annual Report 2014 bibliography identifies the Task Force 2013 but not retrievable original. Deloitte is a separate investigation.	; not specified metadata;
4	Rhinoceros	https://abcdocz.com/doc/3182382/masterplan---halsn%C3%A6s-kommune	Masterplan text tracks retrieval 403; municipal CDX29 matches were other master plans and no relevant 2013-2015 children's PDF. Report 19 / 20 is not original measurement here.	; not specified metadata;
5	Aabenra	https://aabenraa.dk/	Municipal CDX task/analyserapport: 3 matches, no relevant original; precise site/title-year searches did not yield the report. A political article of 12.8.2014 mentions an analysis/development plan but is not the original assessment form.	; not specified metadata;
6	Ringsted	https://ringsted.dk/sites/default/files/kommunen_-_presse_foto_design/2014_12_15_pressemeddelelse_task_force_mandag_endelig.pd f	Presseoriginal actually 200PDF; kommunaltCDX relevant press address but not independent analysis report; precise track joint committee 17.12.2014.	; not specified metadata;
7	Norddjurs	https://norddjurs.dk/	KommunalCDX46 matches; concrete 2017 originals are disability report 21.4.2017 and are not included as the children's course 2014- 2017. Precise children / exposed 2014- 2017 searches did not give birth originals.	; not specified metadata;
8	Ballerup	https://ballerup.dk/sites/default/files/2022-11/%C3%85rsregnskab%202017%20for%20Ballerup%20Kommune.pdf	Three known agman PDF addresses 1270/783/1358 returned 404; migrated agenda address 404; availability 503/connection interruption. Current annual accounts for 2017 actually retrieved, PDF124-131 read.	; not specified metadata;
9	Vejle	https://bvb.vejle.dk/media/21141/11-boerne-og-familieudvalget-b2019.pdf	Strategy 2017 old URL unavailable; availability connection interrupted; budget 2019 retrievable web original, all 4 pages actually read; accounts 2016 relevant PDF24 read as web text.	; not specified metadata;
10	Randers	https://velfaerdslisten.dk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/bilag-4.pdf	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Analysis 12.11.2015 all 72PDFsider text read; graffPDF47-57 / 64 visually read Exactly original URL / locator is shown in taskforce -historical -forer-2012-2018.md.	; not specified metadata;

No	Municipality	Current concrete source / lead	Current control	Documented archive tracks
			Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	
11	Ikast-Brand	https://web.archive.org/web/20160914234342if_/http://www.ikast-brande.dk/media/9238218/task-force-analyserapport-ikast-brande-final-22-juni-2015.pdf	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Analysis 22.6.2015 all 79PDFsider text read; graffPDF48-59 visually read Exactly original-URL / locator appears in taskforce-historical-forer-2012@-@ 2018.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
12	Peas (without pods)	https://toender.kommune-tv.dk/watch/1384	KendtTask Force _ overall report PDF404; CDXonly 2024HTML404 page; nearestarchive 2016 also 404. KommunalTV28.4.2016 paragraph 10 actually refers to DAPH290416.pdf, also 404; availability 503.	; not specified metadata;
13	Nyborg	https://selvbetjening.nb-medier.dk/storage/media-library/2023/12/notat-om-administrationens-orienteringer-til-politiske-udvalg-om-sagsbehandlingen-pa-borne-og-famili-1702632137-unlkd.pdf	Memorandum from the original municipal sender, case S 2018-23721, but retrospective; contemporaneous annexes 5.12.2016/4.2.2019 not obtained. Newer tfh-lfb-nyborg concerns the disability sector, not this children's process.	; not specified metadata;
14	Glostrup	https://dagsorden.glostrup.dk/meeting/attachment/229801	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Status 2019 all 49PDFpages fully read; 10 / 10 current decisions with legal shortcomings, 20 cases in total. 2016 start-up measurement only later reproduction Exact original URL / locator appears from taskforce-glostrup-odder-fmk-svendborg-originaler.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	CDX metadata, not content control; 4 metadata; https://web.archive.org / cdx / search / cd x? url = glostrup.dk% 2F& matchType = prefix&out = json&filter = status code e% 3A200&filter = original% 3A.% 2A% 28% 5BTt% 5Dask% 7C% 5BAa% 5D nalyse report% 29.% 2A &collapse = digest&fl = tim estamp% 2Coriginal% 2 Cmimetype% 2Cstatec ode% 2Cdigest% 2Cleng th
15	Oats	https://dagsordener.odder.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/9bbfc597-021b-4361-9c65-9c09a096af04/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Analysis 2017 all 48PDFpages and status 2019 all 39PDFpages fully read; every 20 cases. Baseline a.k.a. Hashidentic; Slutalias only sidennummer / bulletcoding changed Exactly original-URL / locator appears in taskforce-gloinstrument -odder-fmk-svendborg-originer.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	CDX metadata, not a content check; 4 metadata; https://web.archive.org/cdx/search/cdx?url=odder.dk%2F&matchType=prefix&output=json&filter=statuscode%3A200&filter=original%3A.%2A%28%5BTt%5Dask%7C%5BAa%5Dnalyserapport%29.%2A&collapse=digest&fl=timestamp%2Coriginal%2Cmimetype%2Cstatuscode%2Cdigest%2Clength

No	Municipality	Current concrete source / lead	Current control	Documented archive tracks
16	Faaborg-Midtfyn	https://dagsordener.fmk.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/fccfe148-c8bf-43e7-a443-5be062d8e066/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Analysis 2017 all 47PDFpages, status 2020 all 43PDFpages and consultation 2 pages fully read; 20 cases each. Timetable Visually RAMcontrolled Exact Original URL / Locator	CDX metadata, not content control; 0 metadata; https://web.archive.org / cdx / search / cd x? url = fmk.dk% 2F&matc

No	Municipality	Current concrete source / lead	Current control	Documented archive tracks
			appears from taskforce-glostrup-odder-fmk-svendb org. original.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	hType=prefix&output=json&filter=statuscode%3A200&filter=original%3A.%2A%28%5BTt%5Dask%7C%5BAa%5Dnalyserapport%29.%2A&collapse=digest&fl=timestamp%2Coriginal%2Cmimetype%2Cstatuscode%2Cdigest%2Clength
17	Copenhagen	No specific original address	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Final January 2020 original all 48 pages fully RAM text read; Table 1 / 2PDF20 visually controlled.72 factorows / 5 local front chains; 19 legal cases, 10VISO recycled and 4 follow-up cases recycled. Exactly the original URL / locator is displayed in taskforce -korebenhavn 2020-full-original control.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
18	Svendborg	https://dagsordener.svendborg.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/8298c42e-6e69-40cc-93e3-ab5af491d842/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	Analysis/status original actually checked: analysis 6.2.2018, all 81 PDF pages, and September 2019 status, all 52 PDF pages, read fully as text;20 cases each, separate samples/methods. Baseline 4 section 65/final 2 section 65; final 3 points for attention in another category. The precise original URL/locator is provided in taskforce-glostrup-odder-fmk-svendborg-originaler.md. Other outstanding phase/follow-up material is listed separately; earlier access attempts do not attest to it.	CDX metadata, not content control; 2 metadata; https://web.archive.org / cdx / search / cd x? url = svendborg.dk% 2F &matchType = prefix&output = json&filter = statusco de% 3A200&filter = original% 3A.% 2A% 28% 5BTt% 5Dash% 7C% 5BAa% 5 Dalyse report% 29.% 2 A&collapse = digest&fl = ti mestamp% 2Coriginal% 2Cmimetype% 2Cstatuscode% 2Cdigest% 2Clength
19	Morsø	https://dagsordener.mors.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/f20c95d7-58ef-485e-bf5c-f564b3eeabcd/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Initial 2018 analysis all 59PDFpages as well as 2020 / 2021 municipal follow-up 2 + 1 page full read; finish 2021 report not provided Precise original -URL / locator can be found in taskforce -forloeb-2018-2021-original.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
20	Stevns	No specific original address	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Final 2020 -original all 52 pages text read and PDF22-23 tables visually RAM-controlled; 87 factorows / 17 time series Exactly original -URL / locator is shown in taskforce -stevns2020.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;

No	Municipality	Current concrete source / lead	Current control	Documented archive tracks
21	Product	https://dagsordener.vardekommune.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/90808af1-cdee-42fa-8324-e11227972561/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Analysis 2019 all 61PDFpages and status 2020 all 43 pages fully read; 2021 municipal presentation 2 pages fully read Exactly original URL / locator appears from	; not specified metadata;

No	Municipality	Current concrete source / lead	Current control	Documented archive tracks
			taskforce -forloeb-2018-2021-original.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	
22	Disc	https://dagsordener.skive.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/c47a482f-30ab-458c-8a5c-561ce38228d8/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	In fact, the RAM original check; all recorded facts are shown in read tables. Tried exact residual traces and hashidentic republications are documented in the module.	; not specified metadata;
23	Frederikssund	No specific original address	No specific report address provided	CDX metadata, not content control; 9 metadata; https://web.archive.org / cdx / search / cd x? url = frederikssund.dk% 2F&matchType = prefix &output = json&filter = state uscode% 3A200&filter = o riginal% 3A.% 2A% 28% 5 BTt% 5Dash% 7C% 5BAa% 5Dnalyse report% 29.% 2A&collapse = digest&f l = timestamp% 2Coriginal% 2Cmimetype% 2Cstat uscode% 2Cdigest% 2Cl length
24	Sønderborg	https://dagsordener.sonderborgkommune.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/ae2248d8-2174-431e-a2f8-fa6f4c66b3da/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Analysis 2019 all 61PDFpages and status 2020 all 50 pages fully read; 20 baseline / 4COVID learning cases with delimitations and original deviations Precise original URL / locator are shown in taskforce -forever -2018-2021original.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
25	Medium speed	No specific original address	Analysis/status original actually checked: initial June 2020 report, all 69 pages, and municipal development plan 2020, all 13 pages, read fully as text; PDF44/46/60 visually checked in RAM;110 factual rows/27 time rows/15 plan rows; final presentation in 2022 read separately. The precise original URL/locator is provided in taskforce-middelfart2020-original.md. Other outstanding phase/follow-up material is listed separately; earlier access attempts do not attest to it.	CDX metadata, not content control; 7 metadata; https://web.archive.org / cdx / search / cd x? url = middelfart .dk% 2F &matchType = prefix&out put = json&filter = statusco de% 3A200&filter = origine al% 3A.% 2A% 28% 5BTt% 5Dash% 7C% 5BAa% 5 Dalyse report% 29.% 2 A&collapse = digest&fl = ti mestamp% 2Coriginal% 2Cmimetype% 2Cstatus code% 2Cdigest% 2Clength
26	Odense 1	No specific original address	No specific report address provided	; not specified metadata;
27	Nordfyn	https://presscloud.com/file/74/746822242389248/Analyserapport_-_Nordfyns_Kommune_Socialstyrelsen_Task_Force_oktober_2020.pdf	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Introductory 2020 -Child original all 58 pages text read; PDF34 / 48 tables visually RAM-controlled; 75 factor rows / 11 time series Exactly original -URL / locator is displayed in taskforce -northfyn2020.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;

No	Municipality	Current concrete source / lead	Current control	Documented archive tracks
28	Slaughter	https://dagsordener.slagelse.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/5ed02c4a-a79a-4c4a-a90e-3b01c41d3572/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Analysis 2020 all 61 pages and municipal status 2021 all 15 pages full text; nine table / figure pages visually aligned in RAM; 111 factor rows / 20 municipal target rows Exactly original-URL / locator is shown in taskforce-slagement2020-2021original.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	CDX metadata, not content control; 9 metadata; https://web.archive.org / cdx / search / cd x? url = slagelse.dk% 2F& matchType = prefix&out = json&filter = status code e% 3A200&filter = original% 3A.% 2A% 28% 5BTt% 5Dask% 7C% 5BAa% 5D nalyse report% 29.% 2A &collapse = digest&fl = tim estamp% 2Coriginal% 2 Cmimetype% 2Cstatec ode% 2Cdigest% 2Cleng th
29	Frederiksber g	https://web.archive.org/web/20210529060436id_/https://www.frederiksberg.dk/sites/default/files/meetings-appendices/3274/Punkt_56_Bilag_1_Bilag_1_Task_Force_analyserapport_Fredriksberg_Kommune.pdf	Actual controlled analysis / status original: Introductory 2021 -original all 69 pages text read; PDF42 / 43 / 59 tables visually RAM-controlled; 69 factor rows / 18 time series Exactly original -URL / locator appears in taskforce -frederiksberg2021.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
30	Jammerbug	No specific original address	No specific report address provided	<urlopen error [WinError 10061] No connection could be made because the destination computer actively refused it>; 0 metadata; https://web.archive.org/cdx/search/cdx?url=jammerbugt.dk%2F&matchType=prefix&output=json&filter=statuscode%3A200&filter=original%3A.%2A%28%5BTt%5Dask%7C%5BAa%5Dnalyserapport%29.%2A&collapse=digest&fl=timestamp%2Coriginal%2Cmimetype%2Cstatuscode%2Cdigest%2Clength
31	Odsherd	No specific original address	Analysis/status original actually checked: final 2023 original, all 44 pages read fully as RAM text;37 factual rows/4 case chains.3×3 learning-case reviews are not 9 deduplicated children or a new final legal cohort. The precise original URL/locator is in taskforce-odsherred2023-fuld-originalkontrol. md. Other outstanding phase/follow-up material is listed separately; earlier access attempts do not attest to it.	The read operation timed out; 0 metadata; h ttps: / / web.archive.org / c dx / search / cdx? url = odsherred.dk% 2F&matchType e = prefix&output = json&Fiter = status code% 3A200 &filter = original% 3A.% 2 A% 28% 5BTt% 5Dask% 7C% 5BAa% 5Dnalysera report% 29.% 2A&collapse e = digest&fl = timestamp% 2Coriginal% 2Cmimty pe% 2Cstatuscode% 2C digest% 2Clength

No	Municipality	Current concrete source / lead	Current control	Documented archive tracks
32	Fredericia	https://dagsordner.fredericia.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/21039867-4690-4d91-b62b-44983eb6fe2a/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	In fact controlled analysis / status original: Final October 2023 report all 47 pages and 22.8.2024 follow-up annexes all 4 pages actually read; references 26.1.2022 / 12.10.2023 all 4 pages. New model 3 reviews / 9 cases; own measurement 163BFU / 71 exceedances / 3 declared valid ground. Baseline 20 cases only late rendering and contact documents exactly original URL / locator appears from taskforce-frederi cia-road-taarnby-herningeroriginer.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	<urlopen error [WinError 10061] No connection could be made because the target machine actively refused it>; 0 metadata; https://web.archive.org/cdx/search/cdx?url=fredericia.dk%2F&matchType=prefix&output=json&filter=statuscode%3A200&filter=original%3A.%2A%28%5BTt%5Dask%7C%5BAa%5Dnalyserapport%29.%2A&collapse=digest&fl=timestamp%2Coriginal%2Cmimetype%2Cstatuscode%2Cdigest%2Clength
33	Sunred	No specific original address	Actual controlled analysis / status original: All 65 + 49 pages in analysis 2022 / status 2024 as well as baseline 2 / consultation 19 actually read; additional main text and end controls in two specific modules Precise original URL / locator can be found in taskforce -solrod-odense-end2024-original control.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
34	Odense 2	No specific original address	Actually controlled analysis / status original: All 67 + 39 pages in analysis 2022 / status 2024 actually read; capturing 72 / 92 visually aligned; additional main text widget in specific module Exactly original URL / locator is shown in taskforce -solrod-odense-end2024-original control.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
35	Goldborgsund	No specific original address	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Initial 2022-original all 68 pages read, 64 factorows and 4 calculated times Exactly original-URL / locator appears in taskforce -goldborgsund2022.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
36	Road	https://dagsordener.vejen.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/48c85364-e901-49c1-8ae9-d1759f7f7e64/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Baseline 10.3.2023 all 43 pages, end 2024 all 26 pages, mid-2024 all 3 pages, own summer 2023 supervision all 12 + 12 pages and all graph cells actually read. TF12 cases / 9 cases; BFU8 / 9 temptation error, § 48 8 / 9,2 notifications. Municipal 10 / 3 control and source conflicts preserved. Exactly the original URL / locator is displayed in taskforce-fredericia-road-taarnby-herning-origine al.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	The read operation timed out; 0 metadata; h ttps: / / web.archive.org / c dx / search / cdx? url = road .dk% 2F&matchType = per efix&output = json&filter = status code% 3A200&felt is = original% 3A.% 2A% 2 8% 5BTt% 5Dash% 7C% 5BAa% 5Dalyse report% 29.% 2A&collapse = you est&fl = timestamp% 2Cor iginal% 2Cmimetype% 2 cstatusscode% 2Cdigest% 2Clength

No	Municipality	Current concrete source / lead	Current control	Documented archive tracks
37	Langeland	No specific original address	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Introductory 2023-original all 41 pages and Ministry 2026-follow-up all 16 pages checked; 42 factorows / 10 time series Exactly original-URL / locator is shown in taskforce-lanteland2023-2026.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
38	Tower	https://dagsordener.taarnby.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/65327a80-63c3-40af-af5e-9bbf493a1498/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Mid-way 2024 all 4 pages, slutaş 2025 all 23 pages, May 2026 follow up all 9 pages actually read. Development 3 reviews / 9 cases; 2026 three new cases, 2 inadequate closures / 1 notification. 2023 baseline only later reproduction; 2026RR level of knowledge documented. The exact original URL / locator is displayed in taskforce-fredericia-road-taarnby-hering-original.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	<urlopen error [WinError 10061] No connection could be made because the destination computer actively refused it>; 0 metadata; https://web.archive.org/cdx/search/cdx?url=taarnby.dk%2F&matchType=prefix&output=json&filter=statuscode%3A200&filter=original%3A.%2A%28%5BTt%5Dask%7C%5BAa%5Dnalyserapport%29.%2A&collapse=digest&fl=timestamp%2Coriginal%2Cmimetype%2Cstatuscode%2Cdigest%2Clength
39	Næstved	No specific original address	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Introductory 2023-original all 42 pages text read; 38 factorows / 5 time series, interview table PDF40 visual RAM-controlled Exactly original-URL / locator appears in taskforce-naestved2023-2025.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
40	Rudersdal	No specific original address	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Introductory June 2024 all 40 pages as well as five later original annexes all 41 pages read: Final Report 2026, hearing 2026, mid / extra 2025 and 25-point municipal matrix; 14 rows / 25 series of matrix Exactly original URL / locator appears in taskforce-rudersdal2024-2026-original.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	CDX metadata, not content control; 6 metadata; https://web.archive.org / cdx / search / cd x? url = rudersdal.dk% 2F &matchType = prefix&output = json&filter = statusco de% 3A200&filter = origineal% 3A.% 2A% 28% 5BTt% 5Dash% 7C% 5BAa% 5 Dalyse report% 29.% 2 A&collapse = digest&fl = ti mestamp% 2Coriginal% 2Cmimetype% 2Cstatuscode% 2Cdigest% 2Clength
No	**Municipality**	**Current concrete source / lead**	**Current control**	**Documented archive tracks**
41	Herning	https://dagsordener.herning.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/a0fd4b71-49d6-4c63-97ad-659d3057c6f6/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Baseline 2024 all 40 pages, mid-2025 all 4 pages, end May 2026 all 25 pages actually RAM-read.12 baseline 9 support / 3 prevention; all 3 preventative misdefined. Development 3 × 3 cases 2025 / 26; continuation, children's contact, decision and response deficiencies. 2026 separately. Exactly.	<urlope error [WinError 10060] An attempt to connect failed because the party who had connected did not reply correctly after a period, or one created

No	Municipality	Current concrete source / lead	Current control	Documented archive tracks
			The original URL / locator is displayed in taskforce-frederi cia-vejen-taarnby-herninger.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	connection was interrupted because the host did not reply>; 0 metadata; h ttps: / / web.archive.org / c dx / search / cdx? url = herni ng.dk% 2F&matchType = prefix&output = json&filte r = status code% 3A200&fi lter = original% 3A.% 2A% 28% 5BTt% 5Dask% 7C% 5BAa% 5Dnalyserapp ort% 29.% 2A&collapse = digest&fl = timestamp% 2 Coriginal% 2Cmimetype% 2Cstatuscode% 2Cdig est% 2Clength
42	Sorø	No specific original address	Actually controlled analysis / status original: Child analysis 2024 all 42 pages and final 2026 status all 27 pages fully RAM text read; 70 factorows / 5 local front chains. Baseline 12 = 9 support + 3 preventative; development phase 3 × 3 case readings are not 9 unique children. Precise original URL / locator appears in taskforce -soro-boern2024-2026-full-originer.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;
43	Fax	No specific original address	In fact controlled analysis / status original: Initial 2025 material 45PDFsidetals read Exactly original URL / locator appears in taskforce fakate2025.md. Other phase / follow-up residues are listed separately; previous access experiments do not certify these.	; not specified metadata;

Other schemes, separate from the 43 schemes

Municipality	Scheme	Actual reading	Module	Specific residual amount
Lyngby-Taarbæk	Adult handicap 2015	All 80 original pages, 105 factorial rows, 13 time indications	taskforce -ltk2015.md	Other main-text/phase originals and actual redress; only the stated detailed review is attested
Egedal	Child Handicap 2020	The entire April 2020 child-disability analysis: all 119 pages read fully in RAM, including main text, VISO, material review and legal tables. Same 20 cases with subsamples 8/5; no new cohort total.	taskforce -egedal-full-original control.md	Later 15-month status / development end; personal connection 20 / 8 / 5 and actual resumption / provided support, loss time, compensation and liability.
Sorø	Adult handicap 2024	The entire original: all 119 pages fully read RAM, including main text, juridics, VISO and both material annexes. The same 18 legal cases and 5 re-used VISO cases; no new cohortesum.	taskforce -soro-norfyngrowthfull-originealcontrol.md	Later development/final review; case-specific actual delivery/redress, person linkage, time lost, compensation and responsibility are not published in this original.
Nordfyn	Adult handicap 2025	The entire original: all 103 pages fully read RAM, including main text, juridics, VISO and both material annexes. The same 14 legal cases and 5 re-used VISO cases; no new cohortesum.	taskforce -soro-norfyngrowthfull-originealcontrol.md	Later development/final review; case-specific actual delivery/redress, person linkage, time lost, compensation and responsibility are not published in this original.
Frederikssund	Adult handicap 2022	All March 2022 original all 133 pages of text read; Table 1PDF62 visually in memory. 3 Reader Tables 119 factorial rows. Legal 18 / VISO5, Annex version 5 of 20 retained; non-central child analysis 2021.	taskforce -frederikssund-adult 2022-full-original control.md	Later 15-month status, actual delivery/redress, union of case records/individuals, sanction and compensation; children 2021 separately remain outstanding original material.

Registry authority and necessary specific enquiry

Ankestyrelsen, Social- og Boligstyrelsen and each municipality: original analysis, legal/VISO annexes, submission/exclusion form, measurement case key, follow-up measurement and final report for each process with document date/version number/case-record number/URL. Exclusions of already appealed cases and repeated cases must be stated. Actual redress requires the date of a new decision and a separate date for delivery, return home or payment; the three dates cannot be replaced by a completed development process. No request has been sent.

Task Force: cases, selection and continued errors

These accounts distinguish between disability and vulnerable children. Analysis, development and follow-up are phases in the same course. The same cases can be dealt with several times. A review of the case does not necessarily constitute a statement of objections. The accounts are extended by actual original controls; it is not yet a full national inventory.

Models and selection

Source / period	Specific information	Meaning of counting
Handicap, current model 2026 [TFMODELH]	Six long courses per year; two years; first come, first served. 20 legal cases, five socially assessed by the 20.	Five is a recycled subcommittee; not 25 cases. Self-search affects the selection.
Handicap 2023-2025 [TFRES 25]	Eight programmes/year: four applied for, four reserved on the basis of overturnings in Danmarkskortet. With fewer applications, more may be reserved.	Capacity and offers are not completed or the number of illegal cases.
Ministerial letter 21.5.2025 [TFRES 25]	The road refused in 2025. Odsherred, who refused in 2024, accepted the available offer in 2025.	The municipality's reasons are a statement, not documented redress following all overturnings.
Exposed children, current website [TFMODELB]	Established 2012; four advisory sessions / year. The task force shall not take a decision on personal matters.	Control finds must be linked to a separate reopening, supervision or appeal in the event of actual legal proceedings.

Egedal: children's disability, analysis September 2019-April 2020

The original's legal annexes are checked for method, errors and denominators, PDF 49-81; Tables 1 and 2 are also checked visually. [TFEGEDAL]

Measure	Counter / denominator or categories	The original locator
Committee on Legal Affairs	20; additional expenditure 8, loss of earnings 8, relief 4; appropriation 4 / refusal including partial refusal 16	PDF 49-50, Table 1
Legal deficiencies	14 / 20; hypothetical remittal for reconsideration 9 / 20; confirmation despite deficiency 5 / 20	PDF 54 / 56
Information / consultation / discretion under rule	9/20; 4/20; 1/20	PDF 51 / 57 / 69
Deficiencies per case	Three types 3; two types 4; one type 7	PDF 56
Overall assessment is missing	4/20	PDF 71
Improper time limit for appeal / 15	20/20	PDF 73
Time-limit exceeded	11 / 20: additional expenditure 5, work earnings 4, relief 2; 2-20 weeks, average 8,5 weeks	PDF 73-74
Written delay message	2 / 11; both without justification	PDF 73
Parental involvement is missing	3/20	PDF 74
Follow-up	3; not applicable 5; 12	PDF 74-75
Subcommittee on vulnerable children	8 of the 20: § 52 5; § 11 2; other concern 1	PDF 76, Table 2
Current investigation	Two during the measurement period, two before the period (one obsolete), one defect	PDF 77
Deadline of four months/§ 48 interview/action plan before the decision	Error 2 / 2; 4 / 5; 2 / 5	PDF 77-78

The request for cases changed: first 20 submissions, then 15, five and one replacement case. At least five appealed/currently processed cases and two with appeal-instruction errors were excluded during these rounds. The submissions are not 41 unique cases. Decisions previously examined by Ankestyrelsen were excluded; measurement generally covers two years before 16.8.2019. VISO reused five cases. [TFEGEDAL, PDF 80-81]

Own analysis: A refusal of respite care corrected only after the wait cannot by itself restore the assistance actually lost. The source identifies one specific delayed process involving a benefit in kind that was not implemented, PDF 73-74. The documented loss of time and missing support must therefore be included in the assessment of redress. The error categories overlap and cannot be added to the 14. The original's summary states three cases with wholly favourable findings and appeal guidance, while the detail section states four; both versions are retained. Hypothetical appeal consideration of the nine is not proof that the municipality actually reopened them or compensated the loss.

Sorø: exposed children, analysis 2024

12 cases: nine § 52 and three § 11; April-August 2024. Interview participants 20: advisors 6, management 2, perform 7, general 5. No total error counter. [TFSOROE24, PDF3-7 / 40-41]

Original-controlled targets	Figures and demarcation	PDF page
Personnel supervision deficient	2 / 3	35
Wrong date of decision in case of placing	2 / 3; most of all dates of decision are disputed, without precise figures	32

Original-controlled targets	Figures and demarcation	PDF page
Insufficient support suspect; sent to Ankestyrelsen	3 / 12, May 2024; subsequent outcomes not disclosed	33
Preventive bets	2 / 3 insufficient information; third study required	32-33
Duration of the investigation	One two years after the investigation decision	29
Follow-up	One still without follow-up seven months after start	35
Late Childhood Treatment	One went three months; according to the report forgot the start-up plan	27

In one case, the school was asked to send concerns rather than notifications; requests were not treated as notifications. Therefore, recorded 24 hour assessments do not cover all worrying approaches. [TFSOROE24, PDF26-28]

Own analysis: the count of timely processing becomes distorted if the municipality lets concerning approaches fall outside the notification population. The different error measures overlap; they must not be added together as children. A two-year assessment process requires independent examination of actual access to support and harm associated with specific periods. Forwarding to the Appeals Board documents a review step; redress must be proved by the subsequent course of the case.

Odsherred: exposed children, status 2023

Development period October 2021-January 2023; initial analysis of 20 cases. Six status meetings; three case reviews with a total of nine case occurrences in March/September 2022 and January 2023. Whether these are newly unique cases or overlap with the 20 is not stated. The final report continues to record overruns of the four-month deadline in the majority of ongoing assessments, according to the municipality's report. No precise numerator/denominator. Handling of safeguarding notifications is described as improved, but action plans, assessment and involvement still require work. The source chain concerning earlier audits in 2017/2019 and KLK 2020 is a later account here; the original reviews must be obtained separately. [TFODSHERRED 23, PDF 3-9/43]

Own analysis: The final report's improvement assessment cannot be used as a factor for corrected illegality or restored citizens. It requires a connection from the original case to a new decision, the actual start of the aid and, where appropriate, continued intervention. Verification of the Authority's statement of progress does not replace this citizen-based follow-up control.

Copenhagen: Follow-up case review 2020

19 cases from two entities; measurement period 23.1-31.12.2019. Types of proceedings: placement 3, family treatment 4, relief 2, contact person 2, § 11 offers 4, follow-up of older places 4. Age 0-3: 2,4 -7: 1,8-14: 8,15-17: 8. VISO recycled 10 of 19; start 2017 had 20. [TFKK 20, PDF 18-20 / 28]

Error target	Counter / denominator
Child involvement / § 48	3 / 10; same three cases
Parental involvement	0/11
Investigation missing / update missing	0/11;1/11
Four-month period / reasoned opinion	2/6;4/10
Investigation not completed before decision	0/7
Action plan missing / late	3/10;3/5
Insufficient information	1/19
Three / six-month follow-up	3/4;2/4
Personal supervision	1/4

The table is the original's table 1, PDF 20, with separate denominators; tables 1 and 2 have been visually reconciled. Children under one year, urgent interventions and the measurement period explain several denominator changes, PDF 21-24. In one case, first follow-up was seven months after placement, PDF 26. New deadline, reasoning and follow-up problems are identified against the initial measurement. One autism case is referred for own-initiative action; the subsequent outcome is not stated, PDF 25-26. [TFKK 20]

Our analysis: The follow-up sample documents that a completed development process and an overall assessment of improvement may be accompanied by continuing or new breaches of statutory requirements. The 14 numerators must not be summed as unique children affected by errors. The specific seven-month delay must be included in the consequences analysis as a case in which review of the child's placement intervention did not occur within the statutory deadline. Own-initiative action requires separate outcome checks to prove actual redress.

Sorø: end April 2026 - separate by period

Prior to April 2024-April 2026; six status meetings, seven municipal status reviews, three case reviews with nine entries: May / October 2025 and March 2026. The 12 cases and between the rounds are not available. The initial material had personalised surveillance errors 2 / 3 placing cases and incorrect decision date 2 / 3; these are recycled 2024 findings. The final control had three cases, not a representative national committee. [TFSOROE 26, PDF 3-5 / 19 / 21-22 / 26]

The Task Force continues to record insufficient parental / network involvement, lack of information and slowness. The municipality's internal review every six weeks is not a follow-up to the law. Retesting of notifications and the child's plan were without sufficient end-control basis; therefore, new workflows do not prove directed practices in these areas. [TFSOROE 26, PDF 16-24]

Own analysis: A new procedure and the institution's development assessment do not prove that the specific child was given timely help or that the family was reunited. The necessary coupling data are case ID, actual date of decision, child / parent participation, start of aid, monitoring visits and, where appropriate, continued interventions. The follow-up 2026 control will not be added to 2006-2025 as new citizens.

Specific remaining work

Sorø adult disability 2024, Nordfyn 2025, Faxe 2025 and Sorø children's 2024 malfunctions are now materially controlled in the separate modules and this module. A full central list of participants with the start / end date, analysis, status, legal annexes, sorted cases and resumption must be settled at the Social Security and Housing Agency /Ankestyrelsen. Public participation pages indicate capacity, but do not themselves provide a complete historical list of cases. Several identified municipal originals are still being investigated. No data request has been sent.

Sorø Adult Disability 2024: concrete errors and cut-off complaint

The entire original is now fully read in RAM, including the main text, VISO and material annexes. See? full original checks;. Same cases are reused; no new population.

22 submitted cases, four sorted out, 18 evaluated; five recycled by VISO. Decision window 14.12.2021-14.12.2023, latest and complex cases; recent appeals / AS decisions already taken are excluded, previous complaints allowed by other circumstances. A maximum of three appropriations were actually 11. Seven refusals. Distribution § 84 / 85 / 104 / 107 / 108 / ABL105: 1 / 8 / 2 / 3 / 2 / 2. [TFSOROEV24, PDF49-50 / 70-71]

Measure	Counter / denominator	PDF page
Legal deficiencies, at least one	14/18	54
Information relating to proceedings	8/18	55
Home / Justification / Misassessment	2/18;12/18;6/18	57-60
Party consultation / discretion under rule	1/18;1/18	60-61
Complaint guidance missing	2 / 7 relevant; other 15 meet guidance requirements	62
Quality standard not referred	17 / 18; last irrelevant	63

Measure	Counter / denominator	PDF page
Time-limit exceeded	3 / 6; 1-41 weeks, mean 22; no written message 3 / 3	65
Guardian involvement inadequate	2 / 18; retail also relatives	65-66
Action plan offered / irrelevant	4 / 18; 7 / 18; two prepared, one complete	67
Overall assessment is missing	14/18	67
Follow-up unknown / sufficient / irrelevant	3/18;8/18;7/18	69

PDF55 also indicates information / justification errors 6 / 12; the denominator is not explained and is not changed to 18. Table 1 and PDF55 are visually aligned. [TFSOROEV24]

A § 85 accompanying complaint was rejected as a level of service instead of being transmitted to the Ankestyrelsen. A termination decision for a citizen without the ability to defend his or her interests had no legal basis; guardian came later. [TFSOROEV24, PDF57 / 61]

Our analysis: The complaint documents a specific denial of access to review. The committee's requirement to exclude decisions already appealed may also exclude other cases affected by errors. Neither the 18 nor the 14 may be presented as the municipality's total number of errors or people. No documented remittal, compensation or actual redress follows from this analysis alone. The original complaint, registration date, reconsideration, forwarding decision, Ankestyrelsen's subsequent outcome and period without support must be found. The guardian's later appointment does not prove that the unlawful cessation decision and its financial or health consequences were remedied.

Source

• [TFSOROEV24] Public task force analysis, Sorø Adult Disability 2024,119PDFsider; SHA-256 fe3b5db41818fc4cfe8da98151e62f8f178368d99792e5b23aaf33ec5bebdb92. The audience link requires anonymous reading cookie. Legal error / method section PDF49-71 actually read; other annexes not yet fully examined. No original saved.

Nordfyn 2025: all eligible cases and excluded complaints

The entire original is now fully read in RAM, including the main text, VISO and material annexes. See? full original checks;. Same cases are reused; no new population.

14 cases assessed: nine refusals / five appropriations; § 85 / 95 / 96 / 97 / 107 / 108: 6 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 3 / 2. Window 15.10.2022- 15.10.2024; latest, complex cases. The municipality states that 14 are all eligibility cases; Ankestyrelsen therefore considers its control to be comprehensive general practice. Recent decisions already appealed / AS are excluded; mainly mental difficulties are excluded as the main cause. [TFNORDFYN25, PDF46-47 / 62-64]

Measure	Error counter / denominator	PDF page
Legal deficiency at least one	8/14	49
Information / Statement of reasons	7 / 14; 7 / 9 relevant	50/52
Both above	6 / 7 not available	55
Home / Misassessment	1/14;2/14	50/55
Party consultation / discretion under rule	0/14;0/14	56
Appeal guidance	14 / 14; only written complaint indicated	56-57
Overshooting	4 / 14; 11-23 weeks, mean 18; no message 4 / 4	59

Measure	Error counter / denominator	PDF page
Action plan offers missing / prepared insufficient	2 / 3 relevant; 1 / 1	60
Overall assessment is missing	10/14	60
Follow-up unknown / enlightened / irrelevant	2/14;1/14;11/14	62
Citizens' involvement is lacking	0/14	59

Own analysis: The Board of Appeal's statement of general practice can only bear the criterion-defined population. Excluded complaints and other diagnoses cannot subsequently be considered as flawless cases. The eight are a union of certain types of legal deficiency; the 14 flawed complaint guides are another objective.

The original's only adequate follow-up is based on the announced three-month meeting, not documented. It proves a plan, not actually visit or directed support. [TFNORDFUN25, PDF62]

Source

• [TFNORDFUN25] Ankestyrelsen/ Social and Housing Agency Nordfynanalyse 2025,103PDFsider; SHA-256 0d3015ff129e5902a402c98d07ca042881630754b7c3ab81891fabc5e39dc86d. Legal error / method sections 46-64 actually read; other annexes not yet fully checked. Local authority Official publication page refers directly to the original.

Sorø 2024 and Nordfyn 2025:full checking of original adult disability reports

Both public originals have been read in their entirety in memory: Sorø 119 pages and Nordfyn 103 pages. The table below records review of both the main text and all embedded annexes. Originals or images have not been saved. The information supplements the earlier legal submodules; the same 18 and 14 cases are reused. VISO subsamples of 5 cases in each municipality overlap the legal sample. No new case total or person total is created and nothing is added to the 43 central child case trajectories.

The numbers contain survey outcomes, administrative time targets, organisational / method versions and rule statements with their own unit. Administrative promises are not counted as actual meetings or actual support. Examples without identifiable coupling have not been counted as new citizens. Locators are PDFs pages, not necessarily the printed page number of the report.

Original	The whole original	Visual checks;	Legal / VISO-udva ed	Source
Sorø Adult Disability 2024	119 pages	50	18 / 5; Annex denominator 20 retained	Public original
Nordfyn Adult Disability 2025	103 pages	7, 8, 47	14 / 5	Public original

Sorø Adult Disability 2024

Control: All PDFs pages 1-119 fully read text in RAM; previously sub-widget 49-71 realigned. Trunking 22-26 and 77-78 reread separately.

SHA 256: fe3b5db41818fc4cfe8da98151e62f8f178368d99792e5b23aaf33ec5bebdb92.

Analysis basis, own control and time / organisation targets

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Analysis themes	4	policy, professional management, handling, overall / coherence;	PDF 4
Valuation scale grades	4	quality, no error rate	PDF 5
Theme Day	January 2024	managers / employees; participant-n not disclosed	PDF 5
Citizens' interviews	February 2024	interview -n not disclosed	PDF 6
Group interviews	March 2024	6 listed groups; person-n unknown	PDF 6
Data collection / analysis	December 2023-August 2024	not power measurement after the process;	PDF 6
Team Advisers	12	Team Handicap and Psykiatrics	PDF 6
Professional coordinator / team manager / brain injury coordinator	1/1/1	organisation, not sanctions for responsibility for errors	PDF 6
Administrative assistant / student assistant	1/1	associated team	PDF 6
Vision	2023-2026	replace 2019-2022;	PDF 9
Disability policy	January 2024	approval; replaces 2017-2021, unknown / unused among advisors	PDF 10
Basic principles of disability policy	4	Reference to a UN convention in policy, not a compliance review	PDF 10
Disability policy themes	5	Annual designation of development areas; first implementation 2025 expected	PDF 10-11
Citizens' meeting policy	2017	5 themes; evaluation every 2 years	PDF 11
Development Programme Track	3	authority, bid fraud, financial / management information	PDF 12
Special training	6	training days, all advisors first semester 2024; not error-free targets;	PDF 13
Programme politically anchored	2020-2023	budget / efficiency / analysis; no direct link to disability policy;	PDF 13
Year of quality standards	2015/2018/2021/2024	areas different; unequal / outdated	PDF 15
Reference to quality standard	from 2024	decided; so far until 2023 not practice	PDF 15
§ 85 review submission	February/April 2024	materials list February vs comment / interview April; both are preserved	PDF 15
Compact report	1	time / year; no actual citizen number reproduced;	PDF 16
Economic Policy Review	3	times / year in addition to accounts;	PDF 16
Management / Consultant Economic Report	1	time / month; future quarter for advisors planned	PDF 17
Follow-up meetings management / coordinator / economic consultant	2	times / month	PDF 17
Staff meetings	5-6	times / year; entire Social Service	PDF 19

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Team meetings	14	day interval, straight weeks	PDF 19
Nexus meetings	14	day interval, odd weeks	PDF 20
Article 85 / 103 / 104	1	once / week, Thursdays	PDF 20
Article 100	1	time / month	PDF 20
Case consultation with decision-making powers	2	times / month, planned	PDF 20
Vice-Committee	1	once / month, future cadence	PDF 20
Supervision	5	times / year, according to self-evaluation / interview	PDF 21
§ 141 Action Plan with Action in VISO	1	of 5 socio-professional cases; overall / difficult to measure	PDF 32
GRUS-MUS	1	time / year; beginning autumn 2019	PDF 22
Introduction programme	3	weeks	PDF 23
Mentors' scheme	February 2024	testing as ambition;	PDF 23
§ 100 management supervision	1	time / quarter	PDF 24
Other cases of new supervision	1	case / employee / quarter; from 2024, actual year not disclosed	PDF 24
New action: first follow-up	3	months, municipal statements; actual uniformity contradicted by case control	PDF 34
Further follow-up	1	time / year as ambition	PDF 34
VISO documented follow-up meeting	1	of 5; letter of invitation and minutes of meetings	PDF 34
VISO follow-up without informed consultant participation	1	of 5; decision on export particulars	PDF 34
VISO Trivsel Conclusion against Citizens' Statements	1	of 5; § 107-	PDF 35
Better Message Project	2021-2022	professional initiatives, not redress for specific decisions	PDF 36
TUT Agreement	September 2023	updated, the child's law still being incorporated	PDF 41
Transitional guidance meetings	16/17	years; procedure, not number of persons	PDF 41
VISO specific transition example	1	of 5; meeting / note	PDF 42
Cross-cutting young team	1	time / month	PDF 42
Transitional overview	1	time / quarter; consultants actually lack overview	PDF 42
Coordinated youth action target group	14-29	year, 3 subject areas; not age distribution in measurement take-offs	PDF 43-44
Overvision duration	3	hours / meeting, 5 meetings / year; own product 15 hours are not actually attendance statistics	PDF 102
Grass-Mouse-Different Year	2022	focus group interview in place for generalprocess	PDF 103
Documented political disability policy tracks	15.1./31.1.2024	committee approval / recommendation to the municipal council;	PDF 94

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
§ 85 presentation of the audit in the material list	19.2.2024	versus main text interview April 2024	PDF 100
Mandatory course areas	4	enumerated expectation; actual number not disclosed	PDF 104
Additional course areas	9	enumerated according to question / need	PDF 104
TUT Material Cadence	2	times / month, Tuesday week; main text says 1 / month	PDF 108

Original quality standards of the Task Force

Information	Counter, measure or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Total	to some extent	method other than the legal control of 18 cases	PDF 7
Policy / strategy	to a large extent,	quality assessment, not error rate;	PDF 18
Professional management	to some extent	quality assessment;	PDF 25
Procedure	to some extent	quality assessment;	PDF 38
Overall / Context	to a large extent,	Despite not all § 122 young people covered	PDF 46
Assessment/evaluation/decision systematics	to a lesser extent	specific sub-function;	PDF 31
Selection of actions: Systematic / Information Base	to a lesser extent	specific sub-function;	PDF 33
Transition child / adult	to some extent	specific sub-function;	PDF 43

Original Table 1: Cases by performance and result

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
§ 84 Refusal / authorisation	1/0	n 1	PDF 50
§ 85 Refusal / Authorisation	3/5	n 8	PDF 50
§ 104 Refusal / authorisation	1/1	n 2	PDF 50
§ 107 refusal / authorisation	2/1	n 3	PDF 50
§ 108 refusal / authorisation	0/2	n 2	PDF 50
ABL § 105 Refusal / Authorisation	0/2	n 2	PDF 50
Total refusal / authorisation	7/11	n 18; termination of the measurement at its own request	PDF 50 / 58

Legal outcomes and delimited sub-denominators

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Legal deficiency	14	18	PDF 54
Deficiencies in fact-finding	8	18	PDF 55
Information and reasons	6	12	PDF 55; own denominator 12 in the original, not addressed to 18
Consent open	1	18	PDF 56
Deficiency of residence	2	18	PDF 57
Free choice long-term accommodation	2	The review text's subsample; no guidance necessary because the person requested the offer	PDF 57-58
Deficiency of reasons	12	18	PDF 58
Wrong assessment	6	18	PDF 59
Party consultation deficit	1	18	PDF 60
Estimates under rule	1	18	PDF 61; cut-off specific § 85 complaint
Complaint guidance given / applicable	5/7	2 relevant deficiencies	PDF 62
Appeal guidance despite a wholly favourable finding	10	11; not duty; not error alone	PDF 62 / 50
Complaint guidance meets requirements	15	15; they actually gave, not all 18	PDF 62
Quality standard not referred	17	18; last 1 irrelevant	PDF 63
Relevant time-limit control	6	18; delimited sub-denominator	PDF 65
Time-limit exceeded	3	6; estate, § 85, § 84	PDF 65
Overrun interval	1-41	weeks	PDF 65
Average exceedance	22	weeks among 3 senior	PDF 65
Written delay message / justification	0/0	of 3 members; separate requirements	PDF 65
Guardians / relatives insufficiently involved	2	18; retail 1 guardian / 1 mother; not 2 guardians documented	PDF 65-66
Action plan offered	4	18; relevant extract 11	PDF 67
Action plan offers irrelevant	7	18; refusal / termination	PDF 67
Action plan not offered	7	11; own 18 − 7 − 4, source describes remaining	PDF 67
Action plan prepared	2	4; 2 citizens' rejection of tenders	PDF 67
Action plan meets requirements	1	2; second missing expected time	PDF 67
Overall assessment is missing	14	18	PDF 67
Follow-up not disclosed	3	18	PDF 69
Follow-up sufficiently informed	8	18	PDF 69
Follow-up irrelevant	7	18	PDF 69

Submission and selection

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Called	20	4st quarter 2023	PDF 49
Submitted	22	2 additional	PDF 49
Dissorted	4	22	PDF 49; example outside period, causation unknown
Measured	18	22; not representative	PDF 49
Maximum allowed § 85	10	20	PDF 70
Authorised in full not exceeding	3	20	PDF 70
Actual appropriation	11	18; deviating from maximum 3	PDF 71
§ 84 measured outside originally desired	1	18	PDF 71
Resolution Window	14.12.2021-14.12.2023	latest / complex, municipal selected	PDF 70
Last complaint / AS decision	excluded	previous complaint only for other circumstances allowed;	PDF 70
Primary mental difficulties	excluded	dementia / brain injury / autism including; mental comorbidity possible	PDF 71
Local authority acts	all relevant	and older documents whose meaning; no supplementary actual appeal	PDF 49 / 71
Internal scheme response groups	3	yes / no / irrelevant; substantial comments	PDF 71
Analysis tables / cases of the method detection	20	the original's 20 despite actually 18	PDF 71

Historical rule and legal-consequence references, separate from outcomes

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Time limit for bringing an action	4	weeks, RTL § 67; historical basis of control	PDF 74
Quality standard for certain services	1	time / year at least; non-documented implementation	PDF 76
§ 129 Movement without consent	5	simultaneous conditions in the rule list; no actual count	PDF 78
Follow-up	Current	SEL § 148 (2); no general fixed annual limit as a rule	PDF 76

VISO: recycled cases and defined observations

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Social-work sample	5	PDF 85 says of 20 submitted; PDF 6 says of 18 measured; legally actually 22 submitted	PDF 6 / 49 / 85
Case numbers	4/7/12/17/20	anonymised case ID, not 5 new persons;	PDF 85
Social study period	12.2.-11.3.2024	2 years back from the call	PDF 85
VISO direction indicator marks	4	involvement, assessment, choice of intervention, follow-up	PDF 85
§ 85 Termination	1	5	PDF 85
§ 82 b → § 85	1	5	PDF 85; self-counting
§ 107 Refusal / § 85 Authorisation	1	5	PDF 85
§ 107 termination	1	5	PDF 85
§ 108 Authorisation / free choice	1	5	PDF 85
VUM available	5	5; great variation, no quality completeness derived	PDF 87
Action plan available	1	5	PDF 86 / 89
Orders available	0	5; omission of material, not proof of everything not presented	PDF 86 / 89
Action plan	6	1 action plan; overall / not specifically measurable	PDF 89
VISO particularly good guardianship involvement	1	5	PDF 87
VISO fertility concluded without necessary medical clarification	1	5	PDF 87
VISO assessment not updated despite severe loss of function	1	5	PDF 87
VISO assessment updates	0,5	year in second example, number not disclosed	PDF 87
VISO specialists prompted by counsellor	0	in accessible material;	PDF 88
VISO neurophysiological update possible	1	5; implementation not documented	PDF 88
VISO decision on refusal and authorization	1	5	PDF 89
VISO real-time follow-up meeting	1	5; the same cause of contradiction of well-being	PDF 89
VISO termination without documented consultant participation	1	5; decrease in function not treated	PDF 89
VISO transitional proceedings	1	5; meeting/note, but no subsequent cooperation until STU/residential placement	PDF 90
§ 104 Special support for persons limited	4 halves / 2 whole	days; municipal maximum without legal basis	PDF 115

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Section 107 expectation of independence, at most	1-2	year; excludes settlement for long-term residence	PDF 116
§ 107 appropriation as a starting point	6	months; fixed-term continuous benefit illegal	PDF 116
§ 83 cleaning damage	3	weeks; it shall be possible to derogate from specific requirements;	PDF 117
§ 85 additional transitional support	3	months as a municipal example; may not be used as a fixed-term decision;	PDF 117

Material Control Rule Statements, Time and Scale Objectives

Information	Counter, measure or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Legal Material Note	15.4.2024/19.4.2024	original / updated, same built-in version	PDF 111
Quality standards reviewed	4	Only measured areas; not all materials	PDF 111
Local functional function scale	0-4	unlawful automatic delimitation of eligibility	PDF 111
Function level / § 85	0-4; moderate / difficult / complete as access requirements	Automatic exclusion of light / limited support needs is incorrect; activity-specific assessment is required	PDF 111-114
Input strapper	§ 82 a / b over § 85	Preventive aid cannot replace required § 85compensation	PDF 112
Appeals	General / basic case; Social Service / Team Older	No basic threshold or specific municipal recipient as access requirement	PDF 112
§ 84 relief	Day centre / short visits / limited task list	Other locations, duration and tasks may be necessary upon concrete assessment	PDF 113
§ 84 relatives	Preventive replacement	In fact, specify care and that relatives are not employed for the same task	PDF 113
§ 84 duration / escort	Always temporary; no escort out of home	No pre-time limit; escorts cannot be automatically excluded	PDF 113
Compass Mode	Always through preventive offers	Not mandatory for § 85 persons	PDF 114
§ 85 Cutting	Medical transport / nursing home / stay	No general exclusion; concrete § 83 / 85 needs to be measured	PDF 114
§ 85 Transport payment	Citizen pays	Transport as part of the aid does not require citizens' payment	PDF 114
§ 104 Offer / supplier	Unlisted / listed offers only	§ 104 searched; appropriate supplier assessed individually	PDF 114-115
§ 104 progression / v parity	Restore skills; always temporary	Development not conditionally; longer support may be necessary; no decision time limit	PDF 115
§ 104 Aid ceiling	Half days; max 4 half days / 2 whole days	No legal basis for automatic volume cap	PDF 115
§ 104 Transport / Registration	Common transport; list of suppliers	Actual capacity for joint transport shall be tested; a search offer in the Offering Portal;	PDF 115
Housing and budget	Consistency with approved budget	Word sounds can be read as needs depending on budget; required rewording, not proof of concrete budget rejection	PDF 115-116
§ 107 progression	Max 1-2 years for self-mastering	The provision also includes clarification of future settlement	PDF 116
§ 107 Participation requirements	Engaged in training / job-oriented offers	Non-permitted general access requirements	PDF 116
§ 107 Length of appropriations	As a starting point 6 months	Current performance without predetermined cessation; needs at STU must be tested individually	PDF 116
§ 107 / 108 own contribution	Statutory Order 1387 / 12.12.2006; PM 25-18	Historical source reference, no amount of post-payment specified	PDF 116-117
§ 108 access / free choice	Profits of a close educational environment; own offers	No such access requirement; own offers may not restrict free choice	PDF 117

Information	Counter, measure or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Resolution Template	Only the amount of the individual payment; oral complaint to named adviser	Self-payment requires a separate statement of reasons / redress; no specific complainant	PDF 117
§ 83 / 85 new practice	Cleaning every 3 weeks; care / structure § 83; transition 3 months	Individual derogation; correct provision § 85; no automatic time limit	PDF 117
Compact workflow	§ 82 a / b while considering § 85 application	The measures cannot be used for § 85 people; the target group's cut surface is cloudy	PDF 118

Documented consequences and source chains

• PDF 28 refers to legally inadequate case information as the majority of 18, while the detail numerator is 8 / 18. Maintain statements / counts separately, no majority derived from 8.

• PDF 32 municipal practice provides action plans on residential offers, not § 85 / mobile offers / day offers; legal obligation may also apply there. The accommodation framework alone without a specific aid decision is insufficient PDF 31.
• PDF 29-30 specific § 85 complaint rejected as service level; termination for legal inhabil citizen and other decision addressed to the supplier. Same 18 cases, not new fault counters.

• PDF 42-43 automatic handover only for residential accommodation; others through Kompasset as new applications. Interviews describe late adult assessment and a lack of coordinated transition for some young people covered by section 122 of the Children's Act. Number/period of loss unknown.

• PDF 68-69 support discontinuation followed by uncovered personal / practical assistance; functional level documented aggravated without reaction. Another case denies accommodation without assessing the need without parents' two daily visits. No period / payment / repair declared.

• PDF 66 guardians hear about the terminated supplement fee from the estate offer; the municipality considers payment / § 103 → § 104 as a supplier, fails citizen's decision, parties only later. Late consultation is not evidence of full repair.

• PDF 72-84 legal overview expressly states:formal failures of safeguards may invalidate a substantively correct decision; SEL § 82 care without consent but without physical coercion;§ 141 offer, RTL § 5 holistic assessment,§ 148 follow-up. PM 22-18:deficient guidance may permit assistance from an earlier date; the absence of an alternative move/support option breaches the duty of care. These legal descriptions are not documented redress outcomes in 18 cases.

• VISO PDF 87-90 citizens' statement on mistrust contradicted by conclusion, lack of medical clarity of ability, documented loss of function untreated, cooperation material from other departments unused and transition meeting without further start before STU / boarding. Actual cessation / loss time and subsequent repair is missing.

• PDF 92-103 material list is the gross list of existing documents already in force, without CPR / names; must be included even if website. There are document titles and political meeting dates, not reproduced citizen counts from Targit / census 2023. The Material List is therefore a source chain for the Authority's knowledge, not a new performance register.

• PDF 111- 118 legal material note 15.4. / updated 19.4.2024 automatically establishes the exclusion of light support needs, forced Compass advance, incorrect complaint limits, excluded § 85accompanying / nursing homes / clarification stay, illegal § 104 half-day / support aximum, progress requirements, time constraints § 84 / 104 / 107 / 85, estate related to budget and limited free choice. Self-payment without a separate reasoned decision and oral complaint to a particular adviser is criticised. Number of citizens actually affected, loss time / reoccurrence unknown.

Observed deviations between the original parts

• PDF 13 says all advisors completed 6 course days first semester 2024; PDF 23 says the same training planned. Same period, different status statements.

• PDF 25's list of strengths calls the handling of alterations/remittals established practice; PDF 22 limits the established practice to section 100 and states that there is no established team practice on remittals. No general compliance can be inferred.
• PDF 34 advisors / self evaluation claims continuous systematic follow-up; VISO and the executor find dissimilar practices. PDF 35 final assessment says fixed cadence, but the same main text does not document any fixed call / participant practice. Keep the method difference.

• PDF 33 Advisors claim uniform orders, exporters apply differences in Nexus / apply. None of the interviews can replace the specific case deficiencies.

• PDF 55 calls overlap 6 out of 12 after 8 undisclosed cases.12 corresponds to justification deficiencies in PDF 58; no transfer of 12 to the entire sample. Main text PDF 28 claims the majority undisclosed despite 8 / 18.

• PDF 65 states 2 insufficiently involved guardians, but PDF 66 examples show 1 guardian and 1 mother. Retain 2 cases as overall deficiencies in involvement of citizens/relatives; not 2 guardians.

• The PDF 71 refers to 20 analysis forms and 20 cases, despite 18. Method Template / Population Conflict is maintained.

• PDF 53 does not say variable follow-up, while the detail PDF 69 distributes 3 unlit / 8 enlightened / 7 irrelevant and the main text describes the inequal practices.

• PDF 77 headline calls § 84 social pedagogical support, while the rule text correctly deals with replacement / relief; the measurement continues to refer to § 84 relief.

• PDF 70 the first performance list of the call § 85 / 107 / 108 / 105, but later in fact § 84 / 104 and the other 18 distribution. In fact, keep the result population.

• VISO-original PDF 85 calls 5 of 20 submitted; legal PDF 49 says 22 submitted / 18 measured and main method PDF 6 says 5 of 18.5 is maintained, all three denominators with version / page are retained.

• TUT-main text PDF 42 says 1 meeting / month; the material list's municipal procedures PDF 108 says 2 times / month. Both periodic statements shall be retained; no automatic implementation figures.

Concrete lack of power and responsibility documents

• No unread pages in this 119 page original. Later status / end runs and documented individual repair outcomes do not appear here.

• Personal dedup between 18 legal, 5 VISO, examples and 22 submitted; citizen interview -n and document rules actually affected population unknown.

• Sorø Kommune / AS / SBST: concrete resignations, new decisions, aid delivered, termination periods, transmission of cut-off § 85 complaint and actual compensation / liability is requested coupled with dates.

Nordfyn Adult Disability 2025

Checking: All PDFs pages 1-103 full text read in RAM, including main text, legal annexes, VISO, material list and material control. Table 1 PDF 47 visually controlled.

SHA 256: 0d3015ff129e5902a402c98d07ca042881630754b7c3ab81891fabc5e39dc86d.

Analysis bases, organisation, political and administrative cadence

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Analysis themes	4	organisational / factual, not four error populations;	PDF 4
Rate of assessment	4	quality scale;	PDF 5
Thematic Day / Citizens' Interviews / Gruppe Interviews	February 2025	6 interview groups; person-n not available	PDF 5-6
Data collection / analysis	January-June 2025	baseline, not actual development result	PDF 6
Common Adult Authority	1.1.2025	social / health / elderly; organisational chart on the same date;	PDF 6 / 8, visual
Team internal advisors	6	adult disability;	PDF 7
Team external advisors	2	adult disability;	PDF 7
Specialist team staff	3	car / extra cost / BPA	PDF 7
Head of adult authority services/professional lead/administrative employee	1/1/1	organisational functions, not sanctions;	PDF 6
Management reinforcement	2023-2024	after longer management absences; length unknown	PDF 7
Vision	2022	3 themes	PDF 10
Political basis	2022-2025	8 goals / ambitions, 4 year period	PDF 11
Master plan	2023	3 strategic initiatives; 4 pointers	PDF 12
Policy master plan follow-up	2	times / year, according to the commune	PDF 12
Master plane power / progress dimensions	5	control criteria, non-efficacy numbers;	PDF 12
Confidence strategy principles	5	2022-2025; annual survey of citizen service users	PDF 13-14
Dialogue meeting on trust strategy	1	time / year	PDF 14
Strategic House	2023	4 direction markers / 4 values; no concrete target / follow-up practice	PDF 14-15
Quality standards	2024 approved / late abolished	only legally retained; unknown date of abolition	PDF 16
Budgetary follow-up	4	times / year	PDF 17
Professional policy management information	2	times / year	PDF 17
Administrative activity report	1	time / month	PDF 17
Team meetings	1	once / week	PDF 20
Staff meetings	1	time / month	PDF 20
System administrator visits	3	week interval	PDF 21
Review of overturnings by a lawyer	2	times / year, last 6 months; action plan, not secured actual practice	PDF 21
Introduction examples	2	materials not introduced by number;	PDF 22
Pre-suspension management supervision	2	cases / month from 2 employees, introduced 2024;	PDF 23

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Management supervision current	0	suspended; in fact nothing at the time of analysis	PDF 23
New action follow-up	3	months, municipal procedure	PDF 32
Further follow-up	1	time / year at least, but postponed / priority;	PDF 32
Certain follow-up meetings for residential services	2	year interval; administrative follow-up other years	PDF 32
Transitional Agreement	8.10.2024	Expected implementation March 2025; first meetings at February interview	PDF 39
Review of the Interim Agreement	Summer 2025	Expectations; undocumented implementation	PDF 39-40
Management meetings	4 annually	Plan / practice statements; no record of meetings carried out	PDF 40
Transitional extract	5 years; 3 months before quarterly meeting	Annual future 18 annual groups; quarterly next 16 years. No number of children	PDF 40
Transitional meetings	16 and 17,5 years	Process objectives; not number actually achieved	PDF 40
Lack of transition meeting and guidance	1 interviewer	The family had to find support for itself; no personal connection to VISO	PDF 41
Coordination	Weekly; earlier every 14 days	Weekly time 2024 only limited use; older / social-management meetings stopped by aggregation	PDF 43

Original quality standards of the Task Force

Information	Counter, measure or version	Names, units and delineation;	Original site
Policy / strategy	to a large extent,	control method, not error rate;	PDF 18
Professional management	to some extent	the management method;	PDF 24
Development of competence	to a large extent,	part function	PDF 23
Management supervision	to a lesser extent	current non-supervision;	PDF 24
Saving / knowledge sharing	to some extent	part function	PDF 22
General proceedings	to some extent	neither fault rate nor repair;	PDF 36
Choice of effort: tools / systems	to a large extent,	method / interview contradiction	PDF 31
Follow-up	to some extent	cadence not always observed	PDF 34
Citizens' involvement systematics	to a large extent,	specific sub-function;	PDF 36
Organisation according to citizens' resources / wishes	to a very large extent	specific sub-function;	PDF 36
Transition: guidelines / practice	High / Some	Two different quality dimensions	PDF 42
Overall and coherence	Someone.	Total original quality degree	PDF 44

Original Table 1: Performance and decision result

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
SEL § 85	4/2/6	Full refusal / authorisation / total	PDF 47
SEL § 95	0/1/1	Same result columns	PDF 47
SEL § 96	1/0/1	Same	PDF 47
SEL § 97	1/0/1	Same	PDF 47
SEL § 107	1/2/3	Same	PDF 47
SEL § 108	2/0/2	Same	PDF 47
Total	9/5/14	Cases, not additional citizens	PDF 47

Legal outcomes and precise sub-denominators

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Committee	20 called / 14 submitted and measured	The municipality only provides 14 criteria in October 2022-October 2024	PDF 46
Legal deficiencies Union	8/14	Overlapping legal basis, information, justification and assessment	PDF 49
Information relating to proceedings	7 insufficient / 7 sufficient of 14	Five identified information themes; no personal add-ons	PDF 48 / 52
Home	1 defective / 13 other 14	§ 95 authorisation illegally limited to 1 year	PDF 48 / 50
Reasons	7 deficiencies / 2 sufficient of 9 relevant; 5 full appropriations	Summary calls 7 out of 14 sufficient, including 5 without obligation to state reasons	PDF 48 / 50
Overlap information / justification	6 / 7 not available	Same cases, not new wrong citizens.	PDF 55
Wrong assessment	2 / 14; 12 correct	§ 95 wrongly referred to as BPA and day-to-day monitoring, possible incomplete support	PDF 48 / 55
Party consultation / discretion under rule	0/14;0/14	Only measured in writing committee	PDF 48 / 49
Appeal guidance	14 / 14 deficient	Written demands; 5 full appropriations without obligation to provide guidance also included	PDF 56-57
Quality standard in decisions	0/14	No use or reference; standards' own rules missing separately	PDF 58
Periods exceeded	4/14	11-23 weeks; average 18 weeks.0 / 4 written	PDF 59
Citizens / members of the public	14/14	Actbased measurement; experienced involvement not measured	PDF 59
Action plan offers	1 offer / 2 missing / 11 irrelevant of 14	3 relevant; 1 plan prepared, 1 / 1 missing expected duration	PDF 60
General assessment	10 / 14 deficient	Several reasons for deficiencies may relate to the same case	PDF 60-61
Follow-up	2 without / 1 with / 11 irrelevant of 14	The 1 with is announced meeting after 3 months, not documented event	PDF 62

Sampling, reuse and methodological limitation

Information	Counter, measure or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Period of decision	15.10.2022-15.10.2024	Recent, complex and relevant cases	PDF 63
Original Performance List	§ 84 / 85 / 95 / 96 / 97 / 103 / 104 / 107 / 10 8; ABL 105	Actual 14 breakdown by 6 benefits in Table 1	PDF 62
Planned Committee	20; a maximum of 10 § 85; a maximum of 3 full appropriations	In fact 14; 6 § 85; 5 appropriation. Method Template 20 is still in the call text	PDF 62 / 47
Excluded	Recent decision appealed / appealed or decided by Ankestyrelsen	Former second appeal proceedings may be brought; not national committee union	PDF 63
Diagnostics	Mainly mental difficulties excluded	Cognitive / intellectual and autism modes included; mental comorbidity may be included	PDF 63
Current period	2 years plus older relevant acts	Lack of appeal / reassessment / additional information in this quality review	PDF 46 / 63
Response Scale	Yes / no / not applicable; 14 schedules	Cross-cutting voting; no effective appeal decision	PDF 64

Time / scale requirements of the rule overview, separated from actual outcomes

Information	Counter, measure or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Time limit for bringing an action	4 weeks	Clause 67 of the Law on Legal Security; no new case	PDF 67
Quality standard	At least 1 time annually for certain benefits	Non-obligation to standard on all selected services	PDF 68
Cash grant	More than 20 hours / week; 48 hours / week related, with exemption	Historical representation of rules; unmeasured hours of needs	PDF 70
Care / rights of the parties	§ 82 / § 141 / § 148; PM 60-17 / 57-17 / 22-18 / 47-22	Guardian, support actually delivered and any earlier assistance where guidance was deficient; no actual redress stated	PDF 67-78

VISO: same 14-case subcommittee, no new cohort

Information	Counter, target, or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
VISO Committee	5 / 14; 4 bearing marks	The whole course of proceedings 2 years ago; legal and VISO findings may overlap	PDF 79
Reading period	12.12.2024-15.01.2025	Socio-technical document review	PDF 79
Benefits in the 5 cases	§ 96 refusal / termination + § 85; § 95 (3) + § 85 escort; § 107 refusal; § 108 refusal; § 85 aid / escort	A case may contain several decisions / benefits	PDF 79
Change of proceedings	1 letter example	No total numerator for shifts	PDF 81
Consent / support person	1 example	Indication of relatives and meeting assistance, not empowerment of all party rights	PDF 81
Assessment version	VUM 1.0 and 2.0	Implementation not finished; no number of preversion	PDF 82
Written application awaited	1 accompanying case	Oral application could be provided; possible entry barriers without indicated duration	PDF 82
Lack of action plan offers	2 examples of 5	Justification for non-developing support or inability; both contrary to the obligation to bid	PDF 83
Good previous action plan	1 example	Consistency / responsibility; no new cases	PDF 84
Orders	0 in the 5 cases referred to it;	May be located in Nexus without being transmitted; not proof of 0 produced	PDF 84
Annual follow-up	Example of annual / if needed	Action plan expectation; actual varied practice and lack of conclusions	PDF 84-85
Continued employment offer	1 Follow-up Case	Continued level at the individual’s request; future status for assessment of residential arrangement, not redress	PDF 85
Sectoral cooperation	1 respiration meeting; 1 job center / local psychiatric exam	Original one or two cases; non-independent personal elements	PDF 85
Transitional meetings	16 years / 17,5 years; VUM 8 months before transition in 1 case	Positive VISO practices and planning material; no overall implementation rate	PDF 86

The versions and source chain of the Material Annex

Information	Counter, measure or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Political document base	2022-25/2023/2024-25/2024-27	Vision / master plan / trust strategy / health strategy / budget; documents themselves are listed, not separately fully read here	PDF 87
Management data versions	November 2024; § 82 / 85 and settlement 2023-24	Titles, no original population / amount cells in the Annex	PDF 89
Legal quality	Working methods + action plan + case presentation + minutes	The municipality's original learning link identified; execution not proven by title	PDF 91
Knowledge sharing	No written guidelines	Municipal material response; Campus / newsletter / circulation	PDF 91
VUM / FFB	VUM 2.0 4th edition; FFB 2.01	Method versions, non-citizens or pre-dates	PDF 93
Case flow / versions	May 2024; FSIII May 2023; decision guidance June 2020; out-of-municipality status August 2023	Action plan / order / follow-up integrated Nexus according to the municipality	PDF 93
Transitional and cross-cutting documents	8.10.2024; NOVA 2021; Question Survey 27.05.2024	Titles / dates; no answer number, compliance or person number	PDF 94
Organisational versions	2024 and 1.1.2025; 5 listed record documents	Organisation time, not five government officials	PDF 95

Legal material control: initial rule statements and documented deviation

Information	Counter, measure or version	Names, units and boundaries	Original site
Limitation	3 policy/strategy documents;6 standard groups;7 case-handling materials	Only measured areas of responsibility. No approval of all other municipal material	PDF 96
Masterplan 2023: bet staircase	Minimum intervention as best offer	Disability compensation must be based on the best possible practical compensation; the economic staircase cannot replace the	PDF 97
Digital welfare centre	Screen / Apps / Acute Contact	Concrete ability for actual use / physical visits to be investigated	PDF 97
Temporary residence allowance	Rehabilitation / progress	Current support without ex ante time limit, including maintenance; the actual suitability of the home must be clarified;	PDF 97-98
§ 82 b	Up to 6 months	Cannot be used as a mandatory assessment of needs; § 85 necessary for continuing needs	PDF 98
§ 85 supplier	Own municipal support teams	Suitable and actual reception shall be tested individually;	PDF 98
§ 85 self-care	Hygiene / clothing	Measured under correct § 83 / 85 according to purpose; also motivation in practical execution	PDF 98-99
BPA Persons	Physical and mental function	Physical or mental; incorrect narrowing	PDF 99
§ 97 Freedom of choice	Local staff	The citizen’s right to choose their own companion disregarded in a standard statement	PDF 99
§ 97 care / relocation	Entry into escort	Must be measured under § 83, even outside the home	PDF 99 / 102
§ 97	Deductions for integrated escorts	In fact, individual escorts must be examined, not just the possibilities of the offer	PDF 99-100
§ 97 Refusal	Insomnia or health observation	Non-autonomous automatic cut-off grounds; complete and actual reception must be clarified	PDF 100
§ 107/108	Minimum intervention; offers of accommodation include aid	Compensation individually; the Authority shall separately measure actual aid in accordance with appropriate rules;	PDF 100-101
§ 108 target group	Special social problems included	The required significant permanent impairment of the law shall be tested;	PDF 101
BPA Handbook	Social pedagogy / medicine / respirator monitoring	§ 85 separately; medical care; sectoral responsibility by respiratory system	PDF 101-102
Accompanying grant	Can-determination is abolished in the future	Guidance and individual derogation from quality standard continues	PDF 102
Nexus Complaint Guide	Mail or mail	Oral complaint also allowed; same original template as 14 case deficiencies, not extra 14	PDF 102

Documented consequences and source chains

• PDF 7 previous significant challenges and longer period without leader; management knowledge / efforts 2023-24 is documented as source chain, not evidence that all current errors have been corrected.

• PDF 21 overturning action plan 2024 requires collection every six months, but advisers/self-evaluation do not confirm established practice and collection of all remittals for reconsideration is uncertain. PDF 23 management supervision put on hold and revised after implementation that caused insecurity, with missing information/learning.

• PDF 27- 28 cash grants limited in time 1 year, incorrect assessment by practice, 14 written complaints requirements and 10 missing overall assessments; organisational improvement statements do not override these errors.

• PDF 32:follow-up postponed under workload pressure, prioritised if the provider requests a change; announced intervals do not become actual meeting statistics. PDF 36:transport/geography impedes community participation; number of citizens unknown.
• § 85 support stopped in isolated citizens without clarification of the ability to actually use unvisited social offers; justification example PDF 51 she describes, enlightenment example PDF 54 he. Identity has not been verified and examples are not counted as new persons.

• § 107- rejection of citizens with anxiety, cognitive difficulties and self-harm was based on undocumented help in their own homes and family help. The family's desire to help and nocturnal unpredictable needs had not been investigated (PDF 51 / 53).

• § 85 refusal with help needs left to mother, who himself explained difficulties in overcoming the help; wanted family assistance had not been investigated (PDF 52-53).

• Refusal under § 108 despite low cognitive functioning and isolation, without clarification of the suitability of the home, staffing close at hand throughout the day and night, or the ability to make an emergency call; the telephone had not been used for half a year (PDF 54).
• § 95- grant called BPA and day-to-day monitoring without clarification of compensation or accommodation needs; the report refers to imperfect assistance as an option, not verified subsequent losses (PDF 55).

• PDF 61 provides proof of cessation of residence at the request of the citizen without clarification of continued post / other support; a second cessation without taking a position on requested support in own homes and daily abuse treatment. No evidence of any subsequent support or compensation.

• PDF 61 documents isolated citizens without clarification of escorts / relationships / personal care and a § 85 cessation without assistance for laundry and reminder of care. Uncovered needs are described; duration and repair do not appear.

• The rule overview PDF 78 requires verification of actual appointment of a guardian at age 18 and separation of short-term support under section 82 b from assessment of needs. No number of specific guardianship deficiencies or register of reparation is given.
• VISO PDF 81 describes the expected legal status and long treatment in Familieretshuset with no number or duration. Parents' application for guardianship does not prove actual appointment.

• VISO PDF 82-84 identifies an assessment not updated when support changed substantially, missing diagnostic source references, limited analysis and a specific offer/level without reasons. Counts are not stated; the findings may overlap with the 14 legal cases.

• VISO PDF 84-86 gives documented follow-up/transition meetings actually held as examples, but no person register or proof of later redress for all the breaches of law described.

Observed deviations between the original parts

• The methodology footnote at PDF6 says the count is not representative of general practice; legal PDF46 says 14 are all cases meeting the criteria and therefore cover general practice. The criteria population remains limited by excluded appeal cases/diagnoses.
• PDF 17 self-evaluation says advisors are not currently presented for management information; interviews say hocogoft deadlines. Management raises learning, advisors do not experience learning use. No consistent actual practice is deduced.
• PDF 30 municipal claim all offered action plan contradicted by legal 1 of 3 relevant; VISO 5 contains 2 missing offers and a special good previous action plan. The same boundaries must not be imposed.

• PDF 33 management / executor says all citizens are offered minutes; no interviewer experiences reception (n unknown). PDF 34 Final assessment repeats the tender statement without making actual receipt proven.

• PDF 40 management denotes new workflow implemented; PDF 39 advisors say new agreement not yet implemented. Document / phase status may be different; no harmonisation.

• PDF 42 management describes clear role allocation, advisors describe ambiguity and need for revision. PDF 43 after aggregation unclear handling of § 83 / 85.

• PDF 60 first mentions 2 unoffered action plans and then 2 other cases without consideration. The unique selection of the original 1 / 2 / 11 shall be retained; a further 2 shall not be added as a new population.

• PDF 62 classifies the notice follow-up meeting after 3 months as sufficient follow-up. This is not proof of actual conduct.

• The PDF 62 methodology template calls 20 cases the incoming cases; actually 14 and at most 3 awards in the sample versus an actual 5. Both delimitations are retained.

• The VISO strength list PDF 80 describes continuous follow-up; PDF 84-85 details do not say uniform / sufficient process and multiple cases without conclusion of continuing sufficient support.

Concrete lack of power and responsibility documents

• Nordfyns Municipality: obtain the actual new decisions, delivery of support, loss/back payment and dates from original refusal/cessation to redress for 14 anonymously linked cases. The report does not publish this person/effect register.

• Ankestyrelsen/ SBST: obtain documented subsequent development / final controls and which standard deficiencies were corrected when. Planned revision and elimination of standards does not document the repair of all individual cases.

What the originals prove and what should continue to be disclosed

The Board of Appeal's own reviews demonstrate concrete legal shortcomings, cut-off of the right of appeal, misdemarcation of aid and failure to investigate actual aid needs. Interviews in the main text, municipal self-evaluations and material titles verify the Authority's statements and knowledge, but not the material correctness of the statements. Documented contradictions can be seen above with both locators.

The originals do not publish case-by-case follow-up checks with new decisions, the date support was actually delivered, the period of loss and individual compensation. Deadline overruns are measured in bounded cases; they must not be used as the duration of all cessations of support. The strongest source-supported next demands are case-by-case redress and documentation of actual delivery, processing of a complaint denied review, lawful standards and preservation of the citizen's rights as a party. Municipal management and the competent supervisory bodies must be able to show what they did after acquiring this documented knowledge.

Fax 2025: child's law, loss of time and control of placement

12 cases: nine § 32/46 and three § 30; new/reassessed after 1.1.2024. Submitted March 2025; other collection March-June 2025. Three interviews/22 participants: advisers 7, providers 7, mainstream services 8. Earlier advice in 2024 assessed four cases; overlap not stated. Exclusion of already appealed cases is not specified in the methodology annex. No overall error count. [TFFAXE25, PDF3/5-7/43-44]

Specific objectives	Figures	PDF page
Child welfare assessment relevant	4 / 12; two finished / two unfinished	30
Four-month period between completed	Over 1 / 2	30
Ongoing progress without a position on parallel aid	One survey eight months	30
§ 30 Insufficient information and reasons	3/3	34/36
Placement plan later than three months	2/4	35
Personal supervision not implemented	Four placement cases; one interview after 14 days wrongly designated supervision	38
Efficacy after a written decision	Typically 1-1½ months; several decision letters just under one month after the eligibility decision	33

The check describes the lack of parental involvement and worrying approaches that are not treated as notifications. Therefore, a 24-hour notification target only covers registered notifications. The course was expected to be completed by mid-2027. [TFFAXE25, PDF5 / 21-31]

Own analysis: absence of supervision must be assessed against the placement date and applicable time limit in each of the four cases; without this link, it cannot be termed four concluded decisions establishing unlawfulness. The two exceeded plan time limits, however, have been specifically counted. Repeated deficiencies in participation, fact-finding and support must be followed through to an actual change of intervention, cessation or reunification. The report’s descriptions and new procedures contain no such overall redress count. Case ID, original decision date, letters, a timeline for support and supervision, and documented consequences and responsible decision-makers are required.

Source

• [TFFAXE25] Original task force analysis, Faxe September 2025,45PDFsider / 43 printed pages; SHA-256 07572081c55bf968c3e25297373659ca49bb4d2ee21e557704ae8ab058aa286f. All material pages 3-45 read, Table PDF43 read also visually. Public anonymous reading cookie. Annex ID is distinguished from the agenda's separate case-making -IDf 7 df 49 c 6-30 c 9-4 e 99-8 a 80-125682 f 0 dff 2; the latter is not the report.

Guldborgsund 2022: fully original-controlled task force accounting

All 68 PDF pages read. Table 2 and the methodology discrepancy visually checked. The original’s printed page is the physical PDF page minus 1. Study interval 28.2.2020-22.2.2022; interviews May-June 2022. Children and Family, not the entire youth department. Closed, already appealed/considered by Ankestyrelsen, §65 cases, duplicate families and solely physical disability cases are excluded(PDF59). VISO is a subset of the 20 legal cases.

All case, method and interview numbers

Group	Measure	Number	Denomination	Unit	PDF Page	Limitation
Type of action	Installation	8	20	cases	42	three follow-up cases
Type of action	Family treatment	3	20	cases	42	three follow-up cases
Type of action	Family Adviser	1	20	cases	42	three follow-up cases
Type of action	Relief	1	20	cases	42	three follow-up cases
Type of action	Contact person	4	20	cases	42	three follow-up cases
Type of action	§ 11	3	20	cases	42	three follow-up cases
Age	0-3 years	2	20	cases	42	Actual age range 0-16
Age	4 to 7 years	2	20	cases	42	Actual age range 0-16
Age	8 to 14 years	13	20	cases	42	Actual age range 0-16
Age	15 to 17 years	3	20	cases	42	Actual age range 0-16
Table 2	BFU / update missing	14	17	cases	43	Sub-populations overlap; no misunion
Table 2	BFU over four months	2	3	cases	43	Sub-populations overlap; no misunion
Table 2	BFU without reasoned opinion	0	3	cases	43	Sub-populations overlap; no misunion
Table 2	BFU terminated after the decision	2	2	cases	43	Sub-populations overlap; no misunion
Table 2	Action plan missing	8	16	cases	43	Sub-populations overlap; no misunion
Table 2	Action plan following the decision	7	8	cases	43	Sub-populations overlap; no misunion
Table 2	§ 48 not fulfilled	13	17	cases	43	Sub-populations overlap; no misunion

Group	Measure	Number	Denomination	Unit	PDF Page	Limitation
Table 2	Follow-up periods not met	3	3	cases	43	Sub-populations overlap; no misunion
Involvement	Child high degree	0	17	cases	44	
Involvement	Child any degree	4	17	cases	44	
Involvement	Child poor degree	10	17	cases	44	
Involvement	Child no involvement	2	17	cases	44	
Involvement	Child age not relevant	1	17	cases	44	
Discussion	§ 48 complied with	2	17	cases	45	
Discussion	§ 48 age-based exception	2	17	cases	45	
Discussion	§ 48 error	13	17	cases	45	
Involvement	Parents high degree	0	17	cases	45	Cases, not number of parents
Involvement	Parents any degree	14	17	cases	45	Cases, not number of parents
Involvement	Parents low degree	3	17	cases	45	Cases, not number of parents
Assessment	Current BFU	3	17	cases	46	
Assessment	BFU completely missing	5	17	cases	46	
Assessment	BFU update required	9	17	cases	46	
Assessment	BFU timely	1	3	cases	47	
Assessment	BFU for late	2	3	cases	47	
Information	Information some degree	12	17	cases	48	
Information	Low level of information	5	17	cases	48	
Information	Enlightenment	0	17	cases	48	
Plan	Current action plan	8	17	cases	49	
Plan	Action plan missing	8	17	cases	49	
Plan	Acute derogation	1	17	cases	49	
§ 11	Aid assessed inadequate	3	3	cases	49	
Follow-up	Three months not met	2	2	cases	49	Third case not relevant for the three-month period
Follow-up	Six months not met	3	3	cases	49	

Group	Measure	Number	Denomination	Unit	PDF Page	Limitation
Supervision	Personal supervision not complied with	3	3	cases	50	
Special	Attention points	6	20	cases	51	
Special	Strength	1	20	cases	51	Not an overall assessment of legality
Interview	Team 1	5	29	interviewing persons;	58	
Interview	Team 2	7	29	interviewing persons;	58	
Interview	Intermediate managers	3	29	interviewing persons;	58	
Interview	Director	1	29	interviewing persons;	58	
Interview	Exporter	5	29	interviewing persons;	58	
Interview	General area	7	29	interviewing persons;	58	
Interview	PPC leader phone	1	29	interviewing persons;	58	
Method	Legal proceedings envisaged	20	20	cases	59	9 placement, 4 contact, 4 family, 3 § 11; actual distribution differs
Method	Planned locations	9	20	cases	59	In fact, 8
Method	Planned contact person	4	20	cases	59	
Method	Planned family treatment	4	20	cases	59	
Method	Paragraph 11 planned	3	20	cases	59	
Method	VISO main text	10	20	cases	52	Method PDF65 indicates 9
Method	VISO method	9	20	cases	65	Main text and annexes indicate 10
Method	Free kommuneatet	1	20	cases	25	This section 11 case without clarification note
Method	Other clarification notes referred to	4	20	cases	25	Not assessed
Method	Placing of premises	3	8	cases	42	Subset of the 8
Method	Management supervision planned cases per quarter	10	Not specified	cases	15	Plan from the second half of 2022, not completed controls

Documented timeline

Progress	From	To	Calendar days, own calculation;	PDF Page
BFU by deadline	2021-11-05	2022-02-11	98	47
First status after the three-month period	2021-04-04	2021-07-26	113	50
Implementation for first status	2021-01-04	2021-07-26	203	50
Between personalised visits	2020-06-11	2022-02-25	624	50

Other time / number indications: late schedule 3 days-7 months (PDF49); VISO example more than 1 ½ years of delay (PDF55); two prevention cases with Visos assessment of placement needs (PDF57); no PPRs knowledge in 10VISO cases (PDF39); planned supervision 2 hours every 6 weeks (PDF16). No documented date of restoration or repatriation.

Independent evidence and impact assessment

The 14 missing or outdated assessments are specific recorded deficiencies in the basis for decision-making. They may overlap with the 13 missing child interviews and the missing or late action plans. There is therefore no basis for adding the counts together into a number of different children, unlawful placements or responsible employees. This delimitation changes none of the recorded errors.

The time courses make the duration of the breaks visible. The 624 calendar days between the listed visits include the whole of 2021 without personal visits in the described course. The 113 days are the period after the three-month deadline for the first status, not a documented return process. The material provides a basis for a case-by-case review of the current basis of aid and action, as well as evidence of when each error was actually remedied.

The original's VISO figures conflict: the main text/annex states 10, the methodology section 9. The free municipality information concerning one case cannot be extended to all 20 either. Four additional clarification memoranda are mentioned without assessment of their content. The specific selection and measurement forms must be obtained to clarify the denominators. A standardised methodology section cannot negate the documented contradiction.

Required specific data request

Ankestyrelsen and the Social Protection Agency: the 20 selection forms, the VISO list 9 / 10, the anonymised criteria / case keys and, if applicable, the 65 follow-up. Guldborgsund: date of correction of the error, continued effort / intervention, actual repatriation and, where appropriate, disciplinary, criminal or compensation outcomes. None of these national figures can be derived from the sub-denominators of the report.

Lyngby-Taarbæk 2015: all original Task Force tables and denominators

All 80 pages of reports read (physically 56-135 in the 375 pages of the municipality). Measurement: two years before 1.1.2015. Adult disability § 85 / 96 / 97 / 107. Cases already complained of shall be omitted. Five citizen cases, each with two decisions plus 15 individual cases, give 25 decisions, a maximum of 20 case clusters without any person delusion. VISO: seven decisions in six ways, subset. Interview: five citizens and one relative; not representative.

All table, method and other numbers

Group	Measure	Number	Denominatio n	Unit	Printed / PDF page	Limitation
Table 1.1	§ 85	14	25	decisions	45/100	
Table 1.1	§ 107	6	25	decisions	45/100	
Table 1.1	§ 96	3	25	decisions	45/100	
Table 1.1	§ 97	2	25	decisions	45/100	
Table 1.2	Authorisation	17	25	decisions	45/100	
Table 1.2	Partial authorisation	2	25	decisions	45/100	
Table 1.2	Refusal	6	25	decisions	45/100	
Table 1.3	General rules	20	25	decisions	49/104	Not a union of all formal errors
Table 1.3	Overall rule No	5	25	decisions	49/104	Not a union of all formal errors
Table 1.3	Not applicable	0	25	decisions	49/104	Not a union of all formal errors
Table 1.4	Information high	21	25	decisions	49/104	
Table 1.4	Information	1	25	decisions	49/104	
Table 1.4	Information	3	25	decisions	49/104	
Table 1.4	Information	0	25	decisions	49/104	
Table 1.5	Party consultation high	2	25	decisions	51/106	17 full appropriations without party consultation requirements; applicable n = 8
Table 1.5	Party hearing someone	0	25	decisions	51/106	17 full appropriations without party consultation requirements; applicable n = 8
Table 1.5	Party consultation rings	0	25	decisions	51/106	17 full appropriations without party consultation requirements; applicable n = 8
Table 1.5	Party consultation none	6	25	decisions	51/106	17 full appropriations without party consultation requirements; applicable n = 8
Table 1.5	Party consultation not applicable	17	25	decisions	51/106	17 full appropriations without party consultation requirements; applicable n = 8
Table 1.6	Justification yes	8	25	decisions	52/107	
Table 1.6	Reason No	0	25	decisions	52/107	
Table 1.6	Not applicable	17	25	decisions	52/107	
Quality of the justification	Validating	7	8	decisions	52/107	Insufficient statement of reasons Case 18 on printed 53
Quality of the justification	Inadequate	1	8	decisions	52/107	Insufficient statement of reasons Case 18 on printed 53
Table 1.7	Deadline complied with	2	25	decisions	53/108	Relevant n = 11; not applicable includes follow-up / unclear application situation

Group	Measure	Number	Denominatio n	Unit	Printed / PDF page	Limitation
Table 1.7	Time limit not respected	9	25	decisions	53/108	Relevant n = 11; not applicable includes follow-up / unclear application situation
Table 1.7	Not applicable	14	25	decisions	53/108	Relevant n = 11; not applicable includes follow-up / unclear application situation
Table 1.8	Involvement high	20	25	decisions	55/110	Table continues printed 56
Table 1.8	Involvement	2	25	decisions	55/110	Table continues printed 56
Table 1.8	Involvement	3	25	decisions	55/110	Table continues printed 56
Table 1.8	No involvement	0	25	decisions	55/110	Table continues printed 56
Action plan Legal part	Plan drawn up	10	25	decisions	57/112	Theme section printed 30-31 indicates instead 9 / 16
Action plan Legal part	Plan not prepared	15	25	decisions	57/112	Theme section printed 30-31 indicates instead 9 / 16
Action plan Legal part	Plan not included	1	10	decisions	57/112	
Action plan Legal part	Citizen wants plan	5	9	decisions	57/112	
Table 1.9	Plan cooperation high	6	9	decisions	58/113	Only submitted plans
Table 1.9	Plan cooperation some	3	9	decisions	58/113	Only submitted plans
Table 1.9	Planned cooperation	0	9	decisions	58/113	Only submitted plans
Table 1.9	Plan cooperation none	0	9	decisions	58/113	Only submitted plans
Table 1.10	Context high	8	10	decisions	59/114	ten decisions in five citizens' cases; high 4 / 5 citizens' cases, small 1 / 5
Table 1.10	Context any	0	10	decisions	59/114	ten decisions in five citizens' cases; high 4 / 5 citizens' cases, small 1 / 5
Table 1.10	Context rings	2	10	decisions	59/114	ten decisions in five citizens' cases; high 4 / 5 citizens' cases, small 1 / 5
Table 1.10	Consistency	0	10	decisions	59/114	ten decisions in five citizens' cases; high 4 / 5 citizens' cases, small 1 / 5
Table 1.10	Context not applicable	0	10	decisions	59/114	ten decisions in five citizens' cases; high 4 / 5 citizens' cases, small 1 / 5
Table 1.11	Follow-up agreement yes	10	25	decisions	60/115	Other: sub-objective / implicit follow-up, not three observed breaches

Group	Measure	Number	Denominatio n	Unit	Printed / PDF page	Limitation
Table 1.11	Follow-up agreement No	12	25	decisions	60/115	Other: sub-objective / implicit follow-up, not three observed breaches
Table 1.11	Other	3	25	decisions	60/115	Other: sub-objective / implicit follow-up, not three observed breaches
Civil matters	Context high	4	5	citizens' cases;	59/114	
Civil matters	Context rings	1	5	citizens' cases;	59/114	
Types of errors in overall assessment	§ 85	4	5	decisions	47/102	
Types of errors in overall assessment	§ 107	1	5	decisions	47/102	
Material refusal / sub-authorisation	Correct following summary	5	8	decisions	47/102	Printed 55 also sets out separately for case 18 and uses incorrect allocation number 19; no automatic harmonisation
Material refusal / sub-authorisation	Unclear due to summary procedural errors	3	8	decisions	47/102	Printed 55 also sets out separately for case 18 and uses incorrect allocation number 19; no automatic harmonisation
Parties' consultations	The deficiency may have affected the result	3	6	decisions	51/106	
Parties' consultations	AST assesses the exclusion of performance effects;	3	6	decisions	51/106	Formal shortcomings exist
Selection	Civil matters	5	Not specified	citizens' cases;	46/101	Five citizen cases each of two decisions; a maximum of 20 case clusters without the dedup of individual cases
Selection	Decisions in civil matters	10	Not specified	decisions	46/101	Five citizen cases each of two decisions; a maximum of 20 case clusters without the dedup of individual cases
Selection	Individual cases	15	Not specified	decisions	46/101	Five citizen cases each of two decisions; a maximum of 20 case clusters without the dedup of individual cases
Selection	New section 96 individual cases requested	3	Not specified	planned cases;	46/101	Three most recent; remaining selection five refusals/up to ten under § 85
Selection	Refusal requested	5	Not specified	planned cases;	46/101	
Selection	Clause 85 of individual cases at most	10	Not specified	planned cases;	46/101	
Organisational Interview	Senior management	1	18	interviewing persons;	4/59	
Organisational Interview	Head of Division	2	18	interviewing persons;	4/59	

Group	Measure	Number	Denominatio n	Unit	Printed / PDF page	Limitation
Organisational Interview	Adult advisors	5	18	interviewing persons;	4/59	
Organisational Interview	Stab	3	18	interviewing persons;	4/59	
Organisational Interview	Exporter	2	18	interviewing persons;	4/59	
Organisational Interview	Other administrations	3	18	interviewing persons;	4/59	
Organisational Interview	Handicap thread	2	18	interviewing persons;	4/59	
VISO	Decisions examined	7	25	decisions	66/121	Six cases, one of which is a double benefit.
VISO	Procedure examined	6	Not specified	progress of proceedings;	66/121	
VISO	Ongoing record keeping	6	7	decisions	66/121	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Journal / Follow-up Hole	1	7	decisions	66/121	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Basis of limited duration	1	7	decisions	67/122	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Failure to consult parties	2	7	decisions	67/122	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Undated status notes	2	7	decisions	67/122	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Lack of citizens' comment	1	7	decisions	67/122	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Ongoing follow-up	6	7	decisions	67/122	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Frequent follow-up	2	7	decisions	67/122	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	VUM	2	7	decisions	67/122	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Action plan available	1	7	decisions	68/123	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Action plan offered but not included	1	7	decisions	68/123	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union

Group	Measure	Number	Denominatio n	Unit	Printed / PDF page	Limitation
VISO	Inspecific approaches	7	7	decisions	68/123	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Clear timing of measurement	1	7	decisions	68/123	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
VISO	Guidance on additional aid	2	7	decisions	68/123	Seven decisions taken by the source; six citizen / case proceedings, no separate personal union
Citizens' interview	Citizens	5	Not specified	interviewing persons;	69/124	
Citizens' interview	Pears	1	Not specified	interviewing persons;	69/124	
Citizens' interview	§ 85 alone	1	5	citizens interviewed;	69/124	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average
Citizens' interview	§ 96	2	5	citizens interviewed;	69/124	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average
Citizens' interview	§ 97+§ 104	1	5	citizens interviewed;	69/124	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average
Citizens' interview	§ 97+§ 103+§ 104+§ 108	1	5	citizens interviewed;	69/124	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average
Citizens' interview	No function training provided	3	5	citizens interviewed;	69/124	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average
Citizens' interview	Scheme well explained	2	5	citizens interviewed;	70/125	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average
Citizens' interview	Action plan not offered	3	5	citizens interviewed;	70/125	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average
Citizens' interview	Annual status meetings currently provided	5	5	citizens interviewed;	70/125	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average
Citizens' interview	Sporadic / no previous consultant contact informed	3	5	citizens interviewed;	70/125	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average
Citizens' interview	Undisclosed change of advisor	2	5	citizens interviewed;	71/126	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average

Group	Measure	Number	Denomination	Unit	Printed / PDF page	Limitation
Citizens' interview	Wants custom messages	2	5	citizens interviewed;	71/126	Interview statements, non-legally established errors or representative municipality average
Citizens' interview	Causing wishes for customized letters	1	1	interviewed relatives;	71/126	
Management	§ 85 management supervision 2013	122	Not specified	Cases examined	20/75	Municipality's information in the report; not 122 established errors
Management	Policy follow-up per year	4	Not specified	planned follow-up;	20/75	
Management	Supervision per year	8	Not specified	planned meetings;	16/71	
Organisation	Disability counsellor	5	Not specified	staff	15/70	
Organisation	Psychological advisers	6	Not specified	staff	15/70	
Organisation	§ 100 Special Team	2	Not specified	staff	15/70	Possible subset of advisers
Organisation	Decentralised institutions	10	Not specified	institutions	15/70	

All specific time limits and waiting periods

Progress	Actual time	Deadline	Original exceeding	Printed / PDF page
§ 85	3 months	8 weeks	approx. 4 weeks	54/109
§ 85	2 ½ months	8 weeks	2 weeks	54/109
§ 85	4 months	8 weeks	8 weeks	54/109
§ 85	Not available	8 weeks	Not disclosed; source refers to citizen's circumstances	54/109
§ 107	7 months	2 months	approx. 20 weeks	54/109
§ 96	5 months	8 weeks; the original also writes months	approx. 12 weeks	54/109
§ 107	4 months	2 months	8 weeks	54/109
§ 107	7 months	2 months	28 weeks in original; different from 20 weeks for the same time indication	54/109
§ 97	2 months	4 weeks	5 weeks	54/109
Case 5	5 months	Not available	No own tempo calculation	61/116
VISO follow-up / journal hole	November 2011- March 2013	Not available	About 16 months; no exact days	66/121
Interview action plan	¾ year after support began	Not available	9 months, translation	70/125
Interview no meeting advisor	1989- around 2014	Not available	About 25 years, interview statements	70/125

Source's own number deviations

Subject	Information A	Information B	Precise demarcation
Action plan	10 prepared / 15 missing printed 57 / PDF112	9 produced / 16 missing printed 30-31 / PDF85-86	Only nine plans are included; the difference cannot automatically be changed to 16 breaches of the law without the measurement scheme.
Authorisation	17 full, Table 1.2 printed 45 / PDF100	Summary printed 47 / PDF102 mentions 3; printed 55 / PDF110 mentions other 19 full after one incorrect	19 plus one is contrary to table 17; both sides are visually controlled
Parties' consultations	2 high + 6 none + 17 not applicable, Table 1.5	Printed 50 / PDF105 refers to 19 to a large extent	17 not applicable is not 17 actually heard
§ 107 Time-limit	7 months minus 2 months should be given about 20 weeks	The same time-limits are later specified 28 weeks	Original figures retained, no tacit harmonisation
Disability policy	2007 in analysis printed 11	2008 in material list printed 74	The year of adoption and the title of the document may be different, unchecked original policy

Concrete consequences, responsibilities and lack of recovery data

Case Key in report	Municipal action	Documented deficiency / assessment	Consistency of report	Printed / PDFs idea
1	§ 85 support 6 → 4 hours per week	Failure to consult parties	Reduction 2 hours / week; AS cannot rule out other outcomes	60-61/115-116
5	Residential offers granted, seat only five months later	AS estimates 8- 10 hours § 85 aid insufficient	Five months intermediate period; increasing anxiety / isolation described	61/116
10	§ 85 support 9 → 6 hours, August 2013 until May 2014	Failure to consult the Parties on status bases	Reduction 3 hours / week	61-62/116-117
18	Refusal Article 85	2009 information, sparse current knowledge; faulty justification	Aid applied for cannot be granted; AS cannot exclude the impact of the results	62-63/117-118
3	Refusal § 107, Application February 2014 / Refusal April 2014	Absence of party consultation / note; contradiction in supporting information	AS indicates possible unmet support needs	63-64/118-119

Independent analysis of the scope of the evidence

The overall assessment of five decisions cannot replace the accounts of the six consultation gaps and nine breaks. An error may persist even if the study does not demonstrate a change in the outcome. The reductions and the five-month waiting period are concrete consequences; the report does not publish any subsequent reversal of the decision, refund, compensation or staff appeal. VISO repeats several of the same procedures and therefore does not provide seven additional failed persons.

Specifically necessary next document base

Appeals Board/Social Agency: anonymised assessment forms, linkage of 25 decisions to person/case keys, plan status 9/10, refusal/finding in the party's favour 17/19 and time-limit calculation 20/28 weeks and follow-up measurement. The municipality: case-specific dates for correct support, back payment, any compensation and a specific assessment of responsibility. The public report documents the deficiencies; it does not document their full duration after 2015 or a national person count.

Solrød and Odense: legal samples, baseline and actual follow-up

Limitation and original checks

Solrød's legal results, VISO and methodology annexes have been read on PDF40-65; Odense's on PDF42-67. The tables have been visually checked. The two-page municipal baseline and all 19 pages of the consultation annex have been read in full. All 65+67 pages of the 2022 analyses and all 49+39 pages of the 2024 status reports have now actually been read as text. The main-text and final-review supplements are set out in taskforce-solrod-odense-hovedtekst2022.md and taskforce-solrod-odense-slut2024-originalkontrol.md. There are no unread pages in these obtained originals. Original files have been processed only in memory.

The sample includes pending cases, the municipality having acted as the responsible municipality for at least one year, new decisions and three older placements. Cases already appealed/examined in Ankestyrelsen, cases examined under section 65, completed interventions, multiple children from the same family and cases concerning physical disability alone are excluded. Exclusion counts are not stated. The review covers selected statutory requirements, not overall lawfulness. Ankestyrelsen's assessment of materiality does not in itself change statutory requirements. VISO is a subsample. [TFSOL22,PDF57-62;TFODE22,PDF59-64]

Original numerals with numerator, denominator and device

ID	Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Note
TFSOL22-001	Aggregate sample	20	Not available	cases	PDF41	
TFSOL22-002	Decisions	17	20	cases	PDF41	
TFSOL22-003	Installation	6	20	cases	PDF41	
TFSOL22-004	Family treatment	4	20	cases	PDF41	
TFSOL22-005	Relief	2	20	cases	PDF41	
TFSOL22-006	Contact person	5	20	cases	PDF41	
TFSOL22-007	§ 11 Offer	3	20	cases	PDF41	
TFSOL22-008	Follow-up part	3	6	cases	PDF41	
TFSOL22-009	Age 0-3	3	20	children's cases;	PDF41	
TFSOL22-010	Age 4-7	3	20	children's cases;	PDF41	
TFSOL22-011	Age 8-14	9	20	children's cases;	PDF41	
TFSOL22-012	Age 15-17	5	20	children's cases;	PDF41	
TFSOL22-013	VISO result part	8	20	cases	PDF40	
TFSOL22-014	§ 48 error	6	17	cases	PDF42	
TFSOL22-015	BFU / update missing	11	17	cases	PDF42	
TFSOL22-016	4 months, average	4	6	cases	PDF42	
TFSOL22-017	Reasoned position missing	1	6	cases	PDF42	
TFSOL22-018	BFU by decision	3	6	cases	PDF42	
TFSOL22-019	Action plan missing	12	17	cases	PDF42	
TFSOL22-020	Action plan after decision	4	5	cases	PDF42	
TFSOL22-021	Child, tall	0	17	children's cases;	PDF42	
TFSOL22-022	Child, someone.	4	17	children's cases;	PDF42	
TFSOL22-023	Child, rings	8	17	children's cases;	PDF42	
TFSOL22-024	Child, none	2	17	children's cases;	PDF42	
TFSOL22-025	Child, age omitted	3	17	children's cases;	PDF42	
TFSOL22-026	Parents, high	0	17	cases	PDF43	
TFSOL22-027	Parents, some.	9	17	cases	PDF43	
TFSOL22-028	Parents, rings	8	17	cases	PDF43	
TFSOL22-029	§ 48 met	11	17	cases	PDF43	

ID	Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Note
TFSOL22-030	Discussion not applicable	3	17	cases	PDF43	
TFSOL22-031	§ 48 no conversation by decision	5	17	cases	PDF43	
TFSOL22-032	§ 48 only after decision	1	17	cases	PDF43	
TFSOL22-033	BFU new	5	17	cases	PDF44	
TFSOL22-034	BFU updated	1	17	cases	PDF44	
TFSOL22-035	BFU is missing completely	8	17	cases	PDF44	
TFSOL22-036	BFU update missing	3	17	cases	PDF44	
TFSOL22-037	4 months, br text	4	5	cases	PDF44	Sunred Table 4 / 6, Bread Text 4 / 5
TFSOL22-038	Wanted, high	0	17	cases	PDF46	
TFSOL22-039	Enlightened, someone.	10	17	cases	PDF46	
TFSOL22-040	Informed, ringing	7	17	cases	PDF46	
TFSOL22-041	Action Plan	5	17	cases	PDF46	
TFSOL22-042	§ 11 offers relevant to offers	3	3	cases	PDF47	
TFSOL22-043	Current aid assessed sufficiently	16	20	cases	PDF47	
TFSOL22-044	Children's office informed	4	20	cases	PDF42	
TFSOL22-045	Union of Awareness	11	20	cases	PDF49	
TFSOL22-046	3 months follow-up error	3	3	cases	PDF48	
TFSOL22-047	6 months follow-up error	3	3	cases	PDF49	
TFSOL22-048	Personal supervision error	3	3	cases	PDF49	
TFSOL22-049	Interview: Adviser re	6	23	interviewing persons;	PDF56	
TFSOL22-050	Interview: Middle eders	3	23	interviewing persons;	PDF56	
TFSOL22-051	Interview: Top management	3	23	interviewing persons;	PDF56	
TFSOL22-052	Interview: Almeno region	6	23	interviewing persons;	PDF56	
TFSOL22-053	Interview: Executor	5	23	interviewing persons;	PDF56	
TFSOL22-054	Interview overall	23	Not available	interviewing persons;	PDF56	

ID	Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Note
TFSOL22-055	Interview sessions	6	Not available	interview	PDF56	
TFODE22-001	Aggregate sample	20	Not available	cases	PDF43	
TFODE22-002	Decisions	17	20	cases	PDF43	
TFODE22-003	Installation	8	20	cases	PDF43	
TFODE22-004	Family treatment	3	20	cases	PDF43	
TFODE22-005	Relief	3	20	cases	PDF43	
TFODE22-006	Contact person	3	20	cases	PDF43	
TFODE22-007	§ 11 Offer	3	20	cases	PDF43	
TFODE22-008	Follow-up part	3	8	cases	PDF43	
TFODE22-009	Age 0-3	5	20	children's cases;	PDF43	
TFODE22-010	Age 4-7	3	20	children's cases;	PDF43	
TFODE22-011	Age 8-14	12	20	children's cases;	PDF43	
TFODE22-012	VISO result part	10	20	cases	PDF42	
TFODE22-013	§ 48 error	5	17	cases	PDF44	
TFODE22-014	BFU / update missing	2	14	cases	PDF44	
TFODE22-015	4 months, average	1	6	cases	PDF44	
TFODE22-016	Reasoned position missing	0	12	cases	PDF44	
TFODE22-017	BFU by decision	4	11	cases	PDF44	
TFODE22-018	Action plan missing	6	15	cases	PDF44	
TFODE22-019	Action plan after decision	8	8	cases	PDF44	
TFODE22-020	Child, tall	0	17	children's cases;	PDF44	
TFODE22-021	Child, someone.	5	17	children's cases;	PDF44	
TFODE22-022	Child, rings	7	17	children's cases;	PDF44	
TFODE22-023	Child, none	0	17	children's cases;	PDF44	
TFODE22-024	Child, age omitted	5	17	children's cases;	PDF44	
TFODE22-025	Parents, high	0	17	cases	PDF45	
TFODE22-026	Parents, some.	12	17	cases	PDF45	
TFODE22-027	Parents, rings	5	17	cases	PDF45	
TFODE22-028	§ 48 met	12	17	cases	PDF46	
TFODE22-029	Discussion not applicable	6	17	cases	PDF46	

ID	Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Note
TFODE22-030	§ 48 no conversation by decision	2	17	cases	PDF46	
TFODE22-031	§ 48 only after decision	3	17	cases	PDF46	
TFODE22-032	BFU new	6	17	cases	PDF47	
TFODE22-033	BFU updated	6	17	cases	PDF47	
TFODE22-034	BFU is missing completely	0	17	cases	PDF47	
TFODE22-035	BFU update missing	2	17	cases	PDF47	
TFODE22-036	4 months, br text	1	6	cases	PDF48	Sunred Table 4 / 6, Bread Text 4 / 5
TFODE22-037	Wanted, high	0	17	cases	PDF49	
TFODE22-038	Enlightened, someone.	15	17	cases	PDF49	
TFODE22-039	Informed, ringing	2	17	cases	PDF49	
TFODE22-040	Action Plan	9	17	cases	PDF50	
TFODE22-041	§ 11 offers relevant to offers	3	3	cases	PDF50	
TFODE22-042	Current aid assessed sufficiently	20	20	cases	PDF50	
TFODE22-043	Children's office informed	0	20	cases	PDF44	
TFODE22-044	Union of Awareness	5	20	cases	PDF51	
TFODE22-045	3 months follow-up error	1	3	cases	PDF51	
TFODE22-046	6 months follow-up error	0	2	cases	PDF51	Third case moved; new 3-month deadline respected
TFODE22-047	Personal supervision error	0	3	cases	PDF51	
TFODE22-048	Interview: Guard / view	5	31	interviewing persons;	PDF58	
TFODE22-049	Interview: Advisor to North / South / West	6	31	interviewing persons;	PDF58	
TFODE22-050	Interview: Department Management	6	31	interviewing persons;	PDF58	
TFODE22-051	Interview: Top management	2	31	interviewing persons;	PDF58	
TFODE22-052	Interview: Executor	5	31	interviewing persons;	PDF58	
TFODE22-053	Interview: Almeno region	7	31	interviewing persons;	PDF58	

ID	Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Note
TFODE22-054	Interview overall	31	Not available	interviewing persons;	PDF58	
TFODE22-055	Interview sessions	6	Not available	interview	PDF58	
TFSOL22-056	4 late plans: contact person	3	4	cases	PDF46	Listing 3 + 1 + 1 = 5 against the text 4
TFSOL22-057	4 late plans: application	1	4	cases	PDF46	Source list; non-harmonised
TFSOL22-058	4 late plans: Fam oil treatment	1	4	cases	PDF46	Source list; non-harmonised
TFSOL22-059	Recruitment, hearing and hearing	8	17	cases	PDF57	In fact 6; other Objective 3 / 3 / 3
TFSOL22-060	Location, method of formulation	5	Not available	cases	PDF61	Methodology wording three of five; actual 6 and sample target 8
TFSOL22-061	Continued stowed 22.10.2021	3	3	children's cases;	PDF49	
TFODE22-056	BFUs not currently required	3	17	cases	PDF47	Provisional aid: less than 4 m
TFODE22-057	BFU before decision acute except	1	12	cases	PDF49	
TFODE22-058	Action plan requirements excluded	2	17	cases	PDF50	Acute / concurrent; less than 4 m
TFODE22-059	Sen action plan acute except	1	9	cases	PDF50	
TFODE22-060	VISO Methodeantal	8	20	cases	PDF64	Result Part 10; Decision preserved
TFODE22-061	Father is defined by parent	2	10	cases	PDF54	VISO specific cases; no additional population
TFSOLBASE22-001	Baseline total	416	416	cases	PDF2	Local government own registration; type of error rover
TFSOLBASE22-002	Red	202	416	cases	PDF2	Local government own registration; type of error rover
TFSOLBASE22-003	Yellow	71	416	cases	PDF2	Local government own registration; type of error rover
TFSOLBASE22-004	Green	143	416	cases	PDF2	Local government own registration; type of error rover
TFSOLBASE22-005	Red + yellow, calculated on the dry matter	273	416	cases	PDF2	Local government own registration; type of error rover

ID	Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Note
TFSOLBASE22-006	BFU missing	119	416	cases	PDF2	Local government own registration; type of error rover
TFSOLBASE22-007	Possible additional BFU	22	416	cases	PDF2	Local government own registration; type of error rover
TFSOLBASE22-008	Lack of communication	67	416	cases	PDF2	Local government own registration; type of error rover
TFSOLBASE22-009	Action plan deadline	26	416	cases	PDF2	Local government own registration; type of error rover
TFSOLBASE22-010	Action plan / activation needs	56	416	cases	PDF2	Local government own registration; type of error rover
TFSOLBASE22-011	Unprocessed notifications	28	Not available	notifications;	PDF2	Senser cup according to the municipality; not 28 unique children
TFSOL24-001	Initial sample, recounted	20	Not available	cases	PDF4	Same test as 2022; non-cases
TFSOL24-002	Status meetings	6	Not available	meetings;	PDF5	
TFSOL24-003	Review of cases	3	Not available	Trials	PDF5	
TFSOL24-004	Follow-up test	9	Not available	cases	PDF5	Three times three; per sonkoblingipu displayed
TFODE24-001	Initial sample, recounted	20	Not available	cases	PDF4	Same test as 2022; non-cases
TFODE24-002	Status meetings	6	Not available	meetings;	PDF5	
TFODE24-003	Review of cases	3	Not available	Trials	PDF5	
TFODE24-004	Follow-up test	9	Not available	cases	PDF5	Three times three; per sonkoblingipu displayed
TFSOL24-005	Redress declared complete 31.8.2023	342	Not available	cases	PDF5 / 45	The local authority's clear message; not necessarily documented unification / repair
TFSOL24-006	Total monthly management supervision	11	Not available	cases per month	PDF27	Plan / municipal information; no yearsu nikpersonsum
TFSOL24-007	Receipt	3	Not available	cases per month	PDF27	Plan / municipal information; no yearsu nikpersonsum

ID	Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Note
TFSOL24-008	Each child / youth district	4	Not available	cases per month	PDF27	Plan / municipal information; no yearsu nikpersonsum
TFSOL24-009	Test procedures	3	Not available	cases	PDF15 / 36	Cases brought before the Court of Justice
TFSOL24-010	Extra-sparring meats	3	Not available	meetings;	PDF48	
TFODE24-005	Extra-sparring meats	2	Not available	meetings;	PDF38	
TFODESAG24-00 1	Local follow-up test	18	Not available	cases	PDFReferate 19-20	Conflict medoriginal Report 9
TFODE24-006	Tragting, main item, May 2023	72	Not available	%	PDF11	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-007	Tragting, main item, October 2023	100	Not available	%	PDF11	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkobling
TFODE24-008	Appendix, m aj 2023	92	Not available	%	PDF24	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-009	Compilation, Annex, oktober 2023	100	Not available	%	PDF24	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkobling
TFODE24-010	Penalty, anyone, May 2023	21	Not available	%	PDF24	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-011	Tragting, someone, October 2023	25	Not available	%	PDF24	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkobling
TFODE24-012	Penalty, high, May 2023	71	Not available	%	PDF24	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-013	Penalty, high, October 2023	75	Not available	%	PDF24	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkobling
TFODE24-014	Transfer, high, May 2023	40	Not available	%	PDF27	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-015	Transfer, high, October 2023	100	Not available	%	PDF27	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkobling
TFODE24-016	History, May 2023	21	Not available	%	PDF27	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-017	History, October 2023	29	Not available	%	PDF27	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkobling
TFODE24-018	Social Assessment, High, May 2023	75	Not available	%	PDF27	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator

ID	Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Note
TFODE24-019	Social evaluation, high, October 2023	95	Not available	%	PDF27	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g
TFODE24-020	Return, m aj 2023	88	Not available	%	PDF28	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-021	Return, ok tober 2023	92	Not available	%	PDF28	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g
TFODE24-022	Current BFU, May 2023	88	Not available	%	PDF29	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-023	Current BFU, October 2023	100	Not available	%	PDF29	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g
TFODE24-024	Child at BFU, May 2023	96	Not available	%	PDF29	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-025	Child at BFU, October 2023	90	Not available	%	PDF29	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g
TFODE24-026	Plan before setting, May 2023	38	Not available	%	PDF31	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-027	Plan before setting, October 2023	63	Not available	%	PDF31	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g
TFODE24-028	Plan follow-up timely, May 2023	42	Not available	%	PDF31	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-029	Plan follow-up timely, October 2023	88	Not available	%	PDF31	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g
TFODE24-030	Live target, high, May 2023	8	Not available	%	PDF31	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-031	Live target, high, October 2023	17	Not available	%	PDF31	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g
TFODE24-032	Child by plan, anyone, May 2023	25	Not available	%	PDF31	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-033	Child by plan, nog en, October 2023	26	Not available	%	PDF31	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g
TFODE24-034	Private network, nog en / høj, May 2023	4	Not available	%	PDF31	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-035	Private network, nog en / høj, October 2023	18	Not available	%	PDF31	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g

ID	Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Note
TFODE24-036	Professional network brand, someone / high, ma j 2023	54	Not available	%	PDF31	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-037	Professional network brand, any / high, Oct ober 2023	48	Not available	%	PDF31	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g
TFODE24-038	Relevant assessment g, some / high, May 2023	67	Not available	%	PDF33	Management supervision; n not disclosed; not 9 as a denominator
TFODE24-039	Relevant assessments g, some / high, October 2023	67	Not available	%	PDF33	The same indicator; in ngenpersonkoblin g
TFODE24-040	Transfer, nog en, May 2023	55	Not available	%	PDF27	
TFODE24-041	Social evaluation, some, May 2023	25	Not available	%	PDF27	
TFODE24-042	Child by plan, high, October 2023	11	Not available	%	PDF31	
TFODE24-043	Notifications cleared 1 m, January 2023	60	Not available	%	PDF27	
TFODE24-044	Notifications cleared 1 m, September 2023	90	10	%	PDF27	Senesteti transferred to investigation; not all notifications
TFODE24-045	Notification → ov education, septte mber 2023	12	Not available	days, average approx.	PDF27	
TFODE24-046	ICS course participants	30	Not available	people, approx.	PDF22	
TFODE24-047	Network course learners	45	Not available	people, approx.	PDF30-31	
TFSOLHOR24-00 1	Consultation points	28	Not available	numbered points;	PDF3-18	Not 28 cases / persons
TFSOLHOR24-00 2	342 added after municipal objection	342	Not available	cases	PDF4-5	Same 342 as T FSOL24; the common indicates all open 1.9.2022
TFSOLHOR24-00 3	Status meetings with action / action findings	3	3	status meetings;	PDF14	Municipality claimed one case; Task Force reports all 3 meetings; no addition to the deduplicated child count
TFSOL22-062	Notifications in concrete slow course, up to	14	Not available	notifications;	PDF26	VISO example; no 14 children; overla

ID	Measurement	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Note
TFODE22-062	Child assessed overall, main text	12	17	children's cases;	PDF38	Same 5 some + 7 rings; Fe maludeladteio versid
TFODE22-063	Political reading of places r per quarter	3	Not available	Cases per quarter	PDF15	Encouraged practice; no extra 3 findings
TFODE22-064	Intended interdisciplinary meetings each year, at least	6	Not available	meetings;	PDF19	Guidelines, not export figures

Source deviations preserved

Solrød: deadline of four months, table 4/6 versus body text 4/5; four late action plans versus a list of 3+1+1=5; sample target eight placements, actual six, another methodology sentence five. Odense: VISO result 10 versus methodology 8; minutes 18 follow-up cases versus report 9; funnel process 72% in the main text versus 92% in the municipal annex. The report is dated June 2022, but PDF3 states an interview/data period of February 2022-April 2023. No discrepancy is corrected by guessing. [TFSOL22,PDF42/44/46/57/61;TFODE22,PDF3/42/64;TFODE24,PDF5/11/24/38;TFODESAG24,pkt7]

Timetable and human consequences

Source	Progress	Original declaration	PDF	Own date difference
TFSOL22	Child welfare assessment deadline-overrun interval	2 - 10 months	44	No precise calculation
TFSOL22	Action plan by decision interval	5 days 4 months	46	No precise calculation
TFSOL22	Placing before BFU hearing	2 months	46	No precise calculation
TFSOL22	Personal conversations two held	July 2020 / May 2021; placement mid-March 2020	49	No precise calculation
TFSOL22	Installation → sole follow-up g	Start March 2020 → May 2021; over one year	48-49	No precise calculation
TFSOL22	BFU missing during placement	May 2020 installed; January 2021 new BFU decision; examination sessikjort	44	No precise calculation
TFODE22	BFU overall	4.6.2019→19.3.2020	48	289 calendar days
TFODE22	BFU deadline → finished	4.10.2019 → 19.3.2020; original 5 months 14 days	48	167 calendar days
TFODE22	Joint parental responsibility: father's consent	One week after the placement decision	45	No precise calculation
TFODE22	Follow-up meeting cancelled → fact k	Plan 3 m 3 d; actual button 4 m	51	No precise calculation
TFODE22	BFU update before placing	May 2020 → January 2021; placing under way	56	No precise calculation
TFODE22	Waiting time for preventive action by reference	Up to 3 months; personal contact often immediately	21/31/33	No precise calculation
TFSOL22	Unreported visits → meeting despite repeated notifications	Several months; up to 14 notifications between	26	No precise calculation

What the figures document and what the requirement must be

The baseline categories 202 + 71 + 143 = 416 are disjunct in the municipality's own registration; 273 red / yellow can therefore be calculated within that registration. The actual types of overlaps .28 notifications are hands.416 cases are not evidence for 416 different children and their overlap with Task Forces 20 or the 342 subsequent explanations are not published.

Solrøds 342 is the municipality's preparation report as at 31.8.2023, continued in the Task Force progress report. At PDF20, the Task Force explicitly states that it did not read cases of choice of effort, follow-up and end of final control. This does not document 342 controlled returns, discontinued interventions or replaced losses. A coupled series of cases must be obtained: actual deficiency, date of recognition, corrected decision, actual change, reunification, compensation and liability. [TFSOL24, PDF5 / 20 / 45]

Odense’s management-supervision percentages are based on the municipality’s own statistics with unspecified denominators. The specific waiting-time measurement concerns the ten most recently transferred notifications. The results are neither a national error rate nor a union count of individuals. The decline in documented child involvement in BFU96→90% and professional network involvement 54→48% is retained alongside the rows showing improvement. [TFODE24,PDF27/29/31]

The Odense example of a father’s consent only one week after the placement decision requires the contemporaneous decision, consents and physical moving date. A subsequent signature alone does not document a valid basis at the time of intervention. The information about one decision case before birth similarly requires original dates and the legal authority then in force. Actual movement before birth cannot be inferred from the report’s statement. [TFODE22,PDF44-46]

Consultation response and source chain

The 342 cases were instituted after the municipality's consultation point 4 on all cases opened 1.9.2022. It is the same municipal statement, continued in the progress report. Paragraph 5 maintains an assessment of particular focus areas; paragraph 15 delimits the course from the disability and family care area. Point 16 addresses the start of supervision until January 2023, while the municipal annex continues to indicate the end of 2023. Paragraph 21 maintains involvement / infringement problems in all three status meetings against the municipality's objection to one case. None of these units is an additional children's union. [TFSOLHOR24, PDF4-5 / 11 / 14]

All main parts of text are now actually text read: Solrød 2022 alle 65 / Odense 2022 alle 67 and Solrød 2024 alle 49 / Odense 2024 all 39 original pages. The number-passing control is thus supplemented by full text reading in the separate main text / end modules. Concrete 14 notifications and up to 3 months of waiting are recorded separately above.

Solrød og Odense: full main text control of the analyses 2022

Solrød's 65 pages and Odense's 67 pages have now all actually been read as text. The annex figures already recorded recur in the main text; they are not counted again. This supplement records main-text figures, management's knowledge links and specific descriptions of consequences. The remaining main text of the status reports remains a separate reading item.

Talk to their original population

ID	Source / page	Information	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limitation
TFHEAD-001	TFSOL22 / PDF4	Policy reporting	2	Not available	times / year	Management statements; not misstatements
TFHEAD-002	TFSOL22 / PDF11	Working procedures	3	Not available	documents	
TFHEAD-003	TFSOL22 / PDF12	Upgrading Coordinators	2	Not available	posts	From November 2021; not personal union
TFHEAD-004	TFSOL22 / PDF12	Upgrading advisors	5	Not available	posts	
TFHEAD-005	TFSOL22 / PDF14	Supervisory concept sample	6	Not available	cases / quarter	Concept 2018; actually latest supervision unknown; repetitions possible
TFHEAD-006	TFSOL22 / PDF14	Case by case	3	Not available	months	Concept 2018; not documented actual cadence
TFHEAD-007	TFSOL22 / PDF15	Saving forums	3	Not available	fora	Team / funnel meeting weekly; open door ad hoc
TFHEAD-008	TFSOL22 / PDF19	School districts	3	Not available	districts	Recommended forum in all; not 3 documented breaches
TFHEAD-009	TFSOL22 / PDF21	§ 48 met	11	17	cases	Reproduction of supporting documents, not new population
TFHEAD-010	TFSOL22 / PDF21	Legal conversation from marriage	3	11	cases	Subset of 11; age / maturity
TFHEAD-011	TFSOL22 / PDF22	§ 48 not fulfilled	6	17	cases	5 without conversation, 1 conversation after
TFHEAD-012	TFSOL22 / PDF22	Poor involvement of parents	8	17	cases	Supports 9 to some extent
TFHEAD-013	TFSOL22 / PDF26	Notifications in example	14	Not available	notifications;	Up to 14; same case, not 14 children
TFHEAD-014	TFSOL22 / PDF27	Party consultation waiting time	1	Not available	month	Interview: may go 1 month in non-acute cases
TFHEAD-015	TFSOL22 / PDF28	Missing BFU	8	17	cases	Reproduction of the same sample
TFHEAD-016	TFSOL22 / PDF28	Missing BFU Update	3	17	cases	
TFHEAD-017	TFSOL22 / PDF28	BFU interruption	4	5	cases	2-10 months overrun; minimum 6 and maximum 14 months total BFUtime derived from 4 months deadline
TFHEAD-018	TFSOL22 / PDF28	BFU not before decision	3	Not available	cases	Same sample; relevant undertotal see existing annexes
TFHEAD-019	TFSOL22 / PDF29	Low case information	7	17	cases	10 to some extent

ID	Source / page	Information	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limitation
TFHEAD-020	TFSOL22 / PDF32	Current aid assessed as appropriate	16	20	cases	4 referred; positive assessment does not cancel the guarantee breach
TFHEAD-021	TFSOL22 / PDF33	§ 11 current offers	3	20	cases	All 3 deemed appropriate; other historical § 11 courses criticised, not new 3 errors
TFHEAD-022	TFSOL22 / PDF33	Action plan present	5	17	cases	12 missing
TFHEAD-023	TFSOL22 / PDF33	Active cases in management supervision	280	Not available	cases	Reported management statements; population other than 20
TFHEAD-024	TFSOL22 / PDF33	Active management oversight action plans	42	280	plan registration rings,	Lack of documentation mentioned; difference 238 does not prove 238 missing plans
TFHEAD-025	TFSOL22 / PDF34	Plan timely	1	5	cases	4 by decision
TFHEAD-026	TFSOL22 / PDF36	Absence 3 m / 6 m follow-up	3	3	the place of employment is	Both deadlines in the same 3; not 6 children
TFHEAD-027	TFSOL22 / PDF37	Personal supervision broken	3	3	the place of employment is	At least 2 interviews per year; same follow-up test
TFHEAD-028	TFODE22 / PDF9	Legal sample	20	Not available	cases	The same population as Annex
TFHEAD-029	TFODE22 / PDF9	VISO main text	10	20	cases	Against 8 in the section of method; version deviation retained
TFHEAD -030	TFODE22 / PDF11	Local objectives	10	Not available	objectives;	
TFHEAD-031	TFODE22 / PDF13	Joint strategic plan	6-7	Not available	plans;	3 administrations; other 4BUF plans
TFHEAD-032	TFODE22 / PDF13	BUF strategic plans	4	Not available	plans;	Non-personal plans § 140
TFHEAD-033	TFODE22 / PDF15	Head of the meeting	14	Not available	days	
TFHEAD-034	TFODE22 / PDF15	Sections in key figures	5	Not available	Departments	
TFHEAD-035	TFODE22 / PDF15	Policy-read application cases	3	Not available	cases / quarter	Management statements; repetitions unknown
TFHEAD-036	TFODE22 / PDF16	Review	2-3	Not available	times / semesters	Management statements; advisors describe variation
TFHEAD-037	TFODE22 / PDF16	Saving group size	6-8	Not available	participants;	Every two weeks
TFHEAD-038	TFODE22 / PDF16	Supervision maximum	8	Not available	participants / groups;	

ID	Source / page	Information	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limitation
TFHEAD-039	TFODE22 / PDF16	Supervisionsencer 2020H1	16	Not available	seances	
TFHEAD-040	TFODE22 / PDF16	Joint leadership meeting	6	Not available	weeks	About; full-day meeting every 2 weeks
TFHEAD-041	TFODE22 / PDF16	Annual strategy seminar	2	Not available	days	
TFHEAD-042	TFODE22 / PDF19	Interdisciplinary forum minimum	6	Not available	meetings / year	Guideline; actual cadence varies
TFHEAD-043	TFODE22 / PDF21	Referral time § 11	3	Not available	months	Up to 3, often immediately upon your own request
TFHEAD-044	TFODE22 / PDF24	Rear guards	2	Not available	advisers;	
TFHEAD-045	TFODE22 / PDF25	Slow serious notification	1	Not available	example	Legal test; no new person dedup
TFHEAD-046	TFODE22 / PDF25	VISO cases with lack of professional judgement	10	10	cases	Main text denotes the shortcoming
TFHEAD-047	TFODE22 / PDF28	Placements without professional support assessment	2	Not available	example cases	Original separates one case and another; unknown overlap with annex examples
TFHEAD-048	TFODE22 / PDF28	BFU update time in example	8	Not available	months	The child placed prior to completion of the update
TFHEAD-049	TFODE22 / PDF32	Action plan Elon children's targets	3	Not available	objectives;	Plus 1 family goals and 1 overall purpose
TFHEAD-050	TFODE22 / PDF32	Handleplanskabelon familydestination	1	Not available	objectives;	
TFHEAD-051	TFODE22 / PDF33	§ 11 deemed appropriate	3	3	cases	2 children and 1 young; no cross-year union
TFHEAD-052	TFODE22 / PDF34	Conversation after follow-up	1	Not available	example	
TFHEAD-053	TFODE22 / PDF34	Installation services	3	Not available	cases	Forecast focus; precise outcomes already in annexes
TFHEAD-054	TFODE22 / PDF38	Child rings involved	7	12	cases	5 sufficient; not 20 as the denominator
TFHEAD-055	TFODE22 / PDF39	Parents' rings involved	5	17	cases	12 sufficient
TFHEAD-056	TFODE22 / PDF39	One parent decides on the participation of another.	2	Not available	example cases	Joint custody; VISO Committee

Concrete evidence chains

Own document key;	Original page	Progress	Independent evidence required
TFSOL22-HOVED-P26-SUBSEQUENT 14	TFSOL22 / PDF26	Unannounced visits → several months → meeting; up to 14 notifications along the way	Records / notification dates required
TFSOL22-HOVED-P38-LAENG ET	TFSOL22 / PDF38	Advisor interview: change of counselor → measures longer than necessary	Number, duration and type of action not provided
TFODE22-HOVED-P26-SELVSKADE	TFODE22 / PDF26	Years of school/family concern reports → the child's own approach about self-harm → only then an interview	Original notifications / residence / processing logs required
TFODE22-HOVED-P28-ANBR1	TFODE22 / PDF28	Placement before the need to update the child welfare assessment became visible; no professional assessment of support needs	Placement decision, consent/legal authority and redress required
TFODE22-HOVED-P28-ANBR2	TFODE22 / PDF28	Decision to update BFU→8 months→completed; placement before completion	Information of both accommodation cases known well before; no specific dates reported
TFODE22-HOVED-P32-GUIDE48	TFODE22 / PDF32	Municipality 2020 Guide allows deletion of § 48 conversation after previous conversation / BFU; Task Force detects rule deviation	Original guidance not independently provided; quotes actually read
TFODE22-HOVED-P32-LEDE1 40	TFODE22 / PDF32	Professional management confirms plans upon decision and provides prior ignorance of the claim	The submission is not evidence of legality or individual apology
TFODE22-HOVED-P39-FORAELDRE	TFODE22 / PDF39	In 2 VISO examples, the primary-contact parent determines the other parent's participation despite joint parental responsibility	Case-specific defence / hearing of parties required
TFODE22-HOVED-P40-BOERNEHAVE	TFODE22 / PDF40	Kindergarten omitted from the placement decision despite daily contact	Overlap with ANBR1 / 2 unknown

Independent review of significance and responsibility

The specific placement examples require an assessment based on time and decisions:what documented assessment and valid legal authority supported the intervention on the day the child was moved? A later assessment cannot in itself prove that the decision's earlier basis was sufficient. Nor can it replace evidence of when contact, the intervention or the loss actually ceased.

Sunscreen's description of unnecessarily extended measures is a concrete evidence of continued intervention, not just a statistical lack of registration. The number and duration are still unknown. The statements of advisers and managers about meetings, system registration or ignorance of legal requirements shall be tested against simultaneous acts. They shall not cancel any breach of the guarantee. The regulatory guidance link of Florence must be traced to the original 2020 guidance, its approval, use and the decisions that followed it.

The requirement of working procedures and positive quality assessments do not prove the actual restoration of the child, legal continued intervention or freedom of responsibility. The requirements are therefore case-specific original decision, timeline, underlying information, review of the legal conditions, termination / reunification certificate and separate staff / criminal / replacement decision. No collective personal union can be formed by this supplement.

Versions and reading control

Answers front page jun 2022, PDF3 indicates interview / data period feb 2022-apr 2023; original pressure deviation, no guess main text 10VISO vsmethod 8 is retained in existing module

Solrød and Odense: full original control of the final reports 2024

All 49 + 39 physical PDFs pages are now read, including municipal reports and delivery documents. Ancillary PDF11 / 24 is also visually aligned in memory. This concludes the previous reading test for these two main texts. The table complements the already recorded 2024 figures; overlapping rows shall not be counted again.

Source / PDF	Measurement	Value	Denominatio n	Unit	Limitation
TFSOL24 / 5	Redress cases declared complete	342	-	cases	The municipality's own preparation report 31.08.2023; repeated PDF45; not 342 independently verified repairs
TFSOL24 / 5	The case-handling of the status review	9	-	case handling;	3 reviews January / June / November 2023; no spare key
TFSOL24 / 20	Cases checked by the Court of Justice	0	-	cases	These measures were not explicitly included in the case review;
TFSOL24 / 27	Receipt cases per month of management supervision	3	-	cases / month	Describes concept; not actually annual production
TFSOL24 / 27	Cases per child / adolescent district per month	4	-	cases / district / month	Total 11; number of districts not reconstructed as population denominator
TFSOL24 / 27	Total planned monthly management supervision	11	-	cases / month	No actual 12 months or unique children
TFSOL24 / 36	Advisers for trial actions	3	-	advisers;	Municipally selected; not employee-liability cases
TFSOL24 / 36	Trials	3	-	cases	Overlap with 9 status readings not published
TFSOL24 / 37	Implemented development tracks	2	4	tracks	Notification / inclusion; not guarantee error rate
TFSOL24 / 48	Virtual sparring meetings	3	-	meetings;	In addition to 6 status meetings; organisational activity
TFODE24 / 27	Complete within 1 month September 2023	90	10	% / selected notifications	Only last 10 transferred to investigation; not all notifications; 90% → 9 / 10
TFODE24 / 27	Completed within 1 month January 2023	60	-	%	The same sentence describes 10 metering frames; separatjanuarn not explicitly stated
TFODE24 / 27	Average notification → transfer September 2023	Approx. 12	-	weekdays	Local transfer measurement; population framework not further published
TFODE24 / 11	Tragting May 2023, main text version	72	-	%	Opposition with PDF24; physically visually verified
TFODE24 / 24	Tragting May 2023, municipal annex version	92	-	%	21 any + 71 high; visually verified; 20 percentage points deviation
TFODE24 / 24	Tragting October 2023 total	100	-	%	25 some + 75 high; no actual number denominator
TFODE24 / 24	Tragting May 2023 any degree	21	-	%	No actual number denominator
TFODE24 / 24	Penalty May 2023 high degree	71	-	%	No actual number denominator

Source / PDF	Measurement	Value	Denominatio n	Unit	Limitation
TFODE24 / 24	Tragting October 2023 any degree	25	-	%	No actual number denominator
TFODE24 / 24	Tragting October 2023 high degree	75	-	%	No actual number denominator
TFODE24 / 33	Relevant assessment follow-up May 2023	67	-	%	Some / high overall; not 67 cases
TFODE24 / 33	Relevant assessment follow-up October 2023	67	-	%	Unchanged; complement 33% not automatic illegality union
TFODE24 / 38	Additional short sparring meetings	2	-	meetings;	In addition to 6 status meetings; no new cases

Control limits and specific discrepancies

TFSOL24 PDF4 / 20 / 42: bet selection, follow-up and termination delayed; no cases with these steps read. PDF16: continued lack of child involvement / justification. PDF18: Insufficient information about the next step / safety person. PDF27 indicates the start of supervision at the end of 2023, but PDF11 indicates January 2023. PDF45: 342 pre-reported by the municipality's advisors.

TFODE24 PDF14/17/19:the Task Force finds continuing insufficient child involvement and missing professional assessments. PDF11 states 72% funnelling in May 2023; municipal annex PDF24 states 92%=21%+71%. Both have been visually verified. The other management-supervision percentages have no public denominator in raw counts. PDF27 limits the 90% measurement to the 10 most recently transferred notifications.

Own evidence analysis and requirements

Conclusion: Organisational change and a declaration of completion cannot be equated with documented individual redress. Solrød's review exclusion leaves precisely the scrutiny of continuing intervention, follow-up and closure without a case-specific final check in the report. The already documented 2022 placement/safeguard errors must therefore be followed through their own records, rather than an assumption that 342 completed administrative remedial tasks repair all effects of the interventions.

The continuing lack of relevance assessment by Cedefop is central to whether action continues longer than necessary. Legal review requires current case information, the child's perspective and a reasoned assessment of necessity / proportionality. The transfer measurement of the local 10 notifications shall not be interpreted as the total processing time or reunification time of the municipality.

Requirements: Provide the basis for verification and the effective date of correction for each case, the 342 clarification criteria / verification, the basic figures and the inclusion rules of the management supervisors, as well as documented decision, type of action, termination / return and repair. Identify the conflicting tragedy figures and supervisory starting dates of the report issuer. No concrete criminal / employment response or person union can be deduced from courses and number of meetings.

Langeland: Task Force -original 2023, warranty error, time and oversight correction 2026

All 41 pages of the analysis and all 16 pages of the ministerial opinion are read in memory. Interview Table PDF39 is visually controlled. 2026 shall be treated separately from 20 years of age. No original file / image is stored.

Talk to independent denominators

Source	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
TFLAN23	Committee	12	-	cases	6	Current, municipal
TFLAN23	§ 52	9	12	cases	6	
TFLAN23	§ 11	3	12	cases	6	
TFLAN23	Installation	3	12	cases	29	Sub-Committee of Section 52
TFLAN23	Adequate support	5	12	cases	30	Task Force Assessment
TFLAN23	Doubts about adequate support	7	12	cases	30	Not 7 final decisions
TFLAN23	Notified to the Children's Office	6	7	cases	30	Absence of ex post own-service verification not disclosed
TFLAN23	Failure to notify	1	7	Case	31	18 years imminent; undenied concern
TFLAN23	Wrong § 11 delineation	3	3	cases	30	Task Force evaluates BFU required
TFLAN23	No timely follow-up	9	9	cases	33	Minimum time limits 3 / 6 months
TFLAN23	Action plan prepared	9	9	cases	31	Most late; no precise delay counter
TFLAN23	Lack of target involvement	9	9	cases	32	No documented child / family / network k
TFLAN23	No offer of aid § 54	3	3	cases	29	Parents of placement committees
TFLAN23	BFU decision missing	50	-	%	26	Half of cases with BFU / update; exact n not disclosed
TFLAN23	Interview	5	-	interview	39	
TFLAN23	Advisers	6	16	interviewing persons;	39	
TFLAN23	Senior management	1	16	interviewer	39	
TFLAN23	Exporter link	5	16	interviewing persons;	39	
TFLAN23	General area	4	16	interviewing persons;	39	
TFLAN23	Interview total	16	-	interviewing persons;	39	Children not affected
TFLAN23	Previous powers	50000	-	DKK / case / year	11	Interview doubts about continued competence, unallocated amounts
TFLAN23	Court sparring	3	-	hours / week	13	Management information

Source	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
TFLAN23	Court of First Instance	3	-	cases / week up to	13	
TFLAN23	Individual sparring	0,5	-	hours / week	13	
TFLAN23	Permanent advisers	9	-	staff	5	Upgrading; plus 1 project / 1 substitute
TFLAN23	Projektansat	1	-	staff	5	
TFLAN23	Submission	1	-	staff	5	To 31.10.2023
TFLANISM26	Supervisory entry	26	-	cases	2	Period 1.1.2022-2 8.12.2025 in the Ministry's text; AScitatPDF8 says 28.12.2022. Original deviation
TFLANISM26	Versing 16.2.2026	1	26	Case	8	Moment cut
TFLANISM26	Completed 16.2.2026	25	26	cases	8	
TFLANISM26	§ 50 Opinion	11	25	cases	8	Of which 10 included 3.11.2022
TFLANISM26	Total opinion 2022	10	11	cases	8	Subgroup
TFLANISM26	§ 48 rejection	11	25	cases	8	
TFLANISM26	Completed after examination	2	25	cases	8	
TFLANISM26	Competence deviation g	1	25	Case	8	Transmission of the Data Protection Agency
TFLANISM26	Allowed upgrading	60	-	%	5	Local information, non-effect measures
TFLANISM26	Consultant support	15	-	hours / week mean	6	Agreement announced
TFLANISM26	Appointment January 2026	15	-	social advisers;	8	Local information
TFLANISM26	Duties	1	-	position	8	
TFLANISM26	Recruitment	6	-	social advisers;	8	More than 4 notices; not employee participation
TFLANISM26	Posting notice	4	-	notices	8	
TFLANISM26	Management supervision 2025	1	-	supervision;	9	Status of the municipality; result not disclosed

Specific procedures

The case references below are own document keys. They are not public record numbers; different examples may not be counted as unique children without a coupling certificate. Printed page = PDFside − 2 in 2023 original.

Document key	Search	Months	PDF page	Limitation
TFLAN23-SAG-P23-PSYK	Notification → first call	2	23	Psychiatric notification; coupling to P25 case not documented
TFLAN23-SAG-P23-SCOPDE	Notification → first call	7	23	School absence; no journal ID published
TFLAN23-SAG-P25-BFU	Notification → BFU	13	25	Overshoot 9 months; overlap P23 case
TFLAN23-SAG-P25-BFU	BFU exceedance	9	25	Part of 13, not Appendix
TFLAN23-SAG-P28-SIDE1	BFUstart → effort	8	30	4 + 2 + 2 months; same case
TFLAN23-SAG-P28-SIDE1	After 4 months → decision	2	30	Part of 8
TFLAN23-SAG-P28-SIDE1	Decision → implementation	2	30	Part of 8
TFLAN23-SAG-P28-SIDE2	Assessment → Implementation	>12	30	Second proceedings
TFLAN23-SAG-P29-ANBR	Efficient placement → Action plan	11	31	Played young; no public person / journal ID
TFLAN23-SAG-P29-FAM	Decision → Action plan	7	31	Family treatment; other proceedings

Knowledge, control and compliance

Date	Documented indent	The PDFside of the Ministerial Opinion
2022-11-03	The infringement opinion of the supervisory authority; all current and relevant cases closed should be reviewed;	2
2024-05-28	Task Force note: low lawfulness, no planned verification of correct redress	2
2024-06-03	AS receives Task Force note	2
2024-11-05	Oversight asks about a new course	4
2024-11-29	Municipal consultation	4
2025-02-27	Municipal council acknowledges non-compliance with the law	5
2025-08-27	AS rejects new supervision	6
2025-11-21	Ministry requests documents	7
2026-02-25	Municipal status	8
2026-05-05	Task Force Plan May 2026-January 2028	10
2026-05-06	AS closes follow-up	10
2026-05-29	The Ministry shall re-examine and assess sanctions / reopening	15

Original find and method

2023 the committee has been submitted to the local authority, not by chance at national level. Exclusion of cases already pending has not been indicated; it cannot be borrowed from other investigations. The Task Force notes a lack of consultation, re-evaluation, relevant child involvement, support for accommodation families, professional match and documented decision dates. The formal compliance with the time limit for the acute assessment does not demonstrate the professional content of the assessment. [TFLAN23, PDF21-35]

The 2026 opinion rejects the basis for AS' rejection. The Ministry requires a fresh review of lawfulness, assessment of sanctions under sections 50 a-50 d and the duty to reopen. In the Ministry's assessment, organisation/increased staffing is not evidence of lawful practice. The resumed Task Force process extends to January 2028 and can realistically work only on involvement/assessment; other parts require longer development.26 supervisory records are neither 26 children nor 26 independent breaches of the law. The period-date difference 2025/2022 is retained. [TFLANISM26,PDF8/10-16]

Own evidence and requirements

Conclusion: Drawing up a plan 11 months after a placement leaves the documented period without the planning basis intended to govern objectives, choices and follow-up. The original evidence is the specific placement example TFLAN23-SAG-P29-ANBR. It documents a specific safeguard error and its duration; it does not yet document the lack of legal authority for placement, all individuals' identities or the actual return-home date. These links must be examined in contemporaneous records.

The chain of responsibility must include the municipality, the specific decision-maker, professional management, politicians' knowledge and the supervisory body's own omissions. Criticised redress without follow-up checks requires case-by-case evidence of correction, effective support, any cessation/reunification and compensation. Development agreements and closure of supervision cannot alone prove these outcomes.

Prioritised arguments: lack of a timely and documented basis for decisions; disregarded involvement and support for the family connection; missing effective follow-up; rejection of supervision on an insufficient factual basis. The demands are a fresh specific examination and actual redress, documented assessment of legal authority/proportionality and an assessment of responsibility linking knowledge and continuing omissions to each actor. No criminal culpability is derived from institutional statistics.

Documented errors are the declared guarantee deficiencies and the Ministry's corrected supervisory basis. Hypotheses: actual harm to each child, unlawful continuation of placement, individual guilt and causality. Evidence required: original records / decisions, Task Force notes 28.5.2024 / 5.5.2026, municipality review forms, supervisory review and effective compliance. Quotes of these joints in the ministry's original are preserved as a source chain, not as an autonomous full control of each quoted document.

Næstved 2023: original case committee, warranty errors and time denominators

All 42PDFpages text read in RAM; interview table PDF40 visually RAM-controlled. Printed page = PDFside − 2. The current address returned 404; archived official domain original is actually read.

Talk to the denominators

Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
Committee	12	-	cases	41	Current, municipal
§ 52	9	12	cases	41	
§ 11	3	12	cases	41	
Installation	3	9	cases	35	Sub-committees
Time-limit for compliance	12	12	cases	24	Registered notifications; worrying information may be unregistered
BFUprepared	2	9	cases	27	
BFU update prepared	3	9	cases	27	
BFU deficiencies	1	9	Case	27	Decision of February 2021, not documented
BFU update missing	2	9	cases	27	Current problems not covered
Provisional decision without BFUs	1	9	Case	27	Not error in itself
BFU exceeds 4 months	2	2	cases	28	Both prepared BFU; not all 9 cases
Indistinct date of decision § 52	9	9	cases	28	None of the 52 cases submitted
Doubt of sufficient support, notified	4	12	cases	32	Children’s Office; not 4 completed new decisions
Additional doubts, not notified	1	12	Case	32	Family moved municipality; concern not denied
Doubts on aid as a whole	5	12	cases	32	Derived 4 + 1, separate groups of the same committee
Action plan prepared	8	9	cases	33	Derived 9 minus 1; quality varies
Action plan missing	1	9	Case	33	
Follow-up measurable	6	9	cases	34	
Time limit to expire after measurement period	2	9	cases	34	Excluded from time measurement
Bet not started during measurement period	1	9	Case	34	Excluded from time measurement
3 months not observed	6	6	cases	34	Not 6 / 9 as error rate
6 month deadline complied with	3	6	cases	34	
6 months not observed	3	6	cases	34	Derived; overlaps 3 month errors

Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
Compliance with personal supervision	1	3	placing cases;	35	At least 2 / year
Personal supervision not complied with	2	3	placing cases;	35	Derived
Interview	4	-	interview	40	
Interviews	18	-	persons	40	Not children / families
Advisers	6	18	interviewing persons;	40	
Senior management	2	18	interviewing persons;	40	
Exporter link	5	18	interviewing persons;	40	
General area	5	18	interviewing persons;	40	
District teams	4	-	teams;	5	
Management Control Committee	12	-	cases / team / measurement	14	Local authority information; not 96 unique cases
Management oversight frequency	2	-	measurements / year	14	
Management supervision time	2-3	12	hours / 12 cases	14	
Management information	3	-	months between	13	Local information
Supervision	8	-	times / year	15	
Introduction period	4	-	weeks	10	

Time and knowledge

Document key	Progress	Start	End	Months	PDF page	Limitation
TFNAE23-SAGS-P 29-PSYK	Serious psychiatry direction → beslutning om BFU	2021-02	2021-11	9	31	Gap in calendar months; exact days not stated.§11 chosen in the meantime. No case-record ID
TFNAE23-SAG-P 25- BFU	BFU decision without documented execution	2021-02	2023-04/09	-	27	Observation April-September 2023; not coupled to P29 case
-	Wanted waiting time	-	-	5	12	Management: Family care / Psychology
-	Wanted waiting time	-	-	up to 8	12	Advisers: Family treatment
-	Wanted waiting time	-	-	1,5-9	12	Driver's link: Different bets; not the same case

Date	Search	PDF page
2022-11-29	Application	5
2022-12-15	Undertakings	5
2023-04/09	Data base	3
2023-06	Management receives an oral presentation, known need for correct handling of safeguarding notifications	25
2023-12-04	Original analysis dated	42

Date	Search	PDF page
2025-Q2	Initial expected completion; not actual completion certificate	5

Source-derived findings and method

The sample is current and submitted by the municipality; exclusion of cases already appealed is not stated. Three follow-up cases cannot be measured in time and must not be included in the six-case denominator. Concerning information about suicidal thoughts was not processed as a concern report. The documentation shows deficient child involvement, including children in care whose contact person replaced the child's own interview. According to adviser interviews, professional assessments were postponed until the possibility of granting assistance had been investigated. The Task Force characterises this as unlawful. Workflows sought a child welfare assessment that would last over time rather than ongoing updating. There is no exact aggregate error count. [TFNAE23,PDF24-36/40-41]

The municipality's news item of 3.10.2025 announces completion, continuing documentation/urgent-assessment challenges and follow-up after 6-8 months. It is not the final report's original tables or evidence of individual redress. [TFNAENY25]

Own evidence, responsibilities and requirements

Conclusion: Compliance with deadlines for registered concern reports does not erase the documented failure to process other concerning information. A formally correct 24-hour marker does not prove a professionally sound risk assessment. The connection between incomplete assessment, choice of support and missing follow-up must be examined in each child's contemporaneous case record.

The documented failures of safeguards require a fresh specific assessment of legal authority, need and proportionality, timely effective support and subsequent verification of redress. The established deficiency in individual supervision is not in itself evidence that all three placements lacked legal authority. Return home, actual reunification, harm and individual culpability require specific decisions, dates and evidence from the records. The chain of actors includes the adviser, management responsible for awards, professional management and supervision.

Documented errors: the precise deadlines / supervisors / BFUs and qualitative guarantee deficiencies above. Hypotheses: damage to each child, lack of home space and individual responsibility. Lack of evidence: original final report 2025, notification / recovery results for the 4 cases referred, anonymised cases, actual aid / reunification and sanctions. Priorities are effective emergency protection, documented decision-making, child involvement and effective post-control. The figures are traced to PDFside and SHA; no personal union is constructed.

Stevns 2020: closing measurement, continued warranty errors and concrete placement process

All 52PDFpages text read in RAM; legal / case type tables PDF22-23 visual RAM-controlled. Printed page = PDFside − 1. Legal Main Table PDF22-23 and Case Type DistributionPDF23 are reproduced with their own short terms.

All recorded figures and limits

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
Current 2020	Committee	20	-	cases	21	
Current 2020	New § 52 decisions	14	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	§ 11 offers	3	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	Older placement, follow-up only	3	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	Placement § 52	5	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	Family treatment	6	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	Contact person	3	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	Consultant assistance § 11	3	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	0-3 years	2	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	4 to 7 years	4	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	8 to 14 years	6	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	15 to 17 years	8	20	cases	23	
Current 2020	Insufficient child involvement	7	11	cases	22	14 decisions minus 3 non-applicable
Current 2020	Inadequate parental involvement	6	14	cases	22	
Current 2020	§ 48 not fulfilled	6	11	cases	22	
Current 2020	BFU deficiencies	2	14	cases	22	Started but not completed
Current 2020	BFU update missing	4	14	cases	22	
Current 2020	BFU exceeds 4 months	5	7	cases	22	
Current 2020	Reasoned position missing	1	8	cases	23	
Current 2020	BFU not closed before decision	0	7	cases	23	1 provisional decision minus 8
Current 2020	Action plan missing	6	14	cases	23	
Current 2020	Action plan after decision	5	8	cases	23	
Current 2020	Unsure aid due to lack of information	1	20	cases	23	Refers to § 65
Current 2020	3 months follow-up not applicable	-	3	cases	23	All 3 before the measurement period; not 0 errors
Current 2020	6 months follow-up for late	0	3	cases	23	

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
Current 2020	Personal supervision not complied with	1	3	cases	23	Conversations after school do not replace residence
Current 2020	Child involvement some degree	4	11	cases	24	
Current 2020	Child involvement low degree	6	11	cases	24	
Current 2020	Child involvement at all	1	11	cases	24	
Current 2020	Child involvement not applicable	3	14	cases	24	
Current 2020	Parental involvement	8	14	cases	24	
Current 2020	Low degree of parental involvement	6	14	cases	25	
Current 2020	Joint authority, one parent less involved	3	14	cases	25	
Current 2020	§ 48 complied with	5	11	cases	25	
Current 2020	§ 48 No conversation at all	2	6	cases	25	
Current 2020	§ 48 interview by decision	3	6	cases	25	
Current 2020	§ 48 wrong action discussed	1	6	cases	25	
Current 2020	Current BFU	7	14	cases	26	
Current 2020	Current BFUupdate	1	14	cases	26	
Current 2020	BFU / update sufficiently current	8	14	cases	26	
Current 2020	BFU time limit respected	2	7	cases	27	
Current 2020	Reasoned position	7	8	cases	27	
Current 2020	Provisional decision without pre- BFUclaim	1	8	cases	28	
Current 2020	Action plan prepared	8	14	cases	28	
Current 2020	Action plan before decision	3	8	cases	28	
Current 2020	§ 11 meets needs	3	3	cases	29	
Current 2020	Relevant adequate support	19	20	cases	29	
Current 2020	§ 65 Reference	1	20	cases	29	

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
Current 2020	6 month deadline complied with	3	3	cases	30	
Current 2020	Compliance with personal supervision	2	3	cases	30	
Current 2020	Special features	7	20	cases	30	
Current 2020	Longitude	5	20	cases	30	
Current 2020	Insolvency	1	20	cases	31	
Current 2020	Incorrect professional assessments	3	20	cases	31	
Current 2020	VISO Committee	5	20	cases	33	
Current 2020	VISO parentage insufficiently detected	4	5	cases	35	
Current 2020	VISO Action Plan prepared	5	5	cases	36	
Current 2020	VISA Manager Shift	5	5	cases	36	
Baseline 2017	Start Committee	20	-	cases	21	Only reproduction in 2020 original, not 2017 full report
Baseline 2017	Start § 48 deficiency	11	17	cases	12	
Baseline 2017	Start BFUnclosed before decision	9	10	cases	28	
Baseline 2017	Start § 11 incorrect delimitation	1	-	Case	29	
Baseline 2017	Start § 11 undeclared	1	-	Case	29	
Baseline 2017	Start § 65 Reference	7	20	cases	29	4 Doubts + 3 Wrong Bet
Baseline 2017	Start-up aid doubts	4	7	cases	29	
Baseline 2017	Start support wrong action	3	7	cases	29	
Commune account 2019-20	Management supervision measurements	10	-	supervision;	10	
Commune account 2019-20	Monitoring per case strain	3	-	cases / measurement	42	
Commune account 2019-20	Monitoring per measurement	36	-	cases / measurement	42	
Commune account 2019-20	Supervision total approx.	360	-	case checks;	49	Repeated cases possible; not 360 unique children
Commune account 2019-20	Active cases	500	-	cases	49	Moment cut
Management Oversight January 2020	Last § 48 conversation	18	20	cases	49	Second committee endAS

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
Management Oversight January 2020	Late action plan	19	26	cases	49	
Management Oversight January 2020	Senesterrevisedactio n plan	10	23	cases	49	
Statement of the municipality	BFU backlog before summer 2018	42	-	studies;	46	Reported complete in summer 2019, not independent proof of redress
Statement of the municipality	Action plan b before summer 2018	55	-	plans;	46	Overlap with 42 unknown
Statement of the municipality	Policy budget 2020	500000	-	DKK	38	Budget, not actual expenditure
Statement of the municipality	Planned stakeholders about	80	-	persons	38	Postponed meeting, citizens not affected
Statement of the municipality	Partner Group r	3	-	groups	41	
Statement of the municipality	Supervision group r	2	-	groups	41	
Statement of the municipality	Overvision interval	6	-	weeks	41	
Statement of the municipality	ICS course	3	-	days	41	Autumn 2019
Statement of the municipality	Network Course	5	-	days	41	Planstart May 2020 vvsAnnex 3 Autumn 2020
Statement of the municipality	SPUEntering	2	-	progress	46	
Statement of the municipality	SPUKThematic Days	2	-	days	46	Late course
Statement of the municipality	SPUKTraining Days	4	-	days	46	
Primo 2019	Teaching team § 11	4	-	cases	51	Second committee, no 40 / 44 personal union

Times and concrete evidence chains

Own document keys are not journal numbers. Repeated joints with the same key are the same source example; other keys must not be automatically summed to persons.

Document key	Search	Time	Unit	PDF page	Definition of proof
TFSTE20 -BFU-F RIST -button 2	4 month deadline exceeded	Barely 2	months	27	5 different studies; 15 * 1 year 3 months; not total BFUtide
TFSTE20-BFU-F RIST-2.5	4 month deadline exceeded	2,5	months	27	5 different studies; 15 * 1 year 3 months; not total BFUtide
TFSTE20-BFU-F RIST-4	4 month deadline exceeded	4	months	27	5 different studies; 15 * 1 year 3 months; not total BFUtide
TFSTE20-BFU-F RIST-5.5	4 month deadline exceeded	5,5	months	27	5 different studies; 15 * 1 year 3 months; not total BFUtide

Document key	Search	Time	Unit	PDF page	Definition of proof
TFSTE20-BFU-FRIST-15	4 month deadline exceeded	15	months	27	5 different studies; 15 * 1 year 3 months; not total BFUtide
TFSTE20-SAG-P24-ANBR10	Decision → First relevant child interview	1	day	25	Almost 10 years old is picked up / run on the interview day; conversation by decision
TFSTE20-SAG-P25- ANBR 2015	BFUnov 2015 → place a decision without updating	approximately 4	year	26	Feb 2020 acknowledged deficiency, but 18 years got away
TFSTE20-SAG-P25- ANBR 2017	BFUdec 2017 → placement without update	1,5	year	26	BFU indicated therapy/psychiatric diagnostic assessment
TFSTE20-SAG-P30-ETAR	Informationgauge 2018 → BFU decision gauge 2019	8	months	31	1-year-old child at medical examination
TFSTE20-SAG-P30-ETAR	BFU decision → family action decision	6,5	months	31	BFU continued to be undeveloped on Feb 2020; part of the same process
TFSTE20-SAG-P30-PLEJE	BFUJuly 2019 → location law 2019	4	calendar months approximately	31	Precise days not specified
TFSTE20-SAG-P30-PLEJE	Aid discontinued before placing	>1	month	31	Family treatment terminated before actual placement
TFSTE20 -SAGS-P30-INDST	Agreed recommendation → application decision	Barely 6	months	31	Other publication document
TFSTE20-SAG-P30-PASS	No action taken	4	months	31	First 4 months of measurement plus time before
TFSTE20-SAG-P34- AKUT	Insufficient family support	-	uncalled time	35	VISOcourse; person overlap to ASexamples unknown
-	Notified notification → decision	2-3	months	12	Initial interview estimates
-	Clause 11 duration	up to 18	months	12	Introductory practice, not extra 18 unique children

Source-derived method and finding

The status measurement covers one year until 17.2.2020 and 20 municipal pending cases. VISO5 / 20 has been selected from BFU cases; this explains why the VISA assessment does not cover missing BFU. Three older locations are measured only on follow-up; their 3 month period is before the measurement period. The absence of a starting date before the measurement period shall be replaced by the start of the measurement period, unless the municipality itself has an earlier date. This may shorten the measured delay. The exclusion of pending cases shall not be disclosed. Baseline 2017 is reproduced, not independent control of the entire starting original.

The municipality acknowledges that almost all 20 cases submitted had deficiencies (PDF50), without an exact numerator. Its own supervision figures of 18/20 child interviews and 19/26 action plans concern different selections from AS. Missing professional assessments and record-keeping persist. Training and case-file clearance do not prove individual legal redress. [TFSTE20,PDF21/27/33/36/49-51]

Own legal evidence and requirements

Conclusion: the documented failure to update the basis for the decision is not corrected by reaching the age of majority. The original reproduces the municipality's acknowledgement in February 2020 and its decision not to make a correction. This makes knowledge and continuing omission specific, but does not identify the individual decision-maker's criminal culpability.

An old child welfare assessment, a missing child interview before transport and insufficient support before emergency placement must each be examined against the contemporaneous requirements for investigation, involvement, proportionality and effective support. An overall legality conclusion requires the specific placement decision and the consent/coercion basis. The original's professional statements about parenting capacity must not be accepted as true without the underlying assessments.

Documented errors: the precise legal numerators and local courses above. Hypotheses: a need for placement created by errors, unjustified separation, each child's actual harm and individual responsibility. Necessary documents: initial analysis 2018, contemporaneous decisions/BFUs/interview records, anonymised record keys, actual return home and § 65 outcomes. Strongest arguments: an acknowledged unremedied deficiency in safeguards; a decision before the child was heard; a long-outdated factual basis; missing effective support and subsequent oversight. Demands: a fresh specific assessment, documented redress/reunification, compensation for loss where causation is proved and assessment of each actor's responsibility. No union of errors or persons has been derived from the subgroups.

Frederiksberg 2021: warranty error, delay and source internal deviations

All 69PDFpages text read in RAM; PDF42-43 / 59 tables visually RAM-controlled. Printed page = PDFside − 1. No public original is stored locally.

Talk with your own short names

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
AS	Committee	20	-	cases	42	
AS	§ 52 decisions	17	20	cases	42	
AS	§ 11 offers	3	20	cases	42	
AS	Installation	6	20	cases	42	
AS	Of which also follow-up	3	6	cases	42	
AS	Family treatment	6	20	cases	42	
AS	Contact person	5	20	cases	42	
AS	0-3 years	3	20	cases	42	
AS	4 to 7 years	3	20	cases	42	
AS	8 to 14 years	7	20	cases	42	
AS	15 to 16 years	7	20	cases	42	
AS	BFU / update missing	5	17	cases	43	
AS	BFU time limit exceeded	8	8	cases	43	
AS	Reasoned position missing	0	12	cases	43	
AS	BFU not closed before decision	5	11	cases	43	
AS	Action plan missing	0	17	cases	43	
AS	Action plan not before decision, table	9	15	cases	43	
AS	§ 48 not fulfilled	5	17	cases	43	
AS	Child involvement some degree	8	15	cases	43	
AS	Child involvement low degree	7	15	cases	43	
AS	Child involvement high degree	0	15	cases	43	
AS	Child involvement not applicable	2	17	cases	43	
AS	Parental involvement	13	17	cases	44	
AS	Low degree of parental involvement	4	17	cases	44	
AS	§ 48 complied with, including relevant	12	17	cases	44	
AS	§ 48 not applicable	3	17	cases	44	

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
AS	§ 48 No conversation at all	4	5	cases	44	
AS	§ 48 interview by decision	1	5	cases	45	
AS	Current BFU	8	17	cases	46	
AS	Current BFUupdate	4	17	cases	46	
AS	BFU deficiencies	1	17	cases	46	
AS	BFU update missing	4	17	cases	46	
AS	Reasoned position	12	12	cases	47	
AS	Provisional decision, before -BFU requirement omitted	1	12	cases	48	
AS	BFU decision	6	11	cases	48	
AS	Information of the Court of Justice	13	17	cases	48	
AS	Low level of information	4	17	cases	48	
AS	Action plan prepared	17	17	cases	49	
AS	Action plan before decision	6	17	cases	49	
AS	Actuarial plan within 4 months	2	3	cases	49	
AS	Sent acutal plan	1	3	cases	49	
AS	Action plan for late, text	8	-	cases	50	
AS	For late, placing, text	4	8	cases	50	
AS	Too late, family treatment, text	3	8	cases	50	
AS	For late, contact person, text	2	8	cases	50	
AS	§ 11 aid assessed adequately	3	3	cases	50	
AS	Current aid assessed sufficiently	20	20	cases	50	
AS	3 months' follow-up	2	3	cases	50	
AS	6 months of follow-up	3	3	cases	50	

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
AS	Compliance with personal supervision	3	3	cases	51	
AS	Special features	9	20	cases	51	
VISO	VISO Committee, main text / Annex 1	10	20	cases	52	Only BFU + plan; § 11 and missing BFU omitted
VISO	VISO Committee, Methodology Annex	8	20	cases	66	Deviations from 7 / 52 / 54; not harmonised
VISO	Child not involved in plan	10	10	cases	54	10 cases; not 20 cases
VISO	VISA follow-up	3	-	cases	58	Same sub-group somAS
Interview	Interview Groups	7	-	groups	59	
Interview	Interviews	27	-	persons	59	Children not affected
Interview	Receipt	4	27	persons	59	
Interview	Installation team	4	27	persons	59	
Interview	District	2	27	persons	59	
Interview	Intermediate managers	5	27	persons	59	
Interview	Senior management	1	27	persons	59	
Interview	Exporter area	5	27	persons	59	
Interview	General area	6	27	persons	59	
Local information	Redress review	1000	-	cases	12	Not 1000 proven errors / unique persons
Local information	Management supervision prsection prummer	4	-	checks;	13	
Local information	Management supervision	24	-	checks;	13	Repeated cases possible
Local information	Full Case Trial Range	6	-	weeks	13	From February 2021
Local information	Preventive advisers	4	-	staff	15	2 school + 2 day offers

Time and concrete steps

Document keys are the report's own reference keys, not file numbers or proof of unique persons.

Document key a	Search	Time	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
TFAFRE21-BFU-FRIST-10	4 months past; number = 1	10	days	47	8 studies, overlap with concretecourse possible
TFPRE21-BFU-FRIST-3-5	4 months past; number = 3	3-5	months	47	8 studies, overlap with concretecourse possible

Document key a	Search	Time	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
TFAFRE21-BFU-FRIST-6-9	4 months past; number = 3	6-9	months	47	8 studies, overlap with concretecourse possible
TFPRE21-BFU-FRIST-more	4 months past; number = 1	more	year	47	8 studies, overlap with concretecourse possible
TFPRE21-SAG-P47-FLIGHT	BFUDecision 2016 → placing spring 2019 → BFU autumn 2019	more	year	47	12 year unaccompanied refugee by 2016; no exact days
TFPRE21-SAG-P47-CENSOR	Fristoverrun from measurement period type 4.11.18	9	months	47	First worry summer 2018; actually went further than measurement
TFPRE21-SAG-P46-CONTACT	BFU 2010 → contact person Dec 2020 without update	approximately 10	year	46	The time between document dates; closed 2017, new concerns summer 2019
TFFE21-SAG-P46-UPDATE	Update spring 2019 → finish spring 2020	approx. 1	year	46	Parallel action after 2020 continues to require relevant information
TFAFRE21-SAG-P45-TOTAL	Commitment decision → children's conversation	1	month	45	Previous interview 3,5 months before request
TFPRE21-SAG-P49-AKUTPLA N	Acute placement → plan	10	months	49	4 Month deadline: 6 Months run derived
TFERE21 PLAN HOURS	Decision → Action plan	2 days to>1 year	interval	50	More cases; not one case
TFPRE21-SAG-P50-3M	Placing midmar 2019 → scheduled according to September 2019	approximately 6	months	50	The meeting is not complete
TFPRE21-SAG-P50-6M	Placement March 2019→first placement plan May 2020	approximately 14	months	50	StatusJune 19 without family is used as a start; next June 20 deadline first 20 follow
TFPRE21-SAG-P51-MISTRIV	Notification March 2019 → BFUfinished	9	months	51	Placement in summer 2020 after continuing serious notifications; precise days unknown
TFPRE21-SAG-P51-MISTRIV	Announcement March 2019 → Placing Ommer 2020	approximately 15-18	months	51	Derived calendar interval, non-exact
TFPRE21-SAG-P52-VOLD	Notification → first-reading conversation	2	months	52	The child's serious information was not discussed with parents
TFPRE21-SAG-P52-VOLD	No contact after network meeting	3.5	months	52	No independent personal union withVISOviolence example
TFFE21-SAG-P52-HUSLEJE	BFU Decision → BFU	1	year	52	Repeated rent notifications; support needs in parallel not assessed

Committee and internal deviations

The municipality selects pending cases according to criteria. The complaint / Assereret / § 65 cases and several cases from the same family are already omitted (PDF60). Only selected § 50 / § 140 requirements are measured. Current support is a concern assessment; AStests not the accuracy of the specific measure (PDF64). VISOomits missing BFUand § 11. The Committee is not representative (PDF8).

Deviations: VISO10 cases (PDF7 / 52 / 54) compared with 8 in method (PDF66). Plan error 8 in text versus 4 + 3 + 2 = 9 case types (PDF29 / 50), for which acute plan 10 months; main table has 9 / 15 (PDF43). No harmonization or new

union of errors. Calculating delay from 4.11.2018 conceals earlier concerns in summer 2018(PDF47). The measurement period ends 3.11.2020,but certain examples include later 2020 information(PDF46). The back cover’s May 2021 date and other dating must be reconciled by version.

Self-certification, responsibility and requirements

Conclusion: a positive assessment of current aid does not eliminate any substantiated breach of the guarantee. The proof is the separate counters, times and exclusions. The obligation to protect also concerns effective timely investigation, child participation, proportional action and effective post-control. The assessment of PDF31 on secured legal requirements is contradicted by the same original's 8 / 8 break, 5 / 11 decisions before BFUand 5 / 17 § 48 are missing. This is a demonstrable difference between the Authority's overall formulation and its own precise control findings.

The course of the unaccompanied young person requires verification of the duty of protection and investigation; the absence of follow-up requires verification of the need for continued action. VISOindicates unfocused clipping and targets where responsibility is placed with the child without adequate analysis (PDF56-58). The underlying parental / child descriptions are statements of authority, not independently verified guilt of the family.

Documented errors: the numerators and courses above. Hypotheses: a need for placement caused by errors, unjustified separation, specific harm and individual criminal culpability. Next evidence: contemporaneous decisions, the basis of consent/coercion, original assessments, the redress review and final measurement 2022; actual returns home, compensation and individual responsibility. Strongest demands: individual reopening, a specific lawfulness assessment and documented redress; investigate the actor’s knowledge and continuing omission without automatic institutional exoneration. No national sum of persons can follow from this sample.

Nordfyn 2020: assessment backlog, financial management and missing placement follow-up

All 58PDFpages text read in RAM; PDF34 / 48 tables visually RAM-controlled. Printed page = PDFside − 1. The public PDFwas found via links from the municipality's official archived publication after the FTcopy gave 403.

All recorded figures with delimiting

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
AS	Committee	20	-	cases	33	
AS	§ 52 Decision in period	16	20	cases	33	
AS	§ 11 offers	3	20	cases	33	
AS	Older placement only follow-up	1	20	cases	33	
AS	Duration of placement	7	20	cases	33	
AS	Of which also follow-up	2	7	cases	33	
AS	Family treatment	3	20	cases	33	
AS	Relief	3	20	cases	33	
AS	Contact person	3	20	cases	33	
AS	0-3 years	4	20	cases	33	
AS	4 to 7 years	4	20	cases	33	
AS	8 to 14 years	8	20	cases	33	
AS	15 to 17 years	4	20	cases	33	
AS	BFU / update missing	7	14	cases	34	
AS	BFU time limit exceeded	2	4	cases	34	
AS	Reasoned position missing	1	7	cases	34	
AS	BFU not closed before decision	1	5	cases	34	
AS	Action plan missing	3	16	cases	34	
AS	Action plan not before decision	8	11	cases	34	
AS	§ 48 not fulfilled	4	12	cases	34	
AS	Child involvement some degree	12	12	cases	35	
AS	Child involvement not relevant age	4	16	cases	35	
AS	Parental involvement	13	16	cases	35	
AS	Low degree of parental involvement	2	16	cases	35	
AS	Parental involvement	1	16	cases	35	
AS	§ 48 conversation legally	8	16	cases	35	

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
AS	§ 48 without conversation, immaturity accepted	4	16	cases	35	
AS	§ 48 No conversation at all	2	4	cases	35	
AS	§ 48 interview by decision	1	4	cases	35	
AS	§ 48 Wrong subject	1	4	cases	35	
AS	BFUs measured	14	16	cases	36	
AS	Provisional decision, before -BFU requirement omitted	1	16	cases	36	
AS	Second municipality BFU quality omitted	1	16	cases	36	
AS	Current BFU	4	14	cases	36	
AS	Current BFUupdate	3	14	cases	36	
AS	BFU deficiencies	3	14	cases	36	
AS	BFU update missing	4	14	cases	37	
AS	BFU time limit respected	2	4	cases	37	
AS	Reasoned position	6	7	cases	37	
AS	Precautionary decision before - BFU requirement omitted	2	7	cases	37	
AS	BFU decision	4	5	cases	38	
AS	Degree of relevant evidence	13	16	cases	38	
AS	Low level of information	3	16	cases	38	
AS	Action plan prepared	13	16	cases	38	
AS	Action plan before decision	3	13	cases	38	
AS	Precision pre-plane requirements omitted	2	13	cases	38	
AS	Sensual placement	3	8	cases	38	
AS	Seasonal family care	2	8	cases	38	
AS	Senplane Discharge	2	8	cases	38	
AS	Senplan contact person	1	8	cases	38	

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
AS	§ 11 sufficient aid	2	3	cases	39	
AS	§ 11 insufficient aid	1	3	cases	39	
AS	Adequate current aid	18	20	cases	39	
AS	Current aid uncertain, Asbørnekofotor referred	2	20	cases	39	
AS	3 months' follow-up	3	3	cases	40	
AS	6 months of follow-up	3	3	cases	40	
AS	Personal supervision not complied with	2	3	cases	40	
VISO	VISO Committee, main text / Annex 1	7	20	cases	32	Missing BFU + § 11 omitted
VISO	VISO Committee, Methodology Annex	8	20	cases	55	Source internal deviation
Interview	Interview Groups	7	-	groups	48	
Interview	Interviews	28	-	persons	48	Not affected citizens
Interview	Receipt	4	28	persons	48	
Interview	Youth team	3	28	persons	48	
Interview	Children's team	7	28	persons	48	
Interview	Intermediate managers	3	28	persons	48	
Interview	Chief Executive	2	28	persons	48	
Interview	Suppliers	2	28	persons	48	
Interview	General area	7	28	persons	48	
Quarterly local government information	BFU backlog bultimo 2019	155	-	studies;	21	Represented original, quarterly annexes not independently read
Quarterly local government information	BFUingMarch 2020	143	-	studies;	21	Children's team + previous initiative + overall legal project
Quarterly local government information	BFUtempistoverrunm art s 2020	116	143	studies;	21	Not sample 2 / 4
Quarterly local government information	Parallel measure March 2020	103	-	cases	21	Overlap with 143 / 155 / 20 unknown
Local practice	Anonymous counselling phone time	1	-	hour / day	18	4 days per week
Local practice	Anonymous counselling week days	4	-	days / week	18	

Cut	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Limitation
Local practice	Anonymous counselling maximum	5	-	conversations;	18	Interview information, non-citizens

Time and concrete steps

Document keys are their own source keys, not file numbers. Overlap between different examples is unknown.

Document key	Search	Time	Unit	PDF page	Definition of proof
TFNOR20-BFU-FRIST1	4 month deadline exceeded	approx. 1	month	37	1 of 2BFU
TFNOR20-BFU-FRIST2	4 month deadline exceeded	approx. 1	month	37	2 of 2BFU
TFNOR20-SAG-P38- UPDATE	Decision → BFU Update	8	days	38	1 of 5 relevant decisions
TFNOR20-PLANTIDER	Decision → Action plan	3 days -6 months	interval	39	8 different cases, no sum
TFNOR20-SAGS-P40-PLEJE	Installation Act 2018 → 3 months follow-up	6	months	40	Fristoprun 3 m, not 6 moverrun
TFNOR20 -SAGS-P40-3M2	3 months past	few	days	40	1 of 2 other follow-up cases
TFNOR20 -SAGS-P40-3M3	3 months past	few	days	40	2 of 2 other follow-up cases
TFNOR20 -SAGS-P36-UFOEDT	BFU decision autumn 2018 → still no BFUfeb 2020	approximately 14-17	months	36	Own calendar interval; family treatment decided> 4 months after the BFU decision
TFNOR20 -SAGS-P37-EFTERSKOLE	Sent home from boarding school → placement decision	2	months	37	Child welfare assessment autumn 2018 not updated; other social descriptions not checked against primary material
TFNOR20 -SAG-P39-40-COMPLEK S	School concern report September 2019→§11 offer December 2019	3	calendar months;	39	Nov 2017 notification, June 18 closure; Feb/Mar 20 after the measurement period included
TFNOR20-SAGS-P46-MAGT	Several uses of force →no follow-up	-	uncalled time	46	VISO example, girl in out-of-home care; case-file count/time and person overlap unknown

Source-derived method and source deviations

The Committee has been selected by the municipality and not representative (PDF6 / 32). All appeals / Assereret / § 65 cases, completed interventions and several cases from the same family are omitted (PDF49). Pure physical disability is omitted. Only selected § 50 / § 140 requirements are measured. The BFU 2 / 4 deadline covers investigations carried out, not all 16 decisions or 143 ongoing decisions of the municipality. VISOomit missing BFUand § 11 (PDF55).

Discrepancies: VISO7(PDF6/32/41) against 8 in the methodology(PDF55); planned 17 section 52 against actual 16+1 older follow-up(PDF33/49); methodology mentions 3 of 5 placements(PDF53), actually 7 new+1 older. The main table's § 484/12 corresponds to the text's 4/16 with 4 immaturity exclusions. PDF39-40 includes February/March 2020 after the 1.2.2020 measurement boundary. No harmonisation/union of individuals. Municipal 155/143/116/103 are separate population subsets, not additional sample errors.

Independent evidence and legal consequences

Conclusion: documented breaks in time and guarantees must be tested together with the management of the lack of aid. The original's PDF8 reproduces the Director's statement that previous strategy / quality standards put too much emphasis on the economy and contributed to the sub-measure. PDF21 describes the management's prioritisation of investigations started after 1.1.2020, while old cases continued to lack investigation. The evidence is the report's reproduction of management statements and quarterly data; the original decisions and individual records are the next level of evidence.

Current legality, knowledge and responsibility must be examined actor by actor against the contemporaneous duties to establish facts, investigate, involve and follow up. Closing a case because the family is described as unwilling does not prove that the need for protection has ended. A child in care being subjected to several uses of force without follow-up requires specific investigation of continuing necessity, protection, proportionality and possible redress. Financial priorities or organisational corrective work do not automatically exempt anyone from responsibility.

Documented errors: review numerators and local courses above. Hypotheses: deterioration created by management, error-induced placement, unjustified continued separation and individual criminal culpability. Evidentiary gaps: quarterly information reports, budget/competence decisions, original decisions/BFUs/basis of consent/coercion, use-of-force reports and § 65 outcomes. Strongest demands: reopening cases lacking a current factual basis; specific legal review after use of force; documented timely support and actual return home/reunification where the legal basis requires it; individual assessment of loss and responsibility. No national total can be derived from overlapping reviews.

Rudersdal: continued guarantee deficiencies after Task Force progress, 2024-2026

The final report was published in 2026 and examines 2024-2025. It is included separately from the reports for the 20-year period. Five original annexes, totalling 41 physical PDF pages, have been read in memory. PDF7 in the final report has been visually checked: a photograph without statistics. The original analysis report from June 2024 has now been read in full in taskforce-rudersdal2024-indledende-original.md, a further 40 pages. The municipality's recommendation matrix remains a different source.

Original numbers and denominators

Source / PDF page	Measurement	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Period / selection
TFRUD26 / 5	Status meetings	6	-	meetings;	2024-2025; Development
TFRUD26 / 5	Cases examined	3	-	Trials	January / May / October 2025; Saving, non-representative national sample
TFRUD26 / 5	Cases by way of review	9	-	case handling;	January / May / October 2025; 3 per meeting; reliability not documented
TFRUD26 / 5	Local status reports	6	-	explanations;	2024-2025; the municipality's own description of target attainment
TFRUD26 / 5	Self-evaluation areas	5	-	areas	start / end; Not five errors / persons
TFRUD26 / 6	Further follow-up meeting offered	6-8	-	months	after completion; offers; actual holding not documented
TFRUD26 / 22	Absence of a position on the need for the child's plan	3	3	cases	October 2025; Latest review; steps to be taken
TFRUD26 / 25	Cases at each meeting	3	-	cases	status meeting 2 / 4 / 6; same nine readings as PDF5; not added to 9
TFRUD26 / 25	Workshops on the development plan / management system	2	-	workshops	2024-2025; Activity, non-outcome
TFRUDM25 / 4	Thematic management oversight carried out	1	-	supervision;	until April 2025; Process control; case not disclosed
TFRUDM25 / 4	General management supervision carried out	2	-	supervision;	until April 2025; Process control; case not disclosed
TFRUDE25 / 1	Statusmeetings with counsellors	3	6	meetings;	development phase; Also the final report's 6 meetings; not to be added
TFRUDE25 / 1	Background to experience other municipalities	more than 40	-	municipalities	23.10.2025; Experiences, unchecked national error rate
TFRUDH26 / 2	Municipal consultation response	2	-	answer	04.02 / 17.02.2026; given after consultation 30.01.2026

All rows have separate units. The nine readings, three meetings and 3 / 3 plans are not to be added together. The selection framework, personalkeys, already-pending exclusion and overlap between January / May / October is not published here. No calculation of national errors / personalities.

Guarantees and authority knowledge

TFRUD26 PDF16: continued incomplete child involvement. PDF18: imprecise / long-term declines and standardised 24-hour assessments. PDF20: recent case examples do not clearly justify the suitability of the action. PDF22: 3 / 3 without a statutory position on the child's plan; also lack of justification for the time / purpose of follow-up. No misunion has been published for these categories.

TFRUDH26 PDF2-3: The municipality did not indicate any factual errors; the summary was contested and amended. The mid-term assessment relates to development work, not to the legality of all decisions. TFRUDM25 PDF4: Management action on supervisory findings is assessed only to some extent. TFRUDE25 is a development / anchoring note without individual legality checks.

The municipality's own 25-point matrix

No	Zone	Municipal status	TFRUDK25 / PDF page
1	Common view of children	not started	1
2	Political / professional orientation	in progress	1
3	Working procedures / quality	in progress	1
4	Management information	in progress	2
5	Management supervision	in the target	2
6	Technical Forum	in the target	3
7	Court sparring	in the target	3
8	Interdisciplinary roles	in progress	3
9	Common language	in progress	3
10	Preventive advisers	in the target	3
11	Transfer of experience	in progress	3
12	Role of the Authority	in progress	4
13	The child's perspective	in progress	4
14	Quality of conversation	in progress	4
15	Current involvement	in progress	4
16	Network	not started	4
17	Concern as notification	in the target	5
18	Review	in the target	5
19	Network in the assessment	in progress	5
20	Parental competences	not started	5
21	Professional analysis	in progress	5
22	Options for action	in the target	5
23	Family coordination	split: in target / in progress	6
24	External cooperation	in progress	6
25	Follow-up / closure	in progress, close to target	6

Status 23 is divided between siblings and coordination across child / youth / adult areas. Status 25 is in progress, close to target. This is municipal self-evaluation; not 25 legally tested decisions.

Own evidence analysis, legal proceedings and necessary documents

Conclusion: The termination of the extension does not prove that the child's guarantees have been restored. The concrete evidence is the 3 / 3 lack of the latest review. Plan requirements and reasoned follow-up must be met in each case; an assessment of organisational momentum does not meet these requirements. The lack of assessment of support needs, the suitability of action and the child's perspective weakens the evidence that continued action is necessary and proportionate. The published material does not identify the placement for the particular three cases: the duration of the placement, illegal detention or actual repatriation cannot therefore be attributed to those three without a certificate of record.

Management and the State oversight authorities had specific knowledge of the deficiencies no later than the review in October 2025. The necessary demand is individual verification of safeguards and documented redress: original and

current decisions, type of support / placement, plan assessment, child involvement, reasoned follow-up and time of actual correction. Liability shall be tested against proven knowledge and subsequent omissions. Neither courses, future 2026 plans nor summary changes are proof of the repair of a particular family.

Documented errors: the planning deficiency and the specific guarantee deficiencies listed above. Additional evidence requirements: individual records, type of action, case union, impact time and track of responsibility. The starting dates vary in the originals: mid-term status September 2024, extraordinary status June 2024, end report review period November 2024. They are preserved as source versions without harmonisation.

Rudersdal 2024: the initial Task Force original

The original analysis is now provided and all 40 physical pages of text read. Interview table PDF39 is visually aligned in RAM. Together with end / consultation / middle / additional / status matrix in taskforce-rudersdal2024-2026 original.md 81 original pages are actually read. Home June 2024, bread text prepared May 2024 and data base November 2023-March 2024 are separate date entries. PDFprint page = PDFside − 2.

Factual cells and sample

PDF	Cell	Figures	N	Unit	Limitation
6	Section 52	9	12	cases	
6	§ 11 offers	3	12	cases	
6	Total	12	12	cases	Repeated method PDF39, not further 12
24	Examples of re-assessment	2	-	cases	Number of revaluations required not disclosed; not 10 / 12 errors
24	§ 11 cases without relevant child interview	2	3	cases	Two specific cases; overlap with other talk errors unknown
24	Child first heard after 4 months	1	-	cases	BFU done in the meantime without conversation
25	Example: one parent authority holder completely omitted	1	-	cases	Contact with the child; total malfunctioning unknown
27	BFUconversation mistakenly failed with previous conversation as justification	1	-	cases	Previous notification conversation does not cover BFUpurpose
30	Example: actually released young asked even assess support	1	-	cases	Return-home date/duration not stated; no documented redress following an invalid decision
30	Example: actual placement before BFU completion without adequate assessment	1	-	cases	Parents' wishes governing; judicial review / return not published
31	References to the ASchildrenoffice	2	12	cases	End January 2024; the Office shall assess after disclosure, actual on-board opening / outage not disclosed
33	Example: support completed despite continued needs	1	-	cases	Parents did not want joint treatment; alternatives / visits / conversations not attempted
39	Advisers	7	19	interviewing persons;	
39	Senior management	2	19	interviewing persons;	
39	Exporter area	6	19	interviewing persons;	
39	General area	4	19	interviewing persons;	
39	Total	19	19	interviewing persons;	
38	Group interview	4	-	interview	
24	Time for first child interview in case	4	-	months	BFU executed without conversation before then; dates not published
5	Application	01.12.2022	-	date	
5	Estimated overall trajectory	2	-	year	End 2023 → beginning 2026; development phase begins later than application
5	Authority teams	5	-	teams;	Organisation chart at the end of 2023

PDF	Cell	Figures	N	Unit	Limitation
14	Budget review	2	-	annual rounds;	All cases following management statements; economy is not legal measurement
14	New advisor case review	14	-	days	First 3 months
14	Other case reviews	8	-	weeks	The entire file is not reached on the basis of management information
14	Trade union meetings	14	-	days	Three hours after the commune's statement.
14	Duration of the meeting	3	-	hours	Non-procedural time
15	Joint meeting of the Authority	6	-	weeks	Adult and child areas, not a sampling interval

The original has 12 current cases, 9 § 52 and 3 § 11. It provides patterns and specific cases, not a legal outcome matrix for every requirement. The methodology does not specify exclusion of appealed or § 65 cases, the same family or disability; such filters therefore cannot be imported from other years. The abuse-preparedness plan is expressly omitted because of ongoing revision. The denominator for necessary reassessments and uniqueness between cases are not published.

Specific action, guarantee and significance

An actual placement occurred before completion of the BFU without a sufficient specific assessment; a young person actually returned home was asked to assess their own support needs. One child was not heard until after 4 months, with the BFU completed beforehand. Concerns about the use of force were not followed by an assessment of the intervention. Inadequate information about a support person weakened the child's actual choice. Referral of 2 cases to the children's office in January 2024 does not document their subsequent outcomes. [TFRUD24 PDF22-33]

The independent analysis is that placement and return home require a documented, individual basis. The parents' wishes cannot replace the assessment and reasons that the original itself finds missing; nor must the child bear the authority's responsibility for necessary support after return home. A subsequent development process does not prove that the earlier decisions were reviewed or their consequences repaired. The 3/3 failures to address the child's plan in October 2025 are therefore a new safeguard observation, not redress for the 2024 cases and not documented as the same three individuals.

Specific demand on the register authorities: file numbers for the two referrals to the Children’s Office, next action, date, outcome and implementation, and anonymous linkage to the underlying cases. Actual compensation or return-home claims require the original decision, applicable legal authority, investigation of the case, proportionality, duration, actual cessation and loss. The published patterns must be criticised fully; an aggregate number of placements without legal authority cannot be established from this original.

Slagelse: legal guarantees, waiting time and municipal control 2020- 2021

Two originals on 76 physical pages are fully textured; tables and figures on nine pages are visually aligned in memory. PDFside indications apply to physical pages; TFSL20 printing page = PDFside − 1. Previous empty portal views are replaced by current working original attachments.

Population and separation

TFSL20: 20 municipal selected pending cases, 17 decisions and 3 § 11 offers. Places 8 of which 3 older follow-up cases. Complaints / dealt with Assages and 65 cases, completed interventions, same family and children alone with physical disabilities excluded. VISO10 is a subset with document conditions, not an additional 10 children. The control includes selected requirements, not all of § 50 / § 140 requirements. Assay of current support is concern screening, not approval of the specific measure.

All fact cells with denominators

Source / PDF	Table	Cell	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Limitation
TFSL20 / 37	T1	Installation	8	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 37	T1	Family treatment	3	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 37	T1	Relief	3	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 37	T1	Contact person	3	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 37	T1	§ 11 offers	3	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 37	T1	Total	20	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 37	T2	0-3 years	3	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 37	T2	4 to 7 years	2	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 37	T2	8 to 14 years	9	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 37	T2	15 to 17 years	6	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 37	T2	Total	20	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 38	T3	BFU missing	2	16	cases	T3 heading 17; specific BFUmeasurement 16 after one pre-periodic study omitted
TFSL20 / 38	T3	BFU update missing	5	16	cases	T3 heading 17; specific denominator 16
TFSL20 / 38	T3	BFU four-month deadline exceeded	5	7	cases	Only actually prepared new BFU
TFSL20 / 38	T3	BFU / update without reasoned position	0	9	cases	Seven new and two updates
TFSL20 / 38	T3	BFU / update only after decision	4	7	cases	Nine available studies minus two legally acute / concurrent
TFSL20 / 38	T3	Action plan missing	4	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 38	T3	Action plan illegal late	7	11	cases	13 available plans minus two legally acute
TFSL20 / 38	T3	§ 48 not fulfilled	4	17	cases	Three legally absent conversations are part of 13 observed
TFSL20 / 36	Annex 1	Decisions	17	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 36	Annex 1	§ 11 offers	3	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 36	Annex 1	Visodal quantity	10	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 38	Annex 1	Special features	9	20	cases	

Source / PDF	Table	Cell	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Limitation
TFSL20 / 38	Annex 1	Trade union office informed of possible insufficient support	1	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 39	Annex 1	Child: age makes inclusion irrelevant	3	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 39	Annex 1	Child: high involvement	1	14	cases	
TFSL20 / 39	Annex 1	Child: no involvement	11	14	cases	
TFSL20 / 39	Annex 1	Child: little involvement	2	14	cases	
TFSL20 / 39	Annex 1	Parental authority: high involvement	3	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 39	Annex 1	Parental authority: any involvement	12	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 39	Annex 1	Parental authority: low involvement	2	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 40	Annex 1	Both parties high / some	10	14	cases	
TFSL20 / 40	Annex 1	Child someone / parents call	2	14	cases	
TFSL20 / 40	Annex 1	Child calls / parents any	1	14	cases	
TFSL20 / 40	Annex 1	Child rings / parents high	1	14	cases	
TFSL20 / 40	Annex 1	§ 48 complied with	13	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 40	Annex 1	§ 48 legally absent from age	3	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 40	Annex 1	§ 48 error: no relevant conversation	2	4	cases	
TFSL20 / 40	Annex 1	§ 48 error: only after decision	2	4	cases	
TFSL20 / 41	Annex 1	BFU initial measurement period omitted	1	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 41	Annex 1	New current BFU	7	16	cases	
TFSL20 / 41	Annex 1	Current BFUs Update	2	16	cases	
TFSL20 / 42	Annex 1	BFU timely	2	7	cases	
TFSL20 / 42	Annex 1	Reasoned position new BFU	7	7	cases	

Source / PDF	Table	Cell	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Limitation
TFSL20 / 42	Annex 1	Reasoned position updated	2	2	cases	
TFSL20 / 42	Annex 1	BFU cleared before decision	3	9	cases	
TFSL20 / 43	Annex 1	Acute / concurrent legally excluded	2	9	cases	
TFSL20 / 43	Annex 1	Sen BFU	3	4	cases	
TFSL20 / 43	Annex 1	Late update	1	4	cases	
TFSL20 / 43	Annex 1	Information high degree	1	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 43	Annex 1	Information any degree	14	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 43	Annex 1	Low level of information	2	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Action plan available	13	17	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Missing plan: relief	2	4	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Lack of plan: fa milieu treatment	1	4	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Missing plan: location	1	4	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Pre-decision plan	4	13	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Plan after decision gross	9	13	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Plan legally acute except	2	9	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Illegal late plan: fa milieprocessing	2	7	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Illegal schedule: relief	1	7	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Illegal schedule: contact person	1	7	cases	
TFSL20 / 44	Annex 1	Illegal plan: introduction	3	7	cases	
TFSL20 / 45	Annex 1	§ 11 offers sufficient on offer	1	3	cases	
TFSL20 / 45	Annex 1	§ 11 offers insufficient by tender	2	3	cases	
TFSL20 / 45	Annex 1	Current efforts without ASconcern reference	19	20	cases	

Source / PDF	Table	Cell	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Limitation
TFSL20 / 46	Annex 1	Follow-up proceedings	3	8	cases	
TFSL20 / 46	Annex 1	Three-month requirements all met	0	3	cases	
TFSL20 / 46	Annex 1	Three months old	2	3	cases	
TFSL20 / 46	Annex 1	Three-month timed amber / content failure according to general text	1	3	cases	
TFSL20 / 46	Annex 1	Six-month requirements met	2	3	cases	
TFSL20 / 46	Annex 1	Six-month failure	1	3	cases	
TFSL20 / 47	Annex 1	Personnel law supervision	2	3	cases	
TFSL20 / 47	Annex 1	Personnel law oversight failure	1	3	cases	
TFSL20 / 47	Annex 1	Special Forces	1	20	cases	
TFSL20 / 53	Method T1	Clarification / investigation / forward	6	28	interviewing persons;	
TFSL20 / 53	Method T1	Children / young people / education	5	28	interviewing persons;	
TFSL20 / 53	Method T1	Professional management	5	28	interviewing persons;	
TFSL20 / 53	Method T1	Senior management	2	28	interviewing persons;	
TFSL20 / 53	Method T1	Suppliers	6	28	interviewing persons;	
TFSL20 / 53	Method T1	General area	4	28	interviewing persons;	
TFSL20 / 53	Method T1	Total Interviews	28	28	interviewing persons;	
TFSL20 / 53	Method	Group interview	6	-	interview	Bread text has unfinished placeholder xxpersons; table total 28 checked
TFSL20 / 42	Time	BFUtempst title	1-8	-	months	Five cases; individual duration not published
TFSL20 / 42	Time	Family treatment scase BFU temptation over pass	6	-	months	Police notification May 2018, BFUfinished March 2019
TFSL20 / 42	Time	Parallel proposal after BFUdeadline	4	-	months	January 2019; ASrejects as timely parallel efforts

Source / PDF	Table	Cell	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Limitation
TFSL20 / 43	Time	BFU after family treatment decision	3	-	months	Decision types 2019 / BFUJune 2019
TFSL20 / 40	Time	Child first heard efte apart frame	more than 10	-	days	Time from actual placement; date of decision not disclosed
TFSL20 / 39	Time	Child first heard before moving	1	-	day	It is only after a decision; it is not provided by a decision
TFSL20 / 30	Time	Three-month deadline CaseA	4	-	days	Repeated on PDF46
TFSL20 / 30	Time	Three-month deadline CaseB	8	-	days	Repeated on PDF46
TFSL20 / 30	Time	Three-month deadline CaseC	2	-	months	Contrary to the PDF46 general text's time requirements
TFSL20 / 46	Time	Case C after affixing according to text	4	-	months	Concurrently June 2019 → November 2019; non-compliance is maintained
TFSL20 / 47	Time	Staff law supervision in fact	1	-	conversation / year	At least 2; family matters
TFSL20 / 48	Time	13 year BFU duration	11	-	months	Kkendelsesaug 201 7 / BFU6.7.2018; stotteneedsvaluejj uli 18 / kontaktperso nal'19
TFSL20 / 28	Time	Family household waiting period declared	0,5-1	-	year	Interview information, not case register total
TFSL20 / 28	Time	Politically maximum family household waiting time	2	-	months	Limits in policy guidelines reproduced; original decision not independently controlled
TFSL21 / 14	Figure seniority	0-1 Annual employees	31	78	staff	N78 is its own exact sum of five graph cells, not number of failed
TFSL21 / 14	Figure seniority	Over 1-2 years	11	78	staff	N78 is its own exact sum of five graph cells, not number of failed
TFSL21 / 14	Figure seniority	Over 2 to 5 years	22	78	staff	N78 is its own exact sum of five graph cells, not number of failed
TFSL21 / 14	Figure seniority	Over 5 to 10 years	7	78	staff	N78 is its own exact sum of five graph cells, not number of failed

Source / PDF	Table	Cell	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Limitation
TFSL21 / 14	Figure seniority	Over 10 years	7	78	staff	N78 is its own exact sum of five graph cells, not number of failed
TFSL21 / 3	Organisation	Common family group A	42	-	families	The statement of the complaint not tested in this status; overlap with 32 unknown
TFSL21 / 3	Organisation	Common family group B	32	-	families	Do not summon as 74 unique families
TFSL21 / 1	Organisation	Development points	7	-	points	Activity structure, not 7 errors
TFSL21 / 13	Organisation	Resolving recruitment	6	-	DKK million	Local information, not compensation
TFSL21 / 13	Organisation	Expected number of cases	25	-	cases / advisors	Targets not observed
TFSL21 / 15	Organisation	Expected disability case number	35	-	cases / advisors	Targets not observed
TFSL21 / 13	Organisation	AnsatNovember 2021	4	-	staff	Repeated PDF14, not 8 recruits
TFSL21 / 13	Organisation	Longitude not more than 2 years	54	-	%	Original text; own graph 42 / 78 = 53,85%
TFSL21 / 13	Organisation	Longitude not exceeding 1 year	40	-	%	Original text; own graph 31 / 78 = 39,74%

The municipality's own control: all targets, milestones and September 2021 cells

The percentages are published rounded values. Exact outcome counts are unpublished and have therefore not been back-calculated. Partial compliance cannot be renamed full legality. 14 days/4 weeks are the municipality’s indicators; their legal basis is not established by the table heading alone.

PDF	Checks	Final target%	Milestones% / time	Status%	N	Original qualification;
6	§ 48 Interview	100	75/August 2021	54	39	where applicable,
8	Party consultation 14 d	100	50/August 2021	80	45	total or partial;
8	Professional assessment 4 weeks	75	40/August 2021	44	70	total or partial;
8	Return to courts	100	50/August 2021	56	39	total or partial;
9	Investigation plan	100	75/August 2021	13	56	no sub-classification
9	Network meeting	70	25/August 2021	21	53	where applicable,
9	Oral hearing of the parties	90	30/August 2021	54	53	where applicable,

PDF	Checks	Final target%	Milestones% / time	Status%	N	Original qualification;
9	Maximum 2 focus points	-	35/August 2021	87	55	in whole or in part; target = maximum 2, no target part declared;
9	Focus relevant	100	35/August 2021	94	52	
9	Triangular analysis	100	35/August 2021	100	50	where applicable,
9	The child's needs in assessment	100	35/August 2021	96	50	where applicable,
9	BFU legal deadline	90	45 / December 2021	59	51	
9	Parallel measure correct	-	45 / December 2021	97	35	where applicable; end-target part not disclosed;
10	Pre-decision plan in cooperation	95	30 / December 2021	72	57	
10	Plan 3-5 targets	80	40 / April 2021	83	54	total or partial;
10	Targeting field used	100	30 / April 2022	66	53	
10	Parental support	100	75/August 2021	35	23	where applicable,
11	Follow-up meetings fairly timely	100	35 / December 2021	85	46	
11	Six months' follow-up in time	100	35 / December 2021	85	39	total or partial; same target / milestone as previous
11	Personnel law supervision	100	35 / December 2021	91	23	total or partial;

Documented consistency and verification of sources

The placement interviews took place after the decision in two specific cases: the day before a move to a foster family and more than 10 days after separation from the mother at an institution. Child welfare assessments and plans were deficient or late; each safeguard requires its own denominator. AS assesses materiality specifically and finds no special circumstances rendering the identified safeguard failures immaterial. A § 11 case was sent to the specialist office; the report does not prove that the § 65 case was actually opened. [TFSL20 PDF40-46]

The independent analysis is that a subsequent interview cannot give the child influence over a separation already carried out. Quality targets, organisational measures and a later screening for support concerns likewise do not document that the decision's earlier legal deficiency has been repaired. The specific legal consequence requires the decision's legal basis, case records, annulment or fresh review, effective period and actual reunification. None of the published tables supplies this chain. The error must therefore be described fully and specifically; unlawful placement or abduction requires further individual application of the legal rules to the facts.

Parental planning status 35% / 23 in 2021 demonstrates that the municipality's own control still did not reach its target 100%; also, part-classified fields do not show any certainty of legal legality. No amount of persons involved or percentage of improvement between the two completely different samples shall be calculated.

The differences between the original and the necessary documents

The three-month requirement's overall 0/3 is consistent. PDF30 nevertheless says that all 3 time limits were exceeded, whereas PDF46 generally says 2 late and 1 timely with a content deficiency; the specific example at the same location describes both time and content deficiencies. June→November 2019 is also called 4 months. These statements are retained with page references without harmonisation. Requirement denominators 16/7/9/11 cannot be replaced by the T3 heading's 17. The expression 19/20 relevant support is limited by the methodology's screening for concerns and does not contradict the 2/3 insufficient § 11 offers at the time they were offered.

Lack of personal evidence: individual decision-making exercise, actual repatriation, duration until termination, compensation and employee responsibility. An actual later final report has not yet been identified in this module. Initial policy decisions on prevention and maximum waiting time have only been reproduced, not independently provided.

Middelfart 2020: original figures, action programmes and development plan

June 2020 analysis has 69 physical pages, all text read. PDF44 / 46 / 60 is visually aligned in RAM. The municipal development plan has 13 pages, all read; item 33 / 14.06.2022 has been read separately. The actual tabular outcome of the final report has still not been provided. Pressure side in the analysis = PDFside − 1.

Factic cells and their own denominators

Source / PDF	Cell	Figures	N	Unit	Limitation
TFMID20 / 44	§ 52 decisions during the period	16	20	cases	
TFMID20 / 44	Only follow-up, pre-period decision	1	20	cases	
TFMID20 / 44	§ 11	3	20	cases	
TFMID20 / 44	Total	20	20	cases	
TFMID20 / 44	Placement decisions during the period	7	20	cases	
TFMID20 / 44	Family treatment	3	20	cases	
TFMID20 / 44	Relief	3	20	cases	
TFMID20 / 44	Contact person	3	20	cases	
TFMID20 / 44	0-3 years	2	20	cases by age of the child;	
TFMID20 / 44	4 to 7 years	4	20	cases by age of the child;	
TFMID20 / 44	8 to 14 years	7	20	cases by age of the child;	
TFMID20 / 44	15 to 17 years	7	20	cases by age of the child;	
TFMID20 / 44	Old age	20	20	cases by age of the child;	
TFMID20 / 61	New decisions ordered	17	20	cases	Against actual 16; one decision before the measurement period
TFMID20 / 54	Visoreview actual	7	20	cases	PDF7 / 43 / 54 denotes 7; method PDF66 denotes 8
TFMID20 / 66	Visoreview method indication	8	20	cases	Version deviation against actual 7; not 15 cases
TFMID20 / 61	Requested accommodation	8	20	cases	Method PDF65 indicates 3 out of 5 locations; in fact 7 new + 1 only follow-up
TFMID20 / 65	The location committee of the method	5	-	cases	Non-conformity with 8 take-off / actual period
TFMID20 / 65	Follow-up Committee of the method	3	5	cases	Actual follow-up 3, not 3 new people
TFMID20 / 46	§ 48 not fulfilled	7	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	BFU deficiencies	1	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	BFU update deficiencies	8	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	BFU4 months of freshness	1	1	cases	

Source / PDF	Cell	Figures	N	Unit	Limitation
TFMID20 / 46	Reasoned position missing	0	6	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	BFU / update after decision	2	4	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	Action plan deficiencies	0	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	Action plan after decision	11	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	Age makes inclusion irrelevant	1	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	Child high degree	0	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	Child any degree	10	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	Child poor degree	4	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	Child not at all	1	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	Parents high degree	0	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	Parents any degree	12	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 46	Parents low degree	4	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 47	Both some degree	9	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 47	Child rings / parent someone	3	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 47	Child someone / parent rings	1	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 47	Both rings	1	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 47	Child none / parent rings	1	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 47	§ 48 complied with	8	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 47	Address by decision	4	7	cases	
TFMID20 / 47	No conversation	3	7	cases	
TFMID20 / 47	Illegal opt-out age / maturity	2	3	cases	
TFMID20 / 48	BFUs	15	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 48	Provisional derogation still<4 months	1	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 48	Current new BFU	1	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 48	Current update	5	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 49	Emergency / temporary exemption from pre-condition	2	5	cases	
TFMID20 / 49	Current new BFU before decision	1	1	cases	
TFMID20 / 49	Pre-decision update	1	3	cases	

Source / PDF	Cell	Figures	N	Unit	Limitation
TFMID20 / 49	Updating after the placement decision	2	3	cases	
TFMID20 / 49	Expressed high	2	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 49	Declared any degree	12	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 49	Small degree	2	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 50	Action Plan Current	16	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 50	Acute exemption requirements	1	16	cases	
TFMID20 / 50	Pre-decision plan	4	15	cases	
TFMID20 / 50	Late plan: location	5	11	cases	
TFMID20 / 50	Late plan: relief	3	11	cases	
TFMID20 / 50	Late plan: family care	2	11	cases	
TFMID20 / 50	Late plan: contact person	1	11	cases	
TFMID20 / 50	§ 11 sufficient	1	3	cases	
TFMID20 / 50	§ 11 inadequate	2	3	cases	
TFMID20 / 51	Current aid applicable / sufficient	15	20	cases	
TFMID20 / 51	Current aid uncertain	5	20	cases	
TFMID20 / 51	§ 65 Reference: § 11	2	5	cases	
TFMID20 / 51	§ 65 Reference: Relief	1	5	cases	
TFMID20 / 51	§ 65 Reference: Contact person	1	5	cases	
TFMID20 / 51	§ 65 Reference: Family treatment	1	5	cases	
TFMID20 / 45	Notification cases actually set up	5	20	cases	Creation documented; final § 65 decisions and execution not disclosed
TFMID20 / 52	Follow-up placement	3	8	cases	
TFMID20 / 52	Both decision and follow-up	2	3	cases	
TFMID20 / 52	Only follow-up before period	1	3	cases	
TFMID20 / 52	3 months of follow-up complied with	1	3	cases	
TFMID20 / 52	3 months follow-up for late	2	3	cases	
TFMID20 / 52	6 months follow-up complied with	1	2	cases	

Source / PDF	Cell	Figures	N	Unit	Limitation
TFMID20 / 52	6 Months follow-up not complied with	1	2	cases	
TFMID20 / 52	Personal supervision at least 2 per year	2	2	cases	
TFMID20 / 53	Special attention	5	20	cases	Three cases are reused from the assessment of aid; no Union 10 / 20
TFMID20 / 53	Special strength	1	20	cases	VISO involvement in a complex placement; not an exoneration population
TFMID20 / 60	Receipt	3	23	interviewing persons;	
TFMID20 / 60	Youth team	3	23	interviewing persons;	
TFMID20 / 60	Children's team	3	23	interviewing persons;	
TFMID20 / 60	Intermediate managers	3	23	interviewing persons;	
TFMID20 / 60	Chief Executive	2	23	interviewing persons;	
TFMID20 / 60	Suppliers	4	23	interviewing persons;	
TFMID20 / 60	General area	5	23	interviewing persons;	
TFMID20 / 60	Total	23	23	interviewing persons;	
TFMID20 / 60	Interview Number Bread Text	6	-	interview	The table shows 7 groups, 23 people; group numbers are not necessarily interviewing numbers
TFMID20 / 60	Groups in the interview table	7	-	groups	Own row count; not changing the aforiginal's 6 interview
TFMID20 / 54	VISO BFUlength	30-63	-	pages	7 cases; length is not quality or correctness
TFMID20 / 55	VISO new BFU	1	7	cases	
TFMID20 / 55	VISO updates	6	7	cases	AScurrently 1 + 5; follow-up overlap not identified
TFMID20 / 12	Management supervision planned	2	-	annual rounds;	Forvisitation omitted; actual number not given
TFMID20 / 20	Forvisitation desired course	3	-	months	Practice 6-9 months; interview statements
TFMID20 / 20	Forvisitation actual interview declaration	6-9	-	months	
TFMID20 / 39	Mentalization course	10	-	days	Staff training, not the citizen's waiting time
TFMIDP20 / 6	Planned sample of concern-report interviews	10-12	-	planned cases;	February / April 2021; no actual outages

Source / PDF	Cell	Figures	N	Unit	Limitation
TFMIDP20 / 6	Planned sample of § 48 interviews	10-12	-	planned cases;	February / April 2021; no actual outages
TFMIDP20 / 4	Thematic management oversight planned	5	-	milestones	Feb / apr / jun / aug / dec 2021; not five measurements carried out
TFMIDM22 / Point 33	Management virtually unchanged	14	-	year	Statement by the municipality on the basis of the order; no individual conclusion of the debt
TFMIDV19 / Point 103	Cases referred for preliminary ruling	101	101	cases	Local self-control, not TaskForce Committee 20
TFMIDV19 / Point 103	Selected potential for return home	11	101	cases	Increased support at home
TFMIDV19 / Point 103	Reported, local authority information	5	11	children	Statusoctober 2019, not only returns; individual actual date / cause of error not disclosed
TFMIDV19 / Point 103	Continuing potential for return home	4	11	locations;	Statusoctober 2019
TFMIDV19 / Point 103	No short-term potential for return home	2	11	locations;	Statusoctober 2019
TFMIDV19 / Point 103	Review Group	4-5	-	staff	Non-national employee union
TFMIDV19 / Point 103	Duration of review	2	-	working days;	Not the length of placement of the citizen
TFMIDV19 / Point 103	Subsequent management follow-up	1	-	monthly meeting;	Number actually held not disclosed

The sample is 20 cases, not 20 new decisions:16 under § 52,1 older placement follow-up and 3 under § 11. Already appealed, AS-considered/§ 65, same-family and solely physical disability cases are excluded; the disability team is outside the analysis. Denominators vary by duty and exemption. Error types and the VISO subset overlap. Opening 5 concern-report cases documents no final § 65 decision. [TFMID20 PDF9/44-66]

Actual timeline and local examples

PDF	Local example ID	Action / omission	Date or interval	Precise meaning
49	MIDE-AN-BFU-A	BFU update after the placement decision	approx. 7,5 months	Non-compliance with the legal requirement prior to decision; actual date of removal / termination unknown
49	MID-AN-BFU- B	BFU update after the placement decision	about 2,5 months	Same requirement; not documented entire duration of placement
46	MID-AN-MOR15	First contact with mother with joint custody	4 days by decision	Mother not tried contacted before placement decision
47	MID-KON13	Outstanding follow-up conversation → first conversation	10 months	No § 48 pre-decision interview; intervals should not be interpreted as the duration of placement
47	MID-KON13	First conversation → Contact person decision	additional 5 months	No § 48 pre-decision interview; intervals should not be interpreted as the duration of placement
47	MID-KON13	Decision → First opportunity for the child to take action	approx. 2 months	No § 48 pre-decision interview; intervals should not be interpreted as the duration of placement
48	MID-FAM5Y9M	Decision → conversation	approx. 1 month	The child's behaviour subsequently gives concrete doubts about relevant action.
48	MID-KUND-BFU	Defining known needs according to AS	07.12.2017	The formal start of the municipality does not move the proven knowledge
48	MID-KUND-BFU	Interdisciplinary meeting	22.12.2017	The formal start of the municipality does not move the proven knowledge
48	MID-KUND-BFU	BFF Decision	01.03.2018	The formal start of the municipality does not move the proven knowledge
48	MID-KUND-BFU	The municipality's later start-up registration	02.03.2018	The formal start of the municipality does not move the proven knowledge
48	MID-KUND-BFU	Pneumatic	11.09.2018	The formal start of the municipality does not move the proven knowledge
48	MID-KUND-BFU	Temptation from actual knowledge	approx. 5 months	The formal start of the municipality does not move the proven knowledge
50	MID-11 OVERGREB3	Urgent section 11 reference due to abuse	03.10.2019	Known acute needs; original evaluates passivity, actually later help unknown
50	MID-11 OVERGREB3	First move at the kindergarten meeting	20.11.2019	Known acute needs; original evaluates passivity, actually later help unknown
50	MID-11 OVERGREB3	End of measurement still no startup	29.11.2019	Known acute needs; original evaluates passivity, actually later help unknown
51	MID-AFL6	Discharge family ceases	August 2019	No new relief by 29.11.2019; precise cessation day / new effort unknown
53	MID-AN-HJEM14	BFU from the second municipality	May 2017	Placed young continued vacations / requests home; decision on return is documented, actual date of removal not
53	MID-AN-HJEM14	Update Decision	Final August 2018	Placed young continued vacations / requests home; decision on return is documented, actual date of removal not
53	MID-AN-HJEM14	Placement decision before update	start December 2018	Placed young continued vacations / requests home; decision on return is documented, actual date of removal not
53	MID-AN-HJEM14	Update finished	end February 2019	Placed young continued vacations / requests home; decision on return is documented, actual date of removal not

PDF	Local example ID	Action / omission	Date or interval	Precise meaning
53	MID-AN-HJEM14	Return-home decision after withdrawal of consent	startal'2019	Placed young continued vacations / requests home; decision on return is documented, actual date of removal not
53	MID-KON15	Massive aid needs registered	May 2018	BFU update never made during the measurement period
53	MID-KON15	Young wants contact person	November 2018	BFU update never made during the measurement period
53	MID-KON15	Wish repeated	February 2019	BFU update never made during the measurement period
53	MID-KON15	Contact person decision	19.03.2019	BFU update never made during the measurement period
56	MID-VISO-AN-HJEM	Both the placement and return-home decisions before updating	over 6 months of rescue	VISO example cannot be deduplicated with AS14 year example without journal key

The example IDs are this report's local tracking keys. They are not municipal file numbers and do not prove separate children or overlap between AS and VISO. Therefore, an overall personal union cannot be calculated.

Planned corrections and responsible functions

PDF	Development objectives	Milestones	Responsible function
3	Management oversight model	November 2020	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
4	Baseline all cases	November 2020	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
4	BFU / trucking supervision	February 2021	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
4	§ 48 / Involvement supervision	April 2021	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
4	Supervision of safeguarding-notification interviews	June 2021	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
4	Action plan / follow-up supervision	August 2021	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
4	Systematic / quality control	December 2021	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
6	Safeguarding notification interview sample 10-12	February 2021	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
6	§ 48 sample 10-12	April 2021	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
7	Handover workflow	January 2020	Team Leaders / Professional Coordinator; date preserved despite submission December 2020
8	§ 11 / 50	January 2021	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
10	BFU direction / deadline	Process milestone missing	Project responsibility team manager; no outcome measurement
11	Business model	January 2020	Visiting committee / House of Broachs; original date retained
12	Network procedure	August 2020-June 2021	Team Managers / Professional Coordinator
13	Professional network	?2021	Coronaexposed; not actually implemented

The plan is a plan, not proof of redress. The 2022 meeting item describes a process from August 2020-February 2022 and announces a new plan in August 2022. It publishes no case-by-case implementation or follow-up measurement. Management's 14 years of continuity and acknowledged formal deficiencies are municipal statements about the background to commissioning the work. [TFMIDP20 PDF1-13;TFMIDM22punkt33]

The separate municipal welfare check includes 101 placement cases. 11 were selected for possible repatriation with increased support; the municipality informs 5 actually repatriated children in October 2019,4, still possible and 2 without short term potential. This is a different population than the Task Force's 20 and cannot be added to them as new children. There is no public case coupling for the 14-year-old or the two late BFUupdates and no declared invalidation / repair cause. [TFMIDV19punkt103]

Independent analysis of guarantees, consistency and necessary requirements

The documented prior requirements had a specific function: the child had to be able to influence the decision that changed their life, and the authority had to know the individual support need before choosing an intervention. An assessment 7,5 months after the placement decision cannot retrospectively document what information was actually available when the decision was made. Failure to contact a joint holder of parental responsibility before the decision requires individual scrutiny of hearing of the parties, consent, reasons and significance for the outcome. The public report examines selected requirements; it does not publish the original decisions or a judgment declaring them invalid. The strong documented criticism is therefore the actual breach of the safeguards and the authority's absence of published reparation for their consequences.

The knowledge timeline from 7.12.2017 must be assessed from the information actually received, not the later registered start of 2.3.2018. Development targets for timeliness cannot move the historical deadline or make the elapsed waiting time lawful. The April 2019 return-home decision proves that cessation of the intervention was later decided; it does not prove when the child actually came home, what contact there was, or whether support and loss were remedied.

The necessary specific demand addressed to Middelfart and the Appeals Board is for the anonymously linked original decisions, legal authority and basis of consent, BFU documents with version dates, hearings of the parties, actual move/return-home dates and the 5 notification cases’ record numbers, subsequent decisions and implementation. For the responsible management and staff, contemporaneous evidence of knowledge, instructions and follow-up is also required, together with documentation of legal reassessment and compensation. This is necessary linkage of evidence; it must not be used to tone down the already documented breaches of prior requirements.

Task Force: Glostrup, Odder, Faabors- Midtfyn and Svendborg

Four children's TaskForce programmes; original municipal reports, 2006-2025, with follow-up separately. Only own compact facts; all original pages of RAM.

The tables and main text of the originals are checked in the memory of the specified pages. Figures are cases or actions assessed; categories overlap. Start and end measurements are different samples, not documented personal events. Self-reporting and the assessment of the Task Force are described separately. No total unique debug population or actual reunification series can be derived from these reports.

OD17 - Otter analysis report, 10 March 2017

Original: Odder analysis report,10. March 2017. SHA-256 feba3af87eba229ec8d6cd73bb577c6e22acd02cecfffcbe290b16bff4c1c5f2. 48 PDF pages; read 1-48, the entire original. Measurement period 1.8.2014-1.8.2016. Municipally selected pending cases concerning ages 0-17; no cases involving only physical disabilities, completed interventions, sibling cases or cases previously appealed/considered/under § 65. The municipality responsible for action during the most recent year. New decisions within the most recent year; three older placement cases for follow-up. No representative municipal error rate.

Committee, type of case and age

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
All cases	20	Cases submitted	PDF7 / 28 / 48
§ 52 decisions	14	20; current decisions	PDF29
Installation	5	14 current decisions	PDF29 / 48
Family treatment	3	14	PDF29 / 48
Relief	3	14	PDF29 / 48
Contact person	3	14	PDF29 / 48
§ 11 (3) Offer	3	20; separate assessment	PDF29 / 48
Previous locations only follow-up	3	20; one submitted as family treatment without authorisation	PDF29 / 48
VISOsocial sector sub-sample	5	20; selected with BFU and plan	PDF28 / 44
VISA location / contact person	4/1	5; no further cases	PDF44
Visoages 2-17; over 14	4	5	PDF44
0-3 years	3	20	PDF48T3
4 to 7 years	2	20	PDF48T3
8 to 14 years	11	20	PDF48T3
15 to 17 years	4	20	PDF48T3
Interview authority / staff / offer / PP Rmv / boss / school -day / UU-job	10/1/5/8/3/12/5	interviewing participants; groups cannot be converted to affected citizens;	PDF7-8
BFC employees	ca. 64	organisation information;	PDF10
Staff of the Authority	approx. 20	and 1 Head of Division	PDF10

Legal error: full Table 2 of the original

Error overlaps. Table 2 retains all the deficiencies found and the special features of the footnotes, not a reduced Union.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
BFU deficiencies	3	13 requiring a BFU out of 14 decisions	PDF35 / 48T2
Current supplementation deficiencies	4	13; 1 Special condition assessed	PDF35 / 48T2
Date of expiry of the four-month period	2	4 actualBFU; extension period not tested	PDF36 / 48T2
BFU without a reasoned position	1	6BFU / supplement	PDF36 / 48T2
Child welfare assessment/supplement completed after the decision	2	6; 2 other simultaneous interim operations separately	PDF36-37 / 48T2
Action plan deficiencies	6	14; 1 provisional effort without plan requirements; 1 special condition	PDF38 / 48T2
Action plan after decision	6	7 worked out; 2 special features	PDF39 / 48T2
§ 48 child amalgamation errors	7	14; 2 age not applicable; 1 special condition of 7	PDF32-33 / 48T2

Other outcomes and tried denominators

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Childhood education sufficient / not applicable	5/7/2	14	PDF32
Parental authority sufficient / not sufficient	9/5	14	PDF32
Both sufficiently involved	5	14	PDF32
§ 48 absolutely no conversation	4	7 errors; 11,10,10,8 years old	PDF33
§ 48 interview wrong subject / after placement decision	1/1	7 errors; 9 and 12 years	PDF33
ActuelBFU / current supplement / no BFU / missing supplement	4/2/3/4	13; plus 1 decision	PDF35
BFUntimely / late	2/2	4	PDF36
Justification yes / no	5/1	6	PDF36
BFUFER / simultaneous legal provisional / illegal by decision	2/2/2	6	PDF36-37
Expired high / some degree versus low	10/4	14	PDF37
Scheduled / non / exceptional derogation	7/6/1	14	PDF38
Plan / by decision	1/6	7	PDF39
Currently sufficient support / uncertainty	10/4	14	PDF39-40
§ 65 Self-service created	4	20; 2 familybeh + 1 contact + 1 relief	PDF30 / 40
§ 65 later administratively completed	4	4; AS assessed relevant / sufficient action	PDF30
§ 11 sufficient / uncertain	2/1	3	PDF41
Follow-up proceedings	4	20; 1 current + 3 elderly accommodation	PDF41
Three-month follow-up timely / late / not applicable	0/1/3	4	PDF42
Six-month follow-up timely/not	0/4	4	PDF42
Two annual supervisory interviews yes / no	3/1	4	PDF42-43
Special strengths / attention points	4/8	14; not flawless / flawless	PDF43
VISO BFU new / update	4/1	5	PDF45
VISO BFU during / after implementation	5	5	PDF46
VISO network mentioned / not described	4/1	5; not involved in any	PDF46
VISO current plans	4	5	PDF46
VISO plan with specific target / time perspective	1/1	4 plans; the other no overall / specific objectives	PDF46
Newly opened preventive cases under § 11/§ 52	92%/7,8%	2015 new developments; number not disclosed; rounding is maintained	PDF20

Documented waiting times and consequences

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
BFU time-limit breach, contact person	approximately 16 months	EXPRESSED 4 Months	PDF36
Child welfare assessment deadline exceeded, placement	good 2 years	EXPRESSED 4 Months	PDF36
BFU completed after the placement decision	Ca.1 year	a case;	PDF37
Supplement completed after the placement decision	Ca.1 month	a case;	PDF37
Plans for children already placed	approximately 5 weeks × 2	2 cases	PDF39
Plan after child actually scanned	approximately 11 months	1 case	PDF39
Plan on the placement day after the decision	3 months	1 case	PDF39
Legally assessed plan delay location	21.-26.2.2016	Aged 15; 5 days from actual placement to plan	PDF39
Discharge plan	ca.1 week	1 case; continued uninitiated 9 months after decision	PDF39
First follow-up December 2014 placement → June 2015	ca. 3 months late	1 topical follow-up case	PDF42
Observed relief + contact person → new contact	November 2015- August 2016	At least 9 months without measures; no respite family found	PDF44
Barnanbraguten BFU	August 2015- yardstick 1.8.2016	7 year example; no BFU at end of measurement	PDF44
Barnanbragtknob 1 year old → BFU	well over 1 year after placement	The same case trajectory may overlap other figures; no person total	PDF44
VISO first notification → BFU	4 months 4 years	5 case-social assessments	PDF45
Monitoring not correct	2 conversations in 2 years	Aged 8; both at the office; no visit to the placement location	PDF43

The failures of safeguards have a specific temporal effect: children were already placed while the BFU/plan was still missing, and granted respite care was not implemented for at least nine months. This original contains no dated record of return home, reunification, compensation or individual redress. What is documented is intervention without prior procedural steps required as safeguards; the question of legal authority/invalidity requires the full basis of each decision. Source conflict: the main text PDF25 discusses 4/13 current BFUs, whereas the legal annex PDF35 additionally gives 2 current supplements. The fuller breakdown is retained. PDF13 gives child interviews as 5/12 relevant cases against the annex's 5/14 including 2 age exceptions. This is a denominator difference, not additional cases.

OD19 - Otter Status Report, October 2019

Original: Odder status report, October 2019. SHA-256 00f7746ccd50468d37900eb6dc8af6450d0765f3f479d0c8146a292b004fe812. 39 PDF pages; read 1-39,the entire original. Measurement period 16.4.2018-15.4.2019; development process November 2017-June 2019.20 pending cases submitted by the municipality; VISO 5-case subsample selected with BFU+plan. The original does not repeat the initial measurement's complete specific exclusion list; it is therefore not silently transferred.

All legal deficiencies, original Table 1

Overlap; not 13 self-employed fault groups. § 65 was only created after measurement.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Childhood education inadequate	2	14	PDF17T1
Parental involvement inadequate	3	14	PDF17T1
§ 48 error	5	14	PDF17T1
BFU / update deficiencies	7	14	PDF17T1
BFU deadline overrun	5	7	PDF17T1
BFU Unsubstantiated	0	7	PDF17T1
BFU / update after decision	2	7	PDF17T1
Plan deficiencies	4	14	PDF17T1
Plan after decision	5	10	PDF17T1
Aid insufficient / not applicable	5	20	PDF18T1; Bread text says insecure
Three-month follow-up missing	0	1	PDF18T1
Six-month follow-up missing	2	3	PDF18T1
Personnel law supervision is missing	0	3	PDF18T1

Case polulations and other outcomes

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
All/section 52/section 11/older follow-up cases	20/14/3/3	20	PDF18T2
Placement / family treatment / deload g / contact	5/4/1/4	14	PDF18T2
Age 4-7 / 8-14 / 15-17	2/8/10	20	PDF18
Enough / not / exception	11/2/1	14; functional impairment	PDF19
Parental involvement enough / not	11/3	14;2 joint-parental-responsibility cases with 1 parent omitted	PDF19
§ 48 complied with / not applicable / error	8/1/5	14; 8 includes 1 child attending conversation	PDF20
ActuelBFU / innyBFU / deficiency deopd attering	7/2/5	14	PDF20-21
Missing updates for placement	2	5 missing updates	PDF21
BFUtempest observed / not observed	2/5	7	PDF21
Justification	7	7	PDF22
BFU completed after implementation	2	7	PDF22; table before decision, text before implementation
Actuel plan / deficiency plan	10/4	14; 2 Input + 1 none + 1 empty	PDF23
§ 11 enough / not	1/2	3	PDF23
§ 65 own-account created	5	20; 2 § 11 + 3 § 52; end result not specified	PDF24
Special strengths / attention points	0/8	20	PDF26
VISOdel sample	5	20; BFUand Plan Committee	PDF27
VISO periods without professional management	2	5	PDF28
Network involvement assessed / actual partial resolution	5/1	5VISO	PDF28
VISOactuelle plans	5	5	PDF29
VISO16 + non-transition targets	2	5; both 16 +	PDF29-30
Parental plan on conditions for return home	1	5; no actual return home stated	PDF30
Management supervision 8-10 cases every 14 days	8-10	municipal information at status meetings; not aggregated unique	PDF7
Budget targets public support 2019	100	full-year personages prår; target, unachieved result	PDF32
Budget targets Special class 2021 own / total	80/98	children maximum; not TFerror population	PDF32
Budget objectives: age of tenure	14 to 24 years	target rate reduction; non-number	PDF32
Professional coordinator taking up post	1.9.2019	kommunaltet	PDF33
Task Force Meetings	13	November 2017-June 2019	PDF38

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Apprenticeship	4	September 2017; overlap unknown with baselines 20	PDF38

Time and action

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Child welfare assessment deadline overruns	5 days / 6 weeks / 6 months / 7 months / 7 months	5 cases; 4 months	PDF21
Plan after decision	23 days -6 months	5 cases	PDF23
New BFU decided but not executed	summer 2016 → March 2018	later 3 ½ months + almost 5 months BFU	PDF26
Absconding before a new decision on a secure institution	20-30	1 young; number of vacations, not persons	PDF27
Parental plan explains the requirements for return home	1	No return-home date/outcome	PDF30

The Task Force finds that the municipality has not improved the overall measurement of statutory compliance, although professional systematic working in the VISO subsample has improved. Budget balance in 2019-2021 and a postponed ICS course are specifically discussed in the original; this documents known priorities, not a general excuse for failures of safeguards. Source discrepancies: PDF12 describes 8 compliant § 48 cases and places the child's refusal as the last separate case. The detailed annex PDF20 includes the refusal in 8 and separates disability as 1 not relevant. Both formulations are retained; the 14-case distribution 8+1+5 comes from the detailed annex. Table 1 describes 5/20 as "not sufficient/relevant support"; the main text PDF24 calls uncertainty about support grounds for § 65. The parent plan's clear conditions for return home are not actual reunification. The final outcome of 5 own-initiative cases, compensation, individual redress and placement duration until final return home are not stated.

GL19 - Glostrup status report, April 2019 (front page), May 2019 (kolofon)

Original: Glostrup status report, April 2019(front cover),May 2019(colophon). SHA-256 2e90a70fbe8cde32527203de208cf972a4519199dfc780ec74dc195fc1143941. 49 PDF pages; read 1-49, the entire original. Status measurement 2018, measurement period 5.11.2017-4.11.2018.20 pending cases submitted by the municipality, 10 current decisions. The requested 14 decisions could not be supplied; § 11 and concern reports substitute. Already appealed/considered and § 65 cases excluded; 0-17 years old, not solely physical disability, the municipality responsible for action during the most recent year, most recent decisions working backwards from the cut-off. The report reproduces 2016 baseline figures; the 2016 original's own methodology has not yet been found.

Original Table 2.1: Causes and Union of Decisions

Actual unions of 13/14 and 10/10 are available; reason categories must not be added together. The 2016 cells are later reproductions, not a 2016 original read directly.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
BFU deficiencies	0/1	2016/2018	PDF17T2.1
Current update missing	7/3	2016/2018	PDF17T2.1
BFU deadline overrun	5/5	2016 / 2018; 2018 breads also 4	PDF17T2.1
Date of decision	0/2	2016/2018	PDF17T2.1
BFU content requirements not met	0/0	2016/2018	PDF17T2.1

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Plan deficiencies	0/2	2016/2018	PDF18T2.1
Plan after decision	3/1	2016/2018	PDF18T2.1
Plan content requirements not met	1/0	2016/2018	PDF18T2.1
§ 48 error	5/6	2016/2018	PDF18T2.1
Absence of consent	4/0	2016/2018	PDF18T2.1
Decisions not all legislative requirements	13/10	2016/2018; deduplicated union within each decision sample	PDF18T2.1
Decision	14/10	2016/2018	PDF18T2.1

Original Table 3.1: Progress of particular concern

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Inactivity / slowness	2/2	2016/2018	PDF24T3.1
Lack / lack of professional assessment	3/1	2016/2018	PDF24T3.1
Slow/missing response to a concern report	2/0	2016/2018	PDF24T3.1
Other	1/0	2016/2018	PDF24T3.1
Cases involving criticisable circumstances	8/3	2016 / 2018; every 20 cases	PDF24-25T3.1

All other case counts and samples

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Wanted location / family / relief / contt act / § 11 / notification	5/3/3/3/3/3	requested 20 cases	PDF26
Actual placement / family / relief / contact / § 11 / notification	3/4/0/3/6/4	20; T6.1	PDF26-27
Measures erroneously submitted after the final time limit	2	Reclassified safeguarding notification	PDF26
No decision → § 11 / § 52 family → § 11 / family → contact	1/1/1	reclassifications, non-extrapolation are	PDF26
Duration 0 / 1-2 / 3-4 / 5 -7 years	10/9/0/1	20; T7.1	PDF28-29
Age 0-3 / 4-7 / 8-14 / 15-17	0/6/11/3	20; T7.2; 4 notifications	PDF29
Display location / contact / family	1/2/2	5 of 20; 5-17 years	PDF29
ActuelBFU / ManglendeBFU / Manglendeopdattering / exceptional derogation	5/1/3/1	10	PDF18-19
BFUP / illegal on / legally concurrent	2/2/1	5	PDF19
BFU content	5	5; legal loss	PDF20
2016BFUprepared / missing update	6/7	13BFDuble; tensionary representation	PDF19
2016BFUtempst error	5	6 prepared	PDF20
2018 planned	8	10	PDF20
2016 planned / emergency derogation	13/1	14; tensioning	PDF20
2016 plan content / very high / rings	11/1/1	13; tendon rendering	PDF21
2018 plan content met	8	8	PDF21
§ 48 interview after the placement decision	2	6 errors; 5 and 8 years	PDF21
§ 48 no interview concerning the decision	4	6 error; 3 family + 1 contact	PDF21
§ 11 withBFU / withBFU	5/1	6; Ascond in BFU decisions	PDF22
§ 11 sub-BFU / post BFU	4/1	5; 4 should be § 52	PDF22-23
2016 § 11 måd / kraftbfU	2/1	3; tendon rendering	PDF23
Concern-report cases, child welfare assessment started	4	4; not yet finished	PDF24
2016 Announcement / non-base / shell	1/1/1	3; tendon rendering	PDF24
New prevention advisors	2	municipal self-reporting;	PDF36
New case handlers 1.1.2019	4	municipal self-reporting;	PDF38-39 / 46
Case review now / planned	6 weeks / 4 weeks	self-reporting, not verified outcomes	PDF9
Fixed sparring	every 4 weeks	self-reporting;	PDF39 / 43
Task Force Status Meetings	11	January 2017-October 2018	PDF47
Apprenticeship	1	Spring 2018; overlapping	PDF48

Time, intervention and actual source deviations of the measurement period

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
2018 BFU time-limit breaches	3 days / approx. 5,5 months / barely 7 months / 7,5 months / 9 months	5; Udover4 months; municipal start-up	PDF19-20
2016 child welfare assessment deadline overruns	3 months × 2 / 4 months × 2 / barely 8 months	5; tendon rendering	PDF20
Plan after the placement decision	approximately 2,5 months	1 case	PDF21
Child interview after the placement decision	Ca.2 and 4 months	2 children,5 and 8 years old; before actual implementation	PDF21
Placement decision→actual placement	June → November 2018	Aged 5; the report calls the interval 4 months	PDF25-26
Placement decision with an outdated BFU	June → November 2018	8 years; BFU 2016, lovedrefresh-page18, still at end of measurement	PDF18-19
BFU municipal start / finish	15.9.2017/18.1.2018	3 day calculation; ASmente startburdebe 9.8.2017	PDF20
Contact person decision→child welfare assessment completed	June → September 2018	12 years; AS criticises 8 months from concern report to contact	PDF19
Age 14, family BFU decision without a completed BFU	April → November 2018	family treatment June 2018	PDF18
§ 11BFU	28.2.2018 notification → November 2018	7 years; slowly	PDF25
§ 11 concern → BFU decision	May / June → October 2018	17 years; non-finished	PDF25
VISO outdated information	over ½ years	No assessment of whether information is current	PDF31

The criticism concerns all 10 current decisions examined. The fact that 3/20 case trajectories have particularly problematic circumstances is a different indicator and cannot replace 10/10 failures of safeguards. The municipality's meeting item 19.6.2019 states that no own-initiative cases were opened at the start/end; the original PDF contains no separate section 65 outcome register. The absence of own-initiative action does not document lawful decisions. Source conflicts are retained: PDF17 body text states 4 deadline errors, table 2.1 and its detailed breakdown 5; PDF27 first states a decision deadline of 5. November 2018, finally 5. October 2018, while PDF28 limits the review to 4. November. PDF20 calls 16.8.2017 within the measurement period, which otherwise starts on 5.11.2017; both dates stand without harmonisation. PDF29 main text calls the age group 15-18, the table 15-17. Cover April 2019, colophon May 2019. VISO PDF32 finds that the goals do not describe follow-up and thus make it difficult to assess when a measure can cease. This is a specific risk of continuing interventions without documented review of goals; the original does not state actual return home or total intervention duration until reunification.

FMK17 - Faabor-Midtfyn Analyst Report 31.8.2017

Original: Faaborg-Midtfyn analysis report 31.8.2017. SHA-256 5d926e832f54780b26ade9a0a3f331bdda584dcfae9adf06fc8825d4201acfd8. 47 PDF pages; read 1-47,the entire original. Measurement 1.4.2015-1.4.2017.20 pending cases=17 § 52+3 § 11. The 3 older placements with follow-up are included in 17 and 8 placements, not additional cases. Excludes cases already appealed/considered by the Appeals Board including § 65,sibling cases, physical disability alone, completed interventions; responsible municipality during the last year; 0-17 years. VISO 5-case subsample with BFU+plan.

All original guarantee error Table 2

Overlapping error categories; the original does not disclose the union of failed decisions.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
BFU missing	2	17; 1 special ratio	PDF46T2
BFU update missing	8	17	PDF46T2
Deadline of four months exceeded	1	3 new BFU, 6 actualBFU	PDF46T2 / PDF35
Reasoned position missing	0	6	PDF46T2
BFU terminated by decision	2	6	PDF46T2
Plan missing	3	17	PDF46T2
Plan by decision	6	13 pre-decision obligation; 3 special circumstances	PDF46T2 / PDF38
§ 48 error	3	17	PDF46T2

Sample and other figures

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Installation / family / relief / contact person	8/3/3/3	17	PDF46T1
§ 11 Cases	3	20	PDF46T1
Age 0-3 / 4-7 / 8-14 / 15-17	3/4/9/4	20	PDF46-47T3
Childhood adequate / old age exemption	14/2	15 relevant + 2 exceptions, 1 and 2 years	PDF32
Adequate parental involvement	17	17	PDF33
Both holders of parental responsibility involved	16	17	PDF33; including special conditions
§ 48 complied with / error	14/3	17	PDF33
ActuelBFU / no BFU / no update	6/2/8	16 BFUs; 17. Case 52 (2)	PDF34-35
ActuelBFU new / supplement	3/3	6	PDF35
New BFU deadline respected / not respected	2/1	3	PDF35; update deadlines not tested
BFU justified	6	6	PDF36
Cases reported to a large / some extent	8/9	17; 9 own-resources account	PDF36
Plan exists / missing	14/3	17	PDF37
Pre-condition / emergency derogation plan	13/1	14	PDF37
Plan before / after decision	7/6	13	PDF38
Adequate / uncertain aid	15/2	17	PDF39
§ 65 Self-service created	2	17; 16 years of relief + 13 years of contact	PDF39; end outage not disclosed
§ 11 family advice / conversation	2/1	3	PDF40; all 3 sufficient
The 3 / 6 month follow-up of older sites was observed.	3/3	3	PDF40-41; included in 17
At least 2 annual visits by older accommodation	3	3	PDF41
Special strengths / attention points	3/3	20	PDF41
VISOuter location / family	4/1	5	PDF42; Case numbers 3,6,7,8,11
VISOages 3-5 / 13 years	4/1	5	PDF42
VISO on-going conversation / age-function obstacle	3/2	5	PDF43
VISOBFU before decision	5	5	PDF43
VISOICSStructure	4	5	PDF43
VISOnetworks assessed / actual network care	5/1	5	PDF44
VISOnetworks without contributions	4	5	PDF44
VISOplan exists	5	5	PDF44
VISOplan specific / non-specific	1/4	5	PDF44-45

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Notifications of violence / alcohol	18	1VISO case; not 18 persons	PDF45
Interview management / authority / staff / offer / prevention / school day	7/9/1/5/7/4	interviewing persons, non-TF malfunctions;	PDF7
Social advisers / centre staff	about 40 / ca. 120	organisation information;	PDF10
Socialteams / institutions	3/2	young children, young people, male dicap; age 12-18 and 0-18	PDF10

Time and actual action

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
BFU deadline overrun	5 ½ months	1 location case; in addition to 4 months, early notifications control take-off	PDF35
BFU by decision	1 ½ and over 2 months	2 cases, location / contact person	PDF36
Old BFU without update	2013 × 1 / 2014 × 3 / 2015 × 1 / m aj 2016 × 1 / Aug 2016 × 2	8 cases	PDF34-35
BFU assessed no → decisions yes without update	August 2016 → January 2017	2 cases, location / family	PDF35
Plan after actual placement	6.12.2015→21.12.2015	15 days; Decision September 2015	PDF38
Family plan by decision	January → February 2017	plan assessment does not correspond to actual effort;	PDF38
Contact plan after decision	18 days	Decision 10.10.2016	PDF38
Plan delayed, special conditions	ca.2 weeks / next day / not reported	3 cases; first relief → placement, second removal, third-party care	PDF38
§ 11 Contact → Offer	less than 1 month	3 cases	PDF40
Actual return after placing	Ca.2 ½ years	1 child; respite, previous foster care+mother's treatment; no date/cause of error	PDF41
Baby BFUs supplement decided / unmanufactured / reloading extended	Dec 2015 → Jun 2016 → Oct 2016	ca .1 years; restocking feb 2016; corn condop claims on-going supplement	PDF41-42
VISOnotification→ BFUend	½ -4 years	5 cases; 1 should start earlier	PDF43
VISOinformation old	more than ½ -1 years	without a reasoned assessment of whether it is still current	PDF43
Waiting time for a measure	up to 6 months	interview statements; non-register targets;	PDF27
Unlawful local concern-report thresholds	3/5	Interview: second opinion/in-depth review; § 155 any concern report in an existing case	PDF22

Local municipal thresholds of 3 / 5 notifications may exclude regulatory reassessment of new notifications. Interview statements about deliberately postponing the action plan to expected action may begin describing a known practice contrary to the legal requirement; up to 6 months waiting are statements, not a counted national duration of proceedings. The 2 § 65 creation documents uncertain support in relief and contact cases; the original does not have the subsequent outcome. The actual return after about 2 ½ years is actually reunification but not documented repair of one of the listed errors; no date or identity coupling provides the basis for that conclusion. In 4 / 5 cases, the Visos plans lack concrete objectives and, among other things, conditions for children to return home. It demonstrates a lack of the basis for the cessation exercise, but not a fixed duration of placement. All categories are kept with their own denominators; no union of errors or persons is constructed.

FMK20 - Faaborg-Midtfyn Status Report, March 2020

Original: Faaborg-Midtfyn status report,March 2020. SHA-256 736cd722387e240de10f42119d42cd3f439048c70ead8e85814eefdbb3e614fe. 43 PDF pages; read 1-43, the entire original; figures without textual values remain a separate outstanding item. 20 pending cases; measurement period 28.10.2018-28.10.2019.14 current section 52+3 section 11+3 older placement follow-ups. VISO5 selected by BFU+plan, but the review actually finds only 3 plans; this sampling/result conflict is retained. The 2017 exclusion list is not repeated in full and is not transferred automatically. Development period March 2018-October 2019; municipal plan 2018-2021.

Total guarantee error form, original Table 1

The original has 14 rows, although earlier work message called it 13 terms. Overlap; not unique error union.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Childhood education inadequate	4	13	PDF18T1
Parental involvement inadequate	3	14	PDF18T1
§ 48 interview deficient	4	14	PDF18T1
BFU missing	1	12	PDF18T1
BFU update missing	6	12	PDF18T1
BFU four-month deadline exceeded	3	4	PDF18T1
BFU statement of reasons missing	0	5	PDF18T1
BFU not completed before decision	0	5	PDF18T1
Plan missing	3	14	PDF18T1
Plan by decision	9	11	PDF18T1
Aid cannot be assessed, information missing	3	20	PDF18T1
Three-month follow-up not complied with	0	2	PDF18T1
Six-month follow-up not complied with	1	2	PDF18T1
Personal supervision not complied with	0	2	PDF18T1

Nature of proceedings, partial outcomes and delimitations

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Current location / family / relief / contact	5/3/3/3	14	PDF18T2
§ 11 / Elderly follow-up	3/3	20	PDF18T2
Age 0-3 / 4-7 / 8-14 / 15-17	2/4/7/7	20	PDF18
Childhood any / ring / none / unfed exception	9/2/2/1	14	PDF19
Parental involvement high / someone / rings / none	1/10/2/1	14	PDF19
Both child and parent deprivation	2	3 parental defects	PDF19
Father omitted with joint authority	2	3 parental defects	PDF19
§ 48 Legal / error	10/4	14	PDF20; Malfunction 7 / 9 / 10 / 16
ActuelBFU / update	4/1	14	PDF20
BFU outside measurement period / provisional with time limit	1/1	14	PDF20
Previously on "BFU Without Update..."	6	12 tests; 2 places + 2 cargo + 2 contact	PDF20-21
Provisional contact without BFU deadline	1	12	PDF21
BFUtempest observed / error	1/3	4	PDF21; update deadline not tested
Justified BFU / pre-decision BFU	5/5	5	PDF21
Plan exists / missing	11/3	14	PDF22; missing 2 family + 1 cargo
Plan before / after	2/9	11	PDF22; 2 seneshonest relationships
§ 11 applicable / not	2/1	3	PDF22; complex violence requires BFU
Relevant aid / uncertain	17/3	20	PDF23
§ 65 own-account created	3	20; end outages not disclosed	PDF23
Three-month follow-up timely / outside measurement	2/1	3	PDF23
Six-month follow-up timely/late/return-home exception	1/1/1	3	PDF23-24
Individual supervision carried out/return-home exception	2/1	3	PDF24
Special strengths / attention points	0/6	20	PDF24
VISOBFU	5	5	PDF27
Visoreal analysis is missing	2	5	PDF28
VISOBFU temptation error	3	5	PDF29
Visoplan exists / missing	3/2	5	PDF29
VISO family group conferencing	1	5	PDF27; too late for conflict resolution
VISA cases	2	5	PDF30; ongoing contact, not systematic target follow-up

Time, actual repatriation and municipality knowledge

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Child welfare assessment deadline overruns	2 weeks / 2 ½ months / 3 ½ months there	3; more than 4 months	PDF21
BFU preliminary ruling old	1-2 years	6 missing updates	PDF20
The level of honesty of the plan	next day, pre-implementation	2 / 9 senplan	PDF22
Actual return	before 6 months	1 of 3 older follow-up cases; also an exception to annual supervision	PDF23-24
Late six-month follow-up	1 month	1 case; holder of parental responsibility withdrew consent, close contact; no return-home date stated	PDF23-24
Parenting capacity assessment need→start	February → end October 2019	8 months; family treatment ended in March, temporary respite care during the period	PDF24
Violence notification → Start of support	March → end October 2019	§ 11 offers open; no contact child / parents / school between	PDF24
Psychological assessment need→start→end→contact	July 2018 → Jan 2019 → apr 2019 → July 2019	BFU unupdated pre-contact	PDF25
Parents demand return claims	1	VISOparentplan does not answer what to change	PDF29
Group leaders before / after reduction	4/3	municipal self-report	PDF35
Office status before / after	every month / every second moon d	municipal self-report	PDF35
Follow-up yearly before / between / now	4/3/2	municipal self-report; now budget 2019	PDF38
Management supervision funnel	23	25	PDF38; Municipal 2019 self-measurement, non-TFudtag
Planned maximum	3	ongoing pereffort, local rule	PDF37
ICSsuperusers	2	selected and later 2 new; overlap	PDF37-38
Strategies adopted	3	14.1.2019	PDF32
Action plans under development	11	political plan, not errors in a child's action plan	PDF32
Expected savings on placements in 2019	DKK 3,1 million	political budgetary objectives, not factorised;	PDF40
Saving positions 2018 / 2019	4/4	1 group manager + 1 visitator + 6 government advisors	PDF40
Position reduction overall	19,4%	the municipality's inventory;	PDF40
Notifications 2018 / 2019	1146/1201	2019 kaldesialt; BFU kunjan-Oct	PDF41
BFU Decisions 2018 / 2019	187/203	2018 full year; 2019 Jan -31 Oct	PDF41

Visually controlled municipal schedules

PDF32-33 and 35 checked as images only in RAM. Political/organisational planning; no documentation of completed redress in specific child welfare cases. PDF32 says 11 action plans; the figure on PDF33 has 10 named rows.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
SFO5-9 years	Spring 2020	initiated; expected finished	PDF33 Figure

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Mathematics 0-18 years	Spring 2020	initiated; expected finished	PDF33 Figure
Consistency of child / adolescent life 0-20 years	summer 2020	initiated; expected finished	PDF33 Figure
Digital day services / schools 0-18 years	2020	initiated; expected finished	PDF33 Figure
Quality / oversight model 0-18 years	2020	waiting; startup is coordinated with KL	PDF33 Figure
Language / reading 0-18 years	early 2020	expected start	PDF33 Figure
Authority / preventive cooperation 0-20 years	After revision of the Handlewizard	expected start	PDF33 Figure
Day-offer quality 0- 6 years	mid-2020	following the implementation of day-offer reform;	PDF33 Figure
Resources / cooperation 6-18 years	waiting	no date	PDF33 Figure
Science/STEAM 0-18 years	waiting for national order	no date	PDF33 Figure
Handleguide process / commissions	May-July 2019	phase planned;	PDF35 Figure
Trivelle ruler rewrite / scales	July-November 2019	phase planned;	PDF35 Figure
Professional reading	August-December 2019	phase planned;	PDF35 Figure
Administrative writing process / quality assurance	December 2019-June 2020	phase planned;	PDF35 Figure
Cross-cutting qualification / audit	January-May 2020	phase planned;	PDF35 Figure
Implementation	August 2020 and onwards	phase planned;	PDF35 Figure

The municipality's own final statement describes specific consequences of cuts: slower support, exceeded time limits, outdated assessments and a risk that ineffective measures are not brought to an end. These are contemporaneous statements about the municipality's knowledge, not hypothetical counterarguments or an excuse as to legality. The Task Force's final measurement documents a decline in lawfulness. VISO finds missing answers to parents who specifically ask what is required to get their child home. The two references to actual returns home in the 2017/2020 measurements are separate source examples without identity linkage; they cannot together be presented as two unique remedied cases involving errors. Withdrawn consent in another case is not evidence of return home. The sample is described as 5 VISO cases with BFU+plan, but the substantive review finds only 3 plans. This internal conflict must not be concealed through an automatic plan denominator of 5/5. The municipal self-report claims progress while the external final measurement finds a decline; the self-measurement's 23/25 funnelling cannot be added to 20 TF cases.

FMK20H - Faaborg-Midtfyn consultation response 20.3.2020

Original: Faaborg-Midtfyn consultation response 20.3.2020. SHA-256 5858fba5ab006c96ce72c480f6926c19441c49d525b2d2b40e8cd12be9b13d37. 2 PDFs pages; read 1-2, the entire original. Municipal Party opinion on TFs final report; no new external legality measurement.

Consultation information

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Active Case Tribe	699-907	active cases through 18 months; not unique children	PDF2
TFsample	20	municipal objection concerning representativeness	PDF2
Continued development plan	to 2021	future commitments, unexecuted repairs;	PDF1

Municipal management states its basic agreement with the analysis's substantive content and recommendations, but raises the size of the case population against representativeness. This does not alter the specifically documented failures of safeguards; the reply letter states no individual reopenings, compensation or reunification outcomes.

SV18 - Svendborg Analysis Report 6.2.2018

Original: Svendborg analysis report 6.2.2018. SHA-256 fb92f69cb071785620a76b2ed9e2180f4ab82e795471ad6c8f5f1116de695ce2. 81 PDF pages; read 1-81, the entire original. 20 pending cases, measurement period 18.9.2015-18.9.2017. Actual 16 § 52+4 § 11 against the requested 17+3. Three follow-ups on older placements included in 8 placements/16 § 52. VISO 7 of 20,includes 3 follow-ups; no § 11/cases without a current BFU/notification cases selected, but 2 VISO cases actually lack a current BFU. Excludes cases already appealed/considered by AST including § 65,multiple cases from the same family, physical disabilities only and completed interventions. 0-17 years, the responsible municipality during the last year, a decision as recent as possible in the last year except for 3 older placements.

Total original Table 1: Legal deficiencies

Overlap; no printed overall error union. Special-proportionality assessment is not a general legal basis for derogating from guarantee requirements, see PDF74.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
BFU missing	1	15 BFUs of 16; 1 emergency exception	PDF55T1 / PDF58-59
BFU update missing	8	15	PDF55T1
BFU four-month deadline error	3	4 temptations of 5 current; 1 update except	PDF55T1 / PDF59-60
BFU statement of reasons missing	0	5	PDF55T1
BFU by decision	1	5	PDF55T1
Plan missing	5	16 decisions; 1 old plan outside measurement	PDF55T1 / PDF61
Plan by decision	6	9 pre-condition of 10 actualplans; 1 emergency derogation	PDF55T1 / PDF61
§ 48 error	5	16	PDF55T1

Case types, sample and other outcomes

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Placement / family / relief / contact / § 11	8/2/3/3/4	20	PDF56T2
Age 0-3 / 4-7 / 8-14 / 15-17	2/1/10/7	20	PDF57T3
Wanted § 52 / § 11	17/3	20	PDF73; actual 16 / 4 in footnote
Sufficient / non / old age exemption	10/3/3	16;3 calculated by us as the complement	PDF57
Enough parental involvement	13	16	PDF57
Both child and parental involvement enough	10	16	PDF57
§ 48 complied with / error	11/5	16	PDF58
§ 48 None / by decision	3/2	5 errors; no special features	PDF58
BFU current / older still current / missing / update missing	5/1/1/8	15	PDF58-59
BFUtempest complied with / error / irrelevant	1/3/1	5	PDF59-60
BFUnjustified	5	5	PDF60
BFU before / after Decision	4/1	5	PDF60
Case Information High / Some / Poor	2/11/3	16	PDF60
Plan current / elderly outside measurement / missing	10/1/5	16	PDF61
Planning special / not	1/4	5	PDF61; respite care never initiated
Plan / after / emergency exception	3/6/1	10	PDF61
Plan after special / not	2/4	6	PDF61; 2 pre-factual start
§ 11 family / psychologist	3/1	4	PDF62
§ 11 Relevant / Demand BFU	3/1	4	PDF62
Relevant aid / uncertain	16/4	20	PDF62
§ 65 Self-service open	4	20; 1 absconding+3 missing overall assessments	PDF62-63; End outages not disclosed
Three-month follow-up completed / missing	0/3	3	PDF63
Six-month follow-up completed/missing/outside measurement	1/1/1	3	PDF63
Personal supervision ≥ 2 per year	3	3	PDF63
Special strengths / attention points	5/10	20	PDF63-64
VISOdel sample	7	20	PDF65 / PDF79
VISOmissing actualBFU	2	7	PDF67 / PDF70
VISA follow-up / close follow-up	3/2	7/3	PDF71
VISO family group conferencing: completed/attempt/network placement	1/1/1	7; do not overlap	PDF67
Interview groups / persons	6/32	PDF72 Udsttotal; cell sum 31	PDF72T1

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Interview reception + child + team + upper management + performs + general	5/6/3/4/7/6	31 self-addition against 32 printed	PDF72T1
Strategy objectives Family advice / network meetings per year	4/6	minimum peradvisor; non-obtained registry numbers;	PDF16
Professional team managers	4	starting May-July 2017	PDF20
Team meetings of the receiving authority	3	perweek	PDF21
Advantages advanced	4	Assag May 2017	PDF25
Network Coordinator Training Participation	3	First family group conferences per adviser; rule, not impact measurement	PDF51
Interview siblings / child involvement	2/4	2 siblings 4 withdrawal times; outside 20 sample identity unknown	PDF52

Time, return and intervention

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Child welfare assessment deadline overruns	6 / 8 / 10 months	3; 4 months	PDF59
Placement decision→updated BFU	June 2016 → February 2017	Elder BFUApril 2013; about 8 months after the decision	PDF60
Children's interview by decision	4 months	8 years; actual location at present over 4 months after interview	PDF58
VISO placement decision → actual placement	8 months	1 case; possible same case § 48, non-additivepersons	PDF70
Child welfare assessment→placement decision →actual placement	Dec 2016 → Apr 2017 → Jun 2017	6 months to actual placement; sttask contact / family outreach.	PDF68 / PDF70
Frame after placing	1 week	1 § 65 case; subsequent aid unsubstantiated	PDF62
Actual return	Summer 2017	1 section 65 case;in care for a number of years;professional basis unspecified	PDF63
Aid after return	6	hours § 11 perweek; original family + psychological commitment	PDF63
Relaxation case no record	February → August 2017	BFU 2012 unupdated; Entrepreneurship unclear	PDF62
Suicide burden young without new support	Sep 2016 → Sep 2017	psychologydiscontinuation p. 16; contact type 17 / Decision week 17 / not initiated 18 Sep 17	PDF64-65
FFT Offer → BFU → location assessment	Jan 2016 → Aug 2016 → May 2017	Police / school notifications; not launched pgamanglende attendance	PDF64
VISO first follow-up	4 months	1 of 3 follow-up cases; 3 months	PDF71
Dialog notification wait	multiple weeks	interview; 24-hour assessment postponed until meeting/minutes	PDF31-32
Local reception deadline	4 weeks	interview: non-compliance; non-compliance	PDF29
Short meeting of young children	14 days	Interview example; not a replacement for statutory follow-up	PDF45
Planned end of effort	1-1 ½ month	Interview example of a process; not an account of actual returns home	PDF45

The safeguard errors have been checked against primary material, including missing assessment, plan, child interview and statutory follow-up. No aggregate union of legal errors is published;10/20 special points for attention are a different assessment category. The 4 cases opened under § 65 have no final decisions in the original. The return home in summer 2017 is actual reunification after years in care, but the original finds a lack of documented professional reasons and uncertain support needs afterwards. It must neither be called error-free redress nor automatically attributed to a particular counted placement error. A young person disappearing after 1 week is absconding, not reunification. Source discrepancies: PDF72 prints 32 interviewees, but 6 group counts total 31. Methodology PDF73 requests 17 under § 52+3 under § 11, actual 16+4; standard text PDF74/76 continues with 17 and PDF78 with 3 under § 11 and 3 of 5 placements versus an actual 8. The VISO selection criterion of a current child welfare assessment excludes missing-assessment cases according to PDF79, but 2/7 do not in fact have a current child welfare assessment. PDF33 calls 5/15 current, while the detail at PDF59 has a further 1 old assessment still current; each population is retained. The interviews document known postponement of 24-hour assessments until a dialogue meeting several weeks later and subsequent minutes. This is specific organisational knowledge of the departure from the law. Plans lack objectives and expected duration, weakening review of cessation; the original reports no national population of delayed returns home.

SV19 - Svendborg status report September 2019

Original: Svendborg status report September 2019. SHA-256 89cf7766191ddca603a20e4fc322c58efbae3a10dd9483f241bdeb0842b92636. 52 PDF pages; read 1-52,the entire original. 20 pending cases; measurement period 29.4.2018-29.4.2019. 14 current § 52,3 § 11 and 3 follow-ups on older placements. 5/14 current cases opened during the period; decisions November 2018-March 2019. VISO10/20=7 current+3 follow-ups. Methodology PDF22 expressly refers to the same methodology in baseline 6.2.2018 annex 2,which excludes cases already appealed/considered by the Appeals Board including § 65,multiple cases from the same family, physical disability only and completed interventions; 0-17 years and the responsible municipality during the most recent year. Older follow-up cases are assessed only as to plans/follow-up.

All original Table 1: Errors, Filing and Own denominators

15 original rows, of which one positive. Guarantee errors overlap; no overall error union or total unique person population is published.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Insufficient child involvement	4	14 in T1; 12 relevant in bread text, 2 unborn / baby excluded	PDF22T1 / PDF24
Inadequate parental involvement	2	14	PDF22T1 / PDF24
§ 48 error	6	14	PDF22T1 / PDF25
BFU missing	2	14	PDF22T1 / PDF25
BFU update missing	2	14	PDF22T1 / PDF26
BFU four-month deadline error	6	7	PDF22T1 / PDF26
Justification for lack of support	1	10	PDF22T1 / PDF27
BFU by decision	3	7	PDF22T1 / PDF27
Plan missing	1	14	PDF22T1 / PDF27
Plan by decision	5	11	PDF22T1 / PDF28
§ 11 support can meet support needs	3	3	PDF23T1 / PDF28; POSITIVE row, non-malfunction
Aid not sufficient / relevant	2	20; bread text says insecure and creates § 65	PDF23T1 / PDF29
Three months follow-up deadline error	2	2	PDF23T1 / PDF30
Six months follow-up deadline error	2	3	PDF23T1 / PDF30

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Personal supervision is missing	0	2	PDF23T1 / PDF30

Sample and detailed denominators

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Placement / family / relief / contact / § 11 / elderly follow-up	6/5/0/3/3/3	20	PDF23T2
Age 0-3 / 4-7 / 8-14 / 15-17	2/2/12/4	20	PDF24T3
New cases created during the measurement period	5	14	PDF22
Child education high / someone / rings	1/7/4	12	PDF24; 2 retirement exemptions of 14
Parental involvement high / someone / rings	4/8/2	14	PDF24
§ 48 Compliance / Errors	8/6	14	PDF25
§ 48 by decision / wrong subject matter	4/2	6	PDF25
BFU new / updated / missing / update missing	7/3/2/2	14	PDF25-26
BFU deadline respected / exceeded	1/6	7	PDF26
Overrun 14 d-1 month / 1-2 months / 2-6 months />6 months	1/2/2/1	6	PDF26; UDP4 months
BFU Statement of reasons yes / no	9/1	10	PDF27
BFU requirements / acute or provisional derogation	7/3	10	PDF27
BFU by decision	3	7	PDF27; Bread text also uses pre-action launched
Plan exists / missing	13/1	14	PDF27
Planting requirements / acute derogation	11/2	13	PDF28
Plan before / after decision	6/5	11	PDF28
§ 11 sufficient aid	3	3	PDF28
Aid applicable / uncertain	18/2	20	PDF29
65 cases opened	2	20; end outages not specified	PDF29-31
Three-month follow-up deadline error / outside measurement period	2/1	3	PDF30
Six-month follow-up timely/deadline error	1/2	3	PDF30
Supervision ≥ 2 per year / less than 1 year and irrelevant	2/1	3	PDF30
Special strengths / attention points	0/3	20	PDF30-31
Viso-current / follow-up	7/3	10	PDF32-33
VISO actual analysis	1	7	PDF36; Summary PDF33 says no actual analysis
VISOprivate network involvement	0	7	PDF33; a former foster family self-employed
VISA Recovering / Focused Work	0/1	7	PDF34
Visoplan missing	1	does not mention, in terms of this information;	PDF37
VISOolder follow-up completed	3	3	PDF38; not equivalent to timeliness

Time, duration and self-reporting

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
BFU from 2015 without update → placement	2015 → February 2019	1 case, massive support at home before location	PDF26
Contact decision without plan → called startup	February → March 2019	1 case; actual meeting not documented	PDF27
A late plan after a continuation decision	1 week	old plan covered prior intervention	PDF28
VISO Children's / Parents' conversation before BFU completion	1 ½ years	example of outdated information basis;	PDF35-36
Visoschool opinion before BFO completion	>1 year	same methodological problem; not necessarily extra person	PDF35-36
VISO pedagogical psychological assessment	2012	old material in 2018- 19 case basis	PDF35-36
§ 65 concerned case school courses	3	schools; 14 years; BFUpossible 2014 not transmitted	PDF29-30
§ 65 case PPV → family decision	December 2017 → December 2018	PPV not transmitted; depression / suicide data referred to	PDF29-30
§ 65 case family known by the municipality	since 2010	now 14 years; BFU 2016; up-to-date investigation but reasons for aid deficient	PDF30-31
Pilot development period	May 2018- June 2019	about 1 year against normal 1 ½ years	PDF7-8
Local development plan	2018-2020	3 years; not planned power series	PDF7
New organization	2	units from January 2019;	PDF8-9
Systematic course / legal paper	4/2	Courses winter 2018 and presentation 2018 / 19	PDF9-10
Team / Team leader meeting	1/1	peruge; kommunalt optet	PDF39-43
Management supervision / case review	1/1	per quarter / every 3 months; municipal information	PDF39-43
Concern-report case meetings	2	peruge; kommunalt optet	PDF42-44
ICS implementation modules	3	the third module august- September 2019;	PDF46
Recommended number of targets in plan	3-5	plan standard; not targets achieved	PDF47

The status documents continuing safeguard errors after the development process. Missing child welfare assessments/assessments requiring updating, six missed deadlines, six errors concerning child interviews and continuing late planning weaken the documented grounds for current interventions. Two new § 65 cases are opened; the original documents their opening, not outcomes or actual redress. The two cases with insufficient parental involvement are also among the four with insufficient child involvement. Child involvement has a denominator of 14 in the main table but 12 relevant cases in the detailed examination. The VISO summary's no actual analysis cannot be silently harmonised with the detailed 1/7 analysis at PDF36. The municipality states that new child welfare assessments now meet the deadline of four months and that more interventions end or cases close. This is self-reporting without a counted series of returns home/reunifications identifying unique children or documented reduction in duration. The status gives no new actual return-home dates. The municipality's earlier dialogue-based concern-report model was abandoned because it did not meet statutory requirements. The baseline documents postponed 24-hour assessment; the status documents organisational change. The originals do not document retrospective redress for the individual children's earlier losses.

Checked access and version control

Municipality / source	Test and result
Otter status 2019, versionsalias at 13.1.2020	Both 39-page originals compared in RAM; SHA-256 00f7746ccd50468d37900eb6dc8af6450d0765f3f479d0c8146a292b004fe812 / ac30725526dd21423656ca1c55354154eb9ac49fdcd82b87c1866e2cf041cd53. The alias has added page numbers 1-39 and different bullet encoding. After precisely these corrections, materially different pages:[]. The same measurement is counted once. Alias:https://dagsordener.odder.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/5c9ef252-43a1-495b-a5 b5-439125b9c2db/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true
Glostrup 2016 analysis	Current municipal REST search Task Force gave 21 meetings, at the earliest 2018; analytical report search 6 meetings with 2019 report. Date interval 2016-2017 provided 0 meetings in this portal. Meeting 187 / 15.2.2018,311 / 12.6.2018,483 / 19.12.2018 got the Annex List checked: no central 2016 report. Official permalinks https://dagsorden.glostrup.dk/meeting/187 ; https://dagsorden.glostrup.dk/meeting/311 ; https://dagsorden.glostrup.dk/meeting/483 . Domain-defined web search Task Force + 2016 + analysis gave no source. WaybackCDX matchType = domain glostrup.dk /, original regex.*[Tt] ash.*, status 200, collapse = digest gave 7 irrelevant icon tracks. No disapproval of the rest of the municipality's archives.
Otter 2017 baseline, duplicates	Annex ID3 de 49 ec 3-3300-44 e 9-9871-db 10 e 52 ee 130 (3.4.2017) and 868 e 348 a-a 749-474 d-b 0 e 3-b 9 e 088 f 1098 f (8.5.2017) retrieved in RAM: both 48 pages and SHA-256 feba3af87eba229ec8d6cd73bb577c6e22acd02cecfffcbe290b16bff4c1c5f2, identical to fully read OD17. URL template https://dagsordener.odder.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/{bilags-ID}/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true . Three publications are the same measurement.
Faaborg-Midtfyn	Official FirstAgendaAPI gave concrete analysis 2017, final status 2020 and consultation response 20.3.2020. Growing up / Learning 21.4.2020, meeting 79 ebc 3 ec-7258-406 a-9 ba-0 ad 08 ae 39 f 8a, point 27, Case 27.24.00-A26-1-16 All 47 + 43 + 2 pages read in RAM; pictorial PDF32-33 / 35 in status read in RAM.
Svendborg	Official FirstAgendaAPI: Children / Young people 7.2.2018, meeting 8 fd 41 bf -53 bd-4 b 14 -86 c 5-168214 b 41 c 0 a, point 5; baseline 81 pages. Children / Young 4.9.2019, meeting 9 ba 058 ae-ae 62-4345-bb 7 e-b 1594 e 15 dfab, paragraph 2, Case 19 / 18580; status 52 pages. Both pages of RAM text read. The portal warning of incomplete search after 18.12.2025 is maintained; no zero result is used as unpublished proof.

Specific residual amount

Glostrup: the original 2016 analysis with its methodology/sampling tables has not been obtained through the specific routes tested. Later 2019 before/after cells are sourced as a later account. Specific document request to Glostrup Kommune's Børne-/Familieafdeling and the central Task Force at Ankestyrelsen/Social- og Boligstyrelsen: original 2016 analysis report, annexes/methodology, final version and case-record/meeting reference. The request has been prepared, not sent. All four municipalities: anonymous case examples and samples cannot be deduplicated by person across baseline, status, VISO and section 65. A national or municipal population of unique people affected by errors requires a documented linkage key and legal authority for linking individuals; the reports provide no such key. Odder: baseline 4 section 65 cases were later administratively closed as sufficiently supported;5 section 65 cases from the final measurement have no final outcomes in the status report. Faaborg-Midtfyn:2 baseline+3 final section 65 openings; Svendborg:4 baseline+2 final section 65 openings. These counts must not be summed as unique individuals or completed return-home/compensation cases. Specific final decisions, reopenings, timelines and actual reparation are missing. Actual return home is found as bounded case examples in Faaborg-Midtfyn and the Svendborg baseline. The originals do not document the number of children with delayed reunification or a complete duration series. Continuing support/withdrawn consent/absconding/case closure are separate events; they do not constitute documented return home. Before/after comprises seven independent 20-case measurements=140 case observations, our own addition; VISO consists of subsamples, and status may include old follow-up cases.140 therefore represents neither unique children, families nor people affected by errors. Eight originals read comprise seven central measurement reports and one municipal consultation response,361 PDF pages. Identical publication aliases are not counted again.

Task Force: Fredericia, Vejen, Tårnby and Herning

Four existing child Task Force processes:Fredericia 2021-23,Vejen 2022-24,Tårnby 2023-25 and Herning 2024-26.15 originals, 256 PDF pages have been fully checked substantively in RAM; 2026 follow-up/final review separately. The baseline originals Fredericia 2021 and Tårnby 2023 are specific outstanding access gaps, not declared unpublished. Only own compact facts/metadata have been saved.

Only the specified originals and pages are materially controlled. Figures are cases or actions assessed; categories overlap. Local self-measurement, external control and organisational self-evaluation have different denominators. No total unique fault person population or actual reunification series can be derived without documented person coupling.

FR23 - Fredericia Final Report October 2023

Original: Fredericia final report October 2023. SHA-256 c1aad7958b305a401fdf7c0ab1bf21b83378a08543567c856fc025abe0630c25. 47 PDF pages; read 1-47, the entire original. Newer process model:an initial analysis of 20 cases is referred to; the development process contains 3 reviews with a total of 9 cases in September 2022/February 2023/June 2023. There is no new legal final measurement of 20 cases or complete error-cell table in this final report. Development period February 2022-June 2023, the municipality’s own August 2023 measurements. Selection/exclusion of cases already appealed must be checked in the still missing baseline original, not assumed from previous TF standards.

Control populations and own municipal error / temptation bills

Names 163 is a stock of ongoing investigations. Name 15 is the municipality's own actuality sample. None of them should be summed up with Task Force 9 reviewed cases or converted into unique national defaults population.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Baseline analysis	20	cases, later account; original sample not yet read	PDF 3-4
Development reviews / cases	3/9	sept 2022, feb 2023, jun 2023; identity / overlap not disclosed	PDF 5
Status meetings	6	no case population	PDF 5 / 46
Final meeting	1	in addition to 6 status; from June 2022 to June 2023	PDF 46
Self-valuations	2	August 2021 / June 2023; organisational assessment	PDF 5
Self-evaluated areas	5	supervision / information / standard case procedures / mating / knowledge level;	PDF 5
Ongoing BFU 29.8.2023	163	the municipality's own case population; non-TF 9;	PDF 33
BFU with expiry date	71	163	PDF 33
Overrun with municipal declared valid reason	3	71	PDF 33; Validity not independently tested
Overruns without declared due cause	68	71 − 3, self-calculation	PDF 33
In fact, even within time limit	92	163 − 71, self-calculation	PDF 33
Share actually within time limits	56,44%	92 / 163, self-calculation	PDF 33
Within a time limit including 3 specified exceptions	95	92 + 3, self-calculation	PDF 33
Share including 3 exceptions	58,28%	95 / 163, self-calculation	PDF 33
The original's share still within the deadline	58%	163; matcher rounded 95 / 163 rather than 92 / 163	PDF 16 / 33
Sample of the up-to-dateness of BFUs 29.8.2023	15	Cases in progress created 1.1.2019-1.1.2022	PDF 33
BFURECORRESPONDING TO NEED / ACTION	8	15	PDF 33

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
BFUs not true	7	15 − 8, self-calculation	PDF 33
The original's BFU lawfulness proportion	53%	8 / 15,53,33% self-calculation	PDF 33
BFUactuality sub-target	50%	target May 2023; the augustmetering is said to meet it	PDF 16 / 33
Child welfare assessment currency target date	December 2023	all cases expected to be lawful; future target	PDF 16 / 33

Development, deadlines, knowledge and planned activities

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Start of the closing report	August 2021	municipal submission says June 2021; version / phase difference is maintained	PDF 3; FR 22 P
Development period	February 2022-June 2023	usually about 1 ½ years	PDF 3
Pre-trade break due to change of management	1 month	agreed autumn 2022	PDF 4
Leadership staff with you from the start	1	the names of the entire management group are not disclosed;	PDF 4
TF change assessment: management/assessment/choice-follow-up/involvement	low / someone / low / someone	4 areas; not percentage scale or misunion	PDF 7-8
Legal Action Plan Training	26.8.2022	all advisers; number of persons not disclosed;	PDF 36-37
§ 48 education / follow-up	29.4.2022/17.6.2022	all advisors; no enumerated union of legality;	PDF 40
Section 48 of the supervisory board	September 2022	change in practice; not all cases documented as compliant with the law	PDF 21 / 40
BFU planning requirements from	April 2022	actual use of the IT plan insufficient after the municipality's statement	PDF 16 / 33
Contact time of the New Advisor	1	week after internal delivery; municipal procedure	PDF 32
BFU Action Line presented	29.4.2022/17.6.2022	2 presentations	PDF 32
BFUquality standard presented / follow-up	17.6.2022/26.8.2022	2 presentations	PDF 32
BFU development-plan step	3	step 2 / 3 planlagtsept-Dec 2022 continued not achieved	PDF 35
Involving network training	February/June 2023	2 full days; advisors + exporters, number unknown	PDF 22 / 40
Planned family group conferencing training	February/June 2024	2 future activities	PDF 42
TRIVSEL + project duration	4	year from autumn 2021	PDF 31
TRIVSEL + input persons	about 300-350	municipal estimates; children not affected by error	PDF 31
TRIVSEL + kickoff	30.8.2023	Implementation until end 2024	PDF 29 / 31
TRIVSEL + consent → startup	14	working days; plan standard, not observing a waiting time	PDF 30
TRIVSEL + Leadership Response Time	3	days; plan standard	PDF 30
TRIVSEL + transfer by close of case	14	days; plan standard without order working days at this site	PDF 39
TRIVSEL + implementation 0-5 / school / after 9th grade -18 / 18-25	Aug 2023 / Nov 2023 / jan 2024 / apr 2024	4 planned phases	PDF 30
Municipal vision adopted	17.4.2023	new child policy expected spring 2024	PDF 11 / 23-24
New policy's old-age copy / duration	0 - 25 years / 6 years	future policy	PDF 24
Organisation change	1.10.2023	new Head of Sector for Social / Employment	PDF 12 / 28

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Joint management of Youth Advice from	1.7.2023	management change; not a redress result	PDF 36
New electronic handbook expected to be available	October 2023	early autumn 2022 solution did not work clearly	PDF 13 / 27-28
Number of Workshop	4	1 Aug 2021,1 Oct 2021,2 March / April 2022	PDF 46
Practical course	Autumn 2022	systematics, staff and management;	PDF 46

The original documents persistent legal deficiencies after the development process. The Task Force has not seen the procedures put into practice in the 9 cases examined and finds lawfulness approximately unchanged throughout the process. The municipality's own statistics of 29.8.2023 give 71 breaches of the time limit among 163 BFUs; 68 without a stated valid reason. The municipality has specific knowledge of these circumstances and of 7 assessments that are not current in its own 15-case sample. The original's 58% still within the time limit conceals a local counting discrepancy:163−71=92,56,44%; only when 3 exceptions stated by the municipality are included does the result become 95/163=58,28%. Both original counts and the percentage are retained; none of the authority's statements of a valid reason is treated as independently verified legal authority. The municipality describes deliberate reluctance to remedy the requirement for an action plan before the decision because of expected new legislation. The Task Force criticises this on PDF 20; the contemporaneous, specific omission can be documented without a hypothetical defence against responsibility. A future change in the law documents no remedy for decisions already made. Missing/late plans and imprecise objectives weaken oversight of when interventions should cease. The original specifically describes this risk but gives no counted or dated actual return home/reunification, compensation or completed individual reopening. The closure procedure and expected targets for 2024 are not actual redress.

FR22P - Fredericia presentation 26.1.2022

Original: Fredericia presentation 26.1.2022. SHA-256 b9d298c82b58e5c52e082c526bea54528of525138fd78ad3ca8d96a9f3b6f619. 2 PDFs pages; read 1-2, the entire original. Communal submission, not the analysis report of the original 20 cases.

The precise figures of the presentation

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Overall analysis of the family department	7	themes; the Task Force covers the legality of the case handling;	PDF 1
Start of course	June 2021	against August of the later closing report	PDF 1
Planned TFfollow-up	6	weeks between follow-ups; not actually series	PDF 1
Compensation for the Family Department	750000	DKK; Decision 6.6.2021 as indicated in the original	PDF 1
Initial report submitted	26.1.2022	taken note of	PDF 2

FR23P - Fredericia presentation 12.10.2023

Original: Fredericia presentation 12.10.2023. SHA-256 97a8b9e5ca8126b2ea9bdf60d19e0c4b913ecf5ccac4a5d9575cc4a603fca0d1. 2 PDFs pages; read 1-2, the entire original. Local presentation; data base from autumn 2021 is mentioned.

The denominators of the presentation

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Legal Baseline Review of the Appeal Board	20	cases; original methodological annexes not in the submission	PDF 1
VISO Socio-Professional Baseline Review	10	cases; sub-sample overlap with 20 not explicitly aligned here	PDF 1
Development	2	years, municipal description	PDF 1
Final reporting submitted	12.10.2023	taken note of	PDF 2

FR24O - Fredericia follow-up 22.8.2024

Original: Fredericia follow-up 22.8.2024. SHA-256 7da8bb7104cd0bda6a4d334dfe14ec0124ec04b4be43842ce57858efa691956e. 4 PDF pages; read 1-4, the entire original;PDF 3 plan figure visually checked in RAM. Municipal presentation with recommendations and a blank child-plan form; no new error/compliance statistics.

The layout and presentation

An empty standard form is no person repair or individual decision obtained.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Planfigur objectives	3	empty objective 1-3 with what / where / who; purpose and dream fields	PDF 3
Follow-up submitted	22.8.2024	municipal annex; no measured reunion duration	PDF 1-4

The follow-up annex provides continued recommendations and a children's plan. It does not contain any calculated reduction in temptations or lack of current BFU, no recovery outcomes, actual repatriation or compensation.

VE23 - Road analysis report 10 March 2023

Original: Vejen analysis report 10. March 2023. SHA-256 5143ae3202e679da4daeedad96295731c02b670bebbe27e296ea10c1e90876f2. 43 PDF pages; read 1-43, the entire original. Newer quality model: 12 current cases, not representative. Decisions 8.8.2020-8.8.2022, nine section 52 subsection 3 and three section 11 subsection 3. PDF 42 describes cases received, but states no separate exclusion rule for cases already appealed. Exclusions from the older 20-case standard must not be imported.

Samples, errors and safeguards

BFU and Paragraph 48 can hit the same case. Two notifications are not two final § 65 decisions. Party consultation, plans and follow-up are described without an overall misunion.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Assessment of cases	12	9 § 52 + 3 § 11; not unique national population	PDF 5-6 / 42
52cases	9	12	PDF 42
§ 11 cases	3	12	PDF 42
Period of decision	8.8.2020-8.8.2022	current sample	PDF 42
Acute assessment within 24 hours	12	12	PDF 23; lack of concrete justifications not quantified
BFU studied	9	52cases	PDF 26-28

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
BFU deadline respected	1	9	PDF 27
BFU deadline not respected	8	9 − 1, own calculation	PDF 27
§ 48 fulfilled in time and content	1	9	PDF 31
§ 48 not fulfilled in time and / or in content;	8	9 − 1, own calculation; overlap BFUs error unknown	PDF 31
§ 11 correct target group	2	3	PDF 32
§ 11 Insufficient information / undefined problem	1	3	PDF 32
Informed to the Children's Office of the Appeal Board	2	doubts about sufficient support; no public § 65 performance series in the original;	PDF 32
Action plan required	9	the plans are found in most but pre-decision not met; no precise error union;	PDF 33
Follow-up requirements	9	several deadlines; number not specified	PDF 34
Interview groups / persons	4/18	6 advisors + 3 senior management + 4 exporters + 5 general area	PDF 41
Advisers interviewed	6	18	PDF 41
Top management interview	3	18	PDF 41
Executing the interview	4	18	PDF 41
General area interview	5	18	PDF 41

Time, organisation and known consequences

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Application	2.12.2021	completed 2022-2024;	PDF 4
Social advisers	26	including 3 legal advisers; not number of misplaced staff	PDF 4
Legal advisers	3	26	PDF 4
Foster-care consultants	4	organisation of the application;	PDF 4
Children / Youth Consultants	19	organisation of the application;	PDF 4
Head / Team Managers	1/3	Head and Team Managers	PDF 4
Backland / front	3/1	teams;	PDF 4
Prevention range	30	offers, not children	PDF 10
§ 52offers / group offers	9/4	4 is subset of 9	PDF 10
§ 11 offers / group offers	8/3	3 is subset of 8	PDF 10
Additional group offers	5	health etc.; not sum of persons	PDF 10
Unofficial limit of authorisation	5000	DKK; not written competence plan	PDF 15 / 31
Joint technical conference	1	at the time of the investigation;	PDF 17
Delayed BFUs launch	almost 4 months	concrete example from notification to start note	PDF 24
Placement before action plan	9	months in specific cases; actual return not indicated	PDF 33
Unchanged course without impact assessment	4	years in concrete case; child does not want continuation	PDF 35
Budget rule for § 11	5	interviews at most; the Task Force finds the fettering of discretion unlawful	PDF 32
Priority recruitment	4	start 2023 against waiting list, unmeasured power	PDF 32
Follow-up minimum first / later	3/6	months, rule indication not observed duration	PDF 34
Minimum supervision / child interview placement	2	annual; available examples of untreated child's criticism	PDF 34 / 36

The road has documented the lack of timely BFU in 8 of 9 and the lack of statutory section 48 interview in 8 of 9. The two populations are the same nine cases, but identity coupling between errors has not been published. The absence of a plan of action prior to deployment is specifically fixed to nine months after the intervention; this is not an indication of actual reunification. The Authority's statement on well-placed children is contradicted by the original description of the case: the child asked for a conversation and said that it was not well with the foster family; no documented follow-up and foster parents participated. TF documents the lack of PDF 36. Identity, termination and possible replacement are not shown. Non-response is concrete: a child continued the same course for four years without a documented assessment of progression, despite the child's reluctance. The management's knowledge of capacity-determined incorrect support and a maximum of five conversations is documented in PDF 30-32. The five-conversation rule is explicitly criticised as an estimate under the rule.

VE24 - Road closing status November 2024, kolofon December 2024

Original: Road final status November 2024, colofon December 2024. SHA-256 a8b337aa338ad885c8c8905d066efc6359767fe0a922da96fcf6336e1ee6100b. 26 PDFs pages; read 1-26, the entire original. Development April 2023-August 2024. Three assessments, nine cases October 2023 / February 2024 / June 2024; not new representative final measurement. Posted 21.1.2025. The child's law changes the regulatory framework from 1.1.2024.

Name and actual control

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Status meetings	6	municipal written status before each meeting;	PDF 5 / 25
Case assessments / Cases	3/9	October 2023, February 2024, June 2024; 3 cases per meeting 2 / 4 / 6	PDF 5 / 25
Meetings with case control	2, 4, 6	subset of six meetings;	PDF 25
Self-evaluated areas	5	organisational; non-fault persons;	PDF 5
Further follow-up meeting offered	6-8	months; offers not actually held	PDF 6
The specified duration of development	1	year; calendar period April 2023-August 2024 shall be kept separately;	PDF 3 / 6
New geographic teams	4	organisation change 2024 continued 2025;	PDF 6
Stop-up-meeting interval	3	months, municipal procedure	PDF 9
Case Review Interval	6-8	weeks, municipal procedure	PDF 12
New advisers	3	compensation of the case; not the amount of compensation;	PDF 15
Waiting list	0	the municipality's own statement; external TF control of the choice of effort is missing;	PDF 21-22
§ 30 cases read in development	0	TF cannot test the actual implementation of the guidance	PDF 22
Workshop quality / work organisation / development plan supervision	1/2/2	total 5, own summation; no case population	PDF 25
Overall change assessment	some degree	categorisation of own four-step; less case quality	PDF 3 / 15
General management / professional management	some degree	no%	PDF 8
Quality of proceedings	lower degree	no%	PDF 15
Choice of intervention/follow-up reviewed during development	cannot be assessed / cannot be assessed	the work had not been completed;	PDF 22-23

Time and implementation

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Strategy for the Family Department	Spring 2024	municipal information,	PDF 9
Input catalogue expected implemented	end October 2024	expectations, not documented all cases	PDF 10
Team meetings extended from:	1.11.2024	an extra hour per week,	PDF 12
Competence plan	June 2024	municipal plan	PDF 21
Visiting meetings established	1.10.2024	municipal information,	PDF 21
New law	1.1.2024	rule / procedure break in the year series	PDF 6
Home / colophon	November 2024 / December 2024	same original; keep the date deviation	PDF 1 / 26

The progress report demonstrates that described workflows are not yet reflected in the cases reviewed and that systematic management oversight is not in the target (PDF 11-13). Professional assessments and justifications are still missing and BFU deadlines are still being exceeded (PDF 16 / 20), without any reported misunion. The municipality's statement on waiting list zero cannot be used as proof of proper support: TF has not reviewed § 30 offers in development and has not been able to assess the development of the choice of effort or follow-up (PDF 22-23). Nor has TF verified actual return, reunification or termination after error. These specific control holes have been preserved locally.

VE24M - Road Mid-Term Status January 2024, presented 20.2.2024

Original: Vejen mid-term status January 2024,submitted 20.2.2024. SHA-256 745cb82fbed4b7db388a0cee3a1793cdaaed077458918e346edcff6be76ac728. 3 PDF pages; read 1-3,the entire original. Political status, the first development case review discussed; no new counted population of persons affected by errors.

Status and scale

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Development plans	4	first plan lawfulness/Children's Act active	PDF 2
Development impetus / priority	high / high	Organisational scale	PDF 1-2
Work reflected in operation	low	no percentage scale	PDF 2
Management supervision applied	high	Organisational scale	PDF 3
Management acts on results	someone	Organisational scale	PDF 3
Employee involvement/quality descriptions	high / some	Organisational scale	PDF 3
Plan reviewed with employees	1	time per month; procedure	PDF 3

Policy presentation documents the management's and the committee's knowledge of low daily turnover. It only refers to some action on monitoring results and continued problems with concrete child involvement.

VE23L - The road overall management supervision summer 2023

Original: Vejen overall management supervision summer 2023. SHA-256 8ed472c2582da89cb04f68480bd0d5aac43ebaca54fafe5f5e4d05ff605142ee. 12 PDF pages; read 1-12, the entire text; all graphs PDF 6-11 visually checked in RAM. The municipality’s own review of 10 cases, 3 front-line and 7 back-office cases; not the external TF 12/9. Criteria-based selection: most recently initiated intervention for assessment/choice; at least two action plans for follow-up. The municipality’s statement of random selection does not document representativeness.

All original graph cells

Yes / no / not applicable are case categories; comment is overlapping selection and may not be added. Percentages are the rounding of the originals; the third BFUs limit category is 17%, so the original percentages add up to 101%. Siblings and SOS have source deviations below.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Acute assessment - Yes	7 (70%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Acute assessment - No	0 (0%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Acute assessment - Not applicable	3 (30%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Acute Assessment - Comment	1 (10%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Receipt - Yes	7 (70%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Receipt - No	0 (0%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Receipt - Not applicable	3 (30%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Receipt - Comment	1 (10%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Party hearing - Yes	6 (60%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Party consultation - No	1 (10%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Party consultation - Not applicable	3 (30%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Party hearing - Comment	0 (0%)	10	PDF 6, original graph
Children's interview notification - Yes	2 (20%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Child conversation notification - No	5 (50%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Children's interview notification - Not applicable	3 (30%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Children's interview notification - Comment	0 (0%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Orientation professional notifier - Yes	1 (10%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Orientation professional notifier - No	6 (60%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Information professional - Not applicable	3 (30%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Orientation professional notifier - Comment	2 (20%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Professional assessment notification - Yes	3 (30%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Professional assessment notification - No	4 (40%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Professional assessment notification - Not applicable	3 (30%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Professional assessment notification - Comment	0 (0%)	10	PDF 7, original graph
Current BFU - Yes	6 (60%)	10	PDF 8, original graph
Current BFU - No	3 (30%)	10	PDF 8, original graph
Current BFU - Not applicable	1 (10%)	10	PDF 8, original graph
Current BFU - Comment	1 (10%)	10	PDF 8, original graph
BFU deadline - Yes	1 (17%)	6	PDF 8, original graph

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
BFU deadline - No	4 (67%)	6	PDF 8, original graph
BFU deadline - Not applicable	1 (17%)	6	PDF 8, original graph
BFU deadline - Comment	0 (0%)	6	PDF 8, original graph
Preliminary BFUs assessment - Yes	1 (17%)	6	PDF 8, original graph
Preliminary BFUs assessment - No	3 (50%)	6	PDF 8, original graph
Preliminary BFUs assessment - Not applicable	2 (33%)	6	PDF 8, original graph
Preliminary BFU assessment - Comment	0 (0%)	6	PDF 8, original graph
Children's call BFU - Yes	4 (67%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Children's interview BFU - No	2 (33%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Children's call BFU - Not applicable	0 (0%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Children's interview BFU - Comment	1 (17%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Alternative child perspective - Yes	0 (0%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Alternative child perspective - No	2 (33%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Alternative child perspective - Not applicable	4 (67%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Alternative Child Perspective - Comment	0 (0%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Parental interview BFU - Yes	3 (50%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Parental interview BFU - No	3 (50%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Parental interview BFU - Not applicable	0 (0%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Parental conversation BFU - Comment	3 (50%)	6	PDF 9, original graph
Knowledge from relevant professionals - Yes	6 (100%)	6	PDF 10, original graph
Knowledge from relevant professionals - No	0 (0%)	6	PDF 10, original graph
Knowledge from relevant professionals - Not applicable	0 (0%)	6	PDF 10, original graph
Knowledge from relevant professionals - Comment	0 (0%)	6	PDF 10, original graph
Reasoned professional opinion - Yes	3 (50%)	6	PDF 10, original graph
Reasoned professional opinion - No	3 (50%)	6	PDF 10, original graph
Reasoned professional opinion - Not applicable	0 (0%)	6	PDF 10, original graph
Reasoned opinion - Comment	2 (33%)	6	PDF 10, original graph
Searchexamination - Yes	2 (20%)	10	PDF 10, original graph
Search survey - No	1 (10%)	10	PDF 10, original graph
Searchexamination - Not applicable	7 (70%)	10	PDF 10, original graph
Searching Survey - Comment	0 (0%)	10	PDF 10, original graph
SOS meeting - Yes	1 (10%)	10	PDF 11, original graph
SOS meeting - No	9 (90%)	10	PDF 11, original graph

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
SOS meeting - Not applicable	1 (10%)	10	PDF 11, original graph
SOS meeting - Comment	0 (0%)	10	PDF 11, original graph

Samples and source discrepancies

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Cases before / hinterland	10/3/7	10 total; 3 + 7 subpopulations	PDF 4
Follow-up take-off minimum	2	action plans, excludes cases without at least 2 plans	PDF 3
Siblings studied - Bread text	3	10	PDF 10
Siblings studied - graph	2	10	PDF 10
Siblings not studied - graph	1	10	PDF 10
SOS sum yes / no / not applicable	11	1 + 9 + 1 despite 10 cases; same conflict in text / graph	PDF 11
BFU deadline summary	1	6	PDF 5 indicates only 1 deadline; detailed PDF 8 adds 1 not applicable
Sibling Summary	2/3	PDF 5; not for graph 2 / 10 or text 3 / 10	
The Orient informs summary	1/14%	PDF 4; 14% applies to relevant 7, graph 10% of 10	
Missing written§50 decision	1	comment, not new unique case number	PDF 11
Post-school authorisation registered under wrong §	1	comment, overlap unknown	PDF 11
Youth study not party-consulted	1	comment, overlap unknown	PDF 11

The municipal conclusion on PDF 12 states overall compliance with statutory requirements. At the same time, the checked original graph cells document 4 BFU time-limit breaches among 6,3 missing current BFUs among 10,5 missing child interviews concerning notifications among 10 and 6 failures to inform among 10. The conclusion therefore cannot be used as an absence of breaches of law in the sample. The graph for sibling assessments says 2 yes/1 no/7 not relevant, the main text says 3 yes/7 not relevant, and the summary says 2/3. SOS says 1 yes/9 no/1 not relevant among 10. All figures are retained; there is no harmonisation. The legal start of the BFU time limit is incorrectly given as the decision date in summary PDF 5, whereas the review question itself on PDF 8 uses the municipality's first awareness of a need for support.

VE23T - The road to thematic management supervision summer 2023

Original: Vejen themed management supervision summer 2023. SHA-256 f84ad391deb3d8b672c8a6ccb3537486aca9bc9764e9944a402d9d5d88001895. 12 PDF pages; read 1-12, the entire text; all graphs PDF 5-12 visually checked in RAM. Municipal quality review of 3 cases selected according to trends from overall supervision. Two before and one after new workflows. Shared identities with the overall sample of 10 are not documented.

All original quality graph cells

Each of 23 questions has the same 3 case denominators; each observation is not a new person. Comment is a separate overlap category, here 0. Original 33 / 67 rounding is retained.

Item	Figures	Names / delimitations no	Original location
Acute professional assessment - Low degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 5, original graph
Acute professional assessment - Some degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 5, original graph
Acute professional assessment - High degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 5, original graph
Acute professional assessment - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 5, original graph
Acute professional assessment - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 5, original graph
What to do after notification - Low degree	2 (67%)	3	PDF 5, original graph
What to do after notification - Some degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 5, original graph
What to do after notification - High level	1 (33%)	3	PDF 5, original graph
What to do after notification - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 5, original graph
What to do after notification - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 5, original graph
Relevant Action - Low Degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 6, original graph
Relevant Action - Some Degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 6, original graph
Relevant Action - High Level	1 (33%)	3	PDF 6, original graph
Relevant action - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 6, original graph
Relevant Action - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 6, original graph
Relevant child conversation - Low degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 6, original graph
Relevant child conversation - Some degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 6, original graph
Relevant child conversation - High degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 6, original graph
Relevant child call - Not applicable	1 (33%)	3	PDF 6, original graph
Relevant child conversation - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 6, original graph
The relevant network of the child - low degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Relevant network of the child - Some degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Relevant Network of the Child - High Level	0 (0%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Relevant network of the child - Not applicable	1 (33%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Relevant Network of the Child - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child oriented process / rights - Low degree	2 (67%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child oriented process / rights - Some degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child oriented process / rights - High degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child-oriented process / rights - Not applicable	1 (33%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child oriented process / rights - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child prepared conversation - Low degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child prepared conversation - Some degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child prepared conversation - High degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child prepared conversation - Not applicable	1 (33%)	3	PDF 7, original graph

Item	Figures	Names / delimitations no	Original location
Child prepared conversation - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child talked to fast enough - Low grade	0 (0%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child talked to fast enough - Some degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child spoken to fast enough - High level	1 (33%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child spoken to fast enough - Not applicable	1 (33%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Child spoken to fast enough - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 7, original graph
Relevant Parental Interview - Low Degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Relevant Parental Interview - Some Degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Relevant Parental Conversation - High Level	2 (67%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Relevant parenting conversation - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Relevant Parental Interview - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Parents network - Low degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Parents network - Some degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Parents' Network - High Level	2 (67%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Parents' network - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Parents network - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Essential family conditions - low degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Essential Family Relations - Some Degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Essential family conditions - High degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Essential family relationships - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Essential family relationships - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 8, original graph
Parents prepared - Low degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents prepared - Some degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents prepared - High degree	3 (100%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents prepared - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents prepared - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents process / rights - Low degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents Process / Rights - Some Degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents process / rights - High degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents process / rights - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents process / rights - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents talked with fast enough - Low degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents talked to fast enough - Some degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents talked with fast enough - High	2 (67%)	3	PDF 9, original graph

Item	Figures	Names / delimitations no	Original location
Parents talked to fast enough - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Parents talked with fast enough - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Knowledge private network - Low degree	2 (67%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Knowledge private network - Some degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Knowledge private network - High degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Knowledge private network - Not applicable	1 (33%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Knowledge private network - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 9, original graph
Knowledge professional network - Low degree	2 (67%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Knowledge professional network - Some degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Knowledge professional network - High degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Knowledge professional network - Not applicable	1 (33%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Knowledge professional network - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Specialised knowledge - Low degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Specialised knowledge - Some degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Specialised knowledge - High degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Specialised knowledge - Not applicable	2 (67%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Specialised Knowledge - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Overall Social Assessment - Low Grade	0 (0%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Overall Social Assessment - Some degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Overall Social Assessment - High Level	3 (100%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Overall social assessment - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Overall Social Assessment - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 10, original graph
Child oriented result - Low degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Child oriented result - Some degree	2 (67%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Child oriented result - High degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Child oriented result - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Child oriented result - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Parents oriented result - Low degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Parents oriented result - Some degree	2 (67%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Parents oriented result - High degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Parents oriented result - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Parents oriented result - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Timely treatment / level of concern - low degree	2 (67%)	3	PDF 11, original graph

Item	Figures	Names / delimitations no	Original location
Timely treatment / level of concern - Some degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Timely treatment / level of concern - High level	1 (33%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Timely treatment / level of concern - Not applicable	0 (0%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
Timely Treatment / Concern Level - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 11, original graph
§ 11 relevant assessment - Low grade	0 (0%)	3	PDF 12, original graph
§ 11 relevant assessment - Some degree	1 (33%)	3	PDF 12, original graph
§ 11 Relevant Assessment - High Level	1 (33%)	3	PDF 12, original graph
§ 11 relevant assessment - Not applicable	1 (33%)	3	PDF 12, original graph
§ 11 Relevant Assessment - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 12, original graph
Family guidance § 11 insufficient - Low degree	2 (67%)	3	PDF 12, original graph
Family tutored § 11 inadequate - Some degree	0 (0%)	3	PDF 12, original graph
Family guidance § 11 insufficient - High level	0 (0%)	3	PDF 12, original graph
Family guidance § 11 insufficient - Not applicable	1 (33%)	3	PDF 12, original graph
Family guidance § 11 insufficient - Comment	0 (0%)	3	PDF 12, original graph

Samples and time consequences

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Case	3	two old workflows / a new one	PDF 3
Before / after new workflow	2/1	3	PDF 3
24-hour deadline met	3	3	PDF 3; quality distributed 1 / 1 / 1 on PDF 5
Internal 4-week treatment deadline met	1	3	PDF 4 / 11; not the 4 months BFU deadline of the Act
Child unborn	1	3	explanation of non-relevant conversation; PDF 6
Too narrow for final conclusions	3	the express demarcation of the municipality;	PDF 12

The municipality documents a low level of information of the child on rights in 2 of 3 cases, inadequate private / professional network retrieval in 2 of 3 and low timeliness in 2 of 3. A general assessment of positive change after new workflow is based on only 1 case and cannot eliminate the actual errors or become a general effect.

TA24M - Tårnby mid-road status, submitted 13.11.2024

Original: Tårnby mid-road status, submitted 13.11.2024. SHA-256 7337f6a24768739ed9a338d4ed66c615d404350047569ae431a1039ae0c343b8. 4 PDFs pages; read 1-4, the entire original. Political status on development; first three development cases are mentioned, not an independent new population.

All delimited numbers and status levels

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Cases at status meeting 2	3	Part of later 9 development cases	PDF 2
Case Review Interval	6	weeks, municipal practice	PDF 3
Thematic supervision carried out	1	no information given on the case	PDF 3
Exhaust / priority / operation	someone / high / someone	organisational degrees;	PDF 1-2
Management’s handling of challenges	someone	degree of organisation;	PDF 3
Management supervision / use of results	low / low	no systematic continuous practice;	PDF 3
Employee involvement/quality procedures	someone / low	organisational degrees;	PDF 4

The management and the Political Affairs Committee are specifically informed about the low use of management supervision and low action on the results. The guidelines are not implemented in the proceedings. Organisational momentum cannot therefore be equated with the correction of individual cases.

TA25 - Tårnby Final Report April 2025 submitted 10.9.2025

Original: Tårnby Final Report April 2025, submitted 10.9.2025. SHA-256 11efc70db6c629ed3c009fdebb74e21a2c9d769b04d727d4bde9d79654799ed3. 23 PDFs pages; read 1-23, the entire original. Development December 2023-February 2025. Nine cases April / September 2024 and January 2025, focus preliminary proceedings. The report reproduces baseline if original is not yet retrieved; no exclusion rule or representative error child count.

Control population and omitted control stage

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Status meetings / statuses	6/6	the municipality's statement and status are other sources of knowledge;	PDF 4-5
Cases examined	3/9	April 2024, September 2024, January 2025; 3 cases at meeting 2 / 4 / 6	PDF 4 / 22
Self-evaluated areas	5	organisational, not individuals;	PDF 5
Self-evaluation / ICS measurements	2	Start / End	PDF 5
Duration of the development process	approximately 1 year	calendar period December 2023-February 2025 separately;	PDF 3 / 6
Further follow-up offered	6-8	months; actual follow-up special sign TA 26	PDF 6
Total quality / management / case handling	someone / someone / less	degrees; no error rate	PDF 3 / 8 / 13
Network Involvement Observed	1	of 9, primarily at the request of the family	PDF 16
Coverage seen at status meetings	2	meetings, number of closures not specified precisely;	PDF 18
The whole course of proceedings examined	0	focus notification / screening and a little cover	PDF 16
BFU development work controlled	not working with	deadline data is no quality control;	PDF 18
Choosing Action / Plan Development	cannot be assessed;	the work has not yet been completed;	PDF 20
Follow-up development	cannot be assessed;	the work has not yet been completed;	PDF 20
Workshop quality / work organisation / development plan supervision	1/1/2	Total 4, own summation	PDF 22

Time limits and implementation

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Parental contact after notification	2	days, municipal objectives, not all cases met	PDF 17
Party consultation after notification	4	weeks, municipal objectives, not all cases met	PDF 17
Case Review Interval	6	weeks	PDF 11
Annual reel themes	4	monthly trade days and quarterly re-evaluation;	PDF 9
Working Group Violence / Violence Range	6	months	PDF 12
Other municipalities in Onward without violence	2	project population, not error persons;	PDF 12
The child's law course duration	2	days, number of advisers not disclosed	PDF 14
Upgrading	1	Adviser from 1.1.2025	PDF 17
Team manager staff / professional management from	1.2.2025	organisational change;	PDF 9
Management information expected to be implemented	end 2025	future objectives;	PDF 11
FIT planned from	summer 2025	unmeasured citizen repair;	PDF 19
The child's plan / youth plan planned theme	2026	future activity	PDF 19

The report’s assessment of improved involvement mainly concerns the beginning of the case, not the entire process. TF finds continuing insufficient professional reasons and problems with late child interviews, rights information and the choice of § 30 support. Several cases close after preventive intervention and reopen a few months after a new concern report (PDF 19-20); this is specific inadequacy of support, not proof of return home. The final report documents that workflows and ICS are not sufficiently reflected as implemented in the cases (PDF 10/18). There is no documented final examination of child welfare assessment, choice of intervention and follow-up as complete processes, no new aggregate union of errors and no actual reunification, compensation or accountability series.

TA26 - Tårnby follow-up note May 2026 submitted 10.9.2026

Original: Tower follow-up note May 2026 submitted 10.9.2026. SHA-256 5a4cd382bbe215f7431d0f772883b7fe44ddf9651b6483d6a9696ee17234d1c8. 9 PDFs pages; read 1-9, the entire original. 2026 separately. Three municipal cases selected after agreed focus: 24-hour assessment, screening, hedging. No representative municipal error rate.

New external controls and knowledge levels

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Judicial review	3	municipality selected according to agreed focus; dedup with 2024 / 25 unknown	PDF 2 / 6
Children's conversations held	3	3	PDF 6; quality / time continued criticised
Detection applicable	3	3	PDF 6
Deceleration completed	2	3	PDF 7
Deterioration insufficient	2	the 2 completed; missing involvement/information/reasons	PDF 7
Information to the Children's Office	1	3	PDF 7; non-final § 65 outages
Follow-up meeting	1	date not specified in the original;	PDF 2
Initial TFs start	February 2023	Reported in 2026 note	PDF 2
Baseline dating	September 2023	end 2025 says presentation October 2023; document / presentation separated	PDF 3
Input of the National Audit Office	2022-2024	The municipality provides results and own findings; no new case figures	PDF 3
Upgrading	4	advisors, municipal information	PDF 3
Management oversight interval	3	months, quarterly new cadence	PDF 5
Same theme on trade days	3	previously 1; not persons	PDF 5
Choosing action / follow-up planned	May-June 2026	not working on at the follow-up meeting	PDF 3

The municipality has specific knowledge from Rigsrevisionen’s placement sample for 2022-24 and its own management supervision of deficiencies and inconsistent practice (PDF 3). Nevertheless, the follow-up memorandum states that recommendations from 2023 on choice of intervention and follow-up have not yet been addressed. This is a documented time/knowledge link, not a presumption that interventions actually ended. TF still finds insufficient reasons for 24-hour assessments, late child involvement, retrospective screening and insufficient rights information. Both completed preliminary assessments are insufficient, and one case has been reported to the Children’s Office. No actual § 65 decision, change in support, return home, compensation or disciplinary responsibility is stated.

HE24 - Herning analytical report September 2024 submitted 23.10.2024

Original: Herning analytical report September 2024 submitted 23.10.2024. SHA-256 7d8a25dc3c5a24e7805808fdfa82fa2d209778a0191364944998b946709ebeed. 40 PDFs pages; read 1-40, the entire original; page PDF 8 separately visually controlled in memory. 12 current cases; qualitative, not representative. PDF 6 describes both service law and child law; method PDF 39 describes service law. No precise decision dates or already pending exclusions indicated. Initial decisions may be taken before 2024.

Sample, methodology and case counts actually established

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Case	12	current qualitative sample	PDF 7 / 39
Aid cases	9	§ 52, paragraph 3; later § 32 / 46	PDF 6 / 39
Prevention cases	3	§ 11, par. 3; later § 30	PDF 6 / 39
Placements	3	subset; no further three cases	PDF 33
Inadequately defined preventive action	3	all 3 prevention cases;	PDF 30
Delayed performance, concrete examples	2	Decision end 2022; start-up mid 2023	PDF 29
pre-birth BFU not updated at birth / placement	1	concrete example; overlap unknown	PDF 26
Serious notification: first conversation	10	days; 1 concise course	PDF 34
The same course: BFU decision then	1	week after the interview	PDF 34
The same course of action: next step	3	months after: school opinion	PDF 34
Interview Groups	4	not children / family interviews	PDF 38
Interviews	18	5+2+6+5	PDF 38
Advisers interviewed	5	18	PDF 38
Top management interview	2	18	PDF 38
Executing the interview	6	18	PDF 38
General area interview	5	18	PDF 38
Self-evaluation themes	5	organisational assessment;	PDF 38

Cadence and organisational populations

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Age limits	0-18	years, the report's designation "children"	PDF 5
Application	22.11.2023	start 2024; expected end 2026	PDF 5
Management departments	3	Organisational	PDF 5
Former teams	6	own sum 1 advanced + 4 geographical + 1 young	PDF 5
New organization teams	4	self 1 prevention + 1 young + 2 district	PDF 5
Technical coordinators	7	Staff functions; non-fault persons	PDF 5
The themes of children's policy	3	2023-2027	PDF 10
Themes of the Leader Strategy	3	organisational;	PDF 10
Themes of strategic direction marks	3	imports January 2024	PDF 10-11
Policy reporting	1	month; no fixed placement/case pattern	PDF 13
Controller Review	1	month; economic balance focus	PDF 13-14
Controller management follow-up	month / quarter	cadence	PDF 13
Review of proceedings	4	times / year	PDF 13-14
Coordinator at Control Meeting	2	times / year	PDF 14
District Head of Controller Meeting	1	time / year	PDF 14
Team meeting / case lighting	week / week	two special signboards;	PDF 14
External supervision	5	times / year	PDF 14
Saving forums	7	own count of seven bulletpoints;	PDF 14
Assessment of a safeguarding notification	24	hours; all cases assessed; number of notifications unknown	PDF 24
Yellow / green contact dimensions	14/14	days; followed by red	PDF 23
BFU deadline	4	months; incorrect start date causes an overrun	PDF 26
Personal supervision	2	times / year, reported minimum requirements	PDF 31
LATE PROGRESS	3	months, municipal description	PDF 32

The Task Force's documented criticism includes unprocessed expressions of concern, failures in abuse procedures, insufficient child/parent involvement, an incorrect start for the child welfare assessment deadline, outdated assessments and missing placement supervision/follow-up assessments. PDF 24-25 describes, among other things, sexual abuse with anxiety attacks without processing of a concern report, and digital abuse that the school reports only after the family contacts it. No aggregate union of errors can be formed from the examples. Management states that legality and quality supervision has been paused to await the Children's Act/Task Force, while financial controller checks continue (PDF 13). The source documents the basis for case processing and waiting time, but not actual return home, compensation or personal responsibility. TF's assessment of reconsideration arrangements (PDF 25) is retained as TF's specific assessment, not an independent legal conclusion derived from authority status.

HE25M - Herning midway status June 2025, presented 13.8.2025

Original: Herning midway status June 2025, submitted 13.8.2025. SHA-256 a6b3aac8e8adea11b08c106a3aab13821a13aaf392193d262d50634a167a55fa. 4 PDFs pages; read 1-4, the entire original. Organisational degrees and preliminary development control; no new case / person denominator.

All concrete counters, time and status levels

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Start of course	March 2024	municipal submission 29.5.2024 refers to April; phase / version difference	PDF 1
Development period	November 2024-June 2025	not full 2024 / 25 years	PDF 1
Thematic management oversight	2	reviews; case denominator unknown	PDF 3
Senior management oversight	4	reviews; case denominator unknown	PDF 3
Propulsion	high	Organisational	PDF 2
Relevant priorities	high	Organisational	PDF 2
Advice involvement	high	Organisational	PDF 2
Workflow support	someone	values / quality not yet incorporated	PDF 3
Management supervision	high	Organisational	PDF 3
Management action on results	high	Organisational	PDF 3
Challenge Management	not relevant to assess	no numeric zero	PDF 4
All recommendations are to be implemented	2025	municipal ambition; not result	PDF 2

TF does not yet see any significant change at case level (PDF 1). The management itself has seen the same cause problems and brought them into the development plan (PDF 4): concrete level of knowledge. Overall management supervision is being adapted to the requirements of the National Audit Office (PDF 2-3); no individual repair is provided.

HE26 - Herning Final Report May 2026, submitted 11.8.2026

Original: Herning Final Report May 2026, submitted 11.8.2026. SHA-256 b472d4413937db3e704f4515ab3bee5ea17912970725d19ed9ab6c25dceb1b13. 25 PDFs pages; read 1-25, the entire original; page PDF 8 separately visually controlled in memory. 2026 closure separately. Development November 2024-March 2026; nine development cases: 3 in April 2025,3 in September 2025,3 in February 2026. Not 9 new 2026 people. Dedup with baseline 12 not stated.

Control, self-reporting and time limits

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	Original location
Status meetings	6	organisational; 2. / 4. / 6.	PDF 4 / 24
Written development status	7	population other than 6 meetings;	PDF 5
Cases examined	3	April 2025 / September 2025 / February 2026	PDF 4
Case	9	3 at each meeting; not unique person-dedup	PDF 4 / 24
Development cases 2025	6	own sum 3 + 3; not 2026 cases	PDF 4 / 24
Development cases 2026	3	February 2026; non-full year	PDF 4 / 24
Self-evaluation themes	5	start / end, not individuals	PDF 5
Self-assessments / ICS measurements	2/2	start / end; respondent unknown	PDF 5
Competent ICS respondents	81	%; n unknown	PDF 11
Inadequate clothing	up to half	the same section; question / denominator relationship not clarified	PDF 11
Further follow-up offered	6-8	months; not yet an actual result	PDF 6
The course referred to as	approximately 1 year	calendar November 2024-March 2026 shall be maintained;	PDF 3 / 6
Children's House Mid-Term Meetings	2	times / year	PDF 13
Emergency review	1	time / year, planned	PDF 13
Long wait municipal border	2	months; schedule waiting time	PDF 19
§ 30 examples observed	0	no actual testing of the correct use;	PDF 20
Emergency equipment actually used	cannot be assessed;	No examples of rape / assault cases	PDF 14
Methodology / practice courses	1/1	adoption without consent / systematic; participant n unknown	PDF 24
Workshops	1/1/2	Quality / workflows / level supervision; own sum 4	PDF 24

The final review documents continuing unprocessed notifications and, in several cases, actual development of problems before notification (PDF 18). TF finds a lack of direct contact with children contrary to § 5, subsection3, and stresses the requirements for exceptions under subsection4 (PDF 16). PDF 20 describes long periods before support and interventions initiated without a documented decision. PDF 21-22 finds a continuing insufficient basis for follow-up, including missing provider status reports and assessment of duration/scope. Organisational improvements and municipal self-evaluation are separate evidence populations. The 81% competent ICS respondents and up to half insufficiently equipped cannot silently be combined or harmonised; the questions/respondents are not published here. Missing § 30 examples and missing preparedness examples mean that actual correction of these elements has not been checked. No individual return home/reunification, cessation of support, compensation or accountability response is stated.

Checked access and version control

Municipality / source	Test and result
Fredericia Baseline Original Track	The current FirstAgendaAPI26.1.2022 presentation has been read, but has no public annex list. WaybackCDXdomainfredericia.dk/,regexTask/analyserapport/forunders yielded the municipal page, archived 2.12.2022. The page has actually been read in RAM and describes the Task Force baseline in autumn 2021 with annex name 2022; link https://www.fredericia.dk/os2web/service/gf/v1/fc7cfda4-f598-ec11-a3ae-00505688ca1d is currently 404; exact CDX status 200/collapsedigest yielded 0 entries. Archive page https://web.archive.org/web/2022120206 3224id_/https://www.fredericia.dk/borger/familie-boern-unge/raadgivning-hjaelp-stoette/analyserapport-om-myndighedsarbejdet-paa-boern . Publication of the report at that time is documented;404 and CDX0 do not prove the absence of another public copy.
Tårnby baseline 2023	FirstAgenda 2023 searched using Task Force/Taskforce/analyse/Familierådgivning/kvalitet; all returned item and annex metadata checked. Analyse 54,Familierådgivning 16,kvalitet 62 results; the API may return more than limit 50 with MoreToBeSearched=false. The submission of 5.10.2023 has implementation plan ab 7 e 19 c 5-34 e 3-4 dcd-b 16 b-acf 7 c 6 a 3 ab 38,no central report. An exact web search for Tårnby Task Force analyserapport/oktober 2023 produced no report link. CDX status 200/prefix/filter original.*(ask|analyse|nalyser)*./collapse digest:taarnby.dk 428 candidates, no Task.?force/analyserapport match; dagsordener.taarnby.dk 0. This does not rule out other public copies.
Herning Central originals	The FirstAgenda agenda/annex API yielded analysis a 0 fd 4 b 71-49 d 6-4 c 63-97 ad-659 d 3057 c 6 f 6, midpoint 3 d 6 e 2 e 40-9 d 00-44 c 7-b 0 ad-e 139617635 cf and final 9109 b 2 cf-2 c 5 f-4 ed 4-ae 1 f-f 772 f 18 be 2 c 8. Lowercase /vis/pdf/bilag/{id}/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true with a RAM cookiejar yielded all three complete originals, 69 pages. No original saved.

Specific residual amount

Fredericia: Original baseline 2021 / 2022 with 20 cases' legal outcome table, 10VISOtake and exclusions are specifically identified via the municipal archive page, but the annex is not retrieved from the tested tracks. Document request to the municipality /Ankestyrelsen/ SBST: original PDF baggf-IDfc 7 cfda 4-f 598-ec 11-a 3 ae-00505688 ca 1 d, including method attachments and any new publication URL. End 2023 and follow-up Annex 2024 are fully read. No external request sent.

Tårnby: the original analysis report September 2023 with full method and original numbers missing after the exact tracks above. Against Tårnby Municipality, Social- og Boligstyrelsen and Ankestyrelsen on the report, the version received by the municipality and the specific published annex. Portal zero is no evidence of unpublication.

Vejen: documented person linkage between TF baseline 12, development sample 9 and the municipal samples 10/3; actual outcomes of the two concern reports to the Children’s Office.

Tårnby:outcome of the children’s office notification in 2026. Herning:ICS questions, respondent denominators and the relationship between 81% competent and up to half insufficiently equipped; person linkage between baseline 12 and development sample 9.

All four stages: individual decisions to resume, change of aid, return / reunification or cessation of action with date / duration, as well as actual compensation and liability. These legal consequences are not disclosed in the original texts read. They must be demanded as separate outcomes, not replaced by organisational improvements.

Egedal Child Disability: Full Original Control of Analysis Report April 2020

Original **ELEMAL20**: Egedal Analysis Report April 2020. SHA-256 c875b4ff8b2e47d9071d49302ea1b06efab142f2b5a5e29f17eae6ecdccc61f5.

All PDFs pages 1-119, full text control; PDF 6 / 7 / 50 / 76 also visually RAM-controlled. Former sub-control 49-81 is now completed and aligned, the same original and the same cohort.

Analysis September 2019-April 2020; legal measurement as a starting point 16.8.2017-16.8.2019; VISO November 2019; interviews 2019 / 2020.

Municipal selected cases, extracts, steps, document rules and organisational cadences; no national or municipal representative error rate.

Legal 20, child part take-off 8 and VISO 5 are recycled subsets. Submission rounds 20 / 15 / 5 / 1 are not 41 unique cases. No extra cohorts in 43 central courses.

Phases, sources and population limits

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
Reporting date	April 2020	not follow-up to the development process;	PDF 2 / 119
Period of analysis	September 2019-April 2020	non-calendar year statistics;	PDF 4
Analysis themes	7	organisational and factual themes;	PDF 4 / 117
Legal sample	20	cases submitted by municipalities;	PDF 49 / 116
Childhood / adolescent take-offs	8	of 20	PDF 50 / 76
Disability compensation only	12	remaining of 20	PDF 50
Social-work VISO sample	5	of 20; no further 5	PDF 95 / 116
VISO family treatment	2	out of 5; section 52, subsection 3, no. 3	PDF 95
Viso contact person	2	of 5; §52,subsection 3,point 6	PDF 95
Visos - both bets	1	out of 5; no.3/6	PDF 95
Age of children of VISO	12-17	years; five-case take-off	PDF 95
VISO measurement of § 41 / 42	0	only legal control in AS;	PDF 95
VISO time of check	November 2019	two years back from that date;	PDF 95
Material / self evaluation received	8.11.2019	not power control;	PDF 116-117
Theme Day	7.11.2019	staff / management dialogue;	PDF 117
Parental interviews	22.10.2019	number of parents / families not disclosed,	PDF 117
Group interviews	7.-8.1.2020	number of interviewees not disclosed,	PDF 117
Interview Groups	8	own count of original 8 groups	PDF 117
Additional material	30.1.2020	cooperation/assessment; six annex designations	PDF 115
Expected development status measurement	15	months later; not achieved here	PDF 118
Development status meetings	2	month interval, offered	PDF 117
Proposed learning pathways	2	offers, not implementation figures;	PDF 117

Original Table 1: Grant and Authorisation / Refusal

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
§ 41 Authorisation	1	8	PDF 50, visual
§ 41 Refusal	7	8	PDF 50, visual
§ 42 Authorisation	2	8	PDF 50, visual
§ 42 Refusal	6	8	PDF 50, visual
§ 44 cf. § 84 appropriation	1	4	PDF 50, visual
§ 44 See § 84 Refusal	3	4	PDF 50, visual
Total appropriation	4	20	PDF 50, visual
Total refusal / partial refusal	16	20	PDF 49-50 / 69
Cases concerning persons	3	20	PDF 49
Actual cases assessing additional expenses	7	20	PDF 49
Actual cases assessing earnings compensation	6	20	PDF 49
Actual relief cases	4	20	PDF 49

Legal outcomes and overlapping deficiencies

The outcome of the trial is hypothetical, not actual, complaints or return. Deficiencies and time can overlap. The original's 14 cases with legal shortcomings and the 20 wrong time limits for complaints are separate measurements. Own voting: at least one complaint-free error has been detected in each of the 20 cases examined; 20 + 14 must therefore never be used as 34 different cases. No person count is available.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
Legal deficiency	14	20	PDF 54 / 56
Hypothetical remittal for reconsideration	9	20	PDF 54
Hypothetical confirmation	11	20	PDF 54
Deficiency despite hypothetical confirmation	5	20	PDF 56
Hypothetical change / abrogation	0	all 9 would be remitted for reconsideration	PDF 54
Result-affecting § 41 cases	4	8	PDF 54
Result-affecting § 42cases	5	8	PDF 54
Result-affecting § 44 cases	0	4	PDF 52 / 54; estimating sub-rule 1 does not affect the result according to AS
Three types of deficiencies	3	20	PDF 56
Two types of deficiency	4	20	PDF 56
A deficiency type	7	20	PDF 56
Insufficient information	9	20	PDF 57
Deficiency of reasons	about one third	20	PDF 51 / 65; no exact integer portal
Party consultation deficit	4	20	PDF 51 / 66
Deficiency of residence	3	20	PDF 66

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
Wrong assessment	1	20	PDF 68
Wrong assessment cannot be checked	8	20	PDF 68; information gaps
Estimates under rule	1	20	PDF 69
Overall assessment achieved	16	20	PDF 71
Overall assessment is missing	4	20	PDF 71
Complaint guidance fulfils the FVL § 25	20	20	PDF 73
The time limit for bringing an action is contrary to RTL § 67	20	20	PDF 52 / 73
Appeal guidance where the finding is wholly in the party's favour - summary	3	summary of the original;	PDF 52
Appeal instructions where full relief is granted - main text/detail	4	the main text / retail of the original;	PDF 25 / 73
Wrong fixed time	15.00	all 20; digital no later than 23.59	PDF 73
Time-limit for infringement	11	20	PDF 73
Of which additional expenditure	5	8	PDF 73
Of which earnings	4	8	PDF 73
Of which relief	2	4	PDF 73
Time-limit breach interval	2-20	weeks	PDF 73
Average exceedance	8,5	weeks among 11	PDF 73
Written delay message	2	11	PDF 73
Message justifying the excess	0	of 2 messages	PDF 73
Overrun of established loss of legal status	1	11	PDF 73-74; not deployed
Parents not sufficiently involved	3	20	PDF 74; only the disability-compensation element
Follow-up specific information	3	20	PDF 74
Follow-up not disclosed	5	20	PDF 74
Follow up not applicable	12	20	PDF 75; Refusal

Original Table 2 and Child Case Guarantees

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
§ 52measure	5	20	PDF 76, visual
BFU without measure	0	20	PDF 76, visual
§ 11 Offer	2	20	PDF 76, visual
Other concerns without sufficient action	1	20	PDF 76, visual
Total Table 2	8	20	PDF 76, visual
Current BFU during the measurement period	2	5	PDF 77
BFU before the measurement period	2	5	PDF 77
Of which, still current, unmeasured	1	2	PDF 77
Of which obsolete	1	2	PDF 77; about 2,5 years old
BFU completely missing	1	5	PDF 77
BFU child interview met	2	2	PDF 77; BFU only
BFU reasoned position	2	2	PDF 77
Deadline of four months met	0	2	PDF 77
Four-month deadline not met	2	2	PDF 77
Wrong BFUs start in example	1	month later than AS determination	PDF 78
Same BFU exceedance	approximately 3,5	months	PDF 78
BFU completed before decision	1	2	PDF 78
Parallel support with BFU	1	2	PDF 78; Exemption from the requirement to complete BFU
Current action plans	5	5	PDF 78
Action plan before decision is missing	2	5	PDF 78
Example action plan after decision	3,5	weeks	PDF 78
§ 48 children's agreement met	1	5	PDF 78
§ 48 child interview not met	4	5	PDF 78
Conversation without specific measure	1	4	PDF 78
No conversation before decision	3	4	PDF 78
Example child without conversation	10	year; 1 specific family treatment case	PDF 78
§ 11 considered relevant	2	2	PDF 79; legal sample
Current aid assessed as appropriate / sufficient	8	8	PDF 79; at end of review
Self-handling cases set up	0	no § 65 case opened, not redress statistics	PDF 79

Submission, actual selection and exclusions

According to the municipality, refusals on eligibility grounds could not be provided in the requested number without appealed cases. The actual sample is therefore changed to 3/7/6/4 from the requested 8/4/4/4. Excluded decisions cannot be added as new errors or persons without their original outcomes.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
Desired persons	8	20	PDF 80; later specified: refusal
Desired additional cost measurement	4	20	PDF 80
Requested assessment of earnings compensation	4	20	PDF 80
Desired relief	4	20	PDF 80
Initial authorisation not more than	5	20	PDF 80
Fully granted at most	5	20	PDF 80
First submission	20	not a final sample	PDF 80
Of which positive persons	8	20	PDF 80; miscollected population
Wrong § 44 / 83population	1	20	PDF 80
Appeals against the first round	1	20	PDF 80
Outside the measurement period	2	20	PDF 80
Full relief in the first round	13	20	PDF 80; overlap with 8 positive persons unknown
Second submission	15	actions for damages;	PDF 80
Appeals against the second round	2	15	PDF 80
Complaint guidance errors possible late complaint	2	15	PDF 80; excluded from case measurement
Current AS-treated second round	1	15	PDF 80
Third submission	5	actions for damages;	PDF 81
Current AS-treated third round	1	5	PDF 81
Final action for damages	1	not 41 cases unikunion	PDF 81
Alleged / currently processed: registrations in the rounds	5	own sum 1 + 2 + 1 + 1; not unique cases / persons; identity coupling unknown	PDF 80-81
Complaint guidance errors sorted	2	second round; identity dedup with other unknown	PDF 80
VISA sub-take required	5	20	PDF 81; § 52 and special child-adult transition
Legal period of measurement	two years before 16.8.2019	cases need not have been pending for a full period of 2 years;	PDF 81
Previous AST decisions	excluded	the most recent decision of the municipality is checked;	PDF 81

Organisation, own practice and time / control cadence

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
Director of Local Government / other Directors	1/2	organisation; non-liability reactions	PDF 6, Figure 1
Centre of other Directors	3/4	professional / service centres are kept separate;	PDF 6
The enumerated functions of the Centre	7	own record of points;	PDF 6
Social team / Disability team	1/1	authority, children	PDF 6
Disability sub-teams	2	autism / others	PDF 6
Staff of the Centre	approx. 350	the entire centre, not disabled advisers;	PDF 7, Figure 2
Heads of Centre	1	the whole centre,	PDF 7, Figure 2
Head of Division	3	the whole centre,	PDF 7, Figure 2
Team leaders	15	the whole centre,	PDF 7, Figure 2
Organisational diagram dating	1.4.2020	Figure 2 indicates source March 2019; both dates are retained	PDF 7
Disability policy themes	4	2013 policy, initiatives towards 2016	PDF 9-10
Age of children policy	0-25	years; not age of analytical sample	PDF 11
The dogma of the Egemodell	5	organisational;	PDF 11
Egemodel implementation	2016-2019	the whole area;	PDF 11
Child Disability Model introduced / operated	2017/2019	Only § 50 / 52cases; not all § 41 / 42	PDF 12
Group meeting	1	once / week	PDF 16
Supervision according to self-evaluation	6	times / year	PDF 17
Supervision according to interview	no current	not equal to 6 actual	PDF 17
Inner tubes	4 to 6 weeks weekly	professional coordinator; mentoring abolished;	PDF 18
General management supervision	4	times / year, quarter; themed as needed	PDF 18
Cases per management supervision	approximately 10	interview information; no annual summary;	PDF 19
Involving network meetings	2	times / year, prevention / placement;	PDF 23
Authority / sparring	1	once / week	PDF 30
Authority / carries out cooperation meetings	2	times / year	PDF 30
Egemodel follow-up	4	times / year; only § 50 / 52cases	PDF 33
VISO actual effort follow-up	5	5	PDF 34 / 99; Action plans not regularly adjusted
VISO indicated action schedule interval	6	months; not satisfied in the sample	PDF 34 / 99

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
Transfer meeting age	17,5	year	PDF 38
Adult delivery age	18	year	PDF 38
Economic lists relevant ages	18/23	years; not number of persons	PDF 38
Interdisciplinary cooperation meetings	2	times / year	PDF 39
School / government leaders meet	1	time / month	PDF 39
School / authority sparring	1	once / week	PDF 39
Types of policy annual reports	5	own count; authority / execution, budget, audit, citizen's advisor, ASstatistics	PDF 44
Policy follow-up to the budget	3	times / year	PDF 44
Administrative economic follow-up	1	time / month; forecast quarterly	PDF 44
Economic orientation to employees	3	meetings / year	PDF 44
General management information for employees	1	time / year	PDF 45

Document rules, amounts and time limits - statements criticised, not actual citizens' outcomes

The amounts, ages and thresholds in this section are the verification of municipal documents' rule description 2019 / 20. They are not citizens, they are actually substitutes or present-day rates.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
Temporal standard calculation	1/8	minimum of standard amounts; AS criticism	PDF 101
Model distribution for two children	1 / 3 + 2 / 3 or ½ + ½	municipal text; AS requires calculation for each child	PDF 102
Local transport limit	2	km; AS rejects as a fixed rule of refusal less than 2 km	PDF 103
Local low rate of transport	2,05	kr / km; obsolete	PDF 103
Local car tariffs for disabled people	2,65	DKK / km; specific calculation required	PDF 103
Municipal tariff difference	0,60	kr / km	PDF 103
AS indicated 2019 transport tariff	1,98	DKK / km = 1,73 variable + 0,25 value loss	PDF 103
Hospital transport distance	50	km; historical rule reference	PDF 103
Local equalisation limit	24.000	km / year; insufficient individual assessment	PDF 104
Municipal countervailing charge	1.203	kr / year; explanation not validated by AS	PDF 104
Blood-sucking apparatus / own-account payment	60/40	per cent; distinction between assistive devices and treatment	PDF 104
Municipal diabetes startup	14	days TA; specific needs to be assessed	PDF 104
Local diabetes course limit	1	course by new diagnosis; AS requires concrete assessment	PDF 104
Municipal introduction to an insulin pump	3	days; AS requires concrete assessment	PDF 104
AS indicated medical fee	4.110	kr; historical control reference; not 2026 tariff	PDF 105

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
Municipality 2019 minimum limit	4.900	kr / year; AS records correct 4.945	PDF 106
AS indicated 2019 minimum limit	4.945	DKK / year	PDF 106
Rounding	100	kr; not that the minimum limit is divided by 100	PDF 102 / 106
Observed website limit	4.368	DKK / year, 2012 level	PDF 108
Municipal limit on frequency of checks	more than 6	times / year; AS requires concrete assessment of significant absences	PDF 108
Stated absence of case-law references	2-3	working days / year usually not significant; not fixed count	PDF 108 / 110
Local authority allocation start	1 following month	AS specifies the date of application	PDF 109
Load Degree Example	1 versus 2	fixed degree condition; illegal discretion under rule	PDF 109-110
Local hospital limit	more than 3-4	checks / year; AS requires specific care needs;	PDF 110
First follow-up	3	months, historical rule	PDF 106
Specified follow-up at a maximum later date	6	months, historical rule	PDF 106
Specified placement interview	2	times / year, history rule	PDF 106
The historical minimum limit of the law review	4.596	DKK / year, 2015- level; neither 2019- nor 2026-rate	PDF 86

Consistency / timeliness of the case, recycled examples

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
TA in case of lack of information: authorisation / application	10/37	hours / week; contact scale unknown	PDF 58-59
TA cessation before full need training	August 2019	parents want jobs October 2019; 37 hours / week	PDF 63 / 67
Same termination: municipal notice	3	months	PDF 63 / 67
Same termination: correct warning	14	weeks; hypothetical AS correction	PDF 63 / 67
Justification: care	7	hours, period not specified	PDF 65
The same case: Termination of TA	18	hours / week	PDF 65
The same case: termination of the procedure	10	hours / month	PDF 65
The same case: cessation of activity	2,5	hours / week	PDF 65
Beauty underrule: desired relief	2	weekends / month plus holidays	PDF 69
The same case: relief granted	36	day / year	PDF 69-70
The same case: replacement	6	hours / month	PDF 69-70
The same case: TA	37	hours / week	PDF 70
Same relief interpreted by AS	1 weekend / month + day	the formulation of the original; not own conversion;	PDF 70

The municipality's own modulation, separate from legal review

All eight items are indicated in the self-evaluation as to some extent. They are self-assessments without an informed respondent denominator or error / person count.

Item	Figures	Denominator/scope	PDF Page
Steering basis	to some extent	municipal self-evaluation; no error rate	PDF 9
Professional management and sparring	to some extent	municipal self-evaluation; no error rate	PDF 15
Assessment, evaluation and decision	to some extent	municipal self-evaluation; no error rate	PDF 21
Orders and action plans	to some extent	municipal self-evaluation; no error rate	PDF 28
Follow-up	to some extent	municipal self-evaluation; no error rate	PDF 33
Cooperation between regions and administrations	to some extent	municipal self-evaluation; no error rate	PDF 37
Transition from child to adult	to some extent	municipal self-evaluation; no error rate	PDF 37
Management information for management and development	to some extent	municipal self-evaluation; no error rate	PDF 43

Documented find

Documented legal findings: 14/20 union of deficiencies; 9/20 hypothetical remittals for reconsideration; 20/20 incorrect appeal time limits; 11/20 time-limit breaches. Deficiencies without a hypothetical overturning remain documented deficiencies. None of these is an actual appeal decision or return home.

VISO finds no documented child/parent involvement in concern reports, insufficiently investigated concerns dating back several years, termination of§52 support without an overall assessment, missing specifically recommended family treatment, deficient action plans and irregular adjustment of objectives(PDF96-100). Professional follow-up in all 5 cases is a different measure from timely statutory action-plan follow-up.

In fact, loss of benefits in kind: 1 out of 11 temptations affects the legal position because relief is not initiated and cannot be delivered retroactively (PDF 73- 74). The source does not indicate the length of each delay or actual compensation. The loss of support period must therefore be demanded separately.

The review of materials documents outdated/unlawfully fixed rules on transport, assessment of amounts, start dates and degree of burden (PDF 101-110). The review does not cover all municipal materials; the adult additional-expense section is expressly not examined (PDF 101/105). The number of citizens affected by each documentary rule is not stated.

Precise original inconsistencies

PDF 52 summary: 3 instances of appeal guidance for findings wholly in the party’s favour; PDF 25/73 detail: 4. Both original values are retained.

PDF 95 / 97: VISO 5 cases have BFU, several outside the measurement period; PDF 77: Legal § 52- sub-take 5 has 1 completely missing BFU. VISO has been selected from 20 with § 52 using method PDF 81, but identity / time has not been published; no required harmonisation.

PDF 79:the 2 § 11 cases in the legal review are assessed as relevant; PDF 98:VISO discusses concurrent § 11 intervention in § 52 courses with expected longer-term need. Different case/decision elements; no erroneous inference of 2 additional cases involving errors.

PDF 116 mentions analysis of the adult-disability sector, but the same page states a legal review of 20 child-disability cases and the entire main text/annexes concern children. The template conflict does not change the verified child population.

PDF 7 Figure 2: Organisation per. 1.4.2020 but source March 2019. The figure approximately 350 / 1 / 3 / 15 is the entire organisational data of the Centre, not the child disability population or the fault population.

PDF 17 self-evaluation 6 annual supervision; interview: no current. Plan / cadence is not actually completed activity.

Own analysis and strongest durable requirements

Our analysis: known errors are documented on an individual decision basis, while the main report's positive overall assessments rely on other methods, including interviews and five reused VISO cases. No positive organisational description documents reopening of the nine decisions that would be remitted following review or replaces the lost periods of support.

Own analysis: The sample excludes appealed/already considered decisions and two appeal-guidance errors that could allow a late appeal. At the same time,20 incorrect time-of-day deadlines are found in the retained sample. Exclusions are therefore necessary to describe the scope, but their errors/people cannot be counted without original individual examination.

Specific requirements for further documentation: Egedal Kommune /Ankestyrelsen/ The Danish Social Security Agency should be able to connect the 20 measurement cases to actual resumption, new decisions, payment or delivered relief with dates and loss time. The 15-month status measurement shall be identified and read if available; the April 2020 report is baseline and does not prove later implementation.

Specific residues and hypotheses

No unread pages in this 119-page original. Later status measurement after 15 months / end of development and actual individual repair is not included in the original.

Identity coupling between 20 / 8 / 5 and submission rounds, number of parents / families interviewed and citizens affected by standard rules have not been published here.

Suspicions, not new evidence: number of additional refusals / persons affected by the general document rules found and whether they were actually resumed. No national extrapolation.

Frederikssund: adult disability, the entire Task Force original 2022

All 133 physical PDFs pages are actually text read in memory; Table 1 (PDF62) is also visually controlled. This is the adult scheme. It does not close the separate children's original 2021 in the 43-course directory. No official original or original image is stored locally.

Legal sample 18; VISO5 subset. The original states both 5 of 18(main methodology) and 5 of 20(VISO annex). The refusal denominator of 12 in the appeal-guidance section conflicts with table 1’s 8 full+2 partial=10. Selection ceilings of 2 under§97/7 full grants differ from an actual 3/8. All versions retained; no artificial harmonisation.

Controlled figures and own roll-call votes

T1 performance × result

Indicator	Counter / v value	Denomination	Unit	Period	Locator	Limitation
§ 96 · Authorisation	0	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 96 · Partial refusal	0	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 96 · Full refusal	1	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
Section 96 · Total	1	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 97 · Authorization	0	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 97 · Partial refusal	0	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 97 · Full refusal	3	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§97 · Total	3	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
85 · Authorization	3	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 85 · Partial refusal	2	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 85 · Full refusal	3	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 85 · Total	8	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 107 / 108 / AB L105 · Authorisation	5	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 107 / 108 / AB L105 · Partial refusal	0	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 107 / 108 / AB L105 · Full refusal	1	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
§ 107 / 108 / AB L105 · Total	6	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually

Indicator	Counter / v value	Denomination	Unit	Period	Locator	Limitation
Total · Appropriations	8	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
Total · Partial refusal	2	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
Total · Full refusal	8	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually
Total	18	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF62	Original all 20 cells; sums matched, physical table visually

T2 themes and denominators

Indicator	Counter / Bedi	Denomination	Unit	Period	Locator	Limitation
Called	20	Not available	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF90	Target population not actually received
Measured legal	18	20	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF91	Not possible to obtain 20 suitable; two are target deficiency, undocumented number of dissorted
Legal deficiencies, Union	13	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF65	At least one; no additional coincidence with sub-categories
Competency	4	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF65	
Justification error	11	15	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF68	3 fully beneficiary omitted from relevance N
Justification error in authorisation	5	11	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF68	
Rejection of reasons	6	11	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF68	
Authorisation without a borehole for bid staff assessment	2	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF68	
Authorisation without type / extent of aid	3	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF68	
Decision only to the executor	2	6	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF69	
Principle practice not applied	2	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF70	
Principle practice pending due to information	1	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF70	
Insufficient information	4	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF73	
Of which, at the same time, error of reasoning	3	4	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF73	Exact known intersection; other overlaps not known
Party consultation error registered	0	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF30	Zero in selected investigation, not national legality
Estimates under rule registered	0	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF30	

Indicator	Counter / Bedi	Denomination	Unit	Period	Locator	Limitation
Consent / guardianship points in the main summary	4	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF31	1 cannot consent; 1 consent unsubstantiated; 2 security needs not investigated
Residential services without consent	1	4	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF31	
Residential offers with unexplained consent	1	4	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF31	
Guardian requirements not studied	2	4	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF31	
Unexplained informed consent, Annex category	2	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF74	Stronger category than Main Summary 4; non-automatically identical classifications
Free choice not studied	2	4	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF67	Within the scope of the Section 4; non-autonomous population
Complaint guidance refusal, source denominator	12	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF76	The original's prose 12 refusal is contrary to T1 8 + 2 = 10; keep the deviation
No complaint guidance, refusal	2	12	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF77	
Lack of guidance, other refusals	10	12	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF77	12 − 2, category of the original
Optional authorisation guidance incorrect	5	8	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF76	Funding 8 from T1; not add up to 12 as 17 unique
Deadline exceeded	9	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF84	relevant 15; 9 / 15 = 60%; 9 / 18 = 50% different populations
Not applicable	3	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF85	1 follow-up + 2 pre-adult / post-ear transition
Before the published deadline	6	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF85	
Paragraph 85	5	9	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF84	
Paragraph 97	2	9	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF84	

Indicator	Counter / Bedi	Denomination	Unit	Period	Locator	Limitation
Paragraph 96	1	9	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF84	
Late offers	1	9	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF84	
Written Time Warning	0	9	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF85	
Lowest exceedance	1	9	weeks	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF84	Weeks, not 1 case
Maximum exceedance	43	9	weeks	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF84	Week, not 43 cases
Average exceedance	13	9	weeks	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF84	Weeks; not averages all 18
Action plan offered	5	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF86	
Action plan not offered	5	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF86	
Action plan offers not applicable	8	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF86	Refusal
Prepared from among the offers	0	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF86	
No explanation for non-drafting	4	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF86	
Awaiting 18 years by action plan	1	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF86	
Target group without offers	4	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF86	4 of 5 without offers
Lack of offers because the citizen lives at home	1	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF86	
No overall assessment	12	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF87	
Follow-up documented	4	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF89	
Follow-up not documented	5	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF89	
Follow up not applicable	9	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF89	Refusal / cessation; relevant N = 9
VISO actually reviewed	5	18	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF130	Main method 5 of 18; Annex PDF108 says 5 of 20, numbers 2 / 6 / 11 / 15 / 19
VISO Annex Committee denominator	20	Not available	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF108	Past version deviation, not 20 measured legally

Indicator	Counter / Bedi	Denomination	Unit	Period	Locator	Limitation
VISO § 107 → § 108	2	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF108	
VISO § 108 + § 104	1	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF108	
VISO ABLhjem + § 85	1	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF109	
VISO at home + § 85	1	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF109	
VISO transition child / adult	1	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF109	
VISO guardianship	2	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF109	
VISO medical / slidenostic original material	1	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF111	Other material may repeat diagnostic claims
VISO specialist psychological assessment	2	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF111	
VISO Action Plan prepared	0	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF113	
VISO action plan in writing offered	5	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF113	Tenders, inter alia, decision content; actual oral communication not verified
VISO order attached	1	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF113	Target assessment is based only on this 1
VISO all pension	5	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF114	
VISO chronic treatment, in particular coordination	2	5	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF114	

T3 method / time / norm

Indicator	Counter / Vae rdi	Denomination	Unit	Period	Locator	Limitation
Analysis Start	2021-09-0 1	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF5	
Analysis finished	2022-03-3 1	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF5	
Decision-making	2019-05-1 0	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF91	New cases are preferred
Decision	2021-08-1 0	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF91	Not all 2019-21
COVID omitted from	2020-03-1 7	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF91	
COVID omitted to	2020-06-1 8	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF91	
VISO case reading from	2021-10-2 9	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF108	
VISO case reading for	2021-11-1 9	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF108	
Materials and self-evaluation transmitted	2021-11-0 5	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF131	The documented level of knowledge of the management
Theme Day	2021-10-2 7	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF131	
Citizens' interview	2021-10-2 1	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF131	Repeated in annexes; not 2 interview cohorts
Group interview from	2021-12-0 7	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF131	
Group interview for	2021-12-0 8	Not applicable / information	date	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF131	
§ 85 Call for proposals	10	20	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF90	Ceiling, not actually 8
Article 107	7	20	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF90	Ceiling
§ 97 Call for proposals	2	20	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF90	In fact 3 iT1, out selection deviation see

Indicator	Counter / Vae rdi	Denomination	Unit	Period	Locator	Limitation
§ 108 / ABL105	3	20	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF90	Ceiling
§ 96 Call for proposals	1	20	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF90	
Call mak s fully granted	7	20	cases	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF90	In fact 8 iT1;
Professional leader waxant	2	Not applicable / information	year	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF9	No exact start date; no 2 cases
Competencebuildi ng modules	4	Not applicable / information	modules;	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF21	Norm / Competent System, not actually correct decisions
Audit interval	6	Not applicable / information	months	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF22	VUM / Cura; non-permanent legal management supervision
Journalisationn worm	5	Not applicable / information	working days;	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF41	Standard; unmeasured duration of proceedings
Status norm before follow-up	14	Not applicable / information	days	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF41	Norm, not actually all status received
Example continuous follow-up since	2011	Not applicable / information	year	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF114	Every 2 years; booking since 2016
Example Follow-up Interval	2	Not applicable / information	year	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF114	Only one case
Example Order Page	2016	Not applicable / information	year	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF114	Not new cohorts
Cleaning aid	2020-02	Not applicable / information	month	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF88	FSA-C06
Replacement allowance granted	2020-11	Not applicable / information	month	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF88	§ 83 a; actual startup unknown
Cleaning hole monthly	9	Not applicable / information	months	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF88	Own calendar difference, exact days and physical help unknown
Transitional internal meeting before 18 years	9	1	months	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF115	FSA-C07; undated previous note not exact date of meeting

Indicator	Counter / Vae rdi	Denomination	Unit	Period	Locator	Limitation
Transitional invitation to tender meeting before 18 years	4	1	months	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF115	Professionals only; homelessness and no family leave documented
Planned balance sheet after analysis	15	Not applicable / information	months	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF132	Future concept; annex erroneous child disability in adult report, no actual status original here
BPA workflow standard	5	Not applicable / information	kr / hour	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF118	2018 level, standard not actual personal payment
Accompanying scheme maximum	15	Not applicable / information	hours / month	2019-2021; Analysis report March 2022	PDF101	Legal standard, not actually allocated auxiliary time

Evidence chains and real consequences

Local case reference	Original	Specific action / omission	Meaning and necessary level of evidence
FSA-C01 · Moving / living offers	PDF66-67	Consciousness, jurisdiction and the circle of persons were not sufficiently tested; there was no municipal competence.	Actual date of removal and physical stay not published; FRH verification and, if applicable, invalidity shall be proved.
FSA-C02 · Accompanying refusal, cognitive level described as 6 years	PDF66 / 75	Need for guardianship/consent not investigated; a later financial-administration agreement does not alter the duty.	Level 6 years is the description of the report, not the actual age of the citizen; the repetition is the same.
FSA-C03 · § 85 refusal awaits rehabilitation	PDF69	Only the exporter received a decision; current assistance is assumed to be replaced by future recovery.	Request for a decision to the citizen / representative and assessment of assistance now.
FSA-C04 · BPA refusal	PDF69 / 88	Accompanying needs could, according to the Authority, be met elsewhere, but other aid not granted at the same time.	The grounds for refusal do not actually demonstrate compensated needs.
FSA-C05 · Physical function reduction / bed 2 floor	PDF70-74	§ 85 / § 97 refusal and insufficient objective information on specific function.	Can be the same citizen across examples; no extra person sum.
FSA-C06 · Cleaning aid without compensation	PDF88	§ 85 end February 2020; § 83 a first granted November 2020.	Documented multi-month uncompensated needs; not only slow administrative expedition.
FSA-C07 · Played young, comprehensive disability, transition 18 years	PDF115	Outside consent, family return wish, no formal transition plan; family participation not demonstrated.	The information triggers the verification of continued residence and family life; actual return and legality are not determined by this report alone.
FSA-C08 · Residence offers granted without start-up	PDF89	Suitable temporary accommodation offer not yet found; no start date.	Authorisation is not delivery; intermediate help and actual stay require subsequent documentation.

The local references are the report's own tracking keys, not municipal journal ID. They do not constitute 8 proven different persons. Identity between examples and between VISO / legal material is only used when the text itself connects them.

Independent legal assessment and requirements

A decision, physical delivery and redress are three different events. Assistance in the cleaning case ceased before replacement assistance was awarded; a later new award does not remove the documented intervening loss. The citizen's specific loss, actual assistance in the intervening period and arrears/damages tracks must be examined in contemporaneous decisions and delivery records.

Movements, valid consent, free choice and effective participation by parties are independent guarantees. Inability to participate makes adapted participation and legal representation more necessary. The transition to adult rules requires the demonstration of the new basis of residence and assistance; the previous intervention and an internal meeting are not in themselves sufficient legal basis.

The demands are therefore: lawful fresh examination, access to the original basis of decisions/consent/guardianship, immediate provision for current assistance needs and documentation of actual cessation or redress. Individual criminal/disciplinary responsibility requires identification of the links in decision-making and knowledge; the report must not be converted into an undocumented number of culpable employees.

Limits and residues

The fully read original ends this specific reading hole. It does not contain national persons, exact number of discards, subsequent return, actual relief, sanction or compensation. Planned 15-month status is not an actual follow-up. The original's final annex refers to child disability in an adult report; this metadata deviation is retained.

Sorø: children's analysis 2024 and final report 2026, full originals

Both originals are now actually text read: 42 + 27 pages. Interview Table 2024PDF40 is also visually controlled. 2026 is separate after 20 years.12 baseline cases are repeated in 2026; 9 status readings are 3 rounds of 3 cases, not a documented union of 9 new children.

All controlled figures, timescales and organisational targets

Source	Indicator	Value	Denomination	Unit	Locator	Limitation
TFSOROE24	Assessment of cases	12	Not available / relevan t	cases	PDF3	Non-representativ e local government
TFSOROE24	§ 52 bets	9	12	cases	PDF6	Law of the child 32 / 46
TFSOROE24	§ 11 Preventive	3	12	cases	PDF6	Law of the child 30
TFSOROE24	Installation	3	12	cases	PDF35	Sub-volume 12
TFSOROE24	Do not systematically monitor 2 / year on-site	2	3	cases	PDF35	Town hall interview and executive assistant are specific points
TFSOROE24	Determined problem not assessable	2	3	§ 11 Cases	PDF32	Data insufficient; children continue to be dissatisfied with the autumn
TFSOROE24	§ 11 complex case without relevant BFU	1	3	§ 11 Cases	PDF33	Year of notification; first mentioned
TFSOROE24	The children's office informed	3	12	cases	PDF33	Final May 2024; not 3 proven openings / decisions
TFSOROE24	Date of decision expressed as effect	2	3	housing case r	PDF32	Real date of decision must be used; not physical date proof of prior participation
TFSOROE24	Interview Groups	4	Not available / relevan t	interviews;	PDF40	
TFSOROE24	Advisers	6	20	interviewing persons;	PDF40	
TFSOROE24	Senior management	2	20	interviewing persons;	PDF40	
TFSOROE24	Exporter area	7	20	interviewing persons;	PDF40	
TFSOROE24	General area	5	20	interviewing persons;	PDF40	
TFSOROE24	Interviews total	20	Not available / relevan t	persons	PDF40	Staff interview persons, not citizens with errors
TFSOROE24	Application	2023-11-14	Not available / relevan t	date	PDF5	
TFSOROE24	Data collection from	2024-04	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF3	
TFSOROE24	Data collection for	2024-08	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF3	
TFSOROE24	Overpage dating	2024-10	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF1	

Source	Indicator	Value	Denomination	Unit	Locator	Limitation
TFSOROE24	Kolofondating	2024-11	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF42	Data oversessions are kept
TFSOROE24	Planned forerun	2026	Not available / relevan t	year	PDF5	Not actual repair
TFSOROE24	Specialised teams closed	4	Not available / relevan t	teams;	PDF5	2023 organisation
TFSOROE24	New age groups	2	Not available / relevan t	groups	PDF5	Unfed -10 and 11-18 (23)
TFSOROE24	Part-time co-ordinator closed	4	Not available / relevan t	Functions	PDF5	
TFSOROE24	Full-time coordinator set up	1	Not available / relevan t	function	PDF5	Non-fault / citizen poulation
TFSOROE24	Pedagogical guide marks	10	Not available / relevan t	bearing marks,	PDF11	2015 basis
TFSOROE24	Intended follow-up course frequency	2	Not available / relevan t	pr̊ar	PDF11	Plan not documented fact keeping
TFSOROE24	Resourcelandsk ab zones	5	Not available / relevan t	zones;	PDF12	The minimum effort concentration shall not delay correct help;
TFSOROE24	Additional expenditure / TAF-rev	10	Not available / relevan t	cases / round	PDF15	Only this area, not all bets
TFSOROE24	Objectives of case review	6-8	Not available / relevan t	weeks	PDF15	Do not measure actual delay time
TFSOROE24	Sparring	1	Not available / relevan t	meeting / week	PDF15	Organisational lighting
TFSOROE24	§ 30 Interface Ceiling	10	Not available / relevan t	conversations;	PDF18	Internorthernline m
TFSOROE24	Emergency approval	2024-06-19	Not available / relevan t	date	PDF19	Submitted and public 30 July version different
TFSOROE24	Emergency publication controlled	2024-07-30	Not available / relevan t	date	PDF19	
TFSOROE24	Pupil treatment is delayed.	3	Not available / relevan t	months	PDF27	Allegedly forgotten start-up schedule, causative statements
TFSOROE24	Notification → un gessamtale	2	Not available / relevan t	months	PDF28	One specific case
TFSOROE24	BFU Decision → f	2	Not available / relevan t	year	PDF29	The same example is repeated PDF36; in no 2 cases
TFSOROE24	Family treatment real decision	2023-10	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF32	Almost 3 m later the business ended incorrectly as the decision date

Source	Indicator	Value	Denomination	Unit	Locator	Limitation
TFSOROE24	Failed date shift	almost 3	Not available / relevan t	months	PDF32	The imprecise range of the original
TFSOROE24	Family treatment startup	2023-10	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF35	Sexualiserenda drycase
TFSOROE24	No follow-up yet	2024-05 start	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF35	Cumulative duration
TFSOROE24	Without follow-up since action	7	Not available / relevan t	months	PDF35	Source 7; exact days unknown
TFSOROE26	Development period from	2024-04	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF3	
TFSOROE26	Development period to	2026-04	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF3	
TFSOROE26	Status meetings	6	Not available / relevan t	meetings;	PDF5	
TFSOROE26	Review of proceedings	3	Not available / relevan t	rounds	PDF5	May 25 / Oct 25 / Mar 26
TFSOROE26	Total reading	9	Not available / relevan t	case handling;	PDF5	3 round; dedup not lit
TFSOROE26	Local status	7	Not available / relevan t	status documents;	PDF5	Not 7 Outcome
TFSOROE26	Self-evaluation	5	Not available / relevan t	themes	PDF5	
TFSOROE26	Proposed follow-up meeting after completion	6-8	Not available / relevan t	months	PDF6	Future offers, unrealised termination
TFSOROE26	Statement by the municipality	2026-05-06	Not available / relevan t	date	PDF9	Reported in full read end original; statement not independently original downloaded
TFSOROE26	Management supervision generally	1	Not available / relevan t	Prkvartal	PDF11	Kommunalnormsi on 2025
TFSOROE26	Temporal	2	Not available / relevan t	prår	PDF11	
TFSOROE26	Additional advisers	5	Not available / relevan t	staff	PDF12	Capacity not responsible 5 errors
TFSOROE26	Additional coordinators	2	Not available / relevan t	staff	PDF12	
TFSOROE26	District advisors	2025 Spring	Not available / relevan t	period	PDF14	The municipality recognises previous organisationlaw and general action too long
TFSOROE26	Reassessment work in effect	2026-02	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF18	Actual quality not measured by re-assessment

Source	Indicator	Value	Denomination	Unit	Locator	Limitation
TFSOROE26	Status 6 cases	3	Not available / relevan t	cases	PDF19	Initial procedure, no verification plan / opf
TFSOROE26	Internal proceedings	6	Not available / relevan t	weeks	PDF21	Non-regulatory follow-up
TFSOROE26	Installation fees	2	Not available / relevan t	staff	PDF21	AnsatJun 25
TFSOROE26	Start of installation	2025-06	Not available / relevan t	month	PDF21	
TFSOROE26	ICSmethod course	2025 Spring	Not available / relevan t	period	PDF26	
TFSOROE26	Children's interview ode course	2025	Not available / relevan t	period	PDF26	
TFSOROE26	Systematic practice course	2024	Not available / relevan t	period	PDF26	
TFSOROE26	Workshop Quality	1	Not available / relevan t	workshop	PDF26	
TFSOROE26	Workshop workflow	1	Not available / relevan t	workshop	PDF26	
TFSOROE26	Workshop development plan / supervision	2	Not available / relevan t	workshops	PDF26	
TFSOROE26	Case Review Status 2	3	Not available / relevan t	reading;	PDF26	May 25
TFSOROE26	Review of cases Status 4	3	Not available / relevan t	reading;	PDF26	Oct 25
TFSOROE26	Review of cases Status 6	3	Not available / relevan t	reading;	PDF26	Mar 26

Specific source and impact chains

Local track	Original	Action and consistency
SB24-01	TFSOROE24 PDF27	School asked to avoid the concern-report label; severe neglect; concerns registered without activating safeguards. No formal requirements for concern reports. Number affected across the municipality unknown.
SB24-02	TFSOROE24 PDF27	Childhouse start 3 months late; start-up form allegedly forgotten; delayed trauma treatment, simultaneous concrete acts and actual start date remainder.
SB24-03	TFSOROE24 PDF29 / 36	BFU2 years of decision; same case repeated; proof of time not counted twice.
SB24-04	TFSOROE24 PDF35	Family treatment for 7 months without follow-up; sexualised behaviour; known concern and no timely review of effects. May overlap the Børnehus case; no person total.
SB26-01	TFSOROE26 PDF14	Municipally acknowledged previous unlawful organisation; district advisers without authority-facing functions until spring 25; children required to remain in mainstream interventions. The denominator for individual errors/losses is not stated.

Independent judicial review

Changing the label on an expression of concern does not change its content or the statutory duty to act. The documented trail shows why the number of registered concern reports cannot measure all known risks: the municipality may receive knowledge without activating the registration and safeguard process counted by the statistics. At the same time, responsibility must be linked to specific receipt, decision and omission; an assumed union of people must not be constructed.

A written procedure and a completed development process prove neither timely actual assistance nor redress for earlier losses. The final report primarily examines initial processing; reassessment practice, the quality of plans and follow-up have not been independently measured afterwards. The known period of harm/risk therefore does not automatically end at the report's closure. The demand is for examination against the originals of the three referrals to the children's office, actual assistance and supervision, correction of every failure of safeguards, and specific losses and responsibility.

Checks carried out and precise residues

No unread page in these 42+27 pages. Final own-initiative outcomes of three children's office referrals, the municipal statement of 6.5.26 and current links to delivery/redress/persons have not been obtained.

2024 front page October and colophon November to be preserved. 2026 distinguishes the municipality's 6.5.26 self-statement from the Task Force's own 3 status 6 cases. The fact that the workflow entered into force February 26 has not measured compliance. Internal indicative deadlines cannot replace legal deadlines; source 2026PDF24 points to this difference.

Copenhagen 2020: full control of the status original

All 48 physical pages have been read as text. Tables 1 and 2 PDF20 have been visually reconciled in RAM. Baseline 20, status 19 and VISO10 are different or nested measurements. The municipality's own account is not independent evidence of redress.

Indicator	Counter / Worth i	Denomination	Unit	Locator	Limitation
Child inadequately involved	3	10	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
Inadequate involvement of parents	0	11	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
§ 48 not fulfilled	3	10	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
BFU missing	0	11	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
BFU update missing	1	11	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
BFU less than 4 months	2	6	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
BFU-based position missing	4	10	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
BFU not completed before decision	0	7	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
Action plan missing	3	10	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue

Indicator	Counter / Worth i	Denomination	Unit	Locator	Limitation
Action plan not before decision	3	5	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
Action relevance not assessable	1	19	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
3 Months Follow-Up Wrong	3	4	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
6 Months Follow-Up Wrong	2	4	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
Improper personal supervision	1	4	cases	PDF20	Original Table 1; mentions are only relevant cases for this issue
New location § 52 nr 7	3	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF20	Original Table 2; four previous locations are measured only on follow-up
Family treatment § 52 No 3	4	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF20	Original Table 2; four previous locations are measured only on follow-up
Relief clause 52 No 5	2	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF20	Original Table 2; four previous locations are measured only on follow-up
Contact person § 52 nr 6	2	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF20	Original Table 2; four previous locations are measured only on follow-up
§ 11 Consultant	4	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF20	Original Table 2; four previous locations are measured only on follow-up
Follow-up prior placement	4	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF20	Original Table 2; four previous locations are measured only on follow-up
Total	19	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF20	Original Table 2; four previous locations are measured only on follow-up
0-3 years	2	19	cases / age of child	PDF20	
4 to 7 years	1	19	cases / age of child	PDF20	
8 to 14 years	8	19	cases / age of child	PDF20	
15 to 17 years	8	19	cases / age of child	PDF20	
Baseline	20	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF2	April 2018 analysis, legal 2017 basis; not a new 19 population
Baseline units	2	5	units	PDF2	Not the whole municipality
Status	19	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF2	Non-representative
VISOstatus	10	19	cases	PDF2	Sub-quantity

Indicator	Counter / Worth i	Denomination	Unit	Locator	Limitation
VISOfollow-up	4	10	cases	PDF14	The citizens' plan is assumed; original targets not seen
Measurement period from	2019-01-23	Not available / applicable	date	PDF18	
Measurement period to	2019-12-31	Not available / applicable	date	PDF18	
New BFU	6	11	cases	PDF22	
Updated BFU	4	11	cases	PDF22	
BFUactuality correct	10	11	cases	PDF22	1 old BFU not updated by new support
BFU timely	4	6	cases	PDF23	2 late approx 1 month each
BFU acute / provisional excluded prior to decision	3	10	cases	PDF23	7 relevant, all 7 timely
Plan drawn up	7	11	cases	PDF24	1 acute excluded shortfalls (4 months) outside the measurement period
Plan before decision except acute	2	7	cases	PDF24	5 relevant
Pre-decision plan timely	2	5	cases	PDF24	
Lack of plan with second action plan	2	3	cases	PDF24	Incorrect plan of measured effort
Baseline missing plan	2	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF24	Relevant denominator not disclosed here
§ 11 needs covered	3	4	cases	PDF25	1 complex effort should be made by the other provision
Total effort assessed relevant	18	19	cases	PDF25	Professional assessment by the Board of Appeal
The children's office informed	1	19	cases	PDF25	Reference for § 65; actual opening / decision not shown
First follow-up 7 m after placement	7	Not available / applicable	months	PDF26	One case; 4 months overrun at 3 m
6 months	2	4	cases	PDF26	One of the two has lack of hazard involvement; table is time class
Special Forces	5	19	cases	PDF27	Not separate personal union
Special attention	2	19	cases	PDF27	Non-exhaustive error union
VISO knowingly no child conversation	2	10	cases	PDF29	11 years of violence + teen cases; violence repeated PDF27
Management supervisory board has since autumn 17	6	Not available / applicable	rounds	PDF33	The same cases are repeated at four levels of management
Cases per adviser per supervision	1	Not available / applicable	Case	PDF33	Not number of unique advisors enlightened

Indicator	Counter / Worth i	Denomination	Unit	Locator	Limitation
Supervisory matters	ca 140	Not available / applicable	questions	PDF34	Not cases
Supervision of Aug 18	2	Not available / applicable	prår	PDF34	Quarterly past
Exercise of competence	3	Not available / applicable	months	PDF36	First half of 2018
Training days	6	Not available / applicable	days	PDF36	
Commune assumed power delay	6-10	Not available / applicable	months	PDF36	Non-lawful deferral of guarantees
Network baseline error	80	Not available / applicable	%	PDF38	No N
Network Fourth Oversight Error	44	Not available / applicable	%	PDF38	No N
Network Sixth Supervision Error	31	Not available / applicable	%	PDF38	No N
Pilot project	68	Not available / applicable	families	PDF39	One year; separate pilot population, not 19 cases of error
Network courses ordered	3	Not available / applicable	courses;	PDF39	1 held in autumn 19,2 postponed to the 2nd half of 20
Security plan monitoring targets	25	Not available / applicable	%	PDF40	By 2019 starts, N not disclosed
Safety plan effective supervision	28	Not available / applicable	%	PDF40	Sep 19 municipal own supervision, no N; TFF has not assessed safety plans
Intended to be reviewed	5	Not available / applicable	cases	PDF41	Spring 20 plan, not actual control
Employees	approx. 2000	Not available / applicable	staff	PDF43	Not malfunctioning or citizens
Newsletter	14	Not available / applicable	days / interval	PDF43	Autumn 19 start
Planned baseline	67	Not available / applicable	%	PDF45	Local self-assessment, N not disclosed
Plan end	84	Not available / applicable	%	PDF45	No N
Citizen involvement plan baseline	78	Not available / applicable	%	PDF45	No N
Citizens' involvement plan end	92	Not available / applicable	%	PDF45	No N
Teaching / training programmes	6	Not available / applicable	benefits;	PDF47	Last item planned 2020

Concrete source chains

Local track, not person ID	Locator	Consistency and proof
K20-C01	PDF21	Contact person refused at the child's request; just under 1 year later an award without a current child interview. No actual delivery date.
K20-C02	PDF25-26	PsykiatriNov 19 warns of serious risk; contact person found 29Jan 20, new notification on the same day of insufficient support. § 65 reference has not been proven.
K20-C03	PDF27	Fog exposure known 10 d prior to acute placement; previous concerns. No original physical location / return date.
K20-C04	PDF27 / 29	11 year old tells about violence; counselor fails conversation with reference to alleged withdrawal, which has not been recorded. Same case in Visos division.
K20-C05	PDF29	Teenager with pregnancy plans and referred to suicide attempts; child interview failed to be assessed by parents. Original health / conversation act not provided.

Independent review

The absence of a current child interview, an undated assessment and missing follow-up deprive the child of specific safeguards: the support decided upon is not examined in time against the child's current needs. Here, one case shows a known serious psychiatric risk while relevant support continues to be requested after the measurement period. This requires obtaining contemporaneous records and actual delivery; a report's referral to the Children's Office ends neither the risk period nor the accountability track.

Supervision percentages without a denominator cannot be converted into citizen counts. The same three errors concerning children's involvement must not be counted twice. Development recommendations and planned training do not change the time-bound statutory duty in each case. The demands are individual correction, a current needs assessment, actual support and documented remediation of loss; a union of individuals, invalidity and criminal responsibility require the specific records.

Control status and sources

No unread page in this 48-page original. The 2018 baseline original, individual records, § 65 closure, actual assistance/redress and sanction processes are not documented by this status report.

TFKK20F, PDF1-48; visual control PDF20; SHA256 04801ae999015a3a877286648d5869bd46daccde01a25a7e47a7d0b3075baef2.

Odsherred 2023: full control of the status original

All 44 physical pages are actually text read, including the full commune self-exposition and the performance annex. The file contains no legal error cell matrix. It reproduces 20 baseline cases and 3 × 3 later readings; neither 29 unique children nor an error rate can be deduced.

Indicator	Value	Unit	Locator	Limitation
Baseline	20	cases	PDF3	2021 analysis, not 20 new statuspersons
Analysis dated	2021-09	month	PDF3	Presented October 21
Change from	2021-10	month	PDF3	
Development	2023-01	month	PDF3	
Pre-life period	approx. 1 ½	year	PDF3	Development not actual risk period
Revision Note	2017	year	PDF5	Referred later; original revision not attached

Indicator	Value	Unit	Locator	Limitation
Revision Note	2019	year	PDF5	Referred later; original revision not attached
KLK report	2020-01	month	PDF5	Lawfulness problems discussed; original not attached
Professional management established	2019	year	PDF5	
Redress plan	2020	year	PDF5	Organisational plan is not proof of actual redress
Additional advisory posts	2	posts	PDF5	No citizen error denominator
Departure of department manager	2022 -11 finished	period	PDF5	Annex 26 indicates per 1Dec 22; PDF41: end 2022
Status meetings	6	meetings;	PDF5	
Subject-matter	3	rounds	PDF5	Mar 22 / Sep 22 / Jan 23
Procedural solutions	9	reading;	PDF5	3 round; not documented 9 unique children
Self-evaluation themes	5	themes	PDF6	Not cases of error
BFU deadline	4	months	PDF7	Most exceeded in the commune; none N
Short recommendation horizon	½	year	PDF8	Not deferingthe deadline
Long recommendation horizon	1-2	year	PDF9	No specific redress date
Proposed monitoring volume	1-2	cases / team manager / month	PDF9	Proposals not actually held
Own management information system start	2023-01-01	date	PDF11	Communication to the political level remains outstanding
Thematic supervision model	2	prår	PDF12	Model non-compliance
General prudential model	2	prår	PDF12	Model non-compliance
Political Statute Damage	2	prår	PDF12	Task Force status, not full quality overview
Flow chartevaluation plan	6	months	PDF13	Future, not done
Final implementation supervision	2023-02	month	PDF14	Further unplanned before autumn 23
Internal consultation time limit	14	days	PDF16	Planning / Call, not actually heard within 14 d
Leader accession plan	2023-05-01	date	PDF24	Assumption for delayed implementation; not actually verified
Management supervision prior to completion	3	prår	PDF28	Model 2 + 2 prår, actualtgap
ICSsuperusers	2	Functions	PDF29	One in every team
Policy information model	1	year	PDF30	Future plan
Municipal remnants main groups	3	effort groups,	PDF41	Legality, quality, interdisciplinary cooperation

Indicator	Value	Unit	Locator	Limitation
Practical course	2021-08-11	period	PDF43	Systematic
Learning day on management supervision	2021-03-25	date	PDF43	
Quality Learning Day	2021-06-26	date	PDF43	
Involvement workshop	2.5	days	PDF43	Nov 22
Virtual sparring	2	meetings;	PDF43	Outstanding 6 status meetings

Knowledge and impact chains

Local track	Locator	Proof / residue
ODS23-01	PDF5 / 7 / 18 / 35-36	2017 / 2019 review knowledge → 2020KLK / plan → 2021TF → 2023 continues to be the top BFUs. Original revision / KLKkunde independently read; DUBUwithdrawal denominator not published in status.
ODS23-02	PDF15 / 32-34	Concerning approaches previously not processed as notifications; 24-hour assessment/reconsideration not always activated. Not all § 11 courses had been finally reassessed at closure; no N.
ODS23-03	PDF19-20 / 38-39	Waiting time family treatment and missing / delayed plan / follow-up; no exact waiting time denominator or actual delivery date. Course not sufficient quality training.
ODS23-04	PDF14 / 26 / 41	Oversight/implementation work put on hold because of a leadership vacancy; plan May 23,supervision Feb 23→autumn 23. No individual safeguard obligation was thereby suspended.

Independent judicial review

The closure of development efforts cannot end the lawlessness of a citizens' act. When time overruns and inadequate information persist, the decision still lacks the timely review to ensure the child's current needs and proportionality of the intervention. The guarantees are also valid under management vacancy.

The knowledge timeline makes the authority’s response after earlier warnings open to examination. The decisive evidence is each specific risk signal, receipt, deadline, decision and actual assistance. There is no complete national or municipal person linkage here, and a later account of an audit is not the original audit. The specific demand is DUBU deadline extracts, contemporaneous concern-report/assessment records, the status of all ongoing § 11 reassessments and actual assistance and redress for losses. These gaps must not be rewritten as measured redress.

Control status and source

No unread page in the 44-page original status report. The 2021 analysis original,2017/2019 audit originals,KLKJan 20, the underlying DUBU figures, specific reassessment/delivery/redress/responsibility and status after May 23 have not been obtained through this file.

TFODS23F, all 44 physical pages; SHA256 16432b428157f249d346ecc750d59e5995aab74a41e13cb79d9842806efd39db.

Replaces: National Audit Report 11 / 2025 and follow-up in 2026

The report has been published on 9 April 2026 and includes Decisions 2022-2024. All 54 pages, the four pages of the ministerial statement and the seven pages of the follow-up note have been checked. The municipal annex is visually aligned. The report number is not the year of observation. [RRAN26; RRANSM26; RRANC11126]

Original number

ID	Measure	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Limitation
RRAN26-001	DUBUs municipalities in the starting point	84	98	municipalities	PDF12 / 20	Hillerød is deleted; the number of analyses varies
RRAN26-002	DUBU at least one year, 1.1.2024	86	98	municipalities	PDF38	Two without qualifying decisions
RRAN26-003	DUBU only part of the period	12	84	municipalities	PDF40	The first four months of data shall be omitted;
RRAN26-004	Children's population, first course	3148	Not specifically stated	children	PDF16 / 22 / 40	Repeated cycles per child are omitted
RRAN26-005	Approx. New locations national 2022-24	8000	Not specifically stated	initiations approx.	PDF16	DST information; unit other than unique children
RRAN26-006	Coverage of new locations, report approx.	40	Not specifically stated	%	PDF16	3148 children against some 8000 applications; not random sample
RRAN26-007	At least one of five measured breaches of law	69	3148	percentage of children	PDF22 / 49	83 municipalities; lower edge estimates; no precise error counters published
RRAN26-008	No findings among measured legal requirements	31	3148	percentage of children	PDF22	Non-certification of all legal requirements or correct material assessment
RRAN26-009	Average age when stowed	12	3148	year	PDF16	Box 1
RRAN26-010	Girls	53	3148	%	PDF16	Box 1
RRAN26-011	Boys	47	3148	%	PDF16	Box 1
RRAN26-012	Child / youth homes etc.	73	3148	%	PDF16	Including own rooms / in-house / boarding school
RRAN26-013	Family of care	27	3148	%	PDF16	Box 1
RRAN26-014	With consent	79	3148	%	PDF16	Local law basis
RRAN26-015	Without consent	21	3148	%	PDF16	Local law basis
RRAN26-016	Screening completed	88	510	%	PDF23-24	75 municipalities; re-evaluation can replace screening
RRAN26-017	Screening is missing	12	510	%	PDF23-24	Only municipal identified screening needs 2024
RRAN26-018	Notification for screening, average	27	Not specifically stated	days	PDF24 / 41	Only directly coupled screening / notification; n not specified
RRAN26-019	BFU timely	43	2818	%	PDF25	82 municipalities; total two-time control with exceptions
RRAN26-020	BFU not timely	57	2818	%	PDF25	Figure 4
RRAN26-021	BFU remains missing after six months	21	Not specifically stated	%	PDF25 / 44	Decisions before 1.7.2024; separate n not specified, not automatically 2818

ID	Measure	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Limitation
RRAN26-022	BFU not before the decision	39	Not specifically stated	%	PDF25	Separate percentage; exact n not specified separately
RRAN26-023	BFU exceedance completed non-emergency course	693	Not specifically stated	cases	PDF25 / 44	Sub-population other than Figure 4; uncompleted with duration
RRAN26-024	BFU upper lower quartile, maximum	30	693	days	PDF25	Completed delayed non-emergency cases
RRAN26-025	BFU excess median	77	693	days	PDF25	Not duration of placement or repatriation
RRAN26-026	BFU upper quartile overshoot, at least	138	693	days	PDF25	Not all unfinished business
RRAN26-027	Plan timely	53	2338	%	PDF28	80 municipalities; decisions no later than 30.6.2024
RRAN26-028	Plan not timely	47	2338	%	PDF28	Daily periods, with registration supplements
RRAN26-029	Plan remains missing six months after decision	18	2338	%	PDF29 / 44	Same plan analysis, six-month window
RRAN26-030	Plan not timely, first semester 2024	46	Not specifically stated	%	PDF29	Separate n not provided
RRAN26-031	Plan not timely, 2022-2023	48	Not specifically stated	%	PDF29	Separate n not provided
RRAN26-032	Plan completed too late, duration test	742	Not specifically stated	cases	PDF28 / 46	Not equal to all 47% errors; missing plans without end date are omitted
RRAN26-033	Plan deadline overrun, lower quartile, at most	19	742	days	PDF28	Finished delayed plans
RRAN26-034	Median breach of the plan time limit	44	742	days	PDF28	Finished delayed plans
RRAN26-035	Plan deadline overrun, upper quartile, at least	98	742	days	PDF28	Finished delayed plans
RRAN26-036	Timely follow-up, registered interview	73	2047	%	PDF31	77 municipalities; planned / cancelled may count as completed
RRAN26-037	Too late or lack of follow-up	27	2047	%	PDF31	Installation at least 3 m; start to 30.6.2024
RRAN26-038	Delayed follow-up, duration test	391	Not specifically stated	cases	PDF31 / 48	Sub-population other than Figure 8
RRAN26-039	Follow-up exceeding lower quartile, maximum	10	391	days	PDF31	Duration test
RRAN26-040	Follow-up exceeding median	24	391	days	PDF31	Duration test
RRAN26-041	Follow-up exceeding upper quartile, at least	45	391	days	PDF31	Duration test

ID	Measure	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Limitation
RRAN26-042	Two timely supervisory interviews	82	1161	%	PDF32	71 municipalities; planned / cancelled; at least 1 year's placement
RRAN26-043	Not two timely supervisory conversations	18	1161	%	PDF32	Installation start 2022-2023, at least 1 year follow-up
RRAN26-044	Monitoring in a timely manner in 2024	88	Not specifically stated	%	PDF32 / 48	Modified deadline; n not specified separately; not new places 2024
RRAN26-045	Communes, data bases for consultation	48	84	municipalities	PDF19 / 51	70% of cases; five largest were sent directly
RRAN26-046	Commune, submitted corrections	43	48	municipalities	PDF19 / 51	Corrections mainly due to non-compliance
RRAN26-047	Share of cases in the data base	70	Not specifically stated	%	PDF19	48 municipalities with data base, not 43
RRAN26-048	Municipalities met	8	Not specifically stated	municipalities	PDF18 / 50	Favrskov, Fredensborg, Frederikshavn, Gribskov, København, Lolland, Næstved, Vibo rg
RRAN26-049	Controlled individual children's programmes	12	Not specifically stated	children	PDF18	Parts or whole process; validation, not new misunion
RRAN26-050	Submitted relevant BFU older than one year	44	Not specifically stated	studies;	PDF42	Compiled after municipal registration
RRAN26-051	Submitted later relevant plans	58	Not specifically stated	plans;	PDF46	After the six-month search window; incorporated
RRAN26-052	Submitted subsequent follow-up	8	Not specifically stated	Follow-up	PDF48	Incorporated
RRAN26-053	Additional registration supplements for deadlines	7	Not specifically stated	days	PDF39	Measurement method, non-legal extension
RRAN26-054	State reimbursement threshold 2024	910000	Not specifically stated	DKK	PDF20	Child or total family; report's mandate population
RRAN26-055	Municipal accommodation costs 2024	12.4	Not specifically stated	DKK million	PDF17	Ministry information; national, not just survey children
RRAN26-056	Central reimbursement 2024	5	Not specifically stated	approx.	PDF17	Both children and adults; percentage of placement not separately identified
RRAN26-057	Ankestyrelsen Confirmation, without consent 2022-24	98	Not specifically stated	%	PDF20	Ministerial information on the defendant; population other than 3148
RRAN26-058	Court confirmation according to AS 2022-24	98	Not specifically stated	%	PDF20	Ministerial information on the defendant; second population
RRAN26-059	Task Force participants municipalities	35	Not specifically stated	municipalities	PDF34, T1	Not 35 courses; 43 courses / 42 municipalities in the second 2024 catalogue delimited separately

ID	Measure	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Limitation
RRAN26-060	Task Force appropriations 2021-24	4,7-6,7	Not specifically stated	DKK million annually	PDF34, T1	Interval; non-total consumption
RRAN26-061	Children's catalogue courses	16000	Not specifically stated	people, approx.	PDF34, T1	Union dedup not disclosed
RRAN26-062	Children's catalogue 2021-24	3,5-7,4	Not specifically stated	DKK million annually	PDF34, T1	Interval; non-total consumption
RRAN26-063	The child's legal capacity	3450	Not specifically stated	people, approx.	PDF34, T1	Overlap with other course offers unknown
RRAN26-064	Competence allocation 2023	3.3	Not specifically stated	DKK million	PDF34, T1	Authorisation
RRAN26-065	Award competence 2024	6	Not specifically stated	DKK million	PDF34, T1	Authorisation
RRAN26-066	Experience networks participating municipalities 2023-24	95	98	municipalities	PDF34, T1	Participation, not errors
RRAN26-067	Experience network meets 2023-24	20	Not specifically stated	meetings;	PDF34, T1	Quarterly network
RRAN26-068	Experience network participants 2023-24	1103	Not specifically stated	persons	PDF34, T1	Unique Personal Union not disclosed
RRAN26-069	Municipality compensation 2024	370	Not specifically stated	DKK million	PDF34, T1	Only substantial part directed towards the processing of files
RRAN26-070	BB comparison area 2021 / 24	27	Not specifically stated	municipalities	PDF35	Same municipalities, not the same population of children
RRAN26-071	BB BFUs not complied with 2021	41	Not specifically stated	%	PDF35	Recycling of former BB material
RRAN26-072	BB BFUs not complied with 2024	40	Not specifically stated	%	PDF35	Recycling; BB276-355 places per year
RRAN26-073	BB 2024 placement test	276	Not specifically stated	cases	PDF19 / 35	Decisions 2022; not new RR sample
RRAN26-074	BB supervision advisory opinions	0	Not specifically stated	opinions;	PDF35	Only the aforementioned 2023 supervisory cases; not zero liability in general
RRAN26-075	Surveillance case closed with future DUBU follow-up	1	Not specifically stated	municipality	PDF35	No evidence of cases already recovered
RRANSM26-07 6	2026	6	Not specifically stated	municipalities	PDF4	Information of the Minister's statement; not six errors
RRANSM26-07 7	DUBU- applicable municipalities in the statement	96	98	municipalities	PDF2	10.6.2026, date other than report 93
RRAN26-078	DUBU- applicable municipalities in the report	93	98	municipalities	PDF12	Not similar to study 84
RRAN26-079	Proportion of a vintage planted during upbringing, approx.	4	Not specifically stated	%	PDF10	VIVE information; not a new RR error or placement population

ID	Measure	Figures	Denomination	Unit	Original page	Limitation
RRAN26-080	BB placement tests, annual interval	276-355	Not specifically stated	cases	PDF19 / 35	Recycled AS samples; not new extra RR children

Seven different analytical populations

Analysis	Municipalities	Children
Screening	75	510
Child welfare assessment	82	2818
Involvement	82	1972
The child's plan	80	2338
Follow-up	77	2047
Supervision	71	1161
Total breaking-up union	83	3148

Original Table A: PDF40 / printed 31. The population overlaps; they are not added together.

Hearing corrections: only the 43 correction municipalities

Analysis	Offset with fixes,%	Without fixes,%	Change, percentage point
Screening	12	12	0
BFU	55	57	-2
The child's plan	45	47	-2
Follow-up	24	25	-1
Supervision	14	16	-2
Total breaking-up union	67	69	-2

Original Table B: PDF51 / printed 42. The subpopulation of 43 municipalities shall not replace the 69% of the main population.

All 84 rows in municipal annex C

Municipality / footnote	BFUs error,%	Children BFU	Plan error,%	Plan, children	Original page
Albertslund	48	23	75	20	PDF52 / printed 43
Allerred	36	11	70	10	PDF52 / printed 43
Assens	59	27	35	26	PDF52 / printed 43
Ballerup 1)	-	-	-	-	PDF52 / printed 43
Billund	29	28	32	28	PDF52 / printed 43
(Bornholm 2)	73	55	-	-	PDF52 / printed 43
Springby	49	41	44	39	PDF52 / printed 43
Parsley leaves	56	25	52	25	PDF52 / printed 43
Egedal	74	31	65	31	PDF52 / printed 43
(Esbjerg 2)	48	101	28	18	PDF52 / printed 43
Favrskov	54	24	48	23	PDF52 / printed 43
Fax (1)	-	-	45	11	PDF52 / printed 43
Fredensborg	34	38	24	49	PDF52 / printed 43
Fredericia	58	55	44	55	PDF52 / printed 43
Frederiksberg	33	33	56	32	PDF52 / printed 43
Frederikshavn 4)	55	102	43	100	PDF52 / printed 43
Furesø	78	27	73	26	PDF52 / printed 43
Faaborg-Midtfyn	67	54	35	54	PDF52 / printed 43
Gentofte	38	29	38	29	PDF52 / printed 43
Glostrup 1)	-	-	-	-	PDF52 / printed 43
Count	69	42	25	40	PDF52 / printed 43
Gribskov 1)	-	-	80	10	PDF52 / printed 43
Golden Borgsund	72	123	54	115	PDF52 / printed 43
Haderslev	47	47	36	47	PDF52 / printed 43
Rhinoceros	81	26	28	25	PDF52 / printed 43
Heath site	74	42	79	42	PDF52 / printed 43
Helsingør	90	39	77	39	PDF52 / printed 43
Herlev 1)	-	-	60	10	PDF52 / printed 43
Herning	52	42	49	41	PDF52 / printed 43
Hillerød 2)	-	-	-	-	PDF52 / printed 43
Corner	43	67	55	62	PDF52 / printed 43
Holbæk	76	25	79	24	PDF52 / printed 43
Hvidover	59	46	62	45	PDF53 / printed 44

Municipality / footnote	BFUs error,%	Children BFU	Plan error,%	Plan, children	Original page
Highest-Taastrup 3)	48	62	41	61	PDF53 / printed 44
Hørsholm 1)	-	-	-	-	PDF53 / printed 44
Jammerbug	50	36	42	36	PDF53 / printed 44
Kalundborg	67	43	62	40	PDF53 / printed 44
Kerteminde	78	23	43	23	PDF53 / printed 44
Cold	37	51	35	48	PDF53 / printed 44
Copenhagen (2)	56	315	-	-	PDF53 / printed 44
Køge	61	23	38	21	PDF53 / printed 44
Langeland	100	13	92	12	PDF53 / printed 44
Leaflets	83	12	67	12	PDF53 / printed 44
Lemvig 1)	-	-	-	-	PDF53 / printed 44
Lolland	44	43	45	42	PDF53 / printed 44
Lyngby-Taarbæk	54	26	64	25	PDF53 / printed 44
Læsø 4)	-	-	-	-	PDF53 / printed 44
Mariagerfjord (1)	-	-	-	-	PDF53 / printed 44
Medium speed	68	22	14	22	PDF53 / printed 44
Morsø (1)	62	13	-	-	PDF53 / printed 44
Northern Funen	58	26	36	25	PDF53 / printed 44
Nyborg	69	39	57	35	PDF53 / printed 44
Revived (3)	37	70	52	63	PDF53 / printed 44
Otter (3)	55	11	82	11	PDF53 / printed 44
Odsherd	70	23	45	22	PDF53 / printed 44
Randers	56	43	40	43	PDF53 / printed 44
Rebild 1)	-	-	-	-	PDF53 / printed 44
Ringkøbing-Skjern 3)	32	22	45	22	PDF53 / printed 44
Ringsted	54	37	65	37	PDF53 / printed 44
Roskilde	28	39	24	37	PDF53 / printed 44
Rudersdal	44	16	38	16	PDF53 / printed 44
Samsø (1)	-	-	-	-	PDF53 / printed 44
Silkeborg	61	18	25	24	PDF53 / printed 44
Skanderborg	65	20	50	22	PDF53 / printed 44
Disc	62	16	69	16	PDF53 / printed 44
Slaughter	55	92	51	88	PDF53 / printed 44
Sunred	70	10	30	10	PDF53 / printed 44

Municipality / footnote	BFUs error,%	Children BFU	Plan error,%	Plan, children	Original page
Sorø 2)	47	30	-	-	PDF54 / printed 45
Stevns	75	12	60	10	PDF54 / printed 45
Svendborg	64	44	50	40	PDF54 / printed 45
South Djurs 1	-	-	-	-	PDF54 / printed 45
Thisted	54	28	35	26	PDF54 / printed 45
Coins 1)	-	-	67	15	PDF54 / printed 45
Tower (1)	90	10	-	-	PDF54 / printed 45
Vallensbæk 1)	-	-	-	-	PDF54 / printed 45
Product	25	16	38	16	PDF54 / printed 45
Road	64	33	48	33	PDF54 / printed 45
Road (1)	-	-	38	24	PDF54 / printed 45
West Himmerlands	32	37	33	36	PDF54 / printed 45
Viborg	78	67	48	62	PDF54 / printed 45
Vordingborg	62	45	37	43	PDF54 / printed 45
Peas (1)	-	-	-	-	PDF54 / printed 45
Aabenra	25	24	38	24	PDF54 / printed 45
Aalborg	66	35	47	34	PDF54 / printed 45

Footnotes: (1) discretion; Mariagerfjord is deleted due to time limits. 2) Registration practice; Esbjerg's plan population is partial. (3) only the pre-decision requirement assessed, not the legal postponement of the four-month period. 4) Læsø is part of Frederikshavn. A line is never zero. Visible BFU denominators summer to 2748; visible plane denominators to 2252. The difference to 2818 / 2338 is due, inter alia, to retained cells; the summers are not misplaced. [RRAN26, PDF52-54]

The following 14 municipalities are outside the survey: Dragør, Fanoe, Frederikssund, Gladsaxe, Holstebro, Horsens, Ikast-Brande, Ishøj, Norddjurs, Odense, Rødovre, Struer, Sønderborg, Aarhus.

Measurement method and exclusions

Search	Precise measurement gel	Original page
Population	Refund; the municipality of both the municipality of action / payment; the first course per child; children under 6 m and UKN decisions are omitted.	PDF38
DUBU	First 4 m after system start is omitted; Hillerød completely out; other municipalities and years partly out.	PDF39-40 / 43 / 46-48
Acute	Legal basis and text search emergency / immediate / concurrent / foreman as well as manual control and municipal corrections.	PDF39
Deadline	Seven additional days of measurement; no change in the legal deadline.	PDF39
BFU	Primary closure one year before decision; municipal relevant elderly are included. Cutoff 16.8.24; six-month analysis before 1.7.24.	PDF42-44
BFU acute	The four-month time limit alone is checked; since requirements have not been operationalised independently. Four municipalities are assessed only pre-decision requirements; their completed acute studies are therefore timely.	PDF43
Involvement	1972 children, but no overall percentage of offences. Scheduled cancelled conversations are counted held, without valid reason can be determined.	PDF44 / 49
Plan	Completed / attached document, search 3 m before / 6 m after; municipal relevant plan can be added. Requirements shall be maintained even on expiry date.	PDF44-46
Follow-up	At least 3 m of placement; start to 30.6.24; start up to 1 m before the decision is accepted by computer, not legal approval.	PDF47
Supervision	At least 1 year; start 2022-2023; scheduled and cancelled conversations are counted. If the deadline of 2024 applies, an annual deadline shall apply.	PDF48
Union	At least one finding among available measurements; not all children are measured at all requirements; RR calls result lower-end estimates. No already-pending exclusion indicated.	PDF49
Publication	Municipality cells only if at least 10 children and at least 3 temptations; Læsø is part of Frederikshavn.	PDF54

Knowledge, response and actual redress

Time	Documented indent	Certificate status
2016,2021,202 3	Previous Criticism / Commitment and Children First	RRAN26, PDF12 / 18 / 33 / 36; historical originals are processed in other modules. Not a new individual guilt.
2022	STAR identifies possible reimbursement importance of BFU- / plan deficiencies	RRAN26, PDF36; the STAR note is reproduced, not independently checked here.
2026	Central audit control point on BFU; no similar plan point established	RRAN26, PDF37.
10.6.2026	Minister accepts criticism, warnings invigoration, KL dialogue and quick interpretation; evaluation at end 2027 / 2029	RRANSM26, PDF1-4; commitments, not completed individual redress.
June 2026	Letter sent to the municipalities	RRANC11126, PDF2 / 4 / 6; letter itself and receipt / compliance logs not originally checked here.
24.6.2026	Five continued points of control; the case is followed	RRANC11126, PDF2-3; not completed error recovery.
2026	Financial Committee 7.5; Social Committee 10.6; 22 June 2026 to be indicated five times during consultation calls; § 20 notified 18.6	RRANC11126, PDF7 visually aligned; repeat data fields are not evidence of five distinct meetings conducted.

Independent evidence testing and specific requirements

Conclusion: The documented breaking of law union must be treated as a serious failure in the selected placement processes. **Proof:** Figure 2, Table A and the annex to the method show 69% among the first 3148 children's courses, while separate process analyses and durations show which shortcomings are measured. **Meaning:** These are more than complaints: concrete legal requirements are measured. Registration supplements, emergency demarcation, dissorted municipalities and cancelled calls may leave additional failures outside the measurement. A row per child must be required with each controlled and uncontrolled requirement, original document date and actual action.

The Minister refers to 98% upheld in coercion cases. The two 98% counts concern selected appeal and further-appeal populations; they are not linked to 3148 children and do not examine the same five procedural requirements. The statement therefore cannot negate the documented procedural breaches or prove that the factual basis was sufficient when the intervention occurred. That requires the original decision, contemporaneous evidence, consents, the emergency basis and a precise assessment of the safeguards that failed. [RRANSM26,PDF2; RRAN26,PDF20]

A subsequent completed BFU or plan does not in itself restore the prior legality, child's lost time or family contact. The three duration tests include completed delays; they are not homecoming times and cannot be used to describe the full duration of unfinished interventions. Registers finding a start up to one month before the decision requires original verification of the existence of another valid decision; acceptance of the method of measurement is not a legal basis.

Responsibilities and requirements: The relevant day-to-day rules shall apply to each intervention, including the BFU, the level, follow-up, supervision, consent / emergency conditions and effective review. The level of knowledge and reaction of the Ministry must be tested separately from the fault of the individual staff member. Evidence of a breach of warranty or of a home requires a specific statement of invalidity, immediate protection, effective cessation / reunification where the conditions are fulfilled, compensation and liability for the service / criminal liability. The relevant liability rules; and EMRK-review shall be dealt with in the legal modules of the report.

Evidence, hypotheses and lack of evidence

Documented: the breach-of-law percentages with their populations; the three completed-delay distributions; the methodology’s treatment of registration/cancellation; the ministry’s response and continuing oversight. Hypotheses requiring original records: which children were actually moved without a valid basis; further failures in withheld/excluded data; specific harm, each employee’s knowledge and actual redress. A statistical procedural error alone is not a criminal conviction for abduction.

Required data from Rigsrevisionen and the municipalities: precise counters behind rounded percentages, n for the six-month BFF analysis, separation per cause / year / municipality, anonymised dedup key and connection to complaints, all calls' implementation / cancellation logs and valid cancellation grounds. The ministerial statement 2016 and the STAR note 2022 are now original verified in the National Audit Posts 2026 -kknosning.md / .json; precise linkage of the quoted STAR act and actual implementation is tested separately. Necessary remains from the Ministry / STAR: June 2026 letter and documented subsequent enforcement. Non-public individual certificates shall include the final decision of the residence / contact / payment log and the liability case. No request has been sent.

Places: original control of the Ministry's knowledge and reaction

Controlled October 7, 2026. The original ministerial commitment from 2016 and the public memorandum of the STAR dated 2022 have now been read original. The June letter has been identified as a concrete public municipal annex, but the content of the original could not be retrieved. The Minister's own later mention of the letter is read original. This module does not add any children, breaches of law or replacements to the statistical accounts.

The Minister's statement of 14 October 2016

RRAK16: Karen Ellemann's statement on Report 21 / 2015; Case 2016- 6165, Document 394756, addressed to the Secretariat of the State Auditors. All four scanned original pages are visually read directly in memory. Original statement.

Search	The Minister's own statement or undertaking, initialled	Original page
Knowledge	The Ministry had collected knowledge of municipal practice and knew the case-processing problems; this had provided the grounds for supporting initiatives.	2

Search	The Minister's own statement or undertaking, initialled	Original page
Lack of documentation	The Minister noted the criticism that, after ten years of effort, better case handling and a deliberate effect could not be documented.	2
Responses to future reforms	The Minister would lead the way for better follow-up to new reforms and major changes.	1-2
Ongoing control	Local practice had to be followed through practice / welfare studies, well-being studies, statistics and task force feedback.	2
Efficacy and data basis	The Minister agreed to the need for impact knowledge; described the data lift towards 2020 and annual social policy statement with ten objectives for social mobility.	2-3
Priority	The Minister continued to promise targeted prioritisation of active long-term initiatives; copies were sent to Rigsrevisionen.	4

STAR's note of 21 November 2022

RRAK22: *Guide to categorising errors in the digital municipal audit scheme*, journal 22 / 01328. All five original pages are text-read in memory; page 2's highlighted examples are visually controlled in memory. Original STAR note.

Search	Content of the note, initialled	Original page
Basic conditions	Article 3 of Decree 1265 / 2022 requires the lawful award, proper registration and fulfilment of the requirements of the notice.	1
Subsequent documentation	Reimbursement may be retained by obtaining evidence that the payment was correct at the time of payment.	1
Children's cases	Undocumented statutory child welfare assessments and action plans are among the examples of errors with reimbursement implications.	2, framed box
Start of effort	In particular, for day-to-day stays, documentation of the target group is mentioned at the time of implementation, decision-making, significant steps in the matter and basic conditions.	3-4
Other error category	Overshooting and lack of evidence of justification, hearing of parties and complaint guidance are categorised without any reimbursement effect. The list is not exhaustive.	1/4
Reporting	Errors detected must be reported, even after correction. A matter which the auditor no longer assesses as an error after dialogue shall not be reported as an error.	5

Identity vote: The year, sender and actual BFU / action plan content of the note corresponds to the reference in RR11 / 2025, Paragraph 47, printed page 27 / PDF36. Rigsrevisionen does not indicate the file number or title there. A definitive link between the quoted act and journal 22 / 01328 requires the reference of the National Audit Office; the contents of the public note have been independently verified. The leadership is about reimbursement and financial audit control.

June 2026: the letter itself and the Minister's own later mention

Document	Finds and actual reading status	Locator
The June Letter	Specific Annex ID **834130 f 7-3232-4273-9 e 9 a-159 a 2 bbfc 67 d**, name *Annex 1 - Letter of shepherds to municipalities*. Frederiksberg, Case **00.22.04-G01-9-25**, agenda item **57**, Agenda ID **56 ad 854 e-f 05 a-4 aa 1-995 f-0 ddaa 00 eb 6 a 1**. The original text has not been read.	Annex link of the municipality
The source of the metadate	The annex was located through an external copy of the municipality's case sheet. The copy shall indicate the receipt on 22 June 2026. The date is a search track, not original controlled message / delivery date.	Copied case presentation with direct attachment link
The Minister for Foreign Affairs	**RRAK26S70**, reply to S 70, 26 June 2026, Case **2026-3168**, document **69859952**. Both original pages have been read.	The Minister's original answer

The Minister's later statement, paraphrased	Original page in S 70
Lawful case processing is crucial, even where the placement decision itself may be correct.	1
The Minister recently reported writing to all municipalities about process requirements, fair registration and reimbursement conditions.	1
The minister acknowledges that the letter does not by itself solve the problems, and intends to discuss binding municipal cooperation.	1-2
The Minister agrees with the need for knowledge of the impact of initiatives and the causes of continuing problems; refers to the evaluation initiated.	2

S 70 is an independent original ministerial statement about the letter. It is not the letter itself or a receipt from each municipality. The later references of the National Audit Service can be found in C111 / 26, the conclusion as well as Sections 6, 8 and 12; the locators are in the main module National audit posts 2026.md.

Precise evidentiary meaning and requirements

Documented: The then Minister personally described known municipal case-processing problems and made commitments concerning oversight, knowledge of effects and prioritisation. The public STAR original describes a financial oversight mechanism expressly covering BFUs and action plans. The later Minister personally states that a reminder of the requirements has been issued.

Independent assessment: These statements can be tested against documented actions and outcomes over time. A categorisation without an effect on reimbursement does not answer whether the citizen’s right was infringed. Subsequent production of evidence of an earlier correct payment must likewise not be confused with later fulfilment of a statutory requirement. A commitment, course or letter does not in itself document actual correction, valid legal authority for intervention, return home or reunification.

Hypotheses not proved here: the individual employee’s culpability; which named children were moved without a valid basis; actual receipt in all municipalities; actual enforcement and individual redress after the letter.

Specific demands for documents: The Ministry of Social Affairs should supply the original June 2026 letter with date, record/document number, all annexes, recipient list, dispatch log and documented follow-up. Frederiksberg should supply the already identified annex and receipt record. STAR and the National Audit Office should state whether the cited 2022 memorandum is record 22/01328,with the original document reference, any versions and evidence of dispatch/implementation. The Ministry and agencies should present testing of effects and enforcement actions linked to the commitments; the municipalities should present the specific original case records and actual remedial dates. No inquiry has been sent.

Targeted search and concrete remainder

Search / Control	Actual result
Rigsrevisionen's official 21/2015 case register, ministerial statement link	The original of 14 October 2016 found; four pages visually original checked.
site.star.dk "refusionsmæssig betydning" børnefaglig	Note of 21 November 2022 found on STAR's own server; five pages original checked.
"2022" "notat" "refusionssystemet" STAR and "refusionsmæssig" "børnefaglige" "2022" "notat"	Reference and content aligned; the precise asset identity of RR has still not been published in the reference.
"Information on the circular letter" "National Audit Office's", "22. June 2026" "National Audit Office's" "municipalities'", "Circular letter to municipalities" "National Audit Office's"	Frederiksberg annexes located through the copied case sheet.
Commune specific address, normal / direct-PDF variant, RAM session manager	View page could be downloaded; the PDF variant returned HTTP 500. Without session management, the diversion loop occurred. No original text read or saved.
Folketingets ODA: title includes placement, date 1 June-1 July 2026; full result, no next page	Five document registrations: statement, S 70 question/answer, family-placement question and RR memorandum. No separate letter registration in this delimited extract. S 70 answer checked against the original.
ODA: title contains shepherd's letter, date 1 June-1 August 2026; full result	No document records. This is a specific title search, not proof that the letter does not exist elsewhere.

The only original identified in the three indents of this order, whose text remains missing, is the June letter. The identity between the STAR act and the RR reference and the delivery / compliance tracks are distinct precise remains. All original material and visual side controls are processed in memory; only own compact facts and metadata are stored.

8. Children, parents, disability and the Youth Crime Board

Date: 6 October 2026. Working Annex to the National Report 2006-2025. Public data alone.

1. Main result and limit of person count

Denmark publishes figures on placed children, disability interventions and diagnostic assessment courses, and separate figures on errors by authorities. The checked public tables do not connect this information at individual level. A national count of how many children or parents were affected by an unlawful placement, and how long separation continued after the error was established, therefore cannot be derived from the population figures below. This is a specific deficiency in the publicly available linkage; it does not refute the established errors in appeals and surveys.

The count must keep four levels separate: decisions with errors, unique people in those decisions, intervention actually corrected, and continuing harm/time after the error was found. Remittal is reconsideration. Return home is termination of placement. Reunification is the child's actual return to parents. None of the three may be replaced by the other two.

2. Nationwide series for locations 2006-2025

Unit: persons placed per unit 31 December, not new decisions and not wrong people. Historical years 2006-2010 are BU04, the whole country, FORAN = 001 (net placed), AGE = TOTAL, SEX = TOT. Minors are calculated as 0-5 + 6-11 + 12-17. Historical age figures include the category 18 and above. Years 2011-2025 are current ANB6 and ANB7, all over the country 000, Time = yearH2, Total / 0-17 years. Without consent, BU04 FORAN120 or ANB6 FORAN102, i.e. SEL § 58 / BL § 47, is not all types of coercion. Implementation is ANBIVS1, ADMKOM000, ALERAMSIALT, unit: placed in place, not necessarily unique children.

Year	Placed at end all ages in the table,	Of which 0-17 years	SEL § 58 / BL § 47 without consent, table age	Implementation in the year
2006	13.633	12.235	1.329	Not retrieved
2007	14.224	12.625	1.383	Not retrieved
2008	14.542	12.799	1.554	Not retrieved
2009	14.666	12.890	1.720	Not retrieved
2010	14.597	12.677	1.713	Not retrieved
2011	14.981	12.814	1.779	4.024
2012	14.975	12.710	1.942	3.984
2013	14.785	12.442	2.085	3.737
2014	14.489	12.116	2.165	3.953
2015	14.245	11.959	2.277	4.142
2016	14.131	12.016	2.356	4.502
2017	14.063	11.921	2.403	4.408
2018	13.877	11.703	2.472	4.225
2019	13.435	11.421	2.501	3.674
2020	13.421	11.469	2.513	3.677
2021	13.329	11.426	2.521	3.595

Year	Placed at end all ages in the table,	Of which 0-17 years	SEL § 58 / BL § 47 without consent, table age	Implementation in the year
2022	13.629	11.608	2.633	3.686
2023	13.863	11.695	2.786	3.574
2024	13.842	11.646	2.876	3.580
2025	13.977	11.675	2.971	3.641

Sources and reproduction: BU04, ANB6, ANB7, ANBILS1. Read from Denmark's official API6 October 2026: tableinfo / {table}? format = JSON&long = en and POST / v1 / data with the above dimensions. API. Compact numbers stored here; no full public sources stored locally.

The annual totals sum to 282.704 observations at year-end, including 241.847 observations of minors and 43.979 observations in the stated category without consent. These sums are repeated status observations; the same child may appear in many years. They are neither 282.704 unique people, placement days nor a measure of unlawful placements. Starts in 2011-2025 total 58.402 events, with possible person overlap and repeat placements. Status and starts must not be added together.

2.1 Limitations and revisions

• DST describes current placement statistics as comparable from 2011. The history for 2006-2010 must therefore be shown as a separate table basis, although it may appear in the same table for readers. DST specifically describes 2006 as subject to greater uncertainty due to new data capture and transfer to the Appeals Board. PGF, quality notes.

• Current ANB6 / 7 provides incomplete data for Copenhagen 2019. No number correction has been invented here.

• Current figures cover ages 0-22 and also certain foreign nationals with person IDs. Institution types, reports and legal bases change. The municipality is the municipality responsible for action. The basis for placement is the registered statutory basis, not an independent finding of valid legal authority. DST: Content, population/classification.

• Other in ANB6 may include provisional decisions, Ankestyrelsen’s own-initiative cases, the Youth Crime Board and other interventions without consent. Category 102 is therefore not an exhaustive coercion count.

• NYT published on 23. May 2025 showed the 2024 age groups as 4.799+6.830+2.319=13.948. Current ANB7 shows 13.842. The earlier publication and current figure are different versions of the same statistics, not two populations that can be added together. NYT 51309, table. The report uses the current API version in the series and retains the earlier publication scope separately.

• Data from 2025 published in 2026 are still the year of observation 2025. There are no 2026 observations in this Annex.

3. Actual return, reunification and duration

DST’s individual registers contain reason for cessation, destination after placement and implementation date; the research register BUAF is a process register, BUAH an event register. This makes a precise timeline possible with lawful register access and linkage to decision/appeal data. However, the checked public placement tables contain no national cross-table of error finding -> remittal/annulment -> actual return home -> reunification -> repeat placement. DST: Content, register information, BUAH: effective date and cessation information.

Minimum for a real count of consequences: first actual separation date; legal basis and period of validity; error type and date identified; complaint submission and decision; suspensive effect; new decision after remittal; cessation of placement; actual move home; actual resumption of family life; any further placement and number of days in all intervals. Cessation of placement at age 18 or moving to one's own room does not document a return to the parents. A return-home decision alone does not document implementation.

SFI / VIVE report *Continuity in placement*, Annex B1.7 printed p. 105 (PDF-page 107), shows a deduced narrow population: children born after 1999, returned on parental request: 35 in 2006, 57 in 2007, 51 in 2008, 58 in 2009, 72 in 2010, 64 in 2011 and 84 in 2012. The same child is not counted again at the later date of return in the following years; 143

2006-2008 and 220 in 2010-2012 are such group numbers. These are research committees, not national return figures or the cessation of illegal interference. VIVE, Annex B1.7.

4. Controlled example: error in movement and return 2011

The Board of Appeal's practice study included 81 cases from 16 municipalities for 12-17 year olds. 67 did not comply with the rules: 40 out of 50 moving cases and 27 out of 31 returning cases. 57 had errors in the child interview, 42 in the action plan, 19 had no consent to move from the relevant party without treatment by the Children's and Young Committee; 22 had no decision on the period of return. The mistakes overlap. The selection focused on municipal decisions; 26 cases were assessed as child-friendly and inadequately documented cases were selected. The study shall document the errors of these decisions, but shall not be transmitted to all children placed. Ankestyrelsen 2011, printed p. 2,8-12 and Annex 1.

5. Children with Disabilities: People and Bet 2022-2025

HANDBU01, all over the country 000, gender 0, bets 0100 and 0110. Unit in the first number column: unique 0-17 year-old recipients in the year; second: disability interventions.

Year	Unique children / young people in the year	Inserts
2022	10.850	12.958
2023	12.140	14.460
2024	13.095	15.816
2025	13.276	15.850

HANDBU01, API picked up October 6, 2026. The statistics begin at 2022. Each child is counted once at national level, also at several stakes / municipalities, but from the publication in 2026 can be included in several municipal totals; therefore, these cannot be summed up into the national total. Nine categories of action in the current publication replace eight. These are selected BL / SEL benefits, not all disabled children, and refusals do not appear as recipients. DST: Accessibility, table definitions, NEW 54493,28 May 2026.

The annual numbers of beneficiaries sum up to 49.361 persons' annual records; the stakes to 59.084. First sum is not 49.361 unique children. There is no controlled person connection to error statistics or number of parents / relatives.

6. Adults with Disabilities or Defatment

DST NEW 2 July 2025 represents 87.600 recipients in 2024 K4. Comparable benefits from 2018 to 2024 give 74.800 in 2018 K4 and 80.100 in 2024 K4. NYT 27 August 2026 indicates 88.400 in 2025 K4. These are recipients of selected benefits, not all people with disabilities. 98 municipalities are covered from 2018; 73 have history until 2015. Paragraph 82 a / b became mandatory from 2020 H2, other categories later. Persons refused are not covered as recipients. NEW 51369 demarcation, DST reporting page, NYT 27 August 2026.

HAND02A counts once nationally per person, quarter and type of benefits. A person with multiple types of benefits can therefore be counted several times by summing up the benefits. HAND07 counts per municipality, giving additional possible overlap. API metadata indicates about 175 missing benefits for Aarhus, of which approx. 90 in § 97 in over 67-year-olds, and inaccurate § 82 a / b figures for Holstebro 2024 K3 / K4. Current topic page shows 115.909 under a reception label for 2025 K4 versus NYT 88.400. This difference is not matched to a comparable person definition; 115.909 is therefore not used as a unique number here. HAND02A, HAND07, DST Subject Page.

7. Patients:the right to diagnostic assessment in child psychiatry

The data basis in Rigsrevisionen's report 10/2023 included 54.536 reported processes in 2019 Q3-2022 Q4. The register analysis of referrals up to 2022 Q1 comprised 42.252 processes; 1.759 without an indication of completion were excluded, leaving 40.493 included. Around 70 %/more than 27.000 processes exceeded 30 days. One patient may have several processes. This therefore does not establish more than 27.000 unique children. The suspension from 18. March-1. September 2020 is included as a special period; the sample's legality assessments exclude referrals from 16. February-1. September 2020. Average assessment time increased from 76 to 115 days. The sample had 382 processes:341 in the 8-day information analysis, 260 in the assessment-plan analysis(52 % without a plan),252 in information on choice of provider(63 % without information). The same process may have several errors. Rounded percentages must not be converted into exact cases. Rigsrevisionen, printed pp. 8,13,16,18,28–31.

8. Parents, Families and other indirect rightholders

Neither the placement population nor the disability recipient count documents the number of unique parents affected. A child may have one or two parents, foster parents and other close relations; the same parent may have several children. Registration of the child is therefore not a family account. A documented count of 2 parents per child must not be assumed. Counting parents with specific lost contact, earnings, treatment opportunities or strain requires a separate count with person deduplication and a proved connection to the authority's action.

9. Documented results and necessary investigation steps

Documented: 20 years of placement status; 15 years of start-ups; 4 years of disability interventions and unique year-recipients; delimited 2011 error investigation; delimited child psychiatric initiation study. None of the general population registers even classifies breaches of law.

Not documented here: a national unique number of victims of illegal placement; number of unique affected parents; a national number actually released after reversed decisions; number of days in continued intervention after detected errors; year series 2006-2025 for all disability refusals; unique patients across all misinvestigations.

Necessary: a disidentified link between the complaint / judgment / practice investigation ID and the individual registers, with the basis of decision, date of performance, end-of-life destination and timeline. Otherwise, the report shall present the documented decision-making error and the documented personal consistency separately and indicate exactly which connection is missing. No new private case review has been carried out.

Personal and time series: material extension

Date: October 7, 2026. Public primary data. Supports personstatistik.md. No personal connection to private cases.

1. Disabled cars: decisions, re-treatment and waiting time

DST HANDBIL1 / 2 / 3, country 000, edition 27 August 2026. The table counts cases. An applicant may appear again; refusal is not an assessment of legality. Authorization and refusal shall be added together only as the two categories of decision published in the year. Re-treatment is not added as a new citizen.

Year	Appropriations	Refusal	- - - - - - - weeks	Decision time, weeks	Allowed DKK
2010	Not published	1399	Not published	32	Not published
2011	1793	1356	33	33	333624015
2012	1657	1228	33	33	278462466
2013	1678	1144	32	33	320350173
2014	1598	1035	33	32	320703578
2015	1557	1027	34	32	416378179
2016	1620	1047	35	35	305552990
2017	1507	849	36	34	262774067

Year	Appropriations	Refusal	- - - - - - - weeks	Decision time, weeks	Allowed DKK
2018	1465	888	39	40	265760823
2019	1479	1106	40	38	274821680
2020	1333	970	42	39	263367482
2021	1391	886	41	39	287429560
2022	1212	940	41	38	289763999
2023	1085	843	37	37	305018968
2024	1044	983	37	37	318530134
2025	975	927	34	35	289026006

2025 re-examination: 324 cases, 67 cases of change in outcome, 40 weeks on average (HANDBIL3). There are 1902 grant / refusal cases; 67 / 324 = 20,68% have changed the outcome of the retreatment's own population, not a national level of illegality.

Sources: HANDBIL1, HANDBIL2, HANDBIL3; precise selections are in JSON. Content, Concepts and definitions: § 114- purchase, not special features. From 2023 first municipal decision before complaint; municipal reassessment and ASTM time omitted. Remittal for reconsideration shall not be registered as a new case or as an original case. From 2025 both first / final date and significantly changed outcome. Precision, Other Uncertainty: before 2023, a complaint may be made in time, without the possibility of correction. Failure to report / audit possible.

Own methodological inference:a complete citizen journey cannot be derived from the HANDBIL1/2 waiting time. The 2025 innovation gives actual partial follow-up, but not all years' appeal/post-remittal times. Counts are missing for 2006-09; awards are missing for 2010. Register authority:DST/Ministry of Social Affairs and Housing, predecessor AST before 1. July 2016. Specific inquiry:historical 1998-2010 tables, case deduplication, first/final decision dates, remittal and reassessment courses for 2006-24.

2. Vote of 115.909 against 88.400 adults

The topic page 115.909 is exactly reproduced by summing HAND02A 2025 K 4 over 23 types of benefits × 9 age groups × 3 sex. The sum contains recipients once per type of benefit, but the same person may receive several types. It must not be used as 115.909 unique people. NYT 27 August 2026 lists 88.400 persons with one or more benefits.

4th quarter	Sum of numerical person performance cells
2018 K 4	100327
2019 K 4	100671
2020 K 4	105524
2021 K 4	109008
2022 K 4	111040
2023 K 4	112630
2024 K 4	114950
2025 K 4	115909

HAND02A,updated 11. September 2026; selection in JSON. Non-numerical historical cells arise partly from statutory categories not yet in force; they have not been converted to zero. DST topic page has 115.909 and also refers to NYT 88.400. This is a reconciled difference in units, not 27.509 additional unique citizens. Categories were expanded in 2020/2024/2025; the benefit basket is therefore not homogeneous.

3. Historical Children with Decisions and Current Begins

BU20/BU21 are separate historical decision populations, not substitutes for initiations. The outcome series show differences between the two tables' totals for 2006-13. They are not added together.

Year	BU20 children with decisions	BU21 children with decisions
2006	3356	3152
2007	3405	3257
2008	3422	3276
2009	3068	2937
2010	2957	2808
2011	2774	2681
2012	2565	2486
2013	2172	2098
2014	2577	2577
2015	2608	2608
2016	2768	2768
2017	2188	2188

BU20: AREA 000, ANBRINGAARSAG 003, ALDERIALT, KONTOT. BU21AREA 000, ANBRINGAARSAG 003. Inactive tables, replacing ANBAAR10 from 13 November 2019. P01 carried out in 2006-10 has thus still not been resolved by these tables.

ANBIVS4 gives 2011-25 actual start-ups by legal basis, all ages / sex. The 15 years of consent / without / other / unknown are in JSON. The others may not be renamed volunteers; without consent only SEP 58 / BL 47, not all legal bases are enforceable.

4. Continued material control

Return home, remittal on appeal and reunification must be recorded separately. A nationally linked 2006-25 register of individuals/time after remittal is not published in the tables checked. P02/P03/T 02/T 03 requires decision ID→child/parental role→effective return-home/contact/continuing-intervention date and original placement date. No alteration/remittal rate is multiplied by population counts.

5. Return and termination: all controlled reasons tables, all versions

Three AS originals show actual cause numbers 2007-2015. No version is added with another version of the same year. Mentors are termination events; causes may overlap. Filled 18 means registered termination also for continued stay. That is why it is not reunification. The entire 14 / 15 causal series are in JSON.

AS 2010, 3.10, printed 36 / PDF 38 original.

Reason	2007	2008	2009	2010
Purpose achieved	639	530	477	427
Purpose not achieved	340	411	354	190
Application by the parental authority	415	398	372	322
15 + consent back	260	281	248	160
BUU not extended	7	5	7	-

Reason	2007	2008	2009	2010
AST Redeemer	4	1	-	-
National law repealed	3	1	1	1
Filled 18	1947	2057	2039	2280
Place closed	-	-	-	12
No suitable place	14	15	11	2
New municipality of action	116	91	71	39
Child leaving	-	-	-	221
Place giving	-	-	-	86
Other	601	504	373	217
Undisclosed	-	-	-	-
Total discontinuation	3375	3335	3187	3253

AS 2014, 3.6, printed 27-28 / PDF 29-30 original.

Reason	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Purpose achieved	518	461	401	370	341
Purpose not achieved	212	163	139	165	168
Application by the parental authority	363	328	264	263	269
15 + consent back	185	169	145	154	158
BUU not extended	3	6	9	21	18
AST Redeemer	0	4	1	2	1
National law repealed	1	4	11	3	9
Filled 18	2310	2302	2299	2250	2162
Place closed	14	23	10	5	3
No suitable place	2	5	5	5	3
New municipality of action	44	42	26	30	39
Child leaving	245	258	213	208	185
Place giving	93	86	70	72	77
Other	300	305	254	227	168
Undisclosed	39	52	34	32	34
Total discontinuation	3469	3424	3258	3153	3082

AS 2015, 3.4, printed 18 / PDF 20 (visual) original.

Reason	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Purpose achieved	471	415	383	373	240
Purpose not achieved	164	137	169	170	122

Reason	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Application by the parental authority	328	266	270	293	215
15 + consent back	170	145	156	170	125
BUU not extended	6	9	21	18	9
AST Redeemer	4	1	2	1	2
National law repealed	4	11	3	9	4
Filled 18	2292	2286	2246	2150	2039
Place closed	23	10	6	3	7
No suitable place	5	5	5	3	4
New municipality of action	42	30	33	46	42
Child leaving	258	215	210	191	137
Place giving	88	70	74	77	55
Other	322	276	245	188	162
Undisclosed	50	28	38	37	51
Total discontinuation	3418	3260	3183	3145	2821

AS 2014 s 27 bread text says 2010 = 3153, while the table says 3469 (3153 is the 2013 column). The table is retained as a table find; the text number is an internal inconsistency. The AS 2015 table is image based and is visually read directly from PDF 20 in memory. AS 2014 copy actually read from https://viden.sl.dk/media/4520/anbringelsesstatistik-2014.pdf, AS 2015 as at https://viden.sl.dk/media/8922/ankestyrelsens-anbringelsesstatistik-2015.pdf.

Original 2007 (Ministerial response 5 January 2009) gave up 2831; AS 2010 version gives up 3375 for 2007. The inventory / maintenance breach shall be maintained. Original of the Minister.

P01 partially closed: AS 2010 Figure 1.1 printed 2 / PDF 4 gives effective 0-17-year-olds 2007-10 = 3693 / 3502 / 3254 / 2864. 2006 is still missing. These older counts are not silently inserted into the current ANBIVS1 all ages 2011- 25 series.

Figure 1.1 is visually checked on the original PDF4 on 7 October 2026: the actual placement is 3.693 in 2007 and 3.502 in 2008, not vice versa. The figure actually separates the move from the decision of the year; the figures cannot be counted as national children who are misrepresented.

Precise outstanding inquiry P02: DST/AST's historical placement register 2006-2025,raw categories for actual cessation/return home/aftercare, duration from move-in date, multiple-response reasons, unique children within the year/entire period, recoding and all revision dates; obtain the public aggregates for 2006 and 2016-25. The register is described as CPR-based with parental-responsibility roles (AS 2015 printed 29/PDF 31),but the public tables read do not link to errors on appeal or effective family contact.

6. Multiple placement bases; own type of intervention statistics

BU03A, country 000, 2006-10, all ages:

Basis	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Placement with consent (§ 52.3 (7))	10469	10847	10879	10848	10522
Placement without consent (§ 58)	1329	1383	1554	1720	1713
Youth (§ 74 (a)) (Penal Code)	125	126	124	143	145

Basis	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Aftercare with residential placement(§76.3 no.1)	1372	1542	1668	1693	1802
Serving a sentence (§ 78.2) (Sentence Enforcement Act)	0	0	0	0	10
Article 765 of the Code of Civil Procedure	0	0	0	0	37
Decision of the Presidency (§ 75.1)	0	0	0	0	56
Unstated placement	338	326	317	262	312

BU03A, selection and cause number in JSON. The 0 published for 2006-09 in subsequent imported categories is not used as proof of 0 actual interventions. AS 2010 Table 2.1 says settlement / custody could not be reported separately before 2010. The codes of consent also contain 18 + compliance / other ratios depending on the table; a compulsory union figure requires more than adding SEL 58 with the others.

ANB6 -Other 2011-25 = 143 / 126 / 110 / 115 / 124 / 131 / 159 / 167 / 170 / 229 / 306 / 366 / 417 / 397 / 382; not available = 369 / 391 / 415 / 460 / 408 / 351 / 274 / 239 / 215 / 175 / 118 / 91 / 72 / 60 / 52. All four categories plus total controlled. ANB6.

P07 specific outstanding item: obtain separate coding of the legal basis for SEL 65/75/76, Criminal Code 74 a, Sentence Enforcement Act 78, Administration of Justice Act 765, Aliens Act 36 and Youth Crime Act 14, together with BL 46/47/49/62/143/151 from 2024. DST Contents, Content description states the bases and that ongoing older decisions continue under their original legal basis until a new BL decision. Other in the public table provides no internal breakdown.

7. Separate Appeals Times; updated 2025 and separately 2026 Semester

Time of public proceedings of the Board of Appeal, extract 25 August 2026, table Average length of proceedings.

Type of action	2025 weeks	2025 determined	2026 to 2. kvt.weeks	2026 determined
Local social / employment	35,1	22927	32,0	14706
Committee on Children and Children	6,9	2272	6,6	1158
Notification	6,7	1726	7,5	712
Use of force	6,2	25	14,4	15
Ungdomskriminalitetsrådet (Youth Crime Council), the source's designation	6,3	81	6,2	42
Social supervision	6,9	46	17,4	31

Ongoing late registrations may change annual data. The average for closed cases is not the duration of placement, continued denial of contact or the municipality's new decision after remittal for reconsideration. The 25 use-of-force cases form a separate appeal category, not all reported uses of force. None of the annual counts of decided cases is a unique citizen population.

8. Original Case and Time Series, Unhomogenized

Original, Table 4.21 / 4.22, p. 13 / 14, extract February 2020; 2017 / 18 locked. Unit: months.

Category / Objective	2017	2018	2019
Municipal cases, proceedings	4,7	4,8	4,2
Municipal matters, recess	3,1	3,3	3,0
Compulsory placement and use of force,case processing	1,7	1,8	1,9

Category / Objective	2017	2018	2019
Compulsory placement and use of force,time pending	0,9	1,4	1,0
Information, handling of cases	2,6	2,8	3,4
Information, time of birth	1,8	2,0	1,0

Reality cases. Procedure: Receipt → decision. Lesson: pending cases at the end of the year. Forced and powerful are combined.

Original, Table 4.1 / 4.2, p. 24 / 25; Method p. 23, extract 3 July 2023. Unit: weeks.

Category / Objective	2020	2021	2022
Municipal cases, proceedings	17,5	14,4	14,6
Municipal matters, recess	11,1	11,6	10,6
Forced actions in the field of children, proceedings	6,5	6,2	6,8
Children's forced labour, rest period	3,9	3,3	3,9
Information, handling of cases	6,7	6,8	6,7
Information, time of birth	4,2	4,0	4,0
Other, handling	6,9	6,1	6,0
Other, recess	13,0	13,9	12,3

Cases determined on the merits. For reopened cases,the measured time starts on the reopening date. Other includes access to records,use of force and assisted reproduction; use of force cannot be isolated from this category.

These original annual versions differ slightly from the annual statement's municipal 2020-22 time of 17,4/14,3/14,5 weeks; time pending 10,6/11,0/10,7 weeks. Both versions are retained,and their values are not additional cases relative to one another. The combined 2017-19 coercion/use-of-force population must not automatically be joined to the 2020-22 child-coercion population,in which use of force is part of Other.

Verified outstanding item T01: Full originals for 2011-14 with separate categories, the social appeals boards' and employment appeals boards' own time series for 2006-12, and separate child coercion/use-of-force series for 2023-24 are missing. Table 3, printed p. 41, in Annual Report 2010 has been located in the search index, but the full original has not yet been secured. The request to AST/the ministry/the National Archives must specify year, categories, scope of merits consideration, case ID, the measurement date for time pending, first appeal receipt/reopening and extract version. Months are not converted into weeks without a stated convention. Case-processing targets are not measured process durations.

9. Register assumptions, historical versions and P06

Source card: DST Accuracy and reliability,especially Other uncertainty and Revision practices. Event dates may differ by up to a month. Missing CPR/person ID or event date leads to exclusion. The register is corrected on an assumption of processes complying with the law: a provisional decision is assumed recoded to without consent within seven days; decisions concerning unborn children are assumed recoded at birth if a change has not been reported. Not all events/variables are approved. Copenhagen 2019 has deficiencies in consent and decisive reasons for starts following a 2020 system change; Lejre 2016-20 has incomplete residential-stay data to an unknown extent. New publications replace the entire series, including corrections to historical years.

Own methodological meaning: Registered legal basis cannot prove the actual simultaneous decision or the timely approval of a preliminary decision. Automatic assumptions require separate checks against decision document and date of execution. Non-registration shall not be counted as zero intervention. The rest of the P06 is concrete: DST / Copenhagen must provide scope, affected rows / variables, decoding rule and date / version for each subsequent correction of

2019. The read documentation does not identify a complete numerical post-correction. Lejre requires an independent request for 2016-20.

DST NEW 30567, published 21. September 2020, corrected 23. June 2021 kl. 08.00, renounces 2019 status 13.600 placed and 2.624 without consent. The correction note applies to the age distribution. The current ANB6 version gives up 13.435 and 2.501 for the same year. Differences between annual versions are no more persons; deviations 165 and 123 cannot be attributed to Copenhagen without an audit account because the same correction may affect several categories and municipalities.

10. Historical duration and actual breakdown

BIS66, country 000, age ALT, edition 17 May 2011. Status 31 December by total duration; 2008 excludes all over 17 years according to the table. It's not a complete homecoming cohort.

Duration	2006	2007	2008	2009
Total	14156	15273	12747	12589
0 - 2 months	504	551	531	434
3 - 5 months	726	733	730	573
6 - 11 months	1220	1112	1155	1028
1 - 2 years	3926	4431	3605	3805
3 - 6 years	4120	4298	3431	3441
7 years and over	3658	4145	3295	3307
Undisclosed	2	3	0	1

Own delineation: Containers of the various years' denominators; population of the duration table is not automatically added to BU04A or ANB6. P02 / T03 is only partially covered: total current duration is not the time from a faulty decision to actual reunification.

BU25, land 000, all ages / sex in table, edition 15 October 2019. Reasons for amendment, not homecoming. Århus / Copenhagen 2018 is deficient according to the table note.

Reason	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total	1182	991	1092	917	712
The change follows a planned course of development	233	231	237	196	119
Improvement of conditions for the child / young person	148	118	118	113	72
Absence of conditions for the child / young person	188	129	160	110	92
The child / young person leaves the location (will not be there)	173	122	150	102	98
Placement has collapsed (location has abandoned)	213	170	190	185	126
Ambient location closes	31	57	35	27	33
Priorities of the municipality (2007-09)	0	0	0	0	0
Other reasons	171	149	175	142	97
Undisclosed	25	15	27	42	75

BU32, land 000, all sexes, edition 11. October 2017. All 48 cells (cause × change / cessation × year) in JSON.

Follow-up, all causes of breakdown;	2013	2014	2015	2016
Total	545	549	426	447
Amendment	308	340	257	293
Termination	237	209	169	154

Own delimitation: Crash is concrete recorded events. A termination after a breakdown shall not document a timely return or reunification after a proven regulatory error. The same sequence may be recorded in BU25, BU32 and AS 'cause tables. Therefore, no cross-add-ons.

11. The names wait before the reform; the original versions are retained

Reference time _ RR2008, Table 1 s 2 and Table 2 s 3.

Category, whole country	2007	2008H1
Total	14	14,6

Table 2 separate 2007 social / employment below

Reference time _ RR2010, Table 1 s 3; Table 2 / 3 s 4.

Category, whole country	2007	2008	2009JanNov
Total	14,4	15,3	16,1
social	13,6	14,3	15,6
employment,	14,3	16,2	16,7

2009 excluding December; source extract 5 Jan 2010; 2007 deviates from RR 2008

Reference time _ RR2011, Table 2 s 4; Table 3 s 5.

Category, whole country	2009	2010	2011Q1	2011Q2
social	15,6	17,05	17,2	17,35
employment,	16,7	18,03	15,2	16,43

The whole country is unweighted average of the average of the regions. 2009 recycled from RR 2010.

RR 2008 Table 2 gives separately 2007 social 13,3 and employment 14,7 weeks. RR 2010 gives up 13,6 / 14,3 for the same year, and total 14,4 against previously 14,0. The version difference is retained; 2009 in RR 2010 is missing December. RR 2011 recycles the 2009 figures and is therefore not an independent full-year confirmation. The entire country's average in RR 2011 is explicitly unweighted between regions.

RR19 / 2013, Figure 5, p. 18, Annex 2, p. 28 and Figure 6, p. 22, visually original controlled. All 83 readings in JSON.

Quarter	Social	Employment
2011Q1	17	15
2011Q2	17,8	16,5
2011Q3	20,3	20
2011Q4	18,3	19,7
2012Q1	19,1	18

Quarter	Social	Employment
2012Q2	21,7	19,1
2012Q3	22,2	20,4
2012Q4	25,1	22,2
2013Q1	28,9	22,5
2013Q2	28,3	24,7

Annex 2 whole-country average 2011 / 2012 / 2013H1: social 18,2 / 21,9 / 28,6; employment 17,7 / 19,8 / 23,6 weeks. Figure 6 after the reform has new legal division; March 2014 children / family / service law 36,4, other social 42,7 and employment 34,4. Name averages are regional averages, not calculated directly by all cases. Times are not directly comparable across the reform.

Own final specification: Term 2007-12 is now documented in original versions with their periods; 2009 remains a Jan-November population in these versions. The year 2006, full 2009 and separate child / power 2006-14 require the concrete historical originals. KOU 239 (2009-10), reply 12 October 2010, document 900515, contains 2007-10 time data; KOU 7 (2010@-@ 11), reply 1 November 2010, asks separately for state figures 2001-07. They are localized sources, not yet fully tabulated here.

Placement statistics 2010: all annual-original figures, charts and methodology

The original of the Appeal Board was published in October 2011 and is based on register status on 3 August 2011. All 56 physical pages are text-read. Tiny category and year couplings in figures are also visually controlled in memory. Physical PDF page is usually the printed page plus 2; covers, table of contents and annex cover have special formatting.

Main analysis: consent, termination and effective protection

The figures describe several stages of a placement process. The 2.805 decisions in 2010 include 2.703 municipal and 102 court-determined locations. The 311 municipal decisions without consent represent the printed share of 12 percent of the 2.703 municipal decisions. The category of consent shall record the classification of the authority; it shall not test voluntary, on the basis of information or legality. The 118 changes from coercion to consent are recorded incidents in existing processes. A modified classification does not in itself document the repair of a previous error. [ASAN10, T2.1 and T3.7, PDF 8 and 31]

The cessation table records 3.253 cessations in 2010,including 2.280 upon reaching age 18. The young person may continue in residential placement as aftercare. The new counting rule makes cessations markedly more numerous than in earlier publications. The figures therefore require separate linkage to actual return home, family contact and reunification. Individual reasons for return home may overlap. The table records one annulment by the High Court; dash cells for Ankestyrelsen and the Children and Young People Committee are retained as original markings. The table does not state the appeal duration, the date of physical return home or compensation. [ASAN10,T3.10,PDF37-38]

The compliance table includes 559 decisions on needs and omits decisions on no need. In 53 registrations the need has been decided, but the offer has not yet been determined. The source does not provide the necessary linkage between these 559 decisions and all the 2.280 young people aged at 18. The difference is therefore not a statement of refusal or illegal refusal of assistance. The original describes the absence of post-clearance reports, an overestimated stock in 2007 and the absence of published post-clearance data for 2008-2009. This version recalculates the historical years. Need decision, established offer and actually continued help each requires its registration. [ASAN10, T4.1-T4.3, PDF 40-42 and 55-56]

The authority’s knowledge of registration problems is specific. The original describes a four-week reporting time limit. The response-time figure instead measures from implementation to the latest registered report. The source classifies 40 per cent as reported on time; 19 per cent are more than half a year after implementation. This measures the delay in the statistics using that clock. A count of distinct children without lawful assistance requires further case linkage. CPR and parental-responsibility information make the chain possible in the underlying register, but the annual edition does not link errors and appeals to return home, contact or payment. The demand is de-identified, version-dated course data showing these links. [ASAN10, PDF 47 and 49-54]

Reading and counting rules

All 18 numbered original tables, figures' explicit data values, map legends, the methodology's classification matrix and key facts about denominators and versions are reproduced below. F2.4 and the methodology's weekly figure have no printed point values. In F3.5,small cells without a printed number are marked as such, even where subtraction from the prose total might suggest a value. Axis increments are not observations.

Prick, line, zero and "not printed" have different meanings. Pots before 2010 refer, inter alia, to categories which could not be reported separately. Percentages are the original rounds; exact counters are not recalculated from them. Subcategories, totals, causes and several references in the same case may overlap. A sum of all rows would therefore not be a number of citizens or errors.

Specific internal votes

In the T3.5, the child delimmer summers are 3.567, while the original's total is 3.566. In T3.6, the size columns are 1.078 against the total 1.079. The last column is printed "6 ', where T3.5 uses" 6 and over'. The original cells are preserved. In T3.4 the rows of known age give 12.562 against 12.565 including three of unknown age. F3.1 also has 12.562 with enlightened sex, but it does not prove that the three with undesired sex are the same persons.

In T4.4,the reason rows total 1.152 against 1.091 cessations; 24 cessations have an unknown reason. Multiple reasons may be registered. The printed 376 and 33 per cent do not match 1.091 as denominator:own calculation gives 34, 5 per cent. A rounded proportion of 33 per cent is consistent with 1.152 reason selections as denominator, but the original does not expressly give that denominator. The figures and local discrepancy are retained.

T2.3 counts 2.864 effectuations. The prosas on PDF 27 use 2.805 when referring to the first day institution; this is the decision number. The correct source of the first actual location is therefore T2.3. The same year is shown several times in figures and tables. These views document the same population and do not need to be merged.

Original tables and figure cells

T2.1 - Decisions after consent and judgment

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 8, printed page 6. Unit: Decisions. Limitation: municipal decisions and judicial positions separately.

Category	2007	2008	2009	2010
With consent (§ 52)	3388	3231	2783	2392
Without consent (§ 58)	197	217	207	221
Decision of the Presidency (§ 75 (1))	72	105	130	90
Total municipal decisions	3657	3553	3120	2703
Youth asphyxia	77	69	60	35
Reconciliation	.	.	.	15
Product-strength surrogate	.	.	.	52
Unstated	15	4	6	0
Total	3749	3626	3186	2805

Municipal compulsion 2010 = 221 + 90 = 311 of 2703, not of 2805. Remuneration / custody could not be reported separately before 2010; dot is not 0.

T2.2 - Decisions by sex and age

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 9, printed page 7. Unit: Decisions and rounded percentages. Limit: N = 2805; sex columns 1534 / 1271; age of decision.

Age	Number of boys	Boys per cent.	Number of girls	Girls per cent	Total	Total
0-3 years	209	14	157	12	366	13
4 to 6 years	101	7	80	6	181	6
7-11 years	242	16	174	14	416	15
12 to 14 years	330	22	321	25	651	23
15 to 17 years	652	43	539	42	1191	42
Total decisions	1534	100	1271	100	2805	100

Percentages don't necessarily add up to 100.

T2.3 - First location, effective location

ASAN10, physical PDF page 15, printed page 13. Unit: Number and rounded percentages. Limit: N = 3693 / 3502 / 3254 / 2864; actual occupancy.

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Total family of care	928	25	941	27	883	27	891	31
Network family outside the genus	153	4	157	4	115	4	35	1
Network family within the genus	47	1	27	1	39	1	137	5
General care family	728	20	757	22	729	22	719	25
Own room / coll egium / residence	332	9	301	9	324	10	375	13
Total institution of the day	1333	36	1176	34	1054	33	820	28
Local authority offers (2006-09)	350	9	320	9	361	11	6	0
Actuarial institution (2006-09)	288	8	234	7	194	6	2	0
Day institution partially closed	.	.	.	.	.	.	18	1
Daily institution secured department	46	1	56	2	58	2	67	2
General Section	649	18	566	16	441	14	727	25
Dietary / post-school	281	8	234	7	230	7	171	6
Social pedagogy	667	18	678	19	641	20	507	18
Ship project	24	1	32	1	18	1	11	0
Undisclosed	128	3	140	4	104	3	89	3
Total	3693	100	3502	100	3254	100	2864	100

Network definition specified 2010. Hybles are included in their own room from 2010, previously often municipal daily offers. A few 2010 events in 2009 schedule; dot not 0. Care / institutional totals overlap subcategories.

T2.4 - Reasons for placing the claim

ASAN10, physical PDF page 18, printed page 16. Unit: Decisions; several occasions possible. Limitation: 2748 of 2805 has given rise. The% column uses the number of rows.

Feature	Decisions the occasion;	Only this occasion	Only this occasion %
The municipality's own initiative	1265	279	22, 1
Advice from the child / young person	736	104	14, 1
Contact from a holder of parental responsibility	1226	315	25, 7
Information from family / acquaintance	251	31	12, 4
Information from school	629	47	7, 5
Information from day / leisure homes	176	11	6, 3
Information from healthcare / health services	347	64	18, 4
Information from the police / court	321	140	43, 6
Notification from the other municipality	98	16	16, 3
Information from others	614	99	16, 1
Total decisions with informed reasons	2748	1106	40, 2

57 of the diffusers; the rows must not be summed up to the number of cases.

T3.1 - Children and adolescents aged 31 December

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 22, printed page 20. Unit: Statusmen at December 31. Limit: Stock calculated from reported approaches / departures; not directly municipal ultimo reported.

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
0-3 years	664	5	737	6	788	6	834	7
4 to 6 years	893	7	869	7	912	7	957	8
7-11 years	2773	22	2759	22	2633	21	2580	21
12 to 14 years	3126	25	3165	25	3102	24	2895	23
15 to 17 years	5172	41	5270	41	5396	42	5296	42
Age not known	1	0	1	0	2	0	3	0
Total 0-17 years	12629	100	12801	100	12833	100	12565	100

Annual population cannot be summed up to 20 years of unique children.

T3.2 - Placed by location, end of year

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 26, printed page 24. Unit: Number and rounded percentages. Limit: Ultimo stock 12629 / 12801 / 12833 / 12565.

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Total family of care	5974	47	6149	48	6280	49	6351	51

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Network family outside the genus	333	3	424	3	475	4	409	3
Network family within the genus	236	2	210	2	209	2	305	2
General care family	5405	43	5515	43	5596	44	5637	45
Own room / coll egium / residence	441	3	431	3	440	3	501	4
Total institution of the day	3078	24	3079	24	3037	24	2858	23
Local authority offers (2006-09)	619	5	693	5	774	6	511	4
Actuarial institution (2006-09)	286	2	316	2	300	2	192	2
Day institution partially closed	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-
Daily institution secured department	58	-	52	-	53	-	64	1
General Section	2115	17	2018	16	1910	15	2076	17
Dietary / post-school	626	5	571	4	536	4	459	4
Social pedagogy	2182	17	2268	18	2254	18	2114	17
Ship project	39	-	40	-	36	-	32	-
Undisclosed	289	2	263	2	250	2	250	2
Total	12629	100	12801	100	12833	100	12565	100

Undisclosed is due to a lack of adequate municipal reports. Old institutional types continue in stock; totals overlap with sub-groups. Original line is preserved.

T3.3 - End of period of consent

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 27, printed page 25. Unit: Staff and percentages. Limit: N = annual total stock; 2010 N 12565.

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
With consent (§ 52)	10809	86	10814	84	10649	83	10298	82
Without consent (§ 58)	1412	11	1594	12	1754	14	1763	14
Youth asphyxia	82	1	64	0	67	1	49	0
Reconciliation	.	.	.	.	.	.	7	0
Strength surroga t	.	.	.	.	.	.	32	0

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Undisclosed	326	3	329	3	363	3	416	3
Total	12629	100	12801	100	12833	100	12565	100

Unspecified consent 416; judgment/serving a sentence/remand detention kept separate; a dot before 2010 means no separate reporting option.

T3.4 - Played siblings by age

ASAN10,physical PDF page 29,printed page 27. Unit: children with recorded full siblings, not families. Scope: siblings defined by identical registered holders of parental responsibility; 558 children lack this information.

Age	Sibling number	Sibling percent.	All numbers	All percentages.
0-3 years	204	6	834	7
4 to 6 years	373	10	957	8
7-11 years	1101	31	2580	21
12 to 14 years	966	27	2895	23
15 to 17 years	922	26	5296	42
Total	3566	100	12565	100

All age ranges total 12562; total 12565 includes 3 with undisclosed age from T3.1 No record of all biological siblings.

T3.5 - Sequential flocks by size and type

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 29, printed page 27. Unit: Packs; last row of children. Limit: Type of location, not the same physical location; maximum number of siblings recorded 7.

Category	2 numbers	2%	3 numbers	3%	4 numbers	4%	5 Number	5%	6+ number	6 +%	Total number	Total %
Different type	332	27	107	45	31	42	8	67	3	50	481	31
Same type	900	73	129	55	43	58	4	33	3	50	1079	69
Total siblings	1232	100	236	100	74	100	12	100	6	100	1560	100
Total children	2464	69	708	20	296	8	60	2	39	1	3566	100

Children's allowance 3567 as against printed 3566. Original cells retained; no correction of the number of persons by own sum. The 69% printed proportion corresponds to 1079 of 1560 sibling flocks. The wording of the text on all siblings does not document a person's share or physical common stay.

T3.6 - Sequence flocks in the same type of location

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 30, printed page 28. Unit: Pack in the same type of place. Limit: Column totals 900 / 129 / 43 / 4 / 2; source prints last size 6, not 6 +.

Location	2 numbers	2%	3 numbers	3%	4 numbers	4%	5 Number	5%	6 numbers	6%	Total number	Total %
Total family of care	681	76	89	68	30	70	3	75	2	100	805	75

Location	2 numbers	2%	3 numbers	3%	4 numbers	4%	5 Number	5%	6 numbers	6%	Total number	Total %
Non-family networks	28	3	3	2	3	7	1	25	0	0	35	3
Generic networks	15	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	50	19	2
General care family	638	71	83	64	27	63	2	50	1	50	751	70
Total institution	133	15	20	15	9	21	1	25	0	0	163	15
Municipal round-the-clock service	24	3	3	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	30	3
Akutinstituutno	15	2	4	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	21	2
Partially closed institution	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Security section	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
General Section	91	10	13	10	4	9	1	25	0	0	109	10
Dietary / aftershave	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Socialpedagogisk opholdssted	71	8	15	12	2	5	0	0	0	0	88	8
Ship project t	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Undisclosed	11	1	5	4	2	5	0	0	0	0	19	2
Total	900	100	129	100	43	100	4	100	2	100	1079	100

The column totals 1078 against total 1079; the T3.5 has 3 flocks in 6 + the same type. No assumption of the same physical location. The 805 / 1079 and the rounded 75 per cent in the case of a foster family are counted as sibling flocks. A share of the population requires the weighting of the group sizes; the same type of place does not document the same address.

T3.7 - Follow-up and other incidents

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 31, printed page 29. Unit: Case, not persons. Limit: Decisions / follow-up / cessation in 0-17 years of age.

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Place of relocation / change of location	1413	12	1476	12	1124	10	1044	8
Without consent modified to with consent	120	1	100	1	95	1	118	1
General follow-up action / action plan	5813	49	6330	53	6451	56	7297	59

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Presented children and the Youth Committee	489	4	564	5	526	5	520	4
Return and other termination	3375	28	3335	28	3187	28	3253	26
The transfer to the second municipality of action	89	1	84	1	90	1	71	1
The transfer from the other municipality of action	559	5	40	0	64	1	37	0
Total cases	11858	100	11929	100	11537	100	12340	100

Cessation at age 18 is also included where full-time residential placement continues in aftercare; revised cessation counts exceed those in earlier annual editions. Transfers in/out reflect, among other things, age/reporting delay.

T3.8 - Causes of movement

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 35, printed page 33. Unit: Movements with multiple initiators possible. Limit: N 1413 / 1476 / 1124 / 1044; several markings.

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Municipality	831	59	955	65	798	71	721	69
Location	520	37	610	41	440	39	408	39
The child / child	574	41	560	38	485	43	436	42
Parental authority	406	29	408	28	347	31	301	29
Court of Justice	47	3	55	4	21	2	20	2
Police / prosecution	26	2	25	2	7	1	21	2
Appeal authority	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Undisclosed	196	14	82	6	19	2	12	1
Total removals	1413	-	1476	-	1124	-	1044	-

The original's running text incorrectly refers to table 3.9; the printed table is 3.8. Zero initiation by an appeal authority does not mean zero appeals/errors.

T3.9 - Referral by children and youth committees

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 36, printed page 34. Unit: Questions asked, not 572 children. Limitation: 520 cases with 572 references; several questions same decision.

Type of decision	Acceded	Not accepted	Total	Acceded%
Voluntary section 52 to coercion section 58	53	2	55	96
Maintenance / extended duration § 62 stp.1-4	364	4	368	99
Extended retreatment period 3 annual rule 0 years	15	3	18	83
Continuation of association § 68 a	16	3	19	84

Type of decision	Acceded	Not accepted	Total	Acceded%
Amended place § 69 stk.4-5 after § 58 / 68 a	18	1	19	95
Refusal of a return application § 68 / 68 a	26	1	27	96
Maintenance after preliminary decision § 75 stp.3-4	41	1	42	98
Communication restriction under section 71 subsection 3, read with subsection 5	21	3	24	88
Total submissions	554	18	572	97

Accession is the outcome of the committee, not independent proof of the correct basis. Quotas are the historical names of the original.

T3.10 - Registered returns and other termination by cause

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 38, printed page 36. Unit: Termination with overlapping causation markings. Limit: N 3375 / 3335 / 3187 / 3253; not sum of causative series.

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Objective achieved	639	19	530	16	477	15	427	13
Objective not achieved	340	10	411	12	354	11	190	6
Application by the holder of parental leave	415	12	398	12	372	12	322	10
Young people over 15 years of age withdraw consent	260	8	281	8	248	8	160	5
The Committee shall not accede to the extension of the term of office;	7	0	5	0	7	0	-	-
Ankestyrelsen the lender;	4	0	1	0	-	-	-	-
The national court shall quash the placing decision.	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Falling 18 years	1947	58	2057	62	2039	64	2280	70
Place closes category from 2010	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	0
Suitable place cannot be found	14	0	15	0	11	0	2	0
Allocated new municipality of action	116	3	91	3	71	2	39	1
Child leaves the place category from 2010	-	-	-	-	-	-	221	7
Place gives up category from 2010	-	-	-	-	-	-	86	3
Second Termination	601	18	504	15	373	12	217	7

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Total	3375	-	3335	-	3187	-	3253	-

Excludes changes of responsible municipality where placement continues, cf.3.7; nevertheless a row of 39 other transfers, which must not be harmonised with 71. Cessation at age 18 also occurs with continuing aftercare. New 2010 categories; original dash retained, not 0.

T4.1 - Decisions on the need for protection

ASAN10, physical PDF page 40, printed page 38. Unit: Need decisions with multiple offers. Decrease: 559 positive needs decisions; per cent gender distribution within each row.

Tenders	Male Number	Male percentage points	Female Number	Women%	Total	Total
Visits	161	59	113	41	274	100
Personal Adviser	15	42	21	58	36	100
Permanent contact person	99	51	94	49	193	100
Closing-out scheme	58	53	51	47	109	100
Tenders not decided	25	47	28	53	53	100
Total required decisions	305	55	254	45	559	100

Excluding decisions on no need. Special after 18 years' decisions are taken. Not 559 decisions by all 2280 young people who turn 18. 53 needs without a decision to offer.

T4.2 - Established/re-established residential stays in aftercare

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 41, printed page 39. Unit: Number and rounded percentages. Limitation: Establishment / re-establishment / continuation 18-22 years.

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Total family of care	232	21	203	21	176	21	198	23
Network family outside the genus	11	1	17	2	9	1	14	2
Network family within the genus	8	1	6	1	10	1	8	1
General care family	213	19	180	18	157	19	176	20
Own room / coll egium / residence	246	22	231	23	183	22	220	25
Total institution of the day	187	17	170	18	175	21	135	15
Local authority offers (2006-09)	68	6	59	6	51	6	19	2
Actuarial institution (2006-09)	10	1	6	1	13	2	7	1
Day institution partially closed	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Daily institution secured department	3	0	6	1	2	0	4	0
General Section	106	10	99	10	109	13	104	12
Dietary / post-school	68	6	43	4	38	5	52	6
Social pedagogy	206	19	171	17	173	20	189	21
Ship project	8	1	9	1	2	0	2	0
Undisclosed	166	15	173	17	97	11	90	10
Total	1113	100	1000	101	844	100	886	100

The original 2008 percentage number 101 retained. Previous years of detention recalculated due to non-cessation; no addition to 0-17 locations.

T4.3 -18-22-year-olds in residential aftercare, at year-end

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 42, printed page 40. Unit: Number and rounded percentages. Limits: statusmen 1596 / 1741 / 1774 / 1823.

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Total family of care	425	27	449	26	438	25	449	24
Network family outside the genus	14	1	18	1	19	1	24	1
Network family within the genus	13	1	10	1	15	1	19	1
General care family	398	25	421	24	404	23	406	22
Own room / coll egium / residence	311	19	350	20	370	21	406	22
Total institution of the day	252	17	286	16	307	17	300	16
Local authority offers (2006-09)	79	5	88	5	86	5	57	3
Actuarial institution (2006-09)	8	1	5	0	7	0	6	0
Day institution partially closed	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	0
Daily institution secured department	9	1	20	1	21	1	35	2
General Section	156	10	173	10	193	11	201	11
Dietary / post-school	69	4	66	4	59	3	59	3

Category	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct.
Social pedagogy	346	22	389	22	419	24	439	24
Ship project	8	1	9	1	7	0	10	1
Undisclosed	185	12	192	11	174	10	160	9
Total	1596	100	1741	100	1774	100	1823	100

Recalculated historical aftercare years; in 2010, trajectories with clear case events but no separate continuation decision are also included. Quality for 2007-09 is assessed as lower; the percentage cell 2007 institution 17 is retained.

T4.4 - Cessation of residential stays in aftercare

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 44, printed page 42. Unit: Termination and overlapping of causes. Limitation: 1091 cessation, of which 24 unknown cause; cause number of sums 1152.

Reason	Number	Printed per cent
Purpose achieved	376	33
Purpose not achieved	36	3
Filling 23 years	179	16
The place closes.	4	0
Suitable place cannot be found	1	0
New municipality of action	14	1
Young people leave the site	78	7
Place gives up.	18	2
Second Termination	446	39
Total	1091	100

The printed 376/33 does not agree with 1091 as the percentage denominator: own 34, 5%.33 rounded fits the sum of reasons 1152,but the source does not expressly state this denominator. No harmonisation.

F1.1 - Decisions and effectiveness

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 4, printed page 2. Unit: Annual events. Limit: Same number as 2.1 / 2.3; no addition.

Year	Decisions	Efficacy
2007	3749	3693
2008	3626	3502
2009	3186	3254
2010	2805	2864

Year mapping visually checked by root; the graph text’s extraction order is not year order.

F1.2 - Ultimo stock 0-17 years

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 5, printed page 3. Unit: Staff of the State. Limit: Same stock as 3.1.

Year	Number
2007	12629
2008	12801
2009	12833
2010	12565

No addition to 3.1.

F2.1 - Decisions by age

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 10, printed page 8. Unit: Rounded percentages. Limit: Annual Decisions 3749 / 3626 / 3186 / 2805.

Age	2007%	2008%	2009%	2010 pct.
0-3 years	9	11	12	13
4 to 6 years	6	6	5	6
7-11 years	15	14	14	15
12 to 14 years	29	28	27	23
15 to 17 years	41	42	42	42

Visually verified; no exact integers are recalculated.

F2.2 - Frequency of settlement by age

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 11, printed page 9. Unit: Decisions per 1000 of the same age group. Limit: Source of figure refers to population 1 Jan 2010.

Age	2007 per mille	2008 per mille	2009 per mille	2010 per mille
0-3 years	1, 36	1, 52	1, 44	1, 40
4 to 6 years	1, 12	1, 03	0, 88	0, 92
7-11 years	1, 63	1, 51	1, 3	1, 25
12 to 14 years	5, 09	4, 71	3, 99	3, 09
15 to 17 years	7, 67	7, 33	6, 44	5, 56

No number illegally placed. Root's visual control, PDF 11.

F2.3 - Signature of the municipal decision card

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 12, printed page 10. Unit: Class boundaries of the map. Limitation: 0-17 years of age per municipality; not exact municipality number.

Signature	Printed demarcation
Red	Exceeding 3 per cent
Green	2-3%
Orange	Less than 2 per cent
White	No decision to place

The figure does not print exact ratecels for each municipality. No rate guessed by colour; prose indicates 22 municipalities over 3 and 36 under 2.

F2.5 - First place by sex

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 16, printed page 14. Unit: Percentage of gender-specific effects. Demonstration: The figure does not indicate gender-specific integers.

Location	Boys per cent.	Girls per cent
Total family of care	29, 8	32, 6
Own room etc.	11, 3	15, 2
Daily institution	29, 1	28, 1
Dietary / post-school	6, 3	5, 6
Social pedagogical residence etc.	20, 4	15, 4

Visually controlled; remaining / unilluminated locations not shown separately.

F2.6 - Reasons for placing the claim

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 17, printed page 15. Unit: Percentage; several occasions. Limitation: 2010 provided the occasion, N 2748 from 2.4; earlier years precise information-denominators not here.

Feature	2008%	2009%	2010 pct.
The municipality's own initiative	34, 6	37, 2	46, 0
The child's contact	27, 8	27, 3	26, 8
Approach by the holder of parental responsibility	50, 1	46, 4	44, 6
Family / acquaintance	9, 9	9, 4	9, 1
School	28, 4	28, 9	22, 9
Day / leisure home	6, 4	6, 0	6, 4
Health services	9, 7	11, 5	12, 6
Police / Court	10, 4	10, 9	11, 7
Second municipality	3, 0	4, 0	3, 6
Others	21, 5	22, 7	22, 3

Visually controlled; causality rows overlap.

F2.7 - Parents / Home Local Authorities

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 19, printed page 17. Unit: Rounded causation markings. Limitation: Local authorities reported; several possible; figure no separate valid N.

Specified relationship	2010 pct.
Insufficient care	48
Other decisive factors	37
Violent disharmony	33
Abuse	18

Specified relationship	2010 pct.
Insomnia	14
No decisive relationship	12
Violence / threats to the child	9
Grove care failure	9
Physical poor health conditions	7
Development inhibition	4
Other criminal behaviour	4
Serious illness / other deaths	4
Physical impairment	2
Sexual abuse / incest	2
Parents deceased	2
For adoption	0

No independent control of the accuracy of the relationship. 0 rounded percentage has not been proven 0 events.

F2.8 - Local circumstances of the child

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 20, printed page 18. Unit: Rounded causation markings. Limitation: Several reasons possible; 18 shown rows include none-conditions; method calls 17 cause categories.

Specified relationship	2010 pct.
Outstanding behaviour / adaptation	36
School problems	33
Leisure / friends / networks	30
Other factors	24
Indademergent behaviour / adaptation	20
Self-harm / attention-seeking	19
No decisive relationship	14
Health / other	13
Developmental disorder: autism/ADHD etc.	12
Other criminal behaviour	12
Abuse	10
Missing family relations / street child	6
Insomnia	4
Development inhibition	4
Language problems	4
Unaccompanied refugee	3
Physical impairment	3

Specified relationship	2010 pct.
Youth asphyxia	1

No legal / professional verification of the recorded justification for these statistics.

F2.9 - Summary BFUs themes

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 21, printed page 19. Unit: Thematic markers. Limit: combined parents / children's reasons; unclassified omitted.

Theme	2010 pct.
Development / behaviour	61
Family conditions	89
School conditions	34
Health conditions	49
Recreation / friends	30
Other relevant factors	24

89% does not mean a lawful child welfare assessment; themes may overlap. Methodological rule reproduced in M1.9. The figure's reference to annex point 1.8 does not point to the actual classification matrix in point 1.9, physical PDF 55.

F3.1 - Appointed sex

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 23, printed page 21. Unit: Staff of the State. Limit: 12562 with enlightened sex as against 12565 total; 3 omitted.

Sex	Number	Printed pro sas%
Boys	6816	54
Girls	5746	46
Total gender	12562	100

No assumption of the same three as with undisclosed age.

F3.2 - Year-end placement frequency by age

ASAN10, physical PDF page 24, printed page 22. Unit: per 1000 population of the same age group. Limit: Population of Denmark's Statistics 1 January of the year; calculated ultimo stock.

Age	2008 per mille	2009 per mille	2010 per mille
0-3 years	2, 8	3, 0	3, 2
4 to 6 years	4, 4	4, 7	4, 9
7-11 years	8, 1	7, 8	7, 7
12 to 14 years	14, 8	14, 5	13, 7
15 to 17 years	25, 6	25, 8	24, 7

Visually controlled; not the same as 2.2 new decisions.

F3.3 - Municipal ultimo map signature

ASAN10, physical PDF page 25, printed page 23. Unit: Class boundaries of the map. Limit: Stock of the municipality of trade 0-17 years per 1000.

Signature	Printed demarcation
Orange	3 -9 per 1000
Green	10 -14 per 1000
Red	15 or over per 1000

No exact municipal ratecels in the map; no rate guessed. The printed intervals of the map shall be kept.

F3.4 - Movements per quarter

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 32, printed page 30. Unit: Moving events. Limit: Summer 1413 / 1476 / 1124 / 1044 corresponds to 3.7.

Quarter	2007	2008	2009	2010
Quarter 1	319	339	282	239
2nd quarter	287	357	263	260
3rd quarter	460	472	348	323
4th quarter	347	308	231	222

No confidence dedup over the year.

F3.5 - Movements between types of place

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 33, printed page 31. Unit: Marked moving cells. Demonstration: Five groups by previous location; total in the text 955 as against 1044 as a whole.

From	For food / after keel	To own room	Of a kind used on motor cars agologic	For foster care	For day-to-day testing ution	Printed running text total
Daily institution	12	60	124	85	110	391
Family of care	12	41	57	92	53	255
Social pedagogical residence	7	72	77	15	39	210
Own room	not printed,	31	8	not printed,	9	50
Dietary / post-school	12	20	7	not printed,	9	49

Visually 1450 and 2800 px. Small / unvalued segments not recalculated from row prosa. Outstanding site groups shall not be interpreted as 0.

F3.6 - Causes of movement

ASAN10, physical PDF page 34, printed page 32. Unit: Percentage with multiple causation markings. Limits: Movements, N 1413 / 1476 / 1124 / 1044; not fault counters.

Reason	2007%	2008%	2009%	2010 pct.
Planned development	36	32	33	35
Improving the child's condition	23	21	23	22

Reason	2007%	2008%	2009%	2010 pct.
Aggravation of the child's condition	20	21	20	15
Child leaves the place	17	18	20	17
This place is breaking down.	20	21	22	21
The place closes.	3	4	4	5
Other reasons	20	20	18	19

All years / categories visually controlled.

F4.1 - Survival by sex

ASAN10,physical PDF page 43,printed page 41. Unit:persons at the reference date. Scope:18-22-year-olds in residential placement at year end.

Sex	Number	Prose%
Male	1083	59
Women	740	41
Total	1823	100

Same N as 4.3.

FM2 - Reporting response time

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 52, printed page 50. Unit: Alerts; rounded percentages. Limit: From execution to last recorded reporting; exact N not disclosed.

Response time	Pct.
Pre-performance	5
Less than 1 month	35
2-3 months	23
4-6 months	18
7-9 months	10
More than 9 months	9

40% is called in time; 19% more than six months. Reporting deadline of four weeks from the decision and event → last reporting is different watches; not just 60% breach in unique children.

M1.9 - Method: thematic classification numbers

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 55, printed page 53. Unit: Classification codes, not number of events. Limit: The numbers refer to table 1 question 7 a / 7 b.

Initial code conditions	Theme
Child 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5	Development / behaviour
Children 6 / 16 or parents 1 -12 / 14 -15	Family conditions
Child 7 / 8	School conditions
Children 3 / 9-14 or parents 13	Health conditions

Initial code conditions	Theme
Child 15	Recreation / friends
Child 17	Other relevant factors
None of the above	Undisclosed, omitted from the figure

The codes cannot be set as number of ratios. Child 3 goes in two themes.

MFAKTA - Method and denominator facts

ASAN10, Physical PDF page 50, printed page 48. Unit: Local method / register facts. Limit: No new populations at the same number repeated in report.

Locator physical / printed	Facts	Number / status
PDF 3 / s 1	Records retrieval	Early August 2011
PDF 11 / s 9	Local authorities over 3 decisions per 1000	22
PDF 11 / s 9	Local authorities under 2 decisions per 1000	36
PDF 28 / s 26	Children without informed custody	558 of 12565
PDF 28 / s 26	Former 2009 version without custody	4315 of 12654
PDF 44 / s 42	Absence of maintenance unknown cause	24 of 1091
PDF 47 / s 45	Municipalities with system specialty agreement	8, extract at least quarterly
PDF 50 / s 48	Contact April 2010 to municipalities with highest recorded falls	18
PDF 50 / s 48	Contact July 2010 for municipalities with highest recorded falls	14
PDF 51 / s 49	Reporting graph period	1 Jan 2010- 31 Jan 2011
PDF 53 / s 51	Total registry events 2010 and more time	Barely 139000
PDF 53 / s 51	Registered children since 1 Jan 2006	Some 30000
PDF 53 / s 51	Precise data demarcation	3 August 2011
PDF 54 / s 52	Causal categories of parents / children	15/17
PDF 55 / s 53	Unpublished post-mortem inspection	2008 and 2009
PDF 55 / s 53	Formerly 2007	Overrated according to the original
PDF 56 / s 54	Previous quality of defence	2007- 09 lower than 2010
PDF 56 / s 54	At 18 years of age, normally printed	With the exception of judgment / custody surrogate
PDF 56 / s 54	Compliance inclusion without separate decision	Clear case events can document continued residential placement

Barely / well kept as imprecise indications of size; not exact national personal unions over 20 years old.

Figure widget without guessed values

• F2.4, physical PDF 13 / press 11: Quarterly performance curves have no explicit point values. Annual numbers can be found in if1.1 / T2.1 / T2.3; no quarterly figures are guessed.

• FM1, physical PDF 51 / press 49: Weeks without explicit point values; axis division only. No reporting number guessed from the curve height.

Return and duration of placement: reconciliation of public publication

On 7. October 2026, StatBank's full available table catalogue of 5.737 metadata records was examined, including discontinued tables.44 relevant table metadata records were selected by the ANB/BU/BIS table series and titles concerning placements/children in care, supplemented by BU25/BU32. All 44 tables' variables, periods, units and update dates have actually been retrieved and read. This is **metadata and dimension verification**, not full reading of all 44 tables' value cells. The previously substantively checked population tables and original 2007-2015 reasons for cessation are in the chapter on individuals.

What the public register actually covers

Only BIS66 within the reporting period has a duration dimension: total duration among children in care on 31. December 2006-2009. Its figures have already been extracted in the person module and describe status, not completed processes. Table BIS7 on completed placements and duration of the most recent process covers 2001-2005, before the period. The newer placement tables show status/starts/causes, while BU25 and BU32 show changes and breakdowns. Within this specific 44-table scope, there is no public national 2016-2025 dimension for actual return home, destination after termination or completed placement duration. This is a documented **publication limitation**, not proof that the authorities do not have the information.

Danmarks Statistik's current documentation specifically states that the research registers contain changes, the reason for cessation and where the child moves afterwards. The data-quality section notes uncertainty about these details; changes are validated indirectly through status. A registered cessation therefore cannot automatically become a documented reunited child. National placement status minus the following year's status cannot provide returns home either: new and repeated trajectories, age, a change in the responsible municipality and other reasons for cessation must be included. [DST-PUB26A-C]

Table reconciliation with the entire controlled metadata delimitation

Table	Public period beginning	Latest period	Active Table	Dimensions that are actually controlled
ANB5	2011H1	2025H2	Yes	municipality, location, time
ANB6	2011H1	2025H2	Yes	municipality, measure, time
ANB7	2011H1	2025H2	Yes	municipality, age, time
ANB8	2011H1	2025H2	Yes	location, age, sex, time
ANB9	2011H1	2025H2	Yes	measure, age, sex, time
ANB10	2011H1	2025H2	Yes	location, measure, time
ANBAAR2	2011	2024	No	measure, age, sex, time
ANBAAR15	2011	2024	No	location, age, sex, time
ANBAAR5	2011	2018	No	location, age, sex, time
ANBAAR16	2011	2024	No	province, location, measure, age, sex, time
ANBAAR6	2011	2018	No	province, location, measure, age, sex, time
ANBAAR12	2011	2024	No	administering municipality, placement location, time
ANBAAR13	2011	2024	No	administering municipality, measure, time
ANBAAR9	2011	2024	No	administering municipality, age, time
ANBAAR7	2011	2018	No	province, location, age, sex, time
ANBILS1	2011	2025	Yes	administering municipality, age, time
ANBIVS2	2011	2025	Yes	administering municipality, sex, time
ANBIVS3	2011	2025	Yes	location, age, sex, time
ANBILS4	2011	2025	Yes	measure, age, sex, time
ANBAAR10	2018	2025	Yes	province, cause of placement, age, sex, time
ANBAAR8	2011	2024	No	province, measure, age, sex, time
ANBAAR17	2011	2024	No	province, location, age, sex, time
ANBAAR14	2011	2024	No	administering municipality, age, time
ANBAAR1	2011	2017	No	location, age, sex, time
ANBAAR3	2011	2017	No	administering municipality, placement location, measure, age, sex, time
ANBAAR4	2011	2017	No	administering municipality, placement location, age, sex, time
BU02A	2006	2015	No	area, location, time

Table	Public period beginning	Latest period	Active Table	Dimensions that are actually controlled
BU02B	2006	2015	No	location, age, sex, time
BU03A	2006	2015	No	area, measure, time
BU03B	2006	2015	No	measure, age, sex, time
ANB1	2011Q1	2017Q1	No	area, location, time
ANB2	2011Q1	2017Q1	No	location, age, sex, time
ANB3	2011Q1	2017Q1	No	area, measure, time
ANB4	2011Q1	2017Q1	No	measure, age, sex, time
BU20	2006	2017	No	area, cause of placement, age, sex, time
BU21	2006	2017	No	area, cause of placement, time
BU25	2014	2018	No	area, causes of change, age, gender, time
BU32	2013	2016	No	area, cause of breakdown, follow-up of breakdown, gender, time
BIS66	2006	2009	No	area, age, total duration of placement, time
BIS99	2006	2009	No	area, Measure, time
BIS2	1982	2005	No	area, location, age, sex, time
BIS9	2001	2005	No	area, Measure, time
BIS6	2001	2005	No	area, age, total duration of placement, time
BIS7	2001	2005	No	area, age, duration of last placement, time

Active is the publication status of the catalogue; a closed table is not a closed citizen's case. Several tables show the same register population with different dimensions.44 table metadata are not 44 independent studies or 44 child populations. Historical tables shall not be added to later recalculated versions.

Specific metadata errors and impact requirements

Registered legal basis may be constructed on the basis of an assumption

DST's quality description states that missing reports of changes may be replaced by assumptions of compliance with the law: provisional decisions are recoded after seven days, and decisions concerning unborn children are recoded at birth. The registered category therefore does not alone document the existence or lawfulness of the subsequent decision. This link must be checked against the contemporaneous decision record. [DST-PUB26C, »Other uncertainty«]

The description also states incomplete residential-stay data from Lejre for 2016-2020 of unknown scope and missing consent/reason data for Copenhagen initiations in 2019. Event dates may differ by up to one month; invalid person identification and a missing event date lead to exclusion. Not all variables and events are validated. This requires a separate account of exclusions and versions; the gaps must neither be assigned zero nor converted into an unknown count of unlawful placements. [DST-PUB26C,“Other uncertainty” and “Revision practices”]

The catalogues for ANB8 and ANB10 indicate: **31 June**, a date that does not exist; both are updated on May 7, 2026. The current statistical description indicates 30 June. The report retains this actually read metadata deviation and requires correction of the label; it is not in itself evidence of incorrect underlying numbers. The half-year definition used must be identified from tabular time and method, not just an erroneous heading.

Conclusion → proof → meaning → rule → omission → deviation → consequence → responsibility → requirements: An overall impact account cannot be completed from the public placement status alone. The 44-controlled dimension registers and DST's description of the research registers accurately document the difference between published status and existing cessation / removal information. The specific protection and restoration obligation shall be tested on the relevant right and event, as legal analysis indicates. If the authority does not follow an infamous decision on the actual contact / return of the child, a statistical closure may leave an unclaimed loss of entitlement. Therefore, an objective, unidentified coupling of initial interventions, test outcomes, actual cessation, new residence address and each relevant parental role is required. Mistakes or non-registrations must be verified against simultaneous decisions and actual residence. Responsibility for authority and personal liability shall be the responsibility of each individual.

The precise remaining material to obtain is raw reasons for cessation and destinations for 2006-2025, individual duration and linkage to appeal, remittal, annulment, new decision and actual reunification. No request to an authority has been sent. The gap concerns this data link; it does not change the already documented errors in the placement reviews.

Youth Crime Board 2019-2025:decisions, errors, time and return home

Controlled October 7, 2026. The name started 2019; 2006-2018 is therefore not missing the denominator. All 7 annual reports' key activity / outcome / complaint section are actually read. Compact JSON retains the original and later revised years separately.

Year	Head received / settled	Re-lodged received / settled	Complaints settled	Stated	Repealed / amended t	Rejected
2019	780 / 607	Not available / 82	24	13	11	0
2020	995 / 909	452 / 416	42	29	13	0
2021	927 / 1037	600 / 606	48	37	8	3
2022	898 / 880	655 / 658	60	42	17	1
2023	922 / 933	675 / 676	66	49	14	3
2024	950 / 967	820 / 813	59	49	9	1
2025	1034 / 1047	883 / 889	59	42	16	1

The categories of complaints of the originals sum up to 358 decisions and 88 totally / partially repealed or amended decisions. Repeated cases and overruns do not make the sum unique young, original interventions or families. Changes may be due to new information or modified consent; they do not automatically count as illegal placement.

Documented errors and concrete consequences

• 2019: 11 / 24 amended / repealed; a further 4 / 13 confirmed criticised; a repeal based on undocumented psychological examination reproduced in the second annex. [UKN2019] p.46-47. p.

• 2020:Two decisions lapsed after 1-2 months without implementation; a fresh submission produced identical decisions. After a notification and assessment, both the course and placement ceased; the actual move date is not published. [UKN2020]pp.45-46.

• 2021:10/37 affirmed decisions were also given a deadline for reconsideration. The 10 must not disappear from an account of errors or be called 10 additional alterations/remittals without a category note. One reopened case finally decided in 2022. [UKN2021]p.39.

• 2022: 13 / 42 confirmed at the same time was granted a retrial period before amendment 1 July. Three of 17 changes are due to new circumstances. A resumed proceedings definitively decided on 2023. [UKN2022] p.32. M.

• 2023: 27 homelands: 8 forced returns, 1 continued placement, 3 cessation of the entire process, 15 municipal homelands. Three described homelands after about 1,5 years, about 0,5 years and 1 year. The time indications are course descriptions; no documented country distribution from repeal to actual reunification. [UKN2023] p.24-26

• 2024: Invalid change of location and delviturned institution: lack of necessary descriptions / young person's attitude. Deficiencies also occur in confirmed decisions. [UKN2024] p.32-34.

• 2025: Formally invalid change of location and institution secured: consent / competence not clarified. Two siblings supervised the interaction with one parent terminated. Number of complaints is not number of families. [UKN2025] p.32-34.

Benchmarking of the tempo series

2019 table 3:202 timely/607 decided, 17 over 4 weeks. 2020 figure 5:timely 5%/4% and over 4 weeks 54%/57% in the age groups; no exact figure denominator printed. 2021:timely 10%/12% of 394/643; over 4 weeks 26%/37%.2022:timely 126/880; over 4 weeks 155/880.2023:timely 126/915; over 4 weeks 249/915,18 refusals excluded. 2024:19% timely and 10% over 4 weeks of 954,13 refusals excluded. 2025:22% timely and 11% over 4 weeks of 1031,16 refusals excluded. All intermediate steps are in JSON.2020-2023 graphs checked visually against the originals; rounded percentages have not been converted into exact counts.

Actual reunification and continued intervention

The registered cessation of improvement is 37 / 2020,75 / 2021,93 / 2022,88 / 2023,117 / 2024,134 / 2025. The categories of municipal orientations mix the change of location and repatriation. 2020 p.9 explicitly does not provide municipal information on repatriation. The cessation or orientation figures should therefore not be called reunions.

The 2025 duration in Figure 13 is fixed for the duration of the proceedings, with 89 cases excluded; the basis is referred to as 958 main cases. Two-year programme: 25% of 10-14 years and 6% of 15-17 years.67 / 889 recoveries extended the duration. It doesn't actually describe time separated from parents. The Committee of 20 young people is a descriptive foreword; only one interview was conducted. [UKN2025] p.21-24,29-30

Versions rupture and necessary extraction

• {"year": 2019, "original _ gen _ determined": 82, "later _ gen _ determined": 83, "source": "2021 p.5"}

• {"year": 2020, "original _ head _ determined": 909, "later _ head _ determined": 910, "source": "2024 Figure 10"}

• {"year": 2021, "original _ gen _ received": 600, "later _ gen _ received": 599, "source": "2025 Figure 2"}

• {"year": 2022, "original _ gen _ determined": 658, "later _ gen _ determined": 656, "source": "2023 p.6 / 2025 Figure 2," "additional _ deviation": "2022 p.5 age range 196 + 463 = 659; figure 4 = 658"}

• {"year": 2023, "original _ head _ received": 922, "later _ head _ received": 924, "original _ gen _ received": 675, "later _ gen _ received": 673, "source": "2025 Figure 1 / 2; visually read"}

The precise number of unique young people, parents, placements and actual moves home requires case-record/person linkage at the board, municipalities and Danmarks Statistik. Necessary fields: pseudonymised trajectory key; decision, implementation, complaint, annulment and return-home dates; consent; placement location; reason for outcome; any new decision and responsible authority. The 2019 incoming count of resubmitted cases is not published exactly in the annual report read; a case-record extract is necessary. For several years the court sections provide only approximate proportions and provisional status, not a full exact series of judgments. No gap has been filled by inventing a number.

Research literature: children, parents and actual consequences

Conclusion and application

The studies document stress, limited contact and experience of insufficient involvement among the children and parents studied. The results provide the report with a documented language for losses and for the authorities' knowledge of the need for support. The investigations are not national records of illegal placement and their participants cannot be added to the wrong records of the Ankestyrelsen as new identified victims. Linking requires evidence of the same decision, person, actual breach of justice, time course and consistency.

The report should describe a documented separation and its actual duration even when a control source has only assessed a procedural error. The legal consequences of this particular error are specifically examined in the legal chapters of the report. The loss of the citizen must not be explained as a formal error or reclassified as a crime without verification of the conditions of the crime.

L01. Place without consent - A collection of knowledge, 2025

Original: Anne-Kirstine Mølholt, Emma Hoff Søegaard and Asger Graa Andreasen, VIVE, 2025, 106 PDF pages, ISBN 978-87-7582-406-9. Original report. Author names, title, year and ISBN have been checked on the original's title and colophon pages.

Population and method. The collection of knowledge includes 113 studies after screening 299; 186 were sorted out. The search is Nordic and restricted to Danish, Norwegian, Swedish and English. It cannot be described as a global total. There was no lower annual limit; the search was carried out in 2024. The record of the report indicates 10.982 children and young people placed by the end of 2022, of whom 2.718 were placed without consent, approximately 25%. This is an index at a date, not 10.982 new locations or 2.718 documented illegalities. Original: PDF p. 87 -94, in particular p. 91-93.

The statistical comparisons combine questionnaire waves from 2014-2022. The usual ages are 11, 13, 15 and 17; 2020 includes only 15- and 17-year-olds. Repeated participation across waves cannot be ruled out. A range of response counts across several questions is not a common denominator for all percentages or a count of distinct children. Original:PDF pp. 93-94.

Contact. Table 9.3 compares placement without and with consent. Mother contact weekly is 12 against 19%, every other week 34 against 38%, less often 54 against 44%. Father contact is 12 against 14%, 34 against 31% and 54 against 55%, respectively. The differences in weekly and less frequent maternal contact are statistically significant; the specified father differences are not. The number of responses varies between 2.332 and 3.286 on the contact questions, and the published rounded percentages of the report do not provide the basis for exact group counters. Original: PDF p. 76-78.

Involvement. Among those posted without and with consent 78 as against 72% indicate that the consultant listens; 68 as against 65% trust; 65 as against 59% experience being able to tell about problems; 71 as against 69% feel taken seriously; 61 as against 59% get explanations; 59 as against 57% feel involved. The desire for more involvement is 32 as against 31%, and at least three counsellors' shifts are 38 as against 37%. None of these group differences is referred to as statistically significant. The number of responses varies from 891 to 4.192. Original: PDF p. 85, Table 10.2. The results do not demonstrate that without positive answers everyone has suffered the same legal error.

Consequences. The review of qualitative studies describes children who do not understand the move, lose contact with family and networks or experience not being heard. Parents describe crisis, identity loss, shame, isolation and inadequate support. Experience of regulatory pressure may have an impact on whether consent is perceived as free and on access to assistance. It is a knowledge synthesis of the studies included; whether a concrete consent is invalid requires the original material from each case. Original: PDF p. 54 -61.

L02. Targeted support for parents with placed children - Final evaluation, 2023

Original: Mette Lausten, Hans Skov Kloppenborg, Amanda Engbo and Katrine Iversen, VIVE, 2023, **133 PDF pages**, ISBN 978-87-7582-143-3. Original report; official publication page, 19. January 2023. An earlier file trail with /8784/ is not the functioning original link. The report must not be described as a report of 178 pages.

Coverage. The project included Hallnæs, Herning, Vordingborg and Aarhus in 2020-2022: 111 families with 146 children placed. At the end 23 families had completed the effort, 61 were still active and 27 had stopped early;

the total is 111. Completed interventions lasted an average of 12,5 months. These are intervention participants, not a national or random sample of parents of placed children. Original:PDF pp. 3, 114-115.

Before and after are not all participants. The numbers of questionnaire responses at baseline and the subsequent measurements are 51, 39, 24, 18, 15 and 11. The published response rates in figure 4.1 are 46, 35, 22, 16, 14 and 10 %. These are repeated measurements of participants, not six separate populations. The actual paired comparison between baseline and FU4 over approximately one year comprises **11 parents, 10 %**, even though 15 answered FU4 in isolation. WHO-5 goes from 54,5 to 61,5, total PSOC from 64,5 to 70,3, mastery from 29,8 to 32,5 and satisfaction with the parental role from 34,7 to 37,7. The three main measures first mentioned, WHO-5, total PSOC and satisfaction, are significant at the 5 % level; mastery at the 10 % level. Original: PDF pp. 80-81, figures 4.1-4.2. There is no control group or randomisation; a positive change in these 11 responses is not evidence of a causal improvement for all 111 families. Original: PDF pp. 113-115.

The children's target does not support an overall positive effect claim. SDQ is based on 25 paired responses from locations. The average rises from 14,2 to 15,8, which on the scale represents several difficulties; the difference is significant at 10% level. The proportion outside the normal range ranges from 40 to 36% and the effect on daily function from 21,1 to 31,6%, but these differences are not statistically significant. These are adult responses about children, not 25 children's own answers. Original: PDF p. 84. The report finds no significant change in the contact or well-being of children in contact with the targets studied. All corresponding parents were in contact; it does not document contact with the non-corresponding or all children placed. Original: PDF p. 86 -87.

Selection and the authority's narrative. The municipalities' project managers helped select who could be contacted for interviews. The report describes a risk that they select parents with resources and positive experiences. Parents who had declined or discontinued the intervention were not interviewed. VIVE interviewed five parents and three young people; PwC's additional five parents are also included in the material. The total of 35 interviewees includes professionals and must not be described as 35 affected parents or children. The interviews focused on support; the interviewers deliberately refrained from asking about the placement itself. The survey therefore does not examine the truth, legality or appeal course of the basis for placement. Original: PDF pp. 110-111.

The report's professionals describe that an original negative description of parents could be changed when resources came into focus. It makes it necessary in this report to trace who first provided negative parental information and whether it has been verified; neither the previous nor later municipal characteristics become a proven personal fact by being repeated. Original: PDF p. 83.

L03. Children's and young people's well-being at risk 2023

Original: Mette Lausten, Katrine Iversen and Asger Graa Andreasen, VIVE,**2023**, 182 PDF pages, ISBN 978-87-7582-237-9. Original report. The file trail and subsequent use do not make it a 2024 publication.

Population and answers. The study concerns 11, 13, 15 and 17 years of age. It omits, among other things, young people under the age of young people, custody surrogate and serving as well as unaccompanied minors; it does not cover persons under 11 years of age. The groups are mutually exclusive in order to give priority to placing first. Data were collected from 12 September 2022 to 15 March 2023. Original: PDF p. 161-163.

Group	Population	Extracted	Response	Response
Placed	3.949	2.008	898	44,7
Personal preventive action	5.572	1.608	303	18,8
Family-oriented preventive action	5.386	1.737	370	21,3
§ 11 aid	3.644	1.321	358	27,1
None of the stakes	252.216	2.400	921	38,4
Total	270.767	9.074	2.850	31,4

Source: original PDF p. 163. The register population is not the number of complaints, errors or distinct individuals over 20 years. The representativeness check on PDF p. 168 has its own analysis population of 2.527 children in care and must not

be relabelled as the 3.949 in the sample table. Young people with a physical diagnosis, psychiatric diagnosis and a record of being a victim of violence are underrepresented among respondents in this review. Weighting includes, among other things, age, sex and placement location; it does not document representativeness for every unobserved burden. Original: PDF pp. 168-169.

Contact and self-determination. Among those placed, 82% are in contact with their mother and 58% are in contact with their father, 18% and 42% respectively without contact. Contact includes physical contact, telephone and internet. The total number of responses of the figures, 1.004 and 1.351, includes several study groups and cannot be used to calculate exact numbers placed in each contact situation. Original: PDF p. 101-102.

38% of those placed want more parental contact, 57% consider the scale appropriate and 6% want less; 101% are due to rounding. The specific denominator of the question is not given in this section. About the influence on when the contact takes place, 50% always corresponds, 25% sometimes and 25% never; Figure 6.5 has 783 answers. Where contact takes place: 76% at home with parents, 20% at the location and 14% neutral place, 782 replies with possibility of overlap. Original: PDF p. 103-105.

Search contact: 38% daily / weekly, 16% every other week, 17% monthly and 28% no contact, 732 responses, rounded sum 99%. Original: PDF p. 106. The attachment numbers 48% very strong, 23% strong and 29% less strong on PDF p. 108 have a total denominator of 2.666 across groups. It shall not be used as the number of children placed with lost parentage.

Involvement and a concrete blind angle. The investigation did not allow the applicants to reply that they did not know if they had an advisor. The reason for this was that the investigation was made aware of the consultant in the light of the legal requirement for child interview. As a result, this part of the questionnaire cannot demonstrate that all the persons actually employed had known the consultant, had the conversation or had the right to appeal. It is a concrete measurement design where a legal requirement was used as a prerequisite for fact. Original: PDF p. 135.

44% of those in the Chamber find information on the agenda good, 30% in part, 20% bad and 6% do not know. Explanation of the decision is assessed as good by 58%, partly by 17%, bad by 13% and unknown by 12%. Involvement is assessed as good by 56%, partly by 21%, bad by 14% and unknown by 9%. The denominator 1.400 in the three figures includes several support / placement groups; it cannot be used for exact counters for placed alone. Original: PDF pp. 141-143.

What the report is intended to do with this knowledge

1. Record actual family separation, cessation of contact and loss of participation before assessing redress; a new decision or remittal is not in itself reunification.

2. Distinguish research participants, decision instances and unique affected people. Always state population, responses, question denominator, wave, weighting and exclusions.

3. Please check the authority's original parental and child descriptions. Repeated use of the same description is not independent evidence.

4. Include persons who do not complain, do not respond, interrupt the effort or lose contact as a specific coverage limit. Do not calculate a number for them without documentation.

5. Write explicitly which repair actions are documented: support granted, contact restored, child actually repatriated, compensation paid or liability imposed. A research finding on improved well-being does not replace any of these stages of documentation.

Review scope: This module is based on verification against originals of the methodology, results and consequences sections identified above; it does not declare that all remaining pages of the three reports have been examined. The sources are included in the full report's final bibliography.

Children under 15:detention, seclusion and missing redress

The original opinions document detentions and solitary placements that, according to the regional public prosecutors' own review, did not comply with chapter 75 b of the Administration of Justice Act. A low number of interventions does not remove each child's right to statutory authority, necessity, proportionality and reparation. The oversight response must therefore be followed from the identified departure to actual cessation, an individual accountability response and redress for the child. The published figures end in 2023; the current statistics page expressly states that the annual opinion is no longer published. 2024 and 2025 are therefore not documented zero years. [B15-01-04]

All published annual figures and lawfulness assessments in the originals read

Year	Detention ed	After Chapter 75 b	Not by chapter 75 b	Enerumsanb Rings	Energy not after Chapter 75 b	Source
2016	132	Not specified in the Annex	Not available	21	Not available	B15-05
2017	127	Not specified in the Annex	Not available	16	Not available	B15-05
2018	102	Not specified in the Annex	Not available	10	Not available	B15-05 / 06
2019	122	Not specified in the Annex	Not available	7	Not available	B15-05-07
2020	117	Not specified in the Annex	Not available	5	Not available	B15-05-07
2021	113	88	25	3	3	B15-02
2022	127	97	30	5	5	B15-03
2023	105	87	18	4	4	B15-04

For 2021-2023, the printed annual rows give **345 detention entries, of which 73 were assessed as not compliant with chapter 75 b, and 12 instances of placement alone in a room, all 12 non-compliant**. Placement alone in a room may form part of detention;73+12 therefore does not represent 85 different children or incidents. A person may also appear several times. The figures cannot be deduplicated into counts of children, parents or police officers. According to the original, one person's 2022 detention should properly have been reported in 2021; it is not silently moved. [B15-02-04]

Specific conflict in the demarcation: The 2021- opinion p.5 states that very short identity checks without proper consultation are not already included in the 2021.2022- opinion p.5 link the clarification to January 2022 and says that they are not included in 2022. Both formulations are retained. A secure method break cannot be dated to 2022 alone; the original instructions and records retrieval shall match the actual boundaries of 2021. 2022 includes the police, the NSK and the Faroe Islands; the 2023 method also includes the Greenland Police. The historical graph records give occurrences, no correspondingly proven national error rate. [B15-02, p.5; B15-03, p.5; B15-04, p.4]

Area distribution: all numbers shown, no population emitted

The figures of the 12 Danish circles are reproduced from the charts. Earlier and later annexes overlap the same year; the repeated cells are control versions, not new interventions. The Faroe Islands, Greenland and the NSK are treated separately, where the later graph shows them. [B15-05-07]

Circles	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Copenhagen	41	36	34	25	24	24	33
The West Region of Copenhagen	12	4	12	5	11	7	8
Middle and West Zealand	9	2	7	12	11	10	3
Northern Zealand	14	14	7	6	13	16	16
South Zealand / Lolland-Falster	3	0	3	4	12	8	16

Circles	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Bornholm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Jutland	4	3	2	6	2	10	9
East Jutland	12	13	27	19	12	15	4
Middle and West Jutland	14	4	9	19	7	10	5
South-East Jutland	10	11	2	1	5	5	3
South and South Jutland	3	3	6	6	8	13	2
Funen	5	12	13	14	8	8	3

Later graph attachments extra circuit	2022	2023	Limitation
Faeroe Islands	1	1	The geographical coverage of previous graphs is not automatically identical
Greenland	Not shown in the 2022 Annex	2	Added in 2023-graph; missing cell is not 0
NSK	0	0	Separate organisation from 2022

The district summs for 2017-2021 correspond to the year of the graph. For 2022, Danish circles give 126 + Faroe Islands 1 = 127; for 2023, Danish circles give 102 + Faroe Islands 1 + Greenland 2 = 105. The distribution of the circle is not a measure of the law-abiding action of each circle: the numerators of the circle of legality are not published in these annexes.

What the action and the delay of the control actually meant

Year	Documented concrete demarcation	Time information	Control reaction and lack of actual Subject-matter
2021	12 detentions in store theft: 2 assessed met, 10 not; subset of 113 / 25. Energy distributed in 3 circles; 9 circles did not use it.	3 detentions over 6 hours were estimated in time in accordance with § 821 a.4. Two enclosures lasted 5 minutes and 1 hour 45 minutes; third duration unknown, total retention 28 minutes.	Discussions and admonitions in three districts; training, local procedures and a new form in June 2022. No public linkage to compensation or personal sanction for the three specific solitary placements.
2022	17 detentions in store theft: 4 assessed met, 13 not; subset of 127 / 30. All 5 enumerated assessed without compliance.	All detentions below 5 hours; over 80% below 3 hours. Energy less than 3,5 hours; one only 5 minutes.	The public prosecutor's follow-up and local discussions are reported; it is not a register of actual child repair.
2023	8 out of 18 detentions in the case of shoplifting. All 4 rooms in 2 circles without compliance. About 20% of reported cases with handcuffs or pepper spray; more than half of the forms are not completed.	All detentions below 6 hours; over 4 / 5 below 3 hours. Energy less than 5 hours; one 25 minutes.	Admonitions, training and ongoing discussions are reported. Incomplete forms weaken verification; the precise number of uses of force and deficient forms cannot be calculated from the rounded formulations.

The originals describe both cases where a short identity check was based, while the subsequent detention did not exist, and cases where, according to the public prosecutor, the intervention could have been carried out after the police law. The latter is an assessment by the authorities of a possible other legal basis, no evidence that the conditions were actually met in each specific case. It shall be tested against the simultaneous fact, justification and timeline of the action. [B15-02-04]

Conclusion: The 12 non-compliant enclosures 2021-2023 are a repeated, original documented verification finding. **Statement by the Authority:** Low levels are mentioned in a positive way, and indentations are reported. **Original proof:** The number, duration and methodology of the annual opinions. **Deficiency:** Neither low incidence nor education shows that individual children got cessation, responsibility assessment and repair. **Rule:** Chapter 75 b of the Code of Procedure

and ECHR Article 5; the child’s special protection also follows from the Convention on the Rights of the Child. **Act:** Detention and separate accommodation despite non-compliance with the conditions applied. **Departure:** The legal basis and extent of the interference with liberty must be examined separately; closing the reporting process does not replace this examination. **Consequence:** The child actually lost freedom of movement and possibly contact, however few the minutes or hours. **Responsibility:** The deciding/implementing authority and the people whose specific duty, act and culpability can be proved. **Demand:** All 73 adverse detention entries and 12 placements alone in a room must be linked in de-identified form to the original decision, duration, use of force, oversight response, report, discipline and compensation decision. Actual criminal responsibility under, for example, § 261 or§ 155 is determined by the documented elements of the act and culpability; the general sentencing comparison in chapter 26 does not operate as an automatic judgment on 73 cases.

For 2006-2015, the previous annual originals are required; for 2016-2020, the annual opinions' legality review is required rather than the total of the later graphs alone. For 2024-2025, the six-monthly reports, any follow-up and explanation of the cessation of public publication are required. The termination of publication is documented; it does not demonstrate that the underlying alert or all control tasks have ceased.

9. Health, Compensation and Psychiatric coercion

Date: 6 October 2026. Public primary sources; compact statistical items, no original PDFs files saved.

1. Disciplinary Board of Health

Annual report 2025, pp. 6-8 and 15-18, Figures 1-5. Percentages: rounded outcome, not exact number of criticisms. Extract: June 2026.

Year	New fist Case	Completed Done		Not critique%	Critical%	Inner pelse%	Reverse etaling%	Months	Genopta Females m aturation; no	Rejected ntoppel see
2022	3.047	4.026	3.414	79	17	2	2	11,4	145	113
2023	3.742	3.637	2.609	78	18	2	2	9,1	112	86
2024	4.253	3.764	2.739	80	16	2	3	8,2	109	85
2025	371	2.365	2.042	79	17	3	2	10,3	107	84

Reimbursement also involves criticism / intensification. Processing time excludes early completed / dialogs. From 2025, complaints will be searched as a starting point for preliminary complaints; therefore, the decrease in the number of cases should not be read as a reduction in errors. Private dental complaints with self-payment are excluded from 2025. Geography also includes the Faroe Islands / Greenland. Public / private employment is not divided. No exact critical, personnel or police reporting figures are identified in the key figures.

Graph values check: The coordinates of the PDFs text are read in memory; Figure 3 indicates the percentage distribution above. Rounding in some years gives 101%. The calculation, for example, 17% × 2.042 would be an estimate based on rounded percentages and should not appear as the exact number of criticisms of the Board. With two percentage columns and the reimbursement of dentists, the definition of exit categories must be respected.

2. The Psychiatric Patient Complaints Board

Annual report 2025, p. 7-9 and 15-18, Figure 1 / 3, Table 2 / 3 / 11 / 12. Cases are complaints; repeated complaints from the same patient are counted again. Decisions are complaints / interventions.

Year	Cases received	Completed cases
2021	1.733	1.633
2022	1.731	1.714
2023	1.725	1.622
2024	1.926	1.288
2025	2.070	2.289

2025 complaint points:2.742 approved; 96 approved/formally unlawful; 419 set aside; 487 withdrawn; 349 dismissed. Total 4.093; on the merits 3.257.

Interventions, 2025	Reality decisions	Set aside
Comfortable medicine	782	158
Door locking	13	2
Physical power	71	9
Return	8	3

Interventions, 2025	Reality decisions	Set aside
Forced treatment	879	146
Coercive restraint,initiation	235	28
Forced admission	541	38
Compulsory detention	728	35
Patient / Screening / Other	0	0
Total	3.257	419

Duration of restraint is excluded from the total above: among 207 approved initiations, 103 durations were approved, 82 set aside and 22 had no duration decision. Average 2025: cases with suspensive effect 6,4 working days; other cases 216,9 calendar days. Rejected/withdrawn cases are excluded from time measurement.

2.1 Self-importance of the denominators

The 419 decisions setting aside interventions are a precise intervention count within table 11. This is not a complete count of all instances of unlawfulness established in the year's material:96 decisions on involuntary admission or compulsory detention are registered as approved, formally unlawful, and 82 durations set aside appear separately. The ordinary approval rate therefore cannot be used as the percentage of fully lawful interventions. A specific intervention may be substantively justified and at the same time formally unlawful during part of the period.

419 + 96 + 82 = 597 adverse partial results in these separate categories. This is a calculated category count,not 597 unique patients or whole cases. Initiation and duration of coercive restraint are two different parts of a decision; the latter must not disappear in a conclusion approving initiation. Other interventions decided upon may also belong to the same patient's complaint.

The full number of coercive interventions never appealed is not the denominator in complaints-board statistics. Withdrawal is not proof of legality either. The statistics document decision outcomes; actual cessation time, physical/psychological harm and compensation require their own documentation. A lengthy appeal case does not automatically mean coercion continued for that whole period, but the wait for review is itself a separate consequence.

2.2 Current documentation problems in the report

The report's own tables have different historical totals and denominators. Historical years must not be mixed without reconciliation: p. 16 states that the 2023 regional total includes dismissals/withdrawals, while 2024-2025 are complaint points determined on the merits. The count of restraint duration also changes for brief restraints. The report's main text has differing rounded rates of adverse findings; use the verifiable fractions instead.

The specific 2025 fraction 419/3.257 is 12,86 %. The annual review uses both 12 % and 13 % for these points of complaint. For duration, 82/207 = 39,61 % when cases without a duration decision are included in the denominator; 82/(103+82) = 44,32 % when only duration decisions are included. The two percentages describe different denominators. There is no reason to conceal the difference or interpret 40 % as an unambiguous proportion of all actual compulsory restraints.

2024-endings have been revised in the report; these must not be added to the previous annual report as additional cases. Old and new publications are versions of the same registration.

3. The Psychiatric Appeal Board

Annual report 2025, p. 7-9, Figure 1-3.

Year	Received	Cases decided	Completed without Decision	Total completed	Amending procedure nt	Months
2021	159	156	7	163	8,4 %	5,8
2022	177	164	15	179	7,47 %	4,3

Year	Received	Cases decided	Completed without Decision	Total completed	Amending procedure nt	Months
2023	173	163	5	168	7,69 %	4,2
2024	162	129	9	138	10,31 %	4,6
2025	239	201	18	219	5,4 %	6,9

2025:296 partial decisions,16 amended;16/296 = 5,405 %. This is not 16/201 cases. The Patient Complaints Board's report, pp. 20–21 states the explicit partial-decision denominator. Deprivation of liberty/restraint reviewed by courts falls outside this appeal board's jurisdiction. Both sides may appeal certain interventions; without a breakdown by direction,amendments must therefore not be called newly established unlawful interventions against the patient.

The national report must keep the first instance's 419 findings setting measures aside, the 16 alterations on appeal and any alterations by courts separate until case IDs and the direction of change are reconciled. An intervention may appear both at first instance and in subsequent review. Such a process is a source chain, not several unique victims.

3.1 Judicial review in 2025

The Patient Complaints Board's report, p. 20, table 13:102 court outcomes;59 upheld,8 amended,34 discontinued and 1 dismissed. The amendments comprise 4 concerning deprivation of liberty and 4 concerning coercive restraint. Upheld:52 concerning deprivation of liberty,6 concerning restraint and 1 concerning both. The discontinued category is placed under "not in the court record". The statistics show neither unique patients nor employees' punishment. These results must not be added to the board's first-instance results without case reconciliation.

4. Penalties, Liability and Data Lack

Disciplinary criticism confirms the actual professional / legal difference within the board's competence. It's not a punishment. The lack of police reporting by a public statistician cannot be reinterpreted as zero notifications. No cross-table of criticism has been found in the controlled ratios,> notification -> indictment -> Judgment -> disciplinary action.

Similarly, no unique patients or number of separate employees have been published in the listed ratios. A disciplinary board case may concern several health professionals; a patient may have several complaints and interventions. The treatment of individuals is part of disciplinary proceedings, so the total figure must not be considered merely as a breach of the law of public servants.

Strongest documented conclusion: Appeals board totals inform the reader about decision outcomes, but a complete account of consequences must also include formal unlawfulness, duration set aside on review and the period until actual remedial action. The accountability track requires the intervention's decision-maker, institution, rule, error, causal significance and specific legal consequence.

Additional necessary data: public / private and geography; exact number of criticisms and unique employees; unique cross-case patients; direction and extent of appeal changes; actual cessation of unlawful interference; compensation / compensation; police notification, indictment and punishment if registered; separate inventory of minors and patients with disabilities.

5. Coverage Control

Verified: the above tables and denominators in the three main 2025 reports. The historical series cover 2021-2025 or 2022-2025, as indicated. These aren't a full 2006-2025 series. The other regional, special and meeting participation figures of the sources are not reproduced here. No individual case or private database has been read.

Health wound series - controlled compact factcards

Status 7 October 2026: developing. The figures describe the registers and the accounting practices of the authorities. They are not in themselves independent evidence that any non-critical treatment was lawful. A decision, notification and person are different entities. Award is not proof of actual payment. This annex complements health responsibilities.

Patient Ombudsperson: Annual Report 2014

Priary source: https://stps.dk/media/9203/07757CE5BA2446F2993D7AD0C97DBF60.pdf - PDF page 20 -21,26,34 -36. Original read in memory. All figures below are cases / decisions, not employees or patients.

Year	Treatment d: no criticism	Criticism	Reality denominator	Justice complaints R Received	Rule of law ed	Early rejected rights complaints;
2011	179	73	252	945	590	153
2012	795	483	1278	1116	752	308
2013	1060	466	1526	981	823	not quantified,
2014	970	527	1497	1106	595	234

Year	Right of appeal: confirmed	Modified	Remitted	Appeals
2012	515	48	67	630
2013	519	90	49	658
2014	401	64	45	510

Treatment-facility total 2014:1537 including 40 refused reopenings. 2013 dismissals are missing due to a change of case-record system. Competence: publicly financed treatment, including private providers. After criticism of a treatment facility, the same course could be brought before the disciplinary board:26 uses in 2011-14. Disciplinary 2014:1490 decisions, 445 with criticism including aggravated criticism; 17,1 months. Psychiatric appeals 2014:176 received, 183 closed, 145 decisions on the merits, 63 upheld, 75 amended, 4 remitted for reconsideration; 6,3 months. The last three merits outcomes are not specified in this compilation. Patient-injury appeals 2014:2870 new, 2969 closed; 372 amendments. Subcategories total 2971; the stated 14,6% has no unambiguous denominator here. Medicinal-product appeals 2014:181 new, 168 closed; 7,5 months.

Own method: keep the above local differences open; do not reconstruct hidden categories based on rounded percentages. The right-appeal table is only a subset of rights decisions. Treatment site / disciplinary should not be summed up to persons.

Patient compensation: treatment damage, version 27 May 2026

Priary source: https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/639160013922933960/behandlingsskader-2025-hele-landet-27-05-26.pdf - PDF pages 2-9. Original read in memory. Recognition includes several rules on compensation, including the rule of equity; not all recognition has been found to be professional errors.

Year	Notification r	Somatic: rsubstitutionb right decisions	Somatic: recognised;	Somatic: rejected	Psychiatric: replacement; eligibility; Decisions	Psychiatric: recognised;	Psychiatric: rejected	Total recognised;
2021	10770	9541	2363	7178	220	7	213	2370
2022	10974	9312	2055	7257	144	12	132	2067
2023	11789	11831	2753	9078	321	38	283	2791
2024	13316	12461	2790	9671	219	20	199	2810
2025	16621	13479	3431	10048	434	51	383	3482

Year	Granted somatic DKK million	Granted psychiatric mio.kr.	Public somatic hospitals, notified;	Private hospitals, notified	Dentists, notified
2021	664,53	4,75	7170	613	0
2022	697,13	3,14	7285	671	0
2023	820,63	9,50	7763	812	0
2024	832,21	3,44	7939	888	1001
2025	891,65	7,30	9098	975	2261

2025:13913 eligibility decisions; 7212 amount decisions; 898,95 million kroner awarded. Privately insured treatments:785 new, 751 eligibility decisions, 29,4% recognised, 30,61 million kroner awarded. Public/private are mixed in the home-care group; other includes, among other things, prison/police/defence; unspecified also includes early closure and treatment abroad. Dental jurisdiction changed 2024. Minimum rules changed 1/7/2018.

Own method: the two psychiatry / somatic amounts can be summed up within this version, but the same patient may have several reviews and decisions. Public hospitals are a subset; private suppliers can treat publicly funded patients. A series of notifications is not a series of errors and the year of decision is not necessarily the year of damage.

Patienterstatningen: medicine damage, version 27 May 2026

Priary source: https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/639160017661448385/laegemiddelskader-2025-27-05-26.pdf - PDF page 2-5. Original read in memory.

Year	Notifications	Eligibility decision Oysters	Recognised	Rejected	Recognition p Rotent	DKK million accepted
2021	1632	1128	418	710	37,1	35,6
2022	1546	1611	361	1250	22,4	49,3
2023	1818	1859	382	1477	20,5	52,7
2024	1427	1580	250	1330	15,8	65,6
2025	1238	1149	225	924	19,6	62,9

2025:435 decisions on amounts; 62,87 million kr. awarded. COVID vaccines 2025:186 claims, 306 entitlement decisions, 13,1% recognised. Grounds for rejection in 2025:831 non-compensable injuries, 47 minimum threshold, 31 limitation, 14 other medicinal-product rules, 1 other. Compensation awarded for a side effect is not automatically an employee error.

STPK: historical statistics, separate 2023 version

Priary source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/gdpnn3nn/stpk-i-tal-opdateret-2023.pdf - PDF page 2-8,12-15. The version is not updated; subsequent post-registrations must not overwrite it unnoticed.

Year	Complaint received	Complaint cleared	Months	Dialog Quit t	Anke received	Appeals closed	Anke months
2015	6612	6885	12,8	484	3089	3148	5,3
2016	6335	6953	12,8	513	3203	3122	4,9
2017	6848	6579	13,6	520	3056	3199	5,2
2018	7369	5835	12,8	453	3131	2431	5,4
2019	8146	5485	14,9	304	2988	2769	7,1

Year	Complaint received	Complaint cleared	Months	Dialog Quit t	Anke received	Appeals closed	Anke months
2020	8309	9263	14,0	705	2686	3403	7,2
2021	8972	10855	13,9	918	3006	3019	5,0

Complaints: treatment, disciplinary, rights, compulsory treatment, psychiatric appeal. Appeals: treatment/drug injury, abortion and asbestos/thalidomide first instance. Complaint duration excludes dialogue/early closure; appeal duration covers only treatment/drug injury and excludes early closure. Criticism percentages exclude dismissed reopening requests; disciplinary includes the dental transfer on 1/6/2019.

STPK: current public statistical version, 7 October 2026

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/viden/stpk-i-tal/ - public aggregate display, last updated 5 / 10 / 2026 23: 13: 26UTC. Compact figures in health-public-aggregations.json. Own extracts follow all the view's main filters: only treatment / rights cases and their case groups; exclude test / error records and historical transfers. No personal or case number data have been retrieved.

STPK announces a changed complaint/rights breakdown on 18/2/2026. Treatment-provider/hospital registration before 2023 may be deficient. Repayment following a dental complaint requires prior criticism; outcome categories are the published closure category. Early rejection/closure and dialogue are not included in the denominators for criticism percentages. Historical transfers are excluded;2018 and earlier are clearly incomplete,2019 has only 869 disciplinary criticism classifications. The extract is not used as an unchanged complete historical series of annual originals.

Own method: current precise outcomes are a separate version layer. Compare with the number of annual reports; the exit category of repayment shall not be excluded from critical outcomes or be double counted with the criticism which was its prerequisite. Personal and employee dedup requires separate data.

Precise outstanding aggregate requests

Status after the expansion:the 20-year period has actual accepted-treatment-claim figures in different source versions;STPK activity for 2006-25 is represented. This is not 20 fully harmonised annual outcome tables.

Registrar	Periods / fields that continue to require delivery;	Precise question and vote
Administration of Patient Complaints / STPS, legacy PKN / Patient Offer	2006-10,2013-14,2018-19 exact criticism / insert / indictment / no criticism; place 2018-20; rights 2007-08 / 2018-20	Annual original and current aggregates; date of decision, type of competence, theme of complaint, rejection / dialogue / resumption, public / private and DK / FO / GL; separately historical migrated rows; starting year denominator and all outcome definitions. Determine against reported activity figures and percentage tables without rounding.
Patient Complaints Board, Disciplinary Penalties	2006- 25 combined full criminal follow-up	Requests → end of police / indictment → judgment / penalty per original reference year and year of decision; authority's deduced employees / patients; vote 3 / 2 doctors 2012 / 14 in 2015 statistics as against 4 / 4 in 2016-17.
Patienterstatningen	2006-11 exact treatment-decision denominators/grounds for rejection; drugs 2012; original 2012 annual statistics	Original eligibility decisions/recognised/rejected/annual amounts and current revision version; the same year alone cannot determine the denominator in percentage calculations. Reconcile the 2012 register publication’s 2783/8408 and 9628 claims with the original statistics.
Patient compensation and paying regions / state / insurance companies	All 20 years actual payment / time / persons	Annual book cash payments + interest / repayment, to date, account / final payment date; aggregates for number / p 50 / p 90 / max / main party waiting time; unique patient count per year and entire period, age / disability status, méndegree, death and survivors, public / private / DK / FO / GL. Determine about 8600 interest rate recalculations after H 2022 for actual differences + payment.

Registrar	Periods / fields that continue to require delivery;	Precise question and vote
STPK, Patient Injury Appeals Board / L egg remedy	2006- 07 and 2014- 25 full patient benefit / injury	Each original year's complete outcome denominators including chairperson decisions and early closures;liability/compensation altered to advantage/detriment,remittal and actual new decision/payment;2013 definition as an explicit reference.

Own methodology:these are specific remaining gaps following substantive source checking. No approach to an authority has been sent. Fields not published are not assigned zero; they are included in the account of gaps.

Patient compensation: treatment damage, version 27 June 2022

Source: https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/637976131119058227/2021-Behandlingsskader-Hele-landet%20-%20tilgangely.pdf - PDF page 3-8. Original read in memory.

Year	Date of notification no	Somatic decisions	Somatic recognised;	Somatic rejected	Psykiatris rod decisions	Psykiatris k recognised;	Psykiatris k rejected	Somatic awarded DKK million	Psykiatris k awarded DKK million
2017	9474	9985	2498	7487	179	15	164	696,99	0,34
2018	9571	9221	2204	7017	145	22	123	678,99	6,40
2019	10457	9337	2219	7118	140	13	127	576,46	5,36
2020	9618	9086	2108	6978	180	14	166	654,93	3,38
2021	10773	9540	2386	7154	220	8	212	661,88	4,85

Notifications of public somatic hospitals: 6671,6780,7374,6607,7174; private hospitals: 466,418,509,466,613. Somatic speciality 1666,1376,1430,1377,1571; equity rule 674,661,634,618,685. Unit: decisions / notifications / awards, not persons. The table is historical version; 2021 is specifically revised in 2026 version above.

Disciplinary Board: Annual Report 2017, June 2018 version 1.0

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/wyug3suu/%C3%A5rsberetning-2017-disciplin%C3%A6rn%C3%A6vnet.pdf - PDF pages 5-11 (physical pages 4-10).

2017:1824 decisions;1373 without criticism;417 criticism;34 admonitions;0 requests for prosecution. 63 requests to reopen:50 rejected,13 reopened. Processing time 2016/2017:15,4/15,4 months. Complaint system 2017:6841 new,4790 admitted,1742 rejected/withdrawn;52% courses of treatment and 48% disciplinary. Geographical jurisdiction Denmark, from 19/12/2011 the Faroe Islands,from 1/10/2012 Greenland. Criticism concerning a course of treatment may be followed by a disciplinary case concerning the same incident.

Year	No criticism%	Critical%	Increase%	Request to bring charges %
2012	68,9	26,1	4,9	0,1
2013	71,5	25,6	2,9	0,0
2014	68,7	27,2	4,0	0,1
2015	72,7	25,4	1,9	0,0
2016	75,0	23,0	2,0	0,0
2017	75,3	22,9	1,9	0,0

Own method: percentages cannot be multiplied to exact numbers. 6841-4790-1742 = 309 is a local unbalanced difference in the annual report's ratios, not evidence of 309 decisions. Historical STPK 2023 version renders 6848 received 2017; hold both versions.

Patient insurance 2006-2011: Analysis version 2012

Source: https://cdn.patienterstatningen.dk/patienterstatningen/Media/637810534607166501/Stigningen%20i%20anmeldelser%20til%20og%20erstatningstilkendegivelser%20fra%20Patienterstatningen%202006-2011%20-%20analyse%20af%20baggrunden%20og%20prognose%20for%202012-2015.pdf - PDF pages 2,10,13(table 3)/web text P12;the document's printed page 13. 2011 figures provisional before the 2012 annual report. Scope:treatment injuries;not the medicinal-product series.

Year	Notifications	Finding in the party's favour	Findings in the party's favour %	Compensation prices at current prices
2006	4861	1482	33,3	380,3
2007	5416	1488	30,5	351,7
2008	5519	1506	32,3	438,0
2009	6319	2379	35,3	562,9
2010	7489	2518	35,8	659,2
2011	7993	2712	34,4	766,3

The denominator for the rate of findings in the party's favour is the year's decisions; the exact decision count is not given in table 3. Several responsible treatment facilities can produce several cases per patient. The source calls amounts compensation awards in the title and payments in the explanation; the cash-payment date/accounting definition is therefore a separate data requirement. No decision counts have been calculated from rounded percentages.

Patienterstatningen 2013- 2017: original 2017 treatment statistics

Source: https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/637811297745313048/Aarsrapport2017-Behandlingsskader.pdf - PDF page 11,13 -18 (tables 1 -6), read via the index of the source of the prize. The year of notification (s) and the year of decision (s) may not be assimilated.

Year	Notification r	Notified e persons	Somatic decisions	Somatic recognised;	Somatic rejected	Psychiatric disorders recognised;	Total recognised;	Compensation Table 4
2013	9312	7993	9610	3043	6567	12	3055	749,5
2014	10300	8572	9474	2817	6657	48	2865	723,0
2015	9707	8189	9710	2588	7122	39	2627	684,8
2016	10189	8562	10056	2632	7424	38	2670	704,3
2017	9464	8113	9942	2590	7352	15	2605	693,3

Table 5 amounts in 1.000 kroner:749701,723181,684924,704362,693404. Small differences from table 4 are retained.2016 jurisdiction expanded to prisons/remand prisons/defence; care homes/residential facilities from 1/7/2018. The negative psychiatric compensation entry in 2017 is due to repayment following the region's appeal. People are patients reporting claims; not solely favourable findings and not unique across 20 years.

Own methodology: an actual person series now exists within this scope. It must not be summed as unique people across several years or combined with the people in drug claims without shared identity checks. Substantive harm to health depends on the individual recognition rule,not solely a favourable finding.

Patienterstatningen 2013- 2017: original 2017 drug statistics

Source: https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/637811297700806608/aarsrapport-2017-Laegemiddelskader.pdf - PDF page 7,11 -14 (tables 1,3-7), read via the index of the source of the prize.

Year	Notifications Table 1	Persons Table 1	Decisions Table 4	Recognised Table 4	Rejected Table 4	Replacement 1.000 Cf. Table 6
2013	480	475	480	121	359	46304
2014	593	580	570	176	394	44487
2015	862	857	658	244	414	55698
2016	1003	996	1202	614	588	46428
2017	910	892	967	493	474	50734

Local source differences:2016/2017 table 3 accepted 615/491, while table 4=614/493. 2017 body text 909 notifications,table 1=910. Misdiagnosis/medication errors are counted as treatment, not adverse drug reactions. Table 6 concerns payment year, table 7 closure year. 2017 overall processing time 187 days,56% of decisions within 6 months,8% over 1 year;the administrative 2017 report has 186 days. Vaccine adverse reactions account for a large share of successful claims;this is not automatically employee responsibility.

STPK 2025: the original's 5 annual figures and internal voting

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/yu1bsrdl/aarsrapport-2025.pdf - PDF page 8,11-13, figures 1-4. Parallel File https://www.stpk.dk/media/hx0bbsls/stpk-aarsrapport-2025.pdf controlled: same number.

Year	Complaints Figure received 1	Closed Figure 1	Months Figure 2	Anchor received Figure 3	Closed Figure 3	Replacement appeal months Figure 4
2021	9016	10856	14,0	3009	3017	4,8
2022	9393	11381	9,8	2802	2914	4,9
2023	10254	9997	7,8	3327	2909	4,8
2024	11577	10464	7,3	3555	3175	5,6
2025	12010	10096	8,7	3825	3623	7,2

2025 bread text: complaints 12003 / 10100; anchor 3798 / 3601 (of which 3749 / 3554 replacement anchor). Internal chart / text differences are 7,4,27,22 cases respectively. Post-registration / reopening is indicated as possible deviation from previous reports, but the internal difference is not explained. Complaint reduction without initial closures / psychiatric appeal. Anchorage only treatment / drug damage without initial closures. Competence lapsed dentist / transport 2025.

Own method: graph and bread text are separate observed rows. None of them has been designated as trustees; the authority must reconcile the differences. The table can be used as a figure series with documented local 2025 differences.

Patient complaints 2007-2016: original statistics 2016

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/piqepcvt/statistiske-oplysninger-om-patientklager-2016.pdf - May 2017, version 1.0, PDF page 5, table 3(printed 4). Figures are cases,not people.

Year	Newly created complaints	Rejected	Assumed	Done	Current 31 / 12
2007	3969	869	3215	2387	4146
2008	3822	946	2947	3940	3190

Year	Newly created complaints	Rejected	Assumed	Done	Current 31 / 12
2009	4235	1051	3294	3094	3448
2010	4770	949	3910	4221	3045
2011	4896	1350	3104	3276	3235
2012	5411	1576	4676	3732	3663
2013	6123	1630	4377	3901	4255
2014	6945	1906	4993	3768	5137
2015	6743	1878	4182	4569	5238
2016	6436	1820	5211	5119	4815

Source scope:2016 admissions of 5211 exclude 1099 rights cases and 201 psychiatric appeals; admissions exclude psychiatric appeals from 2010. Registration may occur later than receipt. Requests to reopen 2015=146,2016=215; earlier years were not separately registered on a comparable basis. Decisions include more case types than disciplinary criticism.

PDF pages 8-16(printed 7-15): disciplinary 2016 decided 1927, but criticism denominator 1860=1396 without criticism+428 criticism+36 admonitions+0 charges; excluded 66 refusals to reopen+1 other. Treatment facilities 2099 decided, but 2024 criticism denominator=1292 without+732 criticism; excluded 68 reopening cases+7 other. Total 4026 decided, 3884 criticism denominator. Individual partial decisions concerning professionals with criticism 602=559 criticism+43 admonitions; not 602 unique employees. Treatment facilities 760 critical partial decisions; the total of 1362 partial decisions must not be added to cases. The disciplinary criticism denominator includes 95 Greenland/Faroe Islands.

Own method: the columns are the annual activity report, not the same reception cohort; rejected + assumed may not be forced to be newly created. Cases cannot be converted into unique patients, employees or families without a register of identity. The 134 rejected resignations in both types of decision are complaints, but not new material criticisms.

Original 2015 statistics: 2006, rights and critical denominators

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/szvji0bv/statistiske-oplysninger-om-patientklager-for-2015.pdf - PDF-page 4, Table 3; page 7-9,19-21 (tables 4-6,16-18).

2006 newly opened 3381, dismissed 686, admitted 2783, decided 2305, pending 3372. The 2007-2015 table 3 figures are identical to the retrospective figures in the 2016 statistics. The 2015 admitted figure of 4182 excludes 1096 rights cases and 162 psychiatric appeals; rights table 16 states 1097 admitted. 2015 disciplinary:1575 decided, 1522 substantive=1108 none+386 criticism+28 admonitions+0 charges; 53 refusals to reopen excluded. The 2015 disciplinary annual report states 415 critical outcomes versus this statistic's 414; no harmonisation. Treatment facilities:2055 decided, 2010 substantive=1247 none+763 criticism; 45 reopening cases excluded. Individual decisions concerning professionals 1760, not unique employees.

Year	Right created	Rejected	Assumed	Done
2009	256	49	251	232
2010	341	5	330	300
2011	945	153	688	590
2012	1130	297	1074	753
2013	1004	82	1240	823
2014	1098	233	1087	595
2015	1118	270	1097	796

2015 rights outcomes:denominator 796=77 remitted+537 approved+81 amended+50 no criticism+46 criticism+5 other. Municipal cases appear under the geographical region.

Own method: Regional declaration 2015 cannot be used as the region's legal responsibility; it includes municipalities. Critics and amended / returneddecisions are different outcomes and can be summed up as separate exit categories within the same population, but remittal for reconsideration does not in itself tell what the new decision was or when the citizen received the help.

Original 2016 statistics: rights and criminal follow-up

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/piqepcvt/statistiske-oplysninger-om-patientklager-2016.pdf - PDF-page 18-21 (printed 17-20), tables 15,17,18.

2016 rights cases 1125 created,288 rejected,1099 admitted,921 decided. Denominator 921=139 remitted+530 affirmed+84 altered+85 no criticism+71 criticism+12 other. Municipalities/State/other 297=108 remitted+167 affirmed+15 altered+5 no criticism+1 criticism+1 other. The region is not the same category as in 2015, which placed municipal cases in the region.

Requests to bring charges concerning doctors in 2012-16:4,0,4,0,0(total 8). A separate chiropractor referral in 2012 ended in limitation during police handling. The outcome table gives a total of 1 discontinued prosecution, 2 accepted penalty notices, 4 convictions with a fine/imprisonment, 0 acquittals. Pending annual status 3,0,3,1,1; status repeats across years.

Our methodology:8 requests concerning doctors+1 chiropractor referral do not document 9 unique patients,9 employees or 9 cases involving criticism. Criminal outcomes occur in different years from the requests; annual pending stocks cannot be summed. The police's specific limitation decision is a separate follow-up outcome, not a judgment on the underlying treatment.

Criminal-prosecution series 2006-2015:original 2015 version

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/szvji0bv/statistiske-oplysninger-om-patientklager-for-2015.pdf - PDF-page 22-23, tables 19-20.

Year	Doctors: request	Nurses: request
2006	2	0
2007	2	3
2008	0	1
2009	1	1
2010	3	0
2011	1	0
2012	3	0
2013	0	0
2014	2	0
2015	0	0

2015 report number doctors 14 requests, 6 charges dropped, 2 fines adopted, 3 fines, 0 acquitments; nurses 5 requests, 4 quits, 0 fines / sentence. Nursing pending 1 repeat 2011-15. 2016 and 2017 reports change 2012 / 2014 medical requests to 4 / 4 versus 3 / 2 here. No tacit rectification.

Original 2017 statistics: complaints, rights outcomes and follow-up

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/5tibzo42/statistiske-oplysninger-om-patientklager-2017.pdf - June 2018 version 1.0, PDF-page 4-8,18-19; tables 1,3-5,17-18.

2017 newly opened 6841, dismissed 1742, admitted 4790, decided 4836, pending 4927, requests to reopen 202. Admissions exclude 994 rights cases+144 psychiatric appeals. Decided=1875 disciplinary+1950 treatment-facility+152 psychiatric appeals+859 rights cases. Disciplinary denominator 1824=1373 no criticism+417 criticism+34 aggravated criticism+0 prosecution; 51 reopening cases excluded (the original board report gives 50 refused reopenings). Treatment-facility denominator 1905=1306 no criticism+599 criticism; 45 reopening cases excluded. Rights 859=52 remitted for reconsideration+536 upheld+69 amended+115 no criticism+68 criticism+19 other. Of these, municipalities/State/other 284=26+234+14+0+4+6. Average 13,6 months for 4836 decisions; dialogue time included from 2016. Criminal-case total for 2012-17, doctors: 8 requests, 2 discontinued (2017 adds 1),2 penalty notices, 4 criminal convictions, 0 acquittals; 2017 pending 0. Separate chiropractor case in 2012: limitation during police handling.

Own method: Annual denominator 4836 decisions are not the historical 2023 layer 6579 closed complaints 2017; termination includes multiple closure outcomes. Both are actual statements with different boundaries.

Patienterstatningen 2017-2021: original drug version 30 June 2022

Source: https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/63797613120345667 9/2021-L%C3%A6gemiddelskader-Hele-landet%20-% 20available .pdf - PDF page 2 -5.

Year	Notifications	Eligibility decision Oysters	Recognised	Rejected	Findings in the party's favour %	DKK million accepted
2017	915	968	492	476	50,8	50,4
2018	1037	905	421	484	46,5	35,9
2019	1092	1037	475	562	45,8	27,8
2020	1015	972	446	526	45,9	37,0
2021	1632	1128	420	708	37,2	36,2

2021 amount decisions 517; COVID 616 claims, 152 eligibility decisions, 8,6% recognised. 2021 combined treatment/drug figures in this report's text:12404 reported, 10887 eligibility decisions, 25,8% recognised, 5882 amount decisions, 702,33 million kroner. The 27. June 2022 treatment report's 2021 figures+30. June drug figures yield 12405/10888/702,93:version differences retained. The current 2026 version has 2021 drug claims 418 recognised versus 420 here.

Patient compensation 2017: Annual administrative report and payment time

Source: https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/637811297663901902/aarsrapport-administrativ-2017.pdf - PDF page 6-8; indexed text of the original.

2017 received 10391=9483 treatment injuries+908 drug injuries; 11154 eligibility decisions; 11452 closed. Awarded, million kroner, 2015/16/17:treatment 691,0/713,0/695,6; drugs 55,7/46,0/50,7; total 746,7/759,0/746,3; excluding interest. 2017 average 186 days to an eligibility decision; 242 days from recognition to final payment. Advance payment may occur earlier. Annual Statistics 2017 has 187 days and different counts; the versions are kept separate.

Own method: 242 days is an actual published time goal towards payment, but an average period is not evidence of how long all patients were waiting or whether all decisions were implemented. Additional amounts in the table may not be automatically renamed into the cash payment of the year.

Disciplinary Board 2011- 2012: original annual reports

2011 source:https://www.ft.dk/samling/20111/almdel/SUU/bilag/344/1131055/index.htm - printed pages 8-9,table 1. 2437 decided=1721 no criticism+629 criticism+86 admonitions+1 request to bring charges; 716 critical outcomes including aggravated criticism/prosecution. Originally 70,6% no criticism/25,8% criticism; the later 2015-17 retrospective distribution for 2011 of 72,4/24,0/3,5/0,1 differs and is retained.

2012 source: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/almdel/suu/bilag/363/1264080/index.htm - printed pages 8-10, table 1. 1702 decided=1171 none+444 criticism+83 admonitions+4 requests for prosecution;531 critical. The table's prosecution percentage 0,1 does not match 4/1702;later 2016 statistics 0,2. 90 requests to reopen:70 rejected,20 reopened(2 none→criticism,8

criticism → none, 4 criticism maintained, 6 none maintained). 13,5 month average all; 9,7 months new cases from 2011. By 2012 decisions 439 concern inherited cases; 226 remainder from originally 3045.

Own method: inherited cases are already part of the decision number; they must not be added again. Resumption may change the previous legal classification without a new patient. The 2012 version retrospective 2011 percentages summed 104,5%; the retrospective is not used for person or end-of-life counting.

Disciplinary Board 2020: Original version layer

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/z41lc1wx/sundhedsv%C3%A6senets-disciplin%C3%A6rn%C3%A6vn-2020.pdf - PDF-page 11,13-14 (printed 10,12-13).

2020 substantive decisions 2339 excluding refusals to reopen; outcome percentages 78,5 none/20,2 criticism/1,0 admonition/0,3 request for prosecution. Exact category counts not printed. New treatment complaints 8160 against 7640 in 2019;52% treatment provider,48% individual. Disciplinary processing time 2017-20:15,3/15,1/17,1/16,0 months. Requests to reopen 2017-20=62/110/68/107; refused 51/87/62/85;2020 reopened 22. The original 2017 annual report had 63/50 and 15,4 months:a version difference. The statement on dental jurisdiction gives 1. June 2018 in the 2020 source against 1. June 2019 in the 2023 statistical layer; the legal date must be checked separately.

Own methodology:the 2026 register aggregates' classification of criticism for 2020 totals 2368(1858+477+28+5 repayment),whereas 2019 has only 869.2018 has only 25 registrations within this scope. Exclusion of historical transfers prevents these early public register extracts from being presented as complete original annual counts. Rounded prosecution percentages are not converted into exact requests.

Patient compensation 2012: primary registry survey 2015

Source: Tilma and others (2015), dois10.2147 / CLEP.S84162, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4514350/ - section DPCA, DPCA database (Figure 1-2), Data link possibilities; co-author from Patienterstatningen. Original registry analysis, unchecked annual report 2012.

2012 claims 9628. Closed treatment-injury claims 8408,recognised 2783(33,1%);thus 5625 other closed claims by own subtraction,not automatically all rejected. The figure distributes closed claims by calendar year. The register has CPR,case number,injury/decision date,death,death resulting from treatment,degree of permanent impairment and loss of earning capacity. The DPSD incident register had no CPR linkage in the source's 2015 description. Grounds for recognition include the specialist rule and the reasonableness rule. Original 2012 annual-statistics reference: http://patienterstatningen.dk/da/Udgivels
er-og-tal/Statistik/~/media/Files/Statistik/Statistik%202012/hel%C3%A5rstal_2010_2012_12.ashx - not available in the current web check.

Own methodology:2012 is now represented by actual register figures with explicit publication/scope. The list of recognised treatment injuries for 2006-25 may be assembled with version breaks, but is not a homogeneous unchanged annual-report series. The scope of the 2012 figure of 9628 claims must be reconciled in the original statistics rather than assumed identical to closed treatment claims.

Current register version 2026: exact outcomes 2021-2025

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/viden/stpk-i-tal/ - compact public aggregate extract health -public -aggregation.json, registration version 5 October 2026.

Year	Type of action	No critique	Criticism	Indentation	Repayment g	Classification name;
2021	Disciplinary Board cases	2205	527	50	84	2866
2021	Pre-trade claim	2424	1013	0	26	3463
2022	Disciplinary Board cases	2613	548	64	63	3288
2022	Pre-trade claim	2641	1183	0	21	3845
2023	Disciplinary Board cases	1971	464	43	38	2516
2023	Pre-trade claim	2159	1043	0	33	3235

Year	Type of action	No critique	Criticism	Indentation	Repayment g	Classification name;
2024	Disciplinary Board cases	2117	410	40	74	2641
2024	Pre-trade claim	2432	984	0	22	3438
2025	Disciplinary Board cases	1540	329	49	40	1958
2025	Pre-trade claim	2955	1075	0	18	4048

Own methodology: the column sum is our recalculation of the four separately published closure categories, not an authority-stated substantive total. Other outcomes, closures, reopenings, dialogue and any special police process fall outside this classification denominator. Repayment is counted once and, according to the publication's methodology, is based on criticism. These figures must not be added to the same years in the annual reports.

Year	Rights: tiltr dead	Modified	Remitted	No critique	Criticism	These 5 the outcome room;
2021	562	107	76	87	48	880
2022	466	97	57	71	97	788
2023	386	117	50	105	135	793
2024	526	186	62	55	103	932
2025	175	54	36	47	97	409

Patient Injury Appeals Board 2008-2012:original 2012 decision series

Source: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/almdel/suu/bilag/303/1249963/index.htm - printed pages 9-11, tables 1-2. Table text says 2001-2011, but the actual rows are 2008-2012.

Year	Acceded	Remitted	Responsibilities ring	Replacement change	Other	Defeat fist Conference of Presidents	Exposed	Considered at board meeting
2008	1154	16	126	71	1	1368	66	1434
2009	1177	9	145	71	1	1403	54	1457
2010	1315	20	142	88	2	1567	51	1618
2011	1419	13	125	70	41	1668	46	1714
2012	1595	13	137	92	48	1885	62	1947

2012 chairperson decisions 261=128 affirmed+5 remitted+1 liability+4 compensation+123 other;closed without a decision 127;total closed 2273. Received 2417;5,2 months including time for Patientforsikringen's opinion. 2011 Other definition changes. 2012 Faroese jurisdiction for treatment from 1/1/2012.

Own method: the denominator alone is a reduced denominator. 2012 full decision denominator 2146 = 1885 + 261; correction result 252 = 242 Board meeting + 10 Chairman. Change may decrease / discontinue replacement; the table does not share patient benefit from patient injury.

Patientskadeankenævnet 2013:new ESDH division

Source: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20131/almdel/suu/bilag/599/1398320/index.htm - printed pages 8-11, Table 1.

2013 received 2677, closed 2336, decisions 2224, without decision 112, chairperson decisions 329. Substantive determination 2009=1735 affirmed(1181 liability+369 compensation+185 other)+274 altered(65 liability to detriment,102 liability to advantage,15 other altered,69 compensation increases,5 reductions,18 remitted). Other 215=41 deadline rejections+21

resumption + 118 none -resumption + 35 other. Internal time 5,17 months excl. Private financing under force 1 / 9 / 2013 versus previous plan 1 / 7 / 2013.

Own methodology: of 274 amendments, 171 favour the patient and 70 are adverse under express categories; 15 other+18 remitted are kept separate. Reopening 21 and 118 refusals are other decisions, not new established treatment errors. 2013 includes all chair's decisions; version break from the reduced board-meeting tables before 2013.

Patienterstatningen 2025: Annual Administrative Report

Source: https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/639268050936165809/aarsrapport_2025_patienterstatningen.pdf - PDF-page 11-12 (printed 10-11), Table 2.

2025 decisions on amounts 7672 against 6939 in 2024; closed 14388. Awards in million kr. for 2023/24/25:treatment 833,8/838,6/898,3; medicinal products 52,7/65,6/62,8; total 886,5/904,2/961,1. The main text discusses 2022-24,but the table rows are 2023-25. PDF page 12 gives judgment conclusion in 2022,but original page 13 identifies a judgment of 4. December 2020; an internal year conflict concerning approximately 8600 recalculation cases. Approximately 75% receive full/partial compensation on recognition. The target of 200 days from recognition→final payment was met by the end of 2024; the exact 2025 duration is not stated. The quarterly figure shows times, but no exact point labels.

Our methodology:approximately 8600 recalculations constitute specific State knowledge/follow-up, not 8600 unique people or necessarily the same interest deficiency in each case. Table 2 is called compensation payments in the body text, but the table itself says awarded; bank payments or booked payments must be reconciled before analysis of cash amounts.

STPS 2018 / STPK 2019: original connections and breaks

2018 source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/3kuppomv/%C3%A5rsrapport-2018-stps.pdf - PDF pages 13-14(printed 12-13). Complaints 7397 received,5882 closed,6476 pending,12,8 months. Compensation appeals 3131 received,2432 closed=2244 treatment+185 medicinal product+3 other;approximately 1700 pending,5,4 months. 2018 complaint closures/inflow differ from the later historical version 5835/7369.

2019 source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/fqmnid5k/%C3%A5rsrapport-2019.pdf - pages 8-9. Complaints 7640 received, 5485 completed including dialogue, 9129 pending, 14,9 months. Anker 2988 received, 2769 completed = 2569 treatment + 169 drug + 31 others; 2120 verserendeink.ca 500 lawsuits; 7,1 months. 2019 asbestos 12 definitely, 7 awarded; thalidomide 16 treated, 11 paid out January 2020. May 2019 journal system change: two systems / different registration practices. Historical 2023 version 8146 complaints received 2019 against 7640 here.

Own methodology: thalidomide 16 and 11 have the same scope at treatment/payment stages and must not be added as 27 victims. Pending appeals include court proceedings; backlog is not solely administrative waiting time.

Patient complaint time 2006-2017: controlled original coordinates

Source: https://www.stpk.dk/media/5tibzo42/statistiske-oplysninger-om-patientklager-2017.pdf - PDF page 7(printed 6),figure 2. Figures verified by increasing x-position:1995 starts at 112,5 points;2006 x 314,5;2017 x 516,5. Not merely text-extraction order.

Year	Average months
2006	13,8
2007	15,9
2008	15,1
2009	13,8
2010	12,7
2011	11,3
2012	10,2
2013	13,3

Year	Average months
2014	13,3
2015	12,8
2016	12,4
2017	13,6

From 2006,time is measured from opening rather than admission. From 2016,dialogue time is included. Denominator 2017=4836 decisions(psychiatric appeal, disciplinary, facility, rights),not all closures. The original 2015 report's body text has 12,7 versus a later 12,8 in this graph. A later historical 2023 layer has 2016=12,8 with a different scope. An average is not the actual healthcare treatment delay for each patient.

Health module delivery status 7 October 2026

Actual figures have been provided, not merely source lists: patient complaints 2006-17 new/dismissed/admitted/decided/backlog; STPK 2015-25 received/closed/time in specific versions; criticism of professionals and treatment facilities 2011-17 selected originals and 2021-25 exact current register categories; 2006-15 requests for criminal prosecution and 2012-17 follow-up; patient compensation 2006-25 recognised treatment injuries with the 2012 primary register study; 2013-25 drug outcomes; 2013-17 people reporting claims; 2017 actual assessment time versus final payment; 2008-13 compensation appeal outcomes, including outcomes favourable/adverse to patients in 2013. Outstanding items appear in the precise request table above.

sundhed-20aar-kompakt.json has 20 rows with actual recognised treatment injuries, URL, locator, version layer, status and person/public-employee flags. No sum of unique people over 20 years has been calculated. The sum of the selected annual recognition rows, 48698,is solely our mixed-version decision sum and must not be described as 48698 unique errors or people.

Historical registry supplement 7 October 2026

See patient insurance-historical-registertal.md / .json: actual drug decision / recognition series 2006-2011 and annual unique notifiers, both injury areas, 2006-2011 in original version 9 March 2012. Table 20, page 46, closes the specific pharmaceutical denominators; Table 6, page 19, expands the person-series. Table 21 is forecast, and 2012 drug outcomes remain a separate residue.

Psychiatric compulsion: original annual outages and boundaries 2006-2025

Updated October 7, 2026. Public originals read in memory. Version rows are alternative statements of the same year and shall not be summed. JSON contains all controlled compact number cells, sources and locators.

Interpretation of units

Own method assessment: A complaint is not a unique patient. Several complaints from the same patient and several interventions per complaint are counted separately. Implementation and duration are autonomous parts of decision-making. The Court of First Instance, the Appeals Board and the Court of Justice shall not be summed up as unique unlawful interference without a case-coupling. Unchallenged coercion is outside the complaint population. Revocation / rejection does not prove legality.

Versionsdivided case series

Year	Version	Received	Completed	Revocated	Rejected	Reality / meeting case
2011	P13	1293	-	159	51	1083
2012	P13	1365	-	166	41	1158
2012	P14	1365	-	166	41	1158
2013	P13	1542	-	127	40	1375
2013	P14	1542	-	127	40	1375
2014	P14	1679	-	181	60	1438
2015	P17	1611	-	147	30	1434
2016	P17	1649	-	143	50	1456
2016	P18	1649	-	143	50	1456
2017	P17	1615	-	133	20	1462
2017	P18	1615	-	133	20	1462
2018	P18	1685	-	133	40	1512
2019	P19	1589	1452	173	13	1266
2020	P22	1553	1647	284	59	1304
2021	P22	1733	1633	253	106	1274
2021	P23	1733	1633	253	106	1274
2021	P25	1733	1633	-	-	-
2022	P22	1731	1714	291	93	1330
2022	P23	1731	1714	291	93	1330
2022	P25	1731	1714	-	-	-
2023	P23	1725	1622	255	97	1270
2023	P25	1725	1622	-	-	-
2024	P24	1920	1287	-	-	988
2024	P25	1926	1288	-	-	-
2025	P25	2070	2289	-	-	-

Outcome of action: the original regional tables

Year	Version	Geographical sample	Table total	Approved incl. where appropriate, formally; illegal	Set aside
2008	N10	the Authority's original geographical sub-statement North Jutland;	95	87	8
2009	M11	the Authority's original geographical sub-statement Midtjylland,	305	254	51
2009	N10	the Authority's original geographical sub-statement North Jutland;	111	107	4
2010	H12	original of the Authority; geographical breakdown Capital city	807	718	89
2010	M11	the Authority's original geographical sub-statement Midtjylland,	311	277	34
2010	M12	the Authority's original geographical sub-statement Midtjylland,	311	277	34
2010	N10	the Authority's original geographical sub-statement North Jutland;	91	89	2
2011	H12	original of the Authority; geographical breakdown Capital city	882	749	133
2011	M11	the Authority's original geographical sub-statement Midtjylland,	406	339	67
2011	M12	the Authority's original geographical sub-statement Midtjylland,	406	339	67
2011	P13	country	1974	1661	313
2012	H12	original of the Authority; geographical breakdown Capital city	903	769	134
2012	M12	the Authority's original geographical sub-statement Midtjylland,	418	368	50
2012	P13	country	1985	1741	244
2012	P14	country	1985	1741	244
2013	P13	country	2412	2060	352
2013	P14	country	2412	2060	352
2014	P14	country	2591	2129	462
2015	P17	country	2860	2137	723
2016	P17	country	2607	2094	513

Year	Version	Geographical sample	Table total	Approved incl. where appropriate, formally; illegal	Set aside
2016	P18	country	2607	2094	513
2017	P17	country	2560	2178	382
2017	P18	country	2560	2178	382
2017	P19	country	2560	2178	382
2018	P18	country	2666	2296	370
2018	P19	country	2666	2296	370
2019	P19	country	2281	1921	362
2020	P22	country	2571	2049	522
2021	P22	country	2619	1971	464
2021	P23	country	2619	1971	464
2022	P22	country	2802	2067	460
2022	P23	country	2802	2067	460
2022	P24	country	2802	2067	460
2023	P23	country	3939	2484	497
2023	P24	country	3939	2484	497
2023	P25	country	3939	2484	497
2024	P24	country	2030	1751	279
2024	P25	country	2030	1751	279
2025	P25	country	3257	2838	419

The Court's own annual production, separate from the appeal submitted by the PPKN

Year	Version	Consigne e t	Reality settled	Without reality	Action Parts	Acceded	Modified	Remitted	Revocatio n t	Time months
2013	A14	142	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.1
2014	A14	176	145	38	-	-	-	-	-	6.3
2015	A15	173	142	24	188	129	59	-	-	4.66
2016	A16	207	172	28	218	165	53	-	-	4.6
2017	A17	172	152	32	333	279	48	3	3	4.8
2018	A18	205	144	11	191	154	32	3	2	5.96
2019	A19	180	200	13	292	241	45	4	2	6.3
2020	A20	161	128	8	194	166	23	3	2	3.8
2021	A21	161	157	6	202	181	17	4	1	5.8
2021	A25	159	156	7	-	-	-	-	-	5.8
2022	A22	174	162	16	241	219	18	4	0	4.2
2022	A25	177	164	15	-	-	-	-	-	4.3
2023	A23	171	165	3	260	238	20	2	0	4.2
2023	A25	173	163	5	-	-	-	-	-	4.2
2024	A24	162	129	9	223	-	23	-	-	4.6
2024	A25	162	129	9	-	-	-	-	-	4.6
2025	A25	239	201	18	296	-	16	-	-	6.9

2014-2017 also contains case outcomes in JSON:2014 approved 63/amended 75/remitted 4 versus 145 cases determined on the merits; 2015 93/44/2 versus 142; 2016 115/47/5 versus 172; 2017 126/22/2/annulled 2 versus 152. The first three years' category sums are respectively 3/3/5 below the total. Without documentation, the difference cannot be called a particular decision type.

Version and source check: A 21(version 2 January 2023) states 181 approved parts, 17 amended, 4 remitted, 1 annulled versus 202 total; the figure 89,11% corresponds to 180 approved. A 22's pie chart states 65,49/30,99/1,41%,but the text 219/18/4 of 241. Both discrepancies are retained. A 25 revises 2021-23 received cases from 161/174/171 to 159/177/173 and substantive cases from 157/162/165 to 156/164/163. Original 2022 time 4,2 months becomes 4,3 in A 25. A 17 time 4,8 months becomes 4,99 in A 18. Undocumented cells remain blank, not 0.

Own methodology:amended elements are not automatically findings in the patient's favour; both the patient and hospital authority may appeal. Case outcomes and intervention outcomes cannot be added together. Without consideration on the merits primarily covers withdrawals, but is not documented as withdrawals alone. Total closed cases from 2019 is the own sum of decisions on the merits and cases without consideration on the merits, and the row is marked accordingly in JSON.

Key problems encountered in counting

• P17 p. 23:50 durations set aside among 170 approved restraint initiations in 2017 are omitted from the main statistics. P17 p. 14:the 2015 time is 17 days with an exceptional case/226 decisions, 10 without; 2017 changes the weighting to one code per case.

• P 17-P 22: partially set-aside judgments are counted as upheld. P 22 p.18: an appeal with both upheld and amended interventions may be counted as upheld. P 23 p.14 changes judgment categories and makes mixed outcomes visible.

• P19 table 1 calls 1.452 incoming, but the footnote states actual inflow of 1.589; 1.452 is processed cases. The 2017 breakdown by type has 383 findings setting measures aside, the regional table 382; 2019 approvals 1.920 by type versus 1.921 regionally. The differences are retained.

• P22 manual urban-type tables differ from regional totals. Duration of restraint is separated and must not be set to zero when unpublished.

• P23:3.950 complaint points, 2.484 approved, 497 set aside, 640 withdrawn, 329 dismissed. Regional denominator 3.939. Bytype total 2.848 and 497 set aside in the original; the next version gives 430 excluding duration. Categories for small interventions are combined under other.

• P 24: figure 7.1 has 1.713 approved, 46 formally unlawful, 279 set aside, 280 withdrawn, 148 dismissed =2.466. Sum of substantive figure categories =2.038; regionally 2.030/1.751 approved is printed. Bytype total 2.023/1.750,set aside 277 with separate 4 hand/foot straps, but P 25 states 273. No forced reconciliation.

• P25 figure 3:2.742 approved, 96 formally unlawful, 419 set aside, 487 withdrawn, 349 dismissed = 4.093; on the merits 3.257. The approval rate includes formally unlawful deprivations of liberty. 2024 intake/closures revised from 1.920/1.287 to 1.926/1.288.

• P25 table 12:2023/2024/2025 durations set aside 54/39/82 among 124/98/207 approved initiations; approved duration 66/53/103,no decision 4/6/22. The P23 original has 67 durations set aside; the P24 original shows 0. From 2025,duration is registered only above 4 hours. Breaks in version/scope are retained.

• From 2024, the approval denominator will be changed to material complaints; rejected / withdrawn shall be omitted. Time shall be divided into working days for suspensive appeals and calendar days for other material cases only. 2024 = 6,7 / 85,6; 2025 = 6,4 / 216,9. Average is not the number of breaks or the length of actually continuing coercion.

Own impact and responsibility assessment

Formal illegality and unlawful maintenance are real autonomous deviations which a materially approved implementation does not eliminate. A full statement shall include all those parts of the decision and the date of effective termination. An annual outcome may provide evidence of the Board's findings, but only cannot determine the amount of the person's loss, the extent of the damage, the employee's debt or compensation paid. Later confirmation requires verification of the original's parts and scope, especially by the old mixed counting gel.

Sources and concrete residual controls

• P17: 2017-original, physical page 9-14, 21-26. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• P18: 2018-original, physical pages 4-12. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• P19: 2019-original, physical pages 5-14. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• P22: 2022-original, physical pages 5-18. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• P23: 2023-original, physical page 6-15. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• P24: 2024-original, physical page 6-18. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• P25: 2025-original, physical page 7-10, 15-21. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• P13: 2013-original, physical page 4,7 -10,17 -22. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• P14: 2014-original, physical page 4,7-12,20-24. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• P20: 2020 -original, physical page 6-7,11-15. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• P21: 2021 -original, physical pages 5-7,11-16. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• A14: 2014-original, physical page 7.

• A15: 2015-original, physical page 7.

• A16: 2016-original, physical page 8.

• A17: 2017-original, physical page 8.

• A18: 2018-original, physical page 8.

• A19: 2019-original, physical page 8-9.

• A20: 2020 -original, physical page 8-9.

• A21: 2021 -original, physical page 8-9.

• A22: 2022-original, physical page 8-10. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• A23: 2023-original, physical page 7-9.

• A24: 2024-original, physical page 7-8.

• A25: 2025-original, physical page 7-9.

• N10: 2010- original, physical page printed 4-12. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• M11: 2011-original, physical page 8-10,15-16,19. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• M12: 2012-original, physical page 8-9,14-15. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• H12: 2012-original, physical page 9-10,16-19. Status original checked for the statistical sections given.

• 2006-2010,PPKN first instance:national and all regional outcomes are missing; the 2007 reform and national unit administration in 2013 must not be homogenised. Ask STPK/Nævnenes Hus and the National Archives for all predecessor annual reports and registration manuals..

• 2006-2013,central psychiatric appeal: full original tables from the body itself are missing for 2006-13,apart from 2013 received/time from A14. PP retrospective received figures are not the appeal board’s annual output. Ask STPK for Patientklagenævnet 2006-10 and Psykiatrisk Ankenævn 2011-13,including jurisdictional changes by coercion type..

• 2006-2025, unique patients, employees, actual cessation and compensation: Annual tables do not contain person dedup, actual cessation time or compensation payment; requires data coupling per complaint and intervention.

Accidental events: controlled annual data, demarcation and follow-up

All 20 years now have at least one concrete public figure. It is a source-divided 20-year review, not one harmonised series of public servants' illegality. The statistics, methodology and regional annexes of the 2007 annual original are now checked in public archives; 2009 remains the figures of the ministerial debt, while the actual annual original has not been provided. 2006 / 2008 / 2010 are original publications read in public mirror, verified by colophon, publisher and title. 2012 autoPart 1 is now all 18 pages controlled with separate creation / closing sections; 2012 / 13 retrospective tables in later originals are preserved as other versions. See dpsd2007-2012-historical original.md / .json.

1. Year by year

Year	Population / version	Number	Locator / source
2006	primary approach / 2006	15,556	printed 3 / 7 [UTH 2006]
2007	primary approach to regions / 2007 original	20,368	PDF3 / 6 [DPSD2007OR]; same number also in [UTH2007]
2007	secondary / analysed approach to SST / 2007 original	19,217	PDF3 / 7 [DPSD2007OR]; overlap with primary
2008	primary approach / 2008	21,279	printed 6-11 [UTH 2008],
2009	secondary / analysed at SST / 2009	25,249	SUU 583, response 2010, last text section [UTH 2009]
2010	primary approach / 2010	41,501	printed 7-15 [UTH 2010],
2011	primary approach / 2011	98,669	PDF 4 / 6-14 [UTH 2011]
2012	newly created / 2012 egenoriginal	155,791	PDF4 / 5 / 7 [DPSD2012OR]
2012	closing activity / 2012 egenoriginal	125,870	PDF5 / 15 [DPSD2012OR]; sector section 106193 is kept separate
2012	Final year / 2018	155,000	printed 18-19 / PDF 19-20, Figure 1 [UTH 2018]
2013	Final year / 2018	164,850	printed 18-19 / PDF 19-20, Figure 1 [UTH 2018]
2014	Final year / 2018	167,098	printed 18-19 / PDF 19-20, Figure 1 [UTH 2018]
2015	Final year / 2018	175,243	printed 18-19 / PDF 19-20, Figure 1 [UTH 2018]
2016	Final year / 2018	172,708	printed 18-19 / PDF 19-20, Figure 1 [UTH 2018]
2017	year of creation, subsequently closed / anonymised / 2022	206,173	PDF 6-7 Figure 1 [UTH 2022]
2018	year of creation, subsequently closed / anonymised / 2023	203,590	PDF 10-11 Figure 3 [UTH 2023]
2019	year of creation, subsequently closed / anonymised / 2023	235,620	PDF 10-11 Figure 3 [UTH 2023]
2020	year of creation, subsequently closed / anonymised / 2024	293,726	PDF 8-9 Figure 1 [UTH 2024]
2021	year of creation, subsequently closed / anonymised / 2025	336,083	PDF 11-12 Figure 1 [UTH 2025]
2022	year of creation, subsequently closed / anonymised / 2025	380,272	PDF 11-12 Figure 1 [UTH 2025]
2023	year of creation, subsequently closed / anonymised / 2025	420,302	PDF 11-12 Figure 1 [UTH 2025]
2024	year of creation, subsequently closed / anonymised / 2025	501,969	PDF 11-12 Figure 1 [UTH 2025]
2025	year of creation, subsequently closed / anonymised / 2025	589,888	PDF 11-12 Figure 1 [UTH 2025]

No sum of the above: 2009 is secondary, other early years primary, and later years include selected closed population. Details, all controlled version rows and population overlap are in the accompanying JSON.

2. Central version and selection breaks

• 2006: 15.556 primary, 12.370 secondary; 320 SAC 3,52 analytical sums. 2008: 21.279 / 19.866; 324 SAC 3,73 summaries; 21 other summaries. SAC 3 combines severity and frequency and cannot be counted as death.

• 2010: 41.501 primary, 34.418 secondary; old system 34.208 of which 492 SAC 3; new 210 of which 5 severe + 1 fatal. New categories may overlap.

• 2011: 98.669 primary; preface 78.038 finished against bread text 78.036. The classification table omits hospital reports January-May in old version. Approximately 20.600 in the task's backlog have not been documented 90-day overruns. Patient / relative reports 693 as against 255 completed in September-December.

• 2017 uses year of creation, 2018 year of closure, 2019 year of first closure and 2021 returns to year of creation. Only closed/anonymised data are included centrally; reopened cases are excluded at data extraction. The 2017 creations of 211.873 and closures of 197.722 must not be conflated.

• 2021 original 326.416,2022 retro 334.712,2023 retro 335.381,2024 retro 335.654,2025 retro 336.083 for the same 2021.2024 original 489.361 versus 2025 retro 501.969. Keep each version without summing them.

* From 1 July 2023, the reporting obligation, actual / possible consistency and the geographical / organisational scope of the collection report will be changed; 2024 the types of events will be extended further. 2025 batch 478.356 plus individual 111.532 = 589.888.

3. Public and private cannot be read as employees

Hospital covers public hospitals. The municipality also includes private social housing services; other regions include practitioners and pharmacies. The location groups are therefore not a full breakdown after public / private employment. The boundaries are checked in 2014 PDF 22,2015 PDF 17,2016 PDF 17,2021 PDF 24 and 2023 PDF 14.

4. Actual injury and potential injury

Period / version	None / unknown	Easier / moderate	Serious	Fatal	Population
2023 first semester	50.434	20.277 mild + 10.347 moderate	1.613	312	82.983; PDF 17 fig 9
2023 second half	44.882	21.980	2.173	273	69.308; PDF 17 fig 10
2024 original	82.032	39.808	5.356	654	127.850; PDF 16 fig 8
2025 original	71.549	34.503	4.843	637	111.532; PDF 17 fig 8

2024 potentially fatal 6.010 and 2025 potentially fatal 2.864 are variables other than 654 / 637 actually fatal. 2025 potentially severe 27.940 should also not be added to 4.843 for unique events. Two registrations of the same patient may occur; no nationwide person dedup is documented here.

5. Documented Follow-Up Problem

DPSD 2021 PDF 35 / printed 34, section 4.11: by the end of 2020 around 70.000 events were not formally completed locally by the deadline 90 days. By request, the Board instructed municipalities, regions and private individuals to conclude. Their explanation of learning already carried out is institutional statements. The original does not provide a controlled number of self-employed patients, individual convictions or effects on injuries.

6. Numbering and further necessary proof

2014 original figure 4: 2013 sectoral rows sum 165.356 against bread text 164.850, difference 506; 2014 sum 167.084 versus 167.098, difference − 14. The source does not explain these differences; they are preserved. In 2023, half-year figures 82.983 + 69.308 = 152.291, while the annual figure indicates 152.290 individual events. The difference on one event is an internal source deviation that is not corrected by assumption. 2016 Table 2 sum 170.708 plus 2.000 batch = 172.708; 2018 Table 2 sum 178.220 plus 16.953 batch = 195.173.2015 Table 2 sum 175.243.

The statistical/methodological section and complete regional annex of the 2007 annual original, together with 2012 Part 1, have now been checked. The 2009/2013 annual originals remain precise retrieval items in dpsd2009-historisk-original.md and dpsd2013-historisk-original.md;2012 Part 2/learning annexes are separate outstanding items, as are local contribution reports for 2014/15 and precise severity cells in older annual figures. For missing registration variables, Sundhedsvæsenets Kvalitetsinstitut as DPSD administrator and historically STPS/SST must be asked for version-preserved annual tables, metadata for created/first completed/last completed/closed, aggregate reporting, local 90-day overruns and public/private operation. A separate lawfully pseudonymised deduplication is necessary for individuals; reporting alone does not prove disciplinary or criminal culpability. No request has been sent.

DPSD 2007 and 2012: historical annual originals, table figures and selection

The 2007 original 67 pages are provided in public archives; statistical sections, risk method and the entire regional annex have been checked. 2012Part 1: all 18 pages checked. Table names, units and original cells below do not replace the versions of other annual editions. 2007Table I / II and the tables of the RHannex as well as the 2012Figure 3 / 6 and Table 1-3 are visually controlled directly in memory. No original text / PDF / image is stored locally.

All controlled table rows

2007 Annual Report - PDFside 3

Unit: reports / summaries; mentions: -. Different and overlapping steps. Secondary after local treatment; 90 days' agreement, not 20368 + 19217 persons.

Cut	Number
Primary	20368
Secondary	19217
SACC3	353
SACC3 analysis sums	58

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 Nine main groups - PDFpage 8

Unit: reports / pct.; denominator: 19217. Secondary 2007. Heart failure / accidental death are not fatal consequences alone.

Type	Number	Pct
Medicines	6781	35
Operational / invasive	999	5
Fall	2716	14
Self-harm	149	1
Anaesthesia	421	2
Distortion / communication	2640	14
Failure of continuity	1799	9
Cardiac arrest / unexpected death	117	1
Other	3595	19

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 Figure 4 - PDFpage 9

Unit: per cent; denominator: 19217. SAC combines damage and recurrence risk; 3 are not deaths.

Score	Pct
1	80
2	18
3	2

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 Table I - PDFpage 10

Unit: per cent; denominator: 19217. Reporter roles, non-malfunctioning employees; role definitions mix places of employment.

Rapporteur	Pct
Doctors	15,2
Care	56
Dentists	<0,1
Pharmaceutical products	0,4
Psychologists	<0,1
Second clinical	8
Other staff	7,2
Technical	1,8
Unknown	11,4

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 Table II - PDFpage 11

Unit: reports / summaries; denominator: 353. Summaries are underlying analyses; must not be added to events.

Type	SACC3	Summary
Medicines	24	3
Operational / invasive	21	8
Fall	88	3
Self-harm	65	11
Anaesthesia	3	2
Distortion / communication	14	2
Failure of continuity	38	5
Cardiac arrest / unexpected death	69	23
Other	31	1

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 BilagRH primary - PDFside 65

Unit: reports; denominator: 11754. Regional Capital; Annex Introduction indicates interim report mid-December. Not national extraterritorial.

Quarter	Number
1	2695
2	3073
3	2871
4	3115

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 BilagRH secondary - PDFpage 65

Unit: reports; denominator: 9507. Same region, second step.

Quarter	Number
1	2756
2	2174
3	2155
4	2422

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 BilagRH risk - PDFpage 65

Unit: reports; denominator: 9507. Visible sum 9506, one less than the quarterly figure. No guessed fix.

Score	Number
1	7110
2	2175
3	221

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 BilagRH groups - PDFside 66

Unit: reports; denominator: 9507. Secondary regional; part of wider national population.

Type	Number
Medicines	3171
Operational / invasive	423
Fall	1261
Self-harm	71
Anaesthesia	165
Distortion / communication	1513
Failure of continuity	1126
Cardiac arrest / unexpected death	51
Other	1726

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 BilagRH Rapporteurs - PDFpage 66

Unit: reports; denominator: 9507. Table continues PDF67; rapporteur is not guilty employee.

Role	Number
Doctors	1434
Care	5242
Dentists	2
Pharmaceutical products	78
Psychologists	0
Second clinical	684
Other staff	1208
Technical	328
Unknown	531

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 BilagRH anonymity - PDFside 67

Unit: reports; denominator: 11754. Primary. National 88,9% on PDF11 has a second cut.

Status	Number
Named	11048
Anonymous	706

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2007 SACmatrix - PDFpage 46

Unit: scores; denominator: -. Classification matrix, not 16 events / persons.

Frequency	Catastrophal	Significant	Moderate	Minimum
Frequency	3	3	2	1
Less	3	2	1	1
Rare	3	2	1	1
Very rare	3	2	1	1

Source:DPSD2007OR.

2012 Annual cut - PDFside 5

Unit: reports; mentions: -. Not merging. The year indicates activity; later retrospective 155000 may be retained as a separate version.

Cut	Number
Created	155791
Completed	125870

Source:DPSD2012OR.

2012 Figure 3 - PDFpage 7

Unit: reports; mentions: -. Figure endings sum 106193; year endings 125870. Original does not explain precisely the vote. No assumed common cohorts.

Sector	Created	Completed
Municipalities	98333	65623
Hospital	49145	35157
Private	1205	634
Second region	7108	4779

Source:DPSD2012OR.

2012 Table 1 - PDFpage 9

Unit: per cent; denominator: -. Classified, completed and submitted 2012 cases. Over 90% classified; exact classified denominators are not disclosed.

ICPS	Municipalities	Hospital	Private	Second region
Administration	1,9	18,9	17,6	23,2
Blood	0	0,9	0,5	0,4
Building	0,1	1,2	3,4	0,9
Gases	0	0,3	0,4	0
Individual / team / organisation	0,3	1,7	0,9	1,3
Infection	1,1	0,5	0	0,1
Clinic	1,3	19,9	8,5	22,7
Communication / documentation	2,9	17,8	12,4	18,9
Medicines	68,8	23,9	40,3	29,4
Equipment	0,3	4,3	4,7	1,1
Accidents	21,6	6,7	8,3	0,7
Self-harm	0,1	0,9	0	0,1
Other	1,5	3,1	3	1,2

Source:DPSD2012OR.

2012 Figure 6 - PDFpage 11

Unit: per cent; denominator: [65623, 35157, 634, 4779]. Completed / closed / submitted 2012 cases. Report damage may be altered by the caseworker. Private 67,4% in figure against 97,4% in bread text.

Injury	Municipalities	Hospital	Private	Second region
Unknown	0,2	0	0	0
None	65	53,6	67,4	52,7
Mild	24,6	23,5	20,3	32,7
Moderate	8,6	17,1	9,2	9,9

Injury	Municipalities	Hospital	Private	Second region
Serious	1,4	5	3	4,1
Fatal	0,1	0,8	0,1	0,6

Source:DPSD2012OR.

2012 Table 2 - PDFpage 12

Unit: report records; denominator: 479. Intersectoral local coded and completed / submitted. Hospital ↔ municipality is 135 + 29 = 164; may not be added to 479.

Place of occurrence	Second region	Hospital	Municipality	Private	Manual	Total
Second region	11	17	17	0	18	63
Hospital	25	21	135	1	124	306
Municipality	20	29	12	0	47	108
Private	0	1	0	0	1	2
Total	56	68	164	1	190	479

Source:DPSD2012OR.

2012 Table 3 - PDFpage 13

Unit:report registrations; denominator:18145. Discovered elsewhere; completed/closed/submitted. Blank is an original blank, not assumed 0. Subtotals are not additional persons. A disability service is a location, not a number of persons with disabilities.

Place of occurrence	Manual	Second region	Hospital	Municipality	Private	Total
Pharmacy	132	43	20	256	1	452
General practice	481	330	1290	316	-	2417
Prehospital	180	30	86	17	-	307
Regional development	94	13	-	1	-	108
Specialist	39	17	221	3	-	280
Tooth / therapist / middlemen	14	13	7	3	-	20
Veterinary surgeon	32	62	38	24	-	156
Subtotal regional	972	508	1662	620	1	3763
Public hospital	4315	544	4026	1891	5	10783
Subtotal hospital	4315	544	4026	1893	5	10783
Country of the municipality	96	-	12	64	-	172
Local sands	6	-	-	2	-	8
Home care	473	8	19	304	1	805
Home nursing services	224	13	28	132	-	397
Municipal doctor	4	-	-	1	-	5
Abuse	22	1	1	8	-	32

Place of occurrence	Manual	Second region	Hospital	Municipality	Private	Total
Residential accommodation	1068	5	16	471	1	1561
Social housing services	251	10	8	66	-	335
Health Centre	43	-	1	24	-	66
Health care provider	1	-	-	-	-	1
Training	20	-	6	8	-	34
Entrepreneurial disability services	86	-	-	41	-	127
Municipality of subtotal	2294	37	91	1121	2	3545
Private hospital	28	5	5	12	4	54
Subtotal private	28	5	5	12	4	54
Total	7609	1094	5784	3646	12	18145

Source:DPSD2012OR.

2012 Table 4 - PDFpage 15

Unit: reports; denominator: 125870. Reporter types, not unique patients / relatives. Sum tuned.

Rapporteur	Completed
Health care professional	124234
Patient	1200
Pears	436

Source:DPSD2012OR.

Other exact / reported statistical findings

Year	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Selection / overlap
2007	Name Rapporteur	88,9	-	%	11	Section on secondary; no separate n on the statement, not number of employees
2007	Medicinal product identified	19	24	reports;	12	Sub-group SACC3
2007	Medications without preparation name	5	24	reports;	15	Complementundergrupp e
2007	PEGpneumonia	4	21	reports;	16	Reported preventable; original clinical data not read
2007	Decrease Hospital	46	88	reports;	16	SAC3 Committee
2007	Fall toilet	15	88	reports;	16	SAC3 Committee
2007	Decrease Other	22	88	reports;	16	SAC3 Committee
2007	Decrease	5	88	reports;	16	SAC3 Committee
2007	Suicide executed	51	65	reports;	17	Not all national suicides
2007	Suicide outside / district	38	51	reports;	18	Subgroup, not Appendix
2007	Suicide hospital	13	51	reports;	18	Subgroup
2007	Somatically among hospital suicides	7	13	reports;	18	Subgroup
2007	Studies	14	65	reports;	18	SACC3
2007	Try home visits	5	14	reports;	18	Subgroup
2007	Communication staff	10	14	reports;	19	SACC3
2007	Communication patient	3	14	reports;	20	SACC3
2007	Communication control centre	1	14	reports;	20	SACC3
2007	Continuity Internal Division	27	38	reports;	20	Of which 21 information / 6 capacity
2007	Continuous intermediate hospital services	9	38	reports;	21	SACC3
2007	Loss of samples	2	38	reports;	21	SACC3
2007	Accidental cardiac arrest	45	69	reports;	22	Of which 7CTG; not 69 deaths
2007	Lack of surveillance	9	69	reports;	22	SACC3
2007	Cardiac disorders	15	69	reports;	22	SACC3
2007	Other apparatus	6	31	reports;	23	SACC3

Year	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Selection / overlap
2007	Other diagnosis	12	31	reports;	23	SACC3
2007	Other heterogeneous	13	31	reports;	23	SACC3
2007	LMS marking	109	-	reports;	34	Cross-risk search bits; overlap with main groups
2007	LMSequipment obtained	797	-	reports;	36	All risks; sub-committees
2007	LMSequipment possible contribution	51	797	reports;	36	Committee
2007	LMS equipment already processed	14	51	reports;	36	Previously directly reported; omitted from new case handling
2007	LMS equipment unidentifiable	37	51	reports;	36	Unable to process concrete apparatus; approx. 3 m repaired / discarded
2007	North Jutland entrance	853	-	reports;	52	Regional contribution; part of / overlap with national
2007	North Jutland core analyses	4	-	analyses;	52	Separate from 2 aggregated analyses
2007	North Jutland aggregate	2	-	analyses;	52	Not unique events
2007	Midtylland entrance	4000	-	The frequency of these reports is unknown.	54	DPSD + Skejby's own base; common dupupknown
2007	OuHuxed	30	2121	Events	59	Item 2007; original year of observation not specified
2007	OUHplanter	20	30	action plans;	59	Plans are not 30 events
2007	OUHfultimplement	9	20	action plans;	59	No evidence of prevention effect
2007	OuHdeli	3	20	action plans;	59	Overlap No
2007	The capital end of the analysis	53	-	analyses;	64	Provisional
2007	The capital in progress	24	-	analyses;	64	No subsequent closure
2012	Regional residual primary	5000	-	cases	6	National regional group, not only regional employment
2012	Regional increase	5000	-	cases	6	Not automatic 90 dovershoot
2012	Regional end-of-year	10000	-	cases	6	Sammefly
2012	Municipal residual primo	15000	-	cases	7	Word sound
2012	Local increased residue	24000	-	cases good	7	Order 2012 backlog

Year	Find	Figures	Denomination	Unit	PDF page	Selection / overlap
2012	End of local government	39000	-	cases	7	Not Total National Residual; Regional 10 kseparate
2012	DDKMclassified	21000	-	events approx.	16	16 standards; non-full-year group
2012	National Forum Meetings	2	-	meetings;	17	Activity,not instances of redress
2012	Medical meetings	2	-	meetings;	17	Samples may overlap
2012	Coordination meeting	1	-	meeting	18	Activity
2012	Meeting of advisory committees	1	-	meeting	18	Activity
2007	Cytostatics at decreased organ function	3	24	reports;	13	SAC3 medicinal-product subgroup; overlap with product groups, no additional total
2007	Alarm Events SACC3	5	-	reports;	28	Observation period not specified separately; no new national supplement
2007	Alarm disconnected	3	5	reports;	28	Alarm event sub-group
2007	Alarm delayed reaction	1	5	report	28	Alarm event sub-group
2007	Alarm battery failure and death	1	5	report	28	Reported concrete consequence; journal and individual causality not independently controlled
2007	CTG SAC3 historical search subset	6	-	reports;	29	From beginning of 2004 to May 2007. Overlap with Annual Group 7CTG unknown; cannot be added to 2007 total
2006	Language problem in historical search	29	-	reports;	27	Observation 2006 referred to in Annual original 2007; no automatic additional error / person union

Votes

Year	Checks	Original cells / recognition	Result
2007	Divisions / SAC3 / Summary	19217/353/58	each sum aligned, no common total
2007	RHrisk	9506 versus 9507	one unexplained classification difference;
2007	LMSequipment	14 + 37 = 51 of 797	14 already treated must not be counted as 37 newly treated; 37 is precisely not identifiable;
2012	Sectors created	98333+49145+1205+7108=155791	Adjust
2012	Closed sector / year	106193 versus 125870	difference 19677, cohort / cutoff explanation required
2012	Private no damage	Figure 67,4 against Bread Text 97,4	Visually confirmed source deviation
2012	T3 prehospital	visible 313 against total 307	difference 6, not corrected
2012	T3 tooth / therapist / midwife	visible 37 against total 20	difference 17
2012	T3 Health Center	visible 68 against total 66	difference 2
2012	T3 hospital → municipality	1891 in basisrow versus 1893 subtotal	difference 2; total 10783 fits only subtotal
2012	T3 Second Regional Bread Text	3757 against Table 3763	difference 6
2012	T4 Rapporteurs	124234+1200+436=125870	Adjust

Method, concrete consistency and evidence requirements

2007 archive version: the version date of the colophon is empty as XX.March 2008, version 1,0. No other version with a completed date has been checked. 2007: primary / secondary has different treatment times; the agreement indicates 90 days. SACC3 may include both permanent disability and death as well as frequency; no death / disability union can be formed. The 37 unidentifiable reports of the Equipment Committee show a concrete barrier to follow-up: anonymisation / lack of equipment information and time until discarded / repaired equipment. OuH20 plans / 9 full / 3 partial is follow-up control, not proof of actual prevention of new injuries. [DPSD2007OR, PDF6 / 36 / 45-46 / 59]

2012: public hospitals are listed separately; municipal locations and other regional locations are not employment status. Classification percentages use classified cases, severity uses completed/closed cases, and the reporter total uses a larger closure subset. The institutional explanation of the increase as cultural change is not an independent measurement of actual error frequency. Healthcare professionals/patients/relatives 124234/1200/436 describe the reporter’s role, not unique injured people. [DPSD2012OR, PDF4/7/9-11/15]

Own evidence: Documented statistical / follow-up failures must not be obscured by an overall learning tale. Each specific event requires initial record, report, simultaneous examination, responsible actors, time for treatment and documented actual damage. A subsequent action plan does not document timely treatment, compensation or concrete employee responsibility. The requirement is version-preserved tables, separation, stable event key and legal person coupling as well as concrete compliance / responsibility logs. No new numbers of people are derived here.

Documented errors and separate hypotheses

Documented: the internal number deviations shown; non-identifiable equipment and the reported limitations in case processing; incomplete implementation of the defined OUH plan committee. Hypotheses requiring additional original proof: which equipment / treatment events involved individual responsibility, actual death / permanent disability and causality; whether the annual / sector difference is due to cohort filters; whether concrete plans were subsequently implemented and damage replaced.

Precise residues

2007Figure 1-3 has columns without exact data cells; national quarterly figures may not be guessed. 2012Figure 1 / 2 a / 2 b / 4 / 5 / 7 / 8 / 9 requires underlying graph data for exact full series; several are columns without number labels. 2012Part 2 and the Learning Annex are separate originals; read Part 1 is not full control of the other two parts. 2009 / 2013 own annual originals shall be aligned in separate access modules. Non-public person / error / sanction coupling is a separate registry requirement. No message / data request has been sent.

DPSD 2009 - control of the official source path of the original report

Checked on 7. October 2026. A specific examination of the Danish Health Authority's *Annual Report 2009 - DPSD Danish Patient Safety Database*. The original report's PDF was **not read** in this check. This is a specific source gap; finding an original link or archive metadata is not a check of the report's content.

Documented source path

The archived primary portal from 6 June 2013 was read in memory and contains the following PDF link: Original DPSD- Annual Report 2009 of the Danish Health Board.

SHA-256 of the downloaded portal response: a723of1d4e25fcf3bf4bec21c36aba8a77895f896bff1a80f004en5bda1f43 (12.750 bytes). Hashen refers to the portal page's HTML, not the PDF.

A targeted CDX search on the sst.dk / publ / publ2010 / Oversight / DPSD / and a variant with Publ2010 found for the PDF path only a registration from 20240713221352, with MIME-type text / html and HTTP status 404. It's metadata on a bug page, **not an archived PDF**. The targeted replay with October 16, 2011 as desired date gave HTTP 404. Current official domain and migration variants gave HTTP 429. It documents the outcome of these checks; it does not prove that the original does not exist in another public archive.

Figures that can be documented without pretending to read the annual original

Year	Figures	Unit of measurement and demarcation	Source and locator	Overlap and counting
2009	25.249	Analysed reports received by the Danish Health Service from the regions	SUU general part 2009-10, reply on question 583, the section with the Danish Health Service's DPSDinformation	Already included as the year 2009 in the main note. Do not re-add. The number of reports is not unique patients, all actual events or observed illegality.
2009	50	Events registered under the category "Cardiac arrest or unexpected fatalities"	The same ministerial answer, the same paragraph	Subset of 25.249; not to be added. The collection category does not give a separate number of deaths, deaths caused by errors or unique deaths.

The answer describes DPSD as a reporting system, the number of which depends on the submission of the healthcare provider. Therefore, it cannot quantify the full scale of events or exact deaths resulting from mistreatment. This information is from a later official source, not an independent reading of the annual report.

What remains to be checked in the annual report itself

• All tables, figures, category numbers and annual comparisons.

• The actual date of the report, the inclusion and exclusion rules, any cancellations and status requirements prior to submission from the regions.

• Any differences between locally reported events and analyzed reports received centrally.

• The report's own definition of events, degree of injury, treatment site and reporting group, and overlap between classifications.

• The page number of the annual report and PDF-hash. No PDF-hash is available because the PDF was not downloaded.

No missing category counts have been inferred from rounded percentages in presentations or secondary accounts. Sundhedsstyrelsen's ordinary institutional annual report for 2009 is a different document and cannot replace the DPSD annual report.

Storage and traceability

The check retrieved the portal and archive metadata directly to memory. No original PDF, HTML, text extract or page images were stored locally. The corresponding JSON note contains only its own control results, source references and any hashes, with explicit indication of their source object. The archive's poem for the HTML bug page is not a hash of the original report.

DPSD 2013: defined control of the original annual report

Result: National *DPSD Annual Report 2013, Part 1* are identified by simultaneous bibliographical references, but not retrieved or materially read in this check. Its original statistical cells, denominators and method therefore remain a concrete original residue. A separate Part 2 for 2013 has not been documented by the verified references. Failure to access does not mean zero events, and the file searches do not prove that the original has been lost.

The verification only covers the 2013 original; 2007, 2009 and 2012 are dealt with in other modules. Public HTML / PDF originals were processed in memory, never saved on disk. Metadatafund is not similar to material reading.

Original and source chain

Search	Precise source / locator	Actual control	Meaning
Historical Part 1 Address	Previous file address of the patient pass and DPSD's previous file address	Reference chain; no retrieved year original	Report title and concrete demand targets; no verified annual cells
Institutional bibliography	Hospital pharmacy, North Jutland Region, Research report 2016, references p.21	Bibliographical reference checked; not the entire research report	Points at the old DPSD Part 1 address; does not document its statistics
Subsequent, separate primary method	Patient Information / Ministry, Service Oversight July 2014, PDF-p.18, note under development figure	Title pages and specific annual report references / methodology e read in RAM; 51 pages identified, not full material review	The source indicates that 2012- 2013 is based on database features; ongoing case work may lead to deviations from the annual reports. The numbers are therefore not automatically the original 2013 version
Current institutional responsibilities	STPS, Annual Report page, section before the annual report list	Primary page read	Operational and national UTH tasks were transferred to the Health Service Quality Institute 1.5.2025; historical archive search tracks at STPS and current DPSDs at SundK

Actual delimited archive control

CDX rows are metadata records after the specified filters and digest coincidences; they are neither events, report number nor a complete archive register. Searches without a finding of the original do not prove that no other URL / copy exists.

Search	Filters and demarcation	Returned metadata tree sker	Actual read original content / result
dpsd.dk, the whole host's prefix	URL with 2013; status 200; digest coincidence	4	Metadata; news / newsletter, no year original
dpsd.deme.privatsite.dk, prefix	URL with 2013; status 200; digest coincidence	5	Metadata; No Annual Original
patient ombuddet.dk, prefix	URL with 2013; status 200; digest coincidence	21	Metadata; No Annual Original

Search	Filters and demarcation	Returned metadata tree sker	Actual read original content / result
stps.dk, prefix	URL with 2013 and DPSD; status 200; digest-coincidence	2	Metadata; later guide with 2013 in datoid, no year original
dpsd.dk, prefix	All years; MIME application / pdf; status 200; digest coincidence	64	Metadata; no 2013annual file identified
dpsd.deme.privatsite.dk, prefix	All years; MIME application / pdf; status 200; digest coincidence	0	No match; no proof of no archived PDF under other address
stps.dk, prefix	All years; PDF and DPSD in URL; status 200; digest coincidence	15	Metadata; no 2013annual file identified
dpsd.dk / ~ / media / Foundry / Sit es / DPSD / Files / Years reports /	No status filter; digest coincidence	4	Abbreviated 2013 address, capture 20230614112709, status 302, actually followed to general STPS-UTH page; not annual report
EMEA Annual Report / ~ / medi a / Learning	No status filter; digest coincidence	0	No match
• • • • • • • •	HTML; Status 200; digest coincidence	0	No match
patient ombuddet.dk / en / Publications / Years reports	Status 200; digest coincidence	0	No match
stps.dk / en / releases /, URL with 2013	Status 200; digest coincidence	15	2013-index, capture 20160704154345 actually read; no national 2013annual report reference in the read index
stps.dk / en / releases /, URL with 2014	Status 200; digest coincidence	20	2014-index, capture 20160710050650 actually read; no annual report link. Two GUID-PDF title pages actually read: *Dose Dispensation Version 1.2* (54 pages), *Service overhaul July 2014* (51 pages). No one is DPSD 2013 Part 1
ODA Document of the Folketing	Title contains DPSD or Patient Safety, document date 2014; File extended	0	No match within precise title delineation
ODA Document of the Folketing	Title contains Patient Ombuddens, document date 2014; File Extended	4	Metadata: Document 26279 / SUU Annex 599 has 6 files: Patient revolving, four boards, transfer letter. No Independent DPSDs Year File
Current Annual Report page of STPS	Actual HTML line control and search for 2013	Not an annual statistic	No 2013-PDF reference in the downloaded HTML; unfolding / loading function may delimit the HTML extract

The 51 and 54 pages are document size, not a claim for full report reading. All above counts are own search results. The web search engine's report title, Part 1 / Part 2, government and bibliography searches were used for localization; secondary reproduced 2013 numbers have not been transferred to the original column.

Countable status and precise remainder

Year / version	Counter	Denomination	Unit / population	Samples, exclusions and overlap	Status
2013, Original DPSD Part 1	Not original erified	Not original erified	Reports / incidents according to the original's even unread definition; not automatically unique patients or public servants	Year of occurrence / reporting, closure time, deletions, duplicates, reports transmitted / rejected and public / private sector shall be read in the original;	Actual original balance
2013, later service page n July 2014	Not extracted in this module	Not extracted in this module	Separate database output according to the primary source PDF-p.18	May differ from original annual report; no automatic version harmonisation	Methodology point o riginal controls one; not replacement for Part 1
If applicable, DPSD 2013 Part 2	Existence not verified	Not applicable before identification	Unknown	2012 Part 2 or other learning reports do not document a 2013 Part 2	Title / Original

Explicitly necessary catch up, not dispatched: The historical publication archive of the STPS and the DPSDfunction of the Health Service are requested to locate the original published *DPSD Annual Report 2013, Part 1*, if applicable Part 2 and bibliographic release date, journal number, internal media GUID and previous URLs. In addition, any corrections / new versions and documentation of the exit date, reporting year, report / event definition, duplicate / delete / rejection rules, sector categories, severity and transferred versus locally completed events are requested. If the file has been delivered to another archive, the specific delivery / journal chain is necessary. No statistical gaps are coded as zero.

DPSD 2012: Health Service Contribution and Learning Annexes

The learning annex is text read on all 12 pages and the project table PDF11 is visually controlled. Part 2 is materially read on all 389 pages, with visual RAM control of PDF384. FrAPDF55 is only omitted contact blocks and repeated questions from the RAM view; all response fields are preserved. The extracted text is only processed in memory.

Figures and units

The rows refer to 2012, with clearly marked historical years of comparison. UTH, analyses, meetings, participants and waiting list items have separate units. No sum is a number of illegalities or citizens affected.

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12L PDF5	2012	Patient Ombudd	Newsletters	4	Not available	broadcasts;	Jan / May / Aug / Oct
DPSD12L PDF6-7	2012	Patient Ombudd	Thematic reports	3	Not available	reports;	Dysphagia / medicine / bowel perforation
DPSD12L PDF7	2012	Patient Ombudd	Medical practice summary	1	Not available	publication	Separate from 3 thematic reports
DPSD12L PDF8-9	2012	Patient Ombudd	OBS messages	4	Not available	messages;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12L PDF9	2012	Patient Ombudd	Warnings	0	Not available	warnings;	Not 0 known risks
DPSD12L PDF11	2012	Patient Ombudd	Collaboration pacts / project tree	8	Not available	Table rows	Methodoate appears in 3 places; no project sum
DPSD12L PDF12	2012	Patient Ombudd	Lectures	approx. 60	Not available	lectures	Rounded

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12L PDF12	2012	Patient Ombudd	Theme Days	2	Not available	theme days;	7.6./20.11.2012
DPSD12L PDF12	2012	Patient Ombudd	DPSDtemada g Herlev	ca. 150	Not available	participants;	7.6.2012; rounded
DPSD12L PDF12	2012	Patient Ombudd	Medicinal Products	more than 300	Not available	participants;	20.11.2012; not exact
DPSD12L PDF12	2012	Patient Ombudd	Medical Theme ag registrations	312	Not available	entries	Non-automatic participants
DPSD12L PDF12	2012	Patient Ombudd	Medical Theme Awareness List	just under 90	Not available	waiting list entry r	No Union with 312 / Participants
DPSD12L PDF9	2012	Patient Ombudd	Victoza system fix	1	Not available	week	Supplier correction; not documentation of individual redress
DPSD12D2 PDF8	2012	RN Quality Office	Follow-up group meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	Held in 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF8	2012	RN Quality Office	FMK Group	4	Not available	meetings;	Held in 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF9	2012	RN Quality Office	Intersectoral FMK group	1	Not available	meeting	Nov 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF10	2012	RN Quality Office	Cross-sectoral factors	1	Not available	analysis;	May overlap with other participating institutions
DPSD12D2 PDF13	2012	RN Psykiatrics	Cross-cutting analyses	5	Not available	analyses;	Attendance or holding
DPSD12D2 PDF13	2012	RN Psykiatrics	Contact Committee	4	Not available	committees;	No events
DPSD12D2 PDF14	2012	Himmerland	Cross-sectoral frequency of meetings	4	Not available	meetings / year	Organisation references; not actually accounted for
DPSD12D2 PDF14	2012	Himmerland	KP forum frequency	10	Not available	meetings / year	Organisational aspects
DPSD12D2 PDF15	2012	Himmerland	Cross-sectoral analyses	2	Not available	analyses;	Held in 2012; a 3rd scheduled 2013
DPSD12D2 PDF17	2012	Thy- Mors	Quality Committee	ca. 10	Not available	meetings / year	Rounded frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF17	2012	Thy- Mors	Patient forum	1-2	Not available	meetings / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF18	2012	Thy- Mors	Cross-sectoral analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	With a municipality; overlap unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF20	2012	Vendsysel	Patient safety rounds	3	Not available	rounds	Held in 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF20	2012	Vendsysel	Taskforce-group meetings actually	1	Not available	meeting	4 planned 2013; not Task Force of the Appeal Board
DPSD12D2 PDF21	2012	Vendsysel	UTH Clinic Frederikshavn	5	Not available	meetings;	Can overlap the municipality's contribution

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF21	2012	Vendsysel	UTH Clinic Hjørring	1	Not available	meeting	Can overlap the municipality's contribution
DPSD12D2 PDF20	2012	Vendsysel	Emergency telephone release services	3	Not available	days	After the telephone switchover, the queue
DPSD12D2 PDF21	2012	Vendsysel	X-ray Advi transition without electronic option	6	Not available	months	Disselected paper in transition; number of patients not quantified
DPSD12D2 PDF24	2012	Aalborg University site hospital	Cross-sectoral analyses	3	Not available	analyses;	Participation / holding; institution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF24	2012	Aalborg University site hospital	Medicines Trace 2012	1	Not available	day	All hospitalised 10.12.2012; patient-N not disclosed
DPSD12D2 PDF24	2012	Aalborg University site hospital	Planned drug tracers 2013	3	Not available	tracers	Plan, non-implementation
DPSD12D2 PDF29	2012	Aleris-Hamlet Aalborg	Quality control meetings	4	Not available	meetings / year	Private; frequency; group overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF31	2012	Artros	Difficulty	0-3	Not available	scale	No events
DPSD12D2 PDF35	2012	Parsley leaves	Emergency call test	1	Not available	time / month	Frequency; number of citizens not disclosed
DPSD12D2 PDF42	2012	Læsø	Decentralised case handlers	2	Not available	Functions / Pens	No citizen union
DPSD12D2 PDF43	2012	Læsø	Cross-sectoral area	Underwritte n	Not available	method statements;	No precise sub-reporting rate
DPSD12D2 PDF44	2012	Mariners' fjord	Pårerenderrapp teret UTH analyzed	1	Not available	UTH	May be the same emergency call event
DPSD12D2 PDF44	2012	Mariners' fjord	Emergency Call-UTH	1	Not available	UTH	Analyzed before national OBS; personal union unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF44	2012	Mariners' fjord	Cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	Not 0 events
DPSD12D2 PDF46	2012	Morsø	UTH theme red	5	Not available	meetings;	In addition, ad hoc meetings were unpublished.
DPSD12D2 PDF47	2012	Morsø	Cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	Reports found in hospital did not give analysis
DPSD12D2 PDF48	2012	Rebild	Cross-sectoral analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	Institution overlap possible
DPSD12D2 PDF50	2012	Thisted	Risk management measures	2	Not available	persons	Not injured
DPSD12D2 PDF50-51	2012	Thisted	Specific risk areas	2	Not available	areas	Medicine / fire

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF51	2012	Thisted	Common cross-sectoral analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	Disagreement on the incident was UTH
DPSD12D2 PDF52	2012	West Himmerland	Follow-up group meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; analyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF52	2012	West Himmerland	Local risk event meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; analyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF52	2012	West Himmerland	Cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	No personal union; analyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF54	2012	Aalborg Municipality	Workshop	1	Not available	time / month	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF54	2012	Aalborg Municipality	Newsletters	1	Not available	time / month	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF55	2012	Horsens	Key person-n network	2	Not available	times / year	Half-yearly frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF55	2012	Horsens	Cross-sectoral network	2	Not available	times / year	Half-yearly frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF55	2012	Horsens	Regional risk	4	Not available	times / year	Quarterly frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF57	2012	Hospital unit in the middle	Knowledge sharing meetings	2-4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF57	2012	Hospital unit in the middle	Regional Conference	2	Not available	days	Offer 1 time / year; actual participation -N not disclosed
DPSD12D2 PDF58	2012	Hospital unit in the middle	Regional cross-sectoral meetings	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF59	2012	Hospital Unit West	In-depth analyses	8	Not available	analyses;	No personal union; analyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF59	2012	Hospital Unit West	Patient safety rounds	7	Not available	rounds	No personal union; analyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF59	2012	Hospital Unit West	Local Topic Days	2	Not available	theme days;	No personal union; analyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF59	2012	Hospital Unit West	Searcher Network	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; analyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF59	2012	Hospital Unit West	DPSD2 Workshop ops	10	Not available	workshops	Page man training further undone
DPSD12D2 PDF59	2012	Hospital Unit West	Regional follow up course	1	Not available	course	Overlap Regional Bite
DPSD12D2 PDF59	2012	Hospital Unit West	Basic regional course	1	Not available	course	Overlap Regional Bite

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF59	2012	Hospital Unit West	Newsletters	3	Not available	publications;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF60	2012	Hospital Unit West	Administrative processes	32	Not available	%	Total event -N not disclosed; category overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF60	2012	Hospital Unit West	Communication / documentation	29	Not available	%	Total event -N not disclosed; category overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF60	2012	Hospital Unit West	Medication	approx. 25	Not available	%	Rounded; collected N unknown; category overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF60	2012	Hospital Unit West	Clinical processes	17	Not available	%	32 + 29 + 25 + 17 = 103; no assumption of disfamiliarity
DPSD12D2 PDF60	2012	Hospital Unit West	Equal treatment for men and women	3	Not available	progress / interventions;	1 woman, not 3 patients; yellow papers
DPSD12D2 PDF61	2012	Hospital Unit West	Wasterunners	6	Not available	rounds	Not admitted
DPSD12D2 PDF65	2012	Randers	Contact person meetings	4	Not available	meetings / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF65	2012	Randers	Subscription extractor	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF65	2012	Randers	Posters Copenhagen	2	Not available	entries	No events
DPSD12D2 PDF65	2012	Randers	Poster Paris	1	Not available	Items	The same accreditation theme possible
DPSD12D2 PDF65	2012	Randers	Patient safety rounds	5	Not available	rounds	Held in 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF66	2012	Randers	ISBAR- learning	9	Not available	seances	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF66	2012	Randers	ISBARperson	267	Not available	personnel;	Education, non-injured persons; unique unit not documented
DPSD12D2 PDF67	2012	Randers	Cross-sectoral analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	With cooperation
DPSD12D2 PDF68	2012	Aarhus Univers City Hospital	Medical meetings	2	Not available	theme afternoon age	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF68	2012	Aarhus Univers City Hospital	DPSD2 Workshop ops	2	Not available	workshops	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF69	2012	Aarhus Univers City Hospital	Cross-sectoral analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	With home nursing services

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF69	2012	Aarhus Univers City Hospital	Newsletters	3-4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF70	2012	RM practice	Intersectoral meetings	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF70	2012	RM practice	Hospital meetings	2	Not available	times / year	Can overlap previous row
DPSD12D2 PDF71	2012	RM practice	Serious physiot erap-UTH	2	Not available	UTH	Newsletter; not necessarily 2 unique citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF72	2012	RM regional risk margins	Patient Safety Network	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF72	2012	RM regional risk margins	Cross-sectoral network	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF72	2012	RM regional risk margins	Courses completed	2	Not available	courses;	MedRN; overlapping hospital contributions
DPSD12D2 PDF73	2012	RM regional risk margins	Kick-off 30.8.2012	130	Not available	participants;	No Union with all regional courses
DPSD12D2 PDF77	2012	RM social	Cross-sectoral analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	Judgment-to-treatme nt; overlapping psychiatric contributions possible
DPSD12D2 PDF79	2012	Aleris-Hamlet Aarhus	Quality control	4	Not available	times / year	Koncernoverp Aalborg / Herning
DPSD12D2 PDF81	2012	Aleris-Hamlet Herning	Quality control	4	Not available	times / year	Koncernoverp Aalborg / Aarhus
DPSD12D2 PDF85	2012	Ciconia Aarhus	Quality meetings	at least 4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF86	2012	East Jutland Center for Smertebeha ndling	Processing meeting e	2	Not available	week interval	Private; no 2 meetings
DPSD12D2 PDF88	2012	Favrskov	Cross-sectoral concrete analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	Network exists; not 0 events
DPSD12D2 PDF89	2012	Heath site	Audit Horsens	2	Not available	audits	Possible institution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF91	2012	Herning	Network meeting	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF91	2012	Herning	Network members	9	Not available	members;	Non-citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF91	2012	Herning	West cluster meat is	4	Not available	times / year	6 municipalities; regional overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF91	2012	Herning	The municipalities of the Western cluster	6	Not available	municipalities	Not error
DPSD12D2 PDF91	2012	Herning	Cross-sectoral cooperation meetings	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF91	2012	Herning	Regional cross-sectoral network	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF92	2012	Herning	Emergency call mails	3-4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF92	2012	Herning	Medical examination	2	Not available	half days	Not 2 full days; staff-N unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF93	2012	Herning	Psychological representatives 2013	2	Not available	representatives;	Planned extension
DPSD12D2 PDF96	2012	Horsens Municipality	Regional networks	2	Not available	meetings;	Institution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF96	2012	Horsens Municipality	Cluster meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	4 municipalities / Horsen shospital; overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF96	2012	Horsens Municipality	Communica tion meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF96	2012	Horsens Municipality	Cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	Answer No
DPSD12D2 PDF98	2012	Ikast-Brand	Local government group	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF98	2012	Ikast-Brand	Health agreement follow-up	1	Not available	time / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF98	2012	Ikast-Brand	West cluster network	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency; overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF98	2012	Ikast-Brand	Regional networks	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency; institution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF98	2012	Ikast-Brand	Sectoral cooperation	3-4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF98	2012	Ikast-Brand	Patient Ombudsmen 'Conferences	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF98	2012	Ikast-Brand	Serious cross-sectoral discussion	1	Not available	event	The reproduction of other sectors may be the same
DPSD12D2 PDF101	2012	Norddjurs	Cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	None; not 0 events
DPSD12D2 PDF102	2012	Oats	Cross-sectoral analysis experience	0	Not available	experience;	None yet
DPSD12D2 PDF103	2012	Randers Municipality	Cross-sectoral event	1	Not available	event	Hospital / doctor / home care; possible overlap mortality case same page
DPSD12D2 PDF107	2012	Silkeborg	Case-handling services	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF107	2012	Silkeborg	E-Pill Box-Arrow Projects	2	Not available	projects;	Non-patients

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF109	2012	Skanderborg	Risk Coordinates	14	Not available	Functions / Pens	Not injured
DPSD12D2 PDF109	2012	Skanderborg	Process Group	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF109	2012	Skanderborg	Coordinator / R M meetings	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF109	2012	Skanderborg	Horseradish	2	Not available	times / year	Institution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF109	2012	Skanderborg	Regional TSN	2	Not available	times / year	Institution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF112	2012	Disc	Newsletters	2-4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF113	2012	Struer	Communica tion meetings	4	Not available	meetings;	Held in 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF115	2012	South Djurs	Regional networks	2	Not available	meetings;	Overlap other RM municipalities
DPSD12D2 PDF115	2012	South Djurs	Round meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	Overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF115	2012	South Djurs	Data Extraction	1	Not available	day	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF115	2012	South Djurs	Case-handling services	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF115	2012	South Djurs	New case training courses	2	Not available	courses;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF115	2012	South Djurs	Steering group meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF115	2012	South Djurs	Patient Association Meeting	1	Not available	meeting	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF115	2012	South Djurs	Citizens' meeting chronically ill	1	Not available	meeting	Cannot be converted to number of patients
DPSD12D2 PDF115	2012	South Djurs	Pilot proposal	1	Not available	hour	Patient training; not 1 patient
DPSD12D2 PDF116	2012	South Djurs	Cross-sectoral events	0	Not available	Events	Not 0 injuries
DPSD12D2 PDF117	2012	Viborg	Core Causality Analysis	2	Not available	analyses;	In addition, drug aggregation initiated; not extra exactN
DPSD12D2 PDF118	2012	Viborg	Cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF119	2012	Aarhus Municipality	TSN meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF119	2012	Aarhus Municipality	UTHkonferenc e	1	Not available	Conference	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF119	2012	Aarhus Municipality	Steering group meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF119	2012	Aarhus Municipality	Searcher Network	4	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF119	2012	Aarhus Municipality	Chefta meeting	1	Not available	meeting	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF120	2012	Aarhus Municipality	In-depth analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	The municipality describes extensive resource consumption
DPSD12D2 PDF122	2012	South West Jutland Hospital	Publishers	2	Not available	staff	Not injured
DPSD12D2 PDF123	2012	Little Belt	Patient Safety Round	1	Not available	by department	Department N not disclosed; no total
DPSD12D2 PDF124	2012	Little Belt	Sectoral subcommittees	4	Not available	meetings / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF125	2012	South Jutland	Action area r	4	Not available	areas	Overlap Regional Strategy
DPSD12D2 PDF125	2012	South Jutland	Theme Days 2012	2	Not available	theme days;	3 planned 2013
DPSD12D2 PDF126	2012	South Jutland	FRAM Analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	In addition, several aggregated, exactN unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF126	2012	South Jutland	Half-yearly report	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF129-130	2012	RSD Center for Quality	Risk coordination group	10	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF132	2012	RSD Center for Quality	FRAM-case patient	1	Not available	Patient progress	Interinstitutional; not union with other events
DPSD12D2 PDF132	2012	RSD Center for Quality	FRAM case diagnoses	3	Not available	diagnoses;	Same 1 patient
DPSD12D2 PDF132	2012	RSD Center for Quality	FRAM case hospitals	2	Not available	hospitals;	Same 1 patient + doctor
DPSD12D2 PDF132	2012	RSD Center for Quality	Reception pharmacies	17	Not available	pharmacies;	Not error -N
DPSD12D2 PDF132	2012	RSD Center for Quality	Reception w / observation	2	Not available	hospital unit	Supports pharmacy data; not patients

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF135	2012	OUH	In-depth analysis of UT H	30	Not available	UTH	Number of analyses / unique persons not disclosed
DPSD12D2 PDF135	2012	OUH	Local OBS	3	Not available	themes	Pressure sows / emergency calls / blue samples; not automatically 3 publications
DPSD12D2 PDF136	2012	Aleris-Hamlet Esbjerg	Quality control	4	Not available	times / year	Group overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF139	2012	Heart Centre Varde	SACC analysis point	2	Not available	Scroll border	2 or more; no incident number
DPSD12D2 PDF141	2012	Gigt Hospital	Basic course participants	3	Not available	persons	Not injured
DPSD12D2 PDF141-142	2012	Gigt Hospital	Pharmaceutical sector reports	2	Not available	UTH	Same 2 reproducedPDF142; not 4
DPSD12D2 PDF141	2012	Gigt Hospital	Networkskom muner	4	Not available	municipalities	Not error
DPSD12D2 PDF142	2012	Gigt Hospital	Medical News Messages	2	Not available	newsletters;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF147	2012	Billund	Review of medical instruction	1	Not available	time / year	In addition to ad hoc
DPSD12D2 PDF148	2012	Esbjerg	Case-handling services	3	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF148	2012	Esbjerg	User Council	5	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF152	2012	Fredericia	Theme Days	2	Not available	theme days;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF156	2012	Haderslev	Case-handling services	4	Not available	times / year	Quarterly frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF156	2012	Haderslev	Coordination	4	Not available	municipalities	Together with Sønderjylland; institution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF158	2012	Kerteminde	UTHforum duration	2	Not available	hours	Frequency every 2 months
DPSD12D2 PDF158	2012	Kerteminde	UTHforum interval	2	Not available	months	No 2 meetings
DPSD12D2 PDF158	2012	Kerteminde	Medical course	3	Not available	days	Personnel N unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF159	2012	Kerteminde	Cross-sectoral analysis	1	Not available	UTH	Co-Centres for Quality; overlap possible
DPSD12D2 PDF160	2012	Cold	Steering group	4	Not available	times / year	Quarterly frequency

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF160	2012	Cold	Date of the hearing	3.5	Not available	hours	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF161	2012	Cold	Highlighted care centres	2	Not available	centres	Reporting, not 0 other centres
DPSD12D2 PDF166	2012	Nordfyn	Social UTH project	2	Not available	year	Duration; not 2 projects
DPSD12D2 PDF166	2012	Nordfyn	Trainees	6	Not available	persons	Non-citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF166	2012	Nordfyn	Joint meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	Actual
DPSD12D2 PDF167	2012	Nordfyn	Staff meeting	at least 2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF168	2012	Nyborg	Medication error	87	Not available	%	UTHomes not disclosed; not 87% of citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF169	2012	Nyborg	Sectoral migration reporting is	156	Not available	UTH	Can overlap 12-citizen-case
DPSD12D2 PDF169	2012	Nyborg	Dose pack size	1	Not available	delivery / hand	12CPR-coupled citizens; not 12 independence errors
DPSD12D2 PDF169	2012	Nyborg	Dose package concerned	12	Not available	citizens	Local CPRcoupling provided; no public CPRlist / annual dedup
DPSD12D2 PDF169	2012	Nyborg	Actual cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	Despite 156 reports
DPSD12D2 PDF170	2012	Odense	Intergovernment meetings	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF170	2012	Odense	Internal experience	2	Not available	administration;	Cross-management measures refer to 3; different forums
DPSD12D2 PDF172	2012	Odense	AndreUTHbeh	3	Not available	months	Objective; actual compliance N not disclosed
DPSD12D2 PDF174	2012	Svendborg	Cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	Two municipal contributions DF173-175 may not be summed
DPSD12D2 PDF176	2012	Sønderborg	Coordinating quality group	4	Not available	times / year	Quarterly frequency / in nformation overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF178	2012	Peas (without pods)	Subject-matter	2	Not available	meetings;	Actual
DPSD12D2 PDF178-179	2012	Peas (without pods)	Cross-sectoral elvsledsanaly se	1	Not available	analysis;	Psychologically ill citizen after printing; overlap region possible
DPSD12D2 PDF180	2012	Product	Transsectoral meetings	Approx. 4	Not available	meetings;	Late half 2012; not full year frequency

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF180	2012	Product	Case-handling services	2	Not available	meetings;	In fact, 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF180-181	2012	Product	Medical administration initiative	2	Not available	initiatives;	No events
DPSD12D2 PDF184	2012	Road	Hospital advice is	2	Not available	areas	Two municipal contributions 182-185; non-separatecitizens
DPSD12D2 PDF184	2012	Road	Formal cooperation groups	2	Not available	groups	Non-analyses
DPSD12D2 PDF186	2012	Vejle	Decemberwork shops	2	Not available	workshops	There is a maize workshop; not 2 full years
DPSD12D2 PDF186	2012	Vejle	Patient safety-area meetings	3	Not available	meetings;	2 planning meetings are subset
DPSD12D2 PDF186	2012	Vejle	Planning objectives	2	Not available	meetings;	Within 3 area leaders meetings
DPSD12D2 PDF186	2012	Vejle	Herlive Seminar participants	2	Not available	persons	Not citizens; overlap DPSD12Ltemaday possible
DPSD12D2 PDF186	2012	Vejle	Primary sector conference leaders	4	Not available	persons	No partici pant union
DPSD12D2 PDF186	2012	Vejle	Copenhagen Conference	1	Not available	person	No personal union
DPSD12D2 PDF152	2012	Fredericia	OBS theme areas	5	Not available	themes	Including first aid; DPSD12LList 4 messages; reference years not identical proven
DPSD12D2 PDF189	2012	RSJ psychiatry	Patient Safety Committee	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF189	2012	RSJ psychiatry	DPSDnetwork	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF189	2012	RSJ psychiatry	Seminars	2	Not available	times / year	Somatik overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF189	2012	RSJ psychiatry	Regional policy	4-6	Not available	times / year	Frequency modregiona de facto 5
DPSD12D2 PDF189	2012	RSJ psychiatry	Transsectoral meetings	4	Not available	times / year	Regional overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF189	2012	RSJ psychiatry	Patient safety rounds	6	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF189	2012	RSJ psychiatry	Patient / touch nde information	1	Not available	meeting	Participant-N unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF190	2012	RSJ psychiatry	LocalOBS	2	Not available	messages;	Not national 4

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF192	2012	Hospital Nord	Patient Safety Conferences	2	Not available	conferences;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF193	2012	Hospital Nord	Core Causality Analysis	13	Not available	analyses;	Metabolic acidosis -c ase also DPSD12L; no additional deaths
DPSD12D2 PDF194	2012	Hospital Nord	Transsectoral meetings	2	Not available	month interval	No 2 meetings; regional overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF194	2012	Hospital Nord	LocalOBS	2	Not available	messages;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF194	2012	Hospital Nord	Local PSnyhe letters	3	Not available	publications;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF195	2012	Hospital South	Geographic work meetings	3	Not available	meetings;	March 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF196	2012	Hospital South	Delayed -diagonal ose cross-sector analysis	1	Not available	event / anal nozzle	Actuel practice doctor not participating
DPSD12D2 PDF196	2012	Hospital South	Medicines report is	3-4	Not available	reports;	Non-patients
DPSD12D2 PDF198	2012	RSJ practice	Clostridium-ex-e mpler	3	Not available	UTH	No Personal Union; Web date 25.10.12
DPSD12D2 PDF201	2012	RSJ Pre-hospital	Operator / PSm Oder	Approx. 4	Not available	meetings;	Held in 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF201	2012	RSJ Pre-hospital	Head / corps meeting	Approx. 5	Not available	meetings;	Held in 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF201	2012	RSJ Pre-hospital	Transsectoral meetings	Approx. 4	Not available	meetings;	Regional overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF201	2012	RSJ Pre-hospital	Regional policy	Approx. 5	Not available	meetings;	Regional overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF201	2012	RSJ Pre-hospital	Seminars	2	Not available	days / year	Frequency / institution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF201	2012	Operator 1	Head of station	ca. 11	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF201	2012	Operator 1	National Council	Approx. 6	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF201	2012	Operator 1	Advice	ca. 10	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF201	2012	Operator 2	Quality Committee	12	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF201	2012	Operator 2	Quality Council	ca. 10	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF202	2012	RSJ Pre-hospital	Substantial analysis	5	Not available	analyses;	Interorganisational; not 5 unique citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF203	2012	RSJ Regional	Patient safety group meeting	5	Not available	meetings;	Samme group reference frequency 4-6 elsewhere
DPSD12D2 PDF203	2012	RSJ Regional	Patient safety seminars	2	Not available	seminars;	Institution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF203	2012	RSJ Regional	Cross-sectoral municipalities	17	Not available	municipalities	No events
DPSD12D2 PDF203	2012	RSJ Regional	Intersectoral meetings	4	Not available	meetings;	Institution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF204	2012	RSJ Regional	Action area r	2	Not available	areas	ID / infection; not 2 events
DPSD12D2 PDF206	2012	Private Hospital Møn	BMI operation limit	over 35-40	Not available	BMI	Optional; not patient safety frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF208	2012	Filadelfia	Patient responsible meetings	1	Not available	time / year	To meet needs
DPSD12D2 PDF208	2012	Filadelfia	Patient safety rounds	1	Not available	per department / year	Division N unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF208	2012	Filadelfia	Cross-sectoral experience examples	2	Not available	progress	An instructional / other attention; not a personal union
DPSD12D2 PDF210	2012	Count Private Hospital	Management meetings	4	Not available	times / year	Quarterly frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF210	2012	Count Private Hospital	Patient footprint	1	Not available	time / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF213	2012	Hospital Valdemar	Quality meetings	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF213	2012	Hospital Valdemar	Journalaudit	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF213	2012	Hospital Valdemar	Partition Safety Round	7	Not available	Departments	Non-patients
DPSD12D2 PDF213	2012	Hospital Valdemar	Cardiac arrest rter	6	Not available	suitcases	Weekly 1 control case; not 6 events
DPSD12D2 PDF214	2012	Hospital Valdemar	Track-tested Rval	3	Not available	months	Not 3 samples
DPSD12D2 PDF215	2012	HCAndersenKlubben	Bed-linen	6	Not available	seats;	No events
DPSD12D2 PDF217	2012	Roskilde Private Hospital	UTH Meetings	4	Not available	meetings;	2012
DPSD12D2 PDF219	2012	Forest house	UTHsamletgen review	at least 1	Not available	time / year	Frequency

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DDSD12D2 PDF223	2012	Count	Repeatation	more than 3	Not available	times	Definition; e.g. 1.5 months, not actual number
DDSD12D2 PDF223	2012	Count	Repeatability example	1.5	Not available	month	Definition example
DPSD12D2 PDF233	2012	Lolland	Case-handling team	4	Not available	hold	The same 46 taught; no addition
DPSD12D2 PDF233	2012	Lolland	Member of Chamber of Commerce	46	Not available	team managers / workers	Non-citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF233	2012	Lolland	Analysis group meetings	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF234	2012	Lolland	Patient safety rounds	8	Not available	rounds	In fact; not persons
DPSD12D2 PDF234	2012	Lolland	Round player	2-4	Not available	Staff	There are managers / managers; no person sum
DPSD12D2 PDF234	2012	Lolland	Common concrete cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	Network dialogue not concise analysis
DPSD12D2 PDF236	2012	Næstved	Risk management network	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF236	2012	Næstved	Risk management measures	12	Not available	Functions / Pens	Not affected citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF236	2012	Næstved	Legionella disease	13	Not available	residents	Respiratory infections; not 13 separate events
DPSD12D2 PDF236-237	2012	Næstved	Death by fire	1	Not available	citizen	No automatic addition 13 + 1; person / annual union unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF237	2012	Næstved	Containers	4	Not available	descriptions;	Catheter / Antibiotics / au tistnarsis / cramp; no exactempers onunion
DPSD12D2 PDF238	2012	Odsherred / SSI	Infections and infestations	5	Not available	nursing centres;	Submitted; not 5 events
DPSD12D2 PDF239	2012	Odsherd	Cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF240	2012	Ringsted	Regional networks	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF240	2012	Ringsted	Local network	4	Not available	times / year	8 municipalities; overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF240	2012	Ringsted	Networkskom muner	8	Not available	municipalities	Non-citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF240	2012	Ringsted	UTHstyregrupp e	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF240	2012	Ringsted	First-aid centres	3	Not available	nursing centres;	Souschefer + To add 2 functions; not 3 patients
DPSD12D2 PDF241	2012	Ringsted	Hazardous material	1	Not available	function / person	Also other tasks
DPSD12D2 PDF241-242	2012	Ringsted	Institutions	14	Not available	institutions	In addition 2 private; not 14 events
DPSD12D2 PDF242	2012	Ringsted	Private offers	2	Not available	offers	Separated from 14 institutions; employed status not derived
DPSD12D2 PDF242	2012	Ringsted	Decentralised case handlers	20	Not available	Functions / Pens	Not injured
DPSD12D2 PDF242	2012	Ringsted	Local UTHgru	5	Not available	groups	1-2 prinstitut; non-uniquepersons
DPSD12D2 PDF243	2012	Roskilde Municipality	Regional meetings	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF243	2012	Roskilde Municipality	Patient Safety Conferences	2	Not available	conferences;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF243	2012	Roskilde Municipality	RM occupation	2	Not available	months	1.10.-1.12.2012; derived calendar time
DPSD12D2 PDF245	2012	Slaughter	Patient Safety Conferences	2	Not available	conferences;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF246	2012	Slaughter	Core causality analysis fatal	1	Not available	event / anal nozzle	Kanoverup region alpsychiatry / suicide reference
DPSD12D2 PDF253	2012	Vordingborg	First aid	12	Not available	hours	Employee N unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF254	2012	Vordingborg	Death 2012	0	Not available	Reports of meetings	Source limit; non-national mortality
DPSD12D2 PDF255	2012	Amager / Hvidovre	Searcher course	5	Not available	hours	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF255	2012	Amager / Hvidovre	Network meeting	6	Not available	meetings;	2 hours' attendance
DPSD12D2 PDF257	2012	Amager / Hvidovre	Local case analyses	11	Not available	analyses;	Possible overlap regional 84
DPSD12D2 PDF257	2012	Amager / Hvidovre	Cross-sectoral analyses	4	Not available	analyses;	No additionality / regional non-voting
DPSD12D2 PDF259	2012	Bispebjerg / Frederiksberg	Clostridium project solution	3500	Not available	patients	Not 3500 infections; uniquecitizens not documented

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF259	2012	Bispebjerg / Frederiksberg	Serious test product-UTH	2	Not available	UTH	Aggregated analysis; not 2 unique patients necessarily
DPSD12D2 PDF260	2012	Bornholm Hospital	Coordinator meeting interval	2	Not available	months	Frequency
DDSD12D2 PDF261	2012	Bornholm Hospital	Identification procedures	0.75	Not available	year	Stopped; no documented effect
DPSD12D2 PDF262	2012	Bornholm Hospital	Clostridium 2012	3	Not available	cases	2011 = 23; non-annualunion or proof of causality of the intervention
DPSD12D2 PDF264	2012	Gentofte	Patient safety coordination	14	Not available	Functions / Pens	12 departments; not citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF264	2012	Gentofte	Divisions	12	Not available	Departments	No events
DPSD12D2 PDF264	2012	Gentofte	Network meeting	2	Not available	meetings;	In fact, 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF265	2012	Gentofte	DPSDworkshops p	1	Not available	workshop	Extrajan 2013 planned
DPSD12D2 PDF265	2012	Gentofte	Quality Committee	8	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF265	2012	Gentofte	Patient safety rounds	11	Not available	rounds	Facts-Jun 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF265	2012	Gentofte	RM Management Meeting Range	14	Not available	days	Frequency; 1 hour
DPSD12D2 PDF266	2012	Gentofte	Appeals before the Court	4	Not available	times / year	Quarterly frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF267	2012	Gentofte	EWS document	98.4	Not available	%	Audit-Not disclosed; not 98.4% citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF267	2012	Gentofte	Pressure ulcer prevalence	2	Not available	studies;	Patient -Present
DPSD12D2 PDF268	2012	Gentofte	Cross-sectoral depth analysis	0	Not available	analyses;	Not 0 events
DPSD12D2 PDF268	2012	Gentofte	Core Causality Analysis	5	Not available	analyses;	Regional overlap; five themes
DPSD12D2 PDF269	2012	Glostrup Hospital	Quality	2	Not available	days	No personal union; analyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF269	2012	Glostrup Hospital	Patient Safety Committee	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF269	2012	Glostrup Hospital	Patient Safety Round	1	Not available	per department / year	Section

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF270	2012	Glostrup Hospital	Regional published OBS themes	3	Not available	themes	Not additional national messages
DPSD12D2 PDF271	2012	Glostrup Hospital	Cross-cutting factors	0	Not available	analyses;	Source limit
DPSD12D2 PDF272	2012	Herlev	Courses	2	Not available	courses;	In fact; regional overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF272	2012	Herlev	Network meeting	6	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF273	2012	Herlev	Accredited ash forks	3	Not available	working groups;	Non-Anchor Control askForce
DPSD12D2 PDF273	2012	Herlev	PDA follow-up e audit	2	Not available	audits	Post-audit
DPSD12D2 PDF273	2012	Herlev	PDA objectives	85	Not available	%	Minimum; actual parts departments over 90%; names unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF273	2012	Herlev	PDA division profit or loss	over 90	Not available	%	Not all departments or citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF273	2012	Herlev	Regional impact assessment	4	Not available	analyses;	Can be the same 4 as Hillerød
DPSD12D2 PDF276	2012	Hillerød	Patient safety rounds	12	Not available	rounds	In fact, 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF276	2012	Hillerød	Courses	3	Not available	courses;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF276	2012	Hillerød	PS Network	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF277	2012	Hillerød	Regional analyses	4	Not available	analyses;	Can be the same 4 as Herlev
DPSD12D2 PDF277-278	2012	Hillerød	Core Causality Analysis	6	Not available	analyses;	In addition, 1 management analysis; not 7 citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF277-278	2012	Hillerød	Management analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	Overlap unknown
DPSD12D2 PDF277	2012	Hillerød	Brain-drain practice change	1	Not available	extra-loading day	Post-removal; non-initial injury
DPSD12D2 PDF279	2012	IMT	Entities	6	Not available	units	No events
DPSD12D2 PDF279	2012	IMT	Employees	ca. 650	Not available	staff	Organisational size, not responsible / injured
DPSD12D2 PDF279	2012	IMT	Core Causality Analysis	5	Not available	analyses;	IT risks; regional overlap

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF281	2012	RHP	P.S. Committee meeting interval	2	Not available	months	Approx. Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF281	2012	RHP	Network meeting	3	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF282-283	2012	RHP	Cross-sectoral core causation analyses	14	Not available	analyses;	Same 14 repeated; not 28
DPSD12D2 PDF283	2012	RHP	Core Causality Analysis	22	Not available	analyses;	Relative to 14 cross-sectional unknown; no 36 sum
DPSD12D2 PDF283	2012	RHP	Analyses finished Jan 2013	3	Not available	analyses;	Plan / autumn 2013; not 22 + 3 actually 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF283	2012	RHP	Accident-death analysis	3	Not available	analyses;	Not 3 new unique deaths
DPSD12D2 PDF283	2012	RHP	Medical trackers	2	Not available	tracers	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF283	2012	RHP	Aggregated analyses	2	Not available	analyses;	Unexpected death / self-cancer screening
DPSD12D2 PDF283	2012	RHP	Self-contained autumn rounds	2	Not available	rounds	Spring round
DPSD12D2 PDF283	2012	RHP	ECT patient footprint	1	Not available	progress	No Annual Union
DPSD12D2 PDF284	2012	The National Hospital	Risk managers	2	Not available	Functions / Pens	Not affected citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2012	RH practice	Patient Safety Council meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	Regional recurrence PDF296
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2012	RH practice	UTH 2012	1232	Not available	Reports	709 + 229 + 18 + 11 + 26 5 = 1232; private practice not published
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2012	RH practice	General practice / watchdogs 2012	709	1232	Reports	Part 1232
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2012	RH practice	Specialists 2012	229	1232	Reports	Part 1232
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2012	RH practice	Dentists 2012	18	1232	Reports	Part 1232
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2012	RH practice	Therapeutic / curo praktorer 2012	11	1232	Reports	Part 1232
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2012	RH practice	Pharmacy 2012	265	1232	Reports	Part 1232
DPSD12D2 PDF290	2012	RH practice	Actuarial governments ongoing	7	Not available	analyses;	Ongoing, not 7 completed

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF290	2012	RH practice	Cross-sectoral core causation analyses	4	Not available	analyses;	Candover other sectoral contributions
DPSD12D2 PDF290	2012	RH practice	Aggregated television sector analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	No personal union
DPSD12D2 PDF291	2012	RH practice	Reason for refusal of authorisation	49	Not available	Reports	Partial amount of general / shift doctor; no addition
DPSD12D2 PDF292	2012	RH prehospital	Cooperation	ca. 10	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF292	2012	RH prehospital	UTH 2012	241	Not available	Reports	Public / private investors; no employment union
DPSD12D2 PDF293	2012	RH prehospital	Core Causality Analysis	3	Not available	analyses;	Andreparterkanrapp ter samme
DPSD12D2 PDF294	2012	RH prehospital	Cross-sectoral core causation analyses	2	Not available	analyses;	Unknown ratio to 3; no 5 sum
DPSD12D2 PDF296	2012	RH Regional	Key persons course / network	291	Not available	key persons;	Regional / Hospital contribution overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF296	2012	RH Regional	Medical participant	17	Not available	%	Source hari not exact egg-N; not 0.17 × 291 integer derivation
DPSD12D2 PDF296	2012	RH Regional	Attendance	90	Not available	%	Questionnaire devices are known
DPSD12D2 PDF299	2012	RH Regional	HSMR2012Q3	84	Not available	standardised ratio	Non-fatalities; national 94,2007Q1 regional 99
DPSD12D2 PDF299	2012	RH Regional	National HSMR2012Q3	94	Not available	standardised ratio	Non-raw mortality
DPSD12D2 PDF299	2012	RH Regional	Infection areas	8	Not available	areas	Non-events
DPSD12D2 PDF299	2012	RH Regional	Respiratory moni more than halved	4	12	Departments	N12; since 2010; not 4 patients
DPSD12D2 PDF299	2012	RH Regional	APS team activations	1	Not available	activation	April 12FMK / EPM error; and a planned closure
DPSD12D2 PDF299	2012	RH Regional	Planned system mclose window	10	Not available	hours	2 hospitals; not 10 hours of documented citizen harm
DPSD12D2 PDF299	2012	RH Regional	Hospitals closing window	2	Not available	hospitals;	Regionally confirmed patient injury; non-independence
DPSD12D2 PDF300-301	2012	RH Regional	Pressure ulcer prevalence	2700	Not available	hospitalised patients,	No result / damage-Node

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF301	2010-11 s common net at 2007-09	RH Regional	Apgar under 7 cooperative increase	21	Not available	percentage measure	2010-11 versus 2007-09; not 21% birth or 2012 errors
DPSD12D2 PDF301	2012	RH Regional	Meetings of the GTT network	2	Not available	meetings;	Half-year interval
DPSD12D2 PDF302	2012	RH Regional	Cross-sectoral depth analyses initiated	12	Not available	analyses;	Not all completed; overlapping institutions
DPSD12D2 PDF303	2012	RH Regional	Analysis abandoned	1	Not available	analysis;	Conflict level; no serious occurrence
DPSD12D2 PDF304	2012	RH Regional	Core Causal Action Median 2012	77	Not available	days	Previously 110; N unknown; not actual patient redress time
DPSD12D2 PDF304	2012	RH Regional	Total local core causation analyses	84	Not available	analyses;	Of which 28 transversal; not 112
DPSD12D2 PDF304	2012	RH Regional	Cross-cutting analyses	28	Not available	analyses;	Part 84; hospital / hospital sector transition, not all sector 12
DPSD12D2 PDF306	2012	Unilabs	Inventory value	1	Not available	month	Private; Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF306	2012	Unilabs	Grade 4 - 5 reporting deadline	24	Not available	hours	NormiktickoverholdN
DPSD12D2 PDF308	2012	Aleris Copenhagen	Fusionated matrices	2	Not available	matrices;	Non-trading non-derivative financial assets
DPSD12D2 PDF308	2012	Aleris Copenhagen	Quality control	4	Not available	times / year	Other Aleris contributions
DPSD12D2 PDF310	2012	Amartro	Theme Day	1	Not available	theme day	August 12
DPSD12D2 PDF310	2012	Amartro	Risk assessment frequency	at least 1	Not available	time / year	Non-effective events
DPSD12D2 PDF312	2012	Frederiksberg Center	Meeting of Chambers	2	Not available	meetings;	May / Sept 12; Second PDF314 sammeorganisation
DPSD12D2 PDF312	2012	Frederiksberg Center	Staff Day November	1	Not available	day	Candover annual 2 days
DPSD12D2 PDF313	2012	Frederiksberg Center	Contact person	24	Not available	hours	Guideline, not actually fulfillingN
DPSD12D2 PDF313-314	2012	Frederiksberg Center	Experienced UTH 2012	0	Not available	experience reports	Same 0 repetitto contribution; non-general 0 errors
DPSD12D2 PDF314	2012	Frederiksberg Center	Staff days	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF315	2012	Source High	Date of meetings	3	Not available	meetings;	26 Jan / 28 Feb / 15 Nov 12

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF316	2012	Coastal hospital	Quality Committee	1	Not available	time / month	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF317	2012	Coastal hospital	Monitoring committees	8	Not available	areas	Non-events
DPSD12D2 PDF317	2012	Coastal hospital	Journalaudit 2011 and forward	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency; 2010 four × 20 + 20 journal not 2012 patient N
DPSD12D2 PDF317-318	2012	Coastal hospital	UTHalt	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF318	2012	Coastal hospital	CAVE / VAS / tim eout / handhygie	over 90	Not available	%	Four distinct objectives; non-effective error rate
DPSD12D2 PDF318	2012	Coastal hospital	Informed document objectives	over 95	Not available	%	Non-effective delivery
DPSD12D2 PDF318	2012	Coastal hospital	ID Blood Test Feather	less than 1	Not available	%	Non-effective rate
DPSD12D2 PDF318	2012	Coastal hospital	Significant / cat astrofal medicine injury	less than 1	Not available	%	Medicaments (excluding those put up for retail sale)
DPSD12D2 PDF318	2012	Coastal hospital	Patient survey coverage	more than 85	Not available	%	Not actual participation
DPSD12D2 PDF318	2012	Coastal hospital	Postoperative T KA / THA - Inection objectives	less than 2	Not available	%	Not actual infections
DPSD12D2 PDF318	2012	Coastal hospital	Image diagnostic response time	less than 4	Not available	days	Audit of 20 case records; targets, not actual duration
DPSD12D2 PDF319	2012	Copenhagen Private Hospital	Operation safety	1	Not available	round	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF319	2012	Copenhagen Private Hospital	Cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	participation;	None; not 0UTH
DPSD12D2 PDF321	2012	Nørmark	Quality Committee	6	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF321	2012	Nørmark	Special review	1	Not available	time / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF321	2012	Nørmark	Staff dead e-interval	Approx. 3	Not available	months	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF323	2012	Teres Copenhagen	Quality Committee	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF323	2012	Teres / Park	Lack of genetic training plan	1	Not available	UTH	Home care report; can overlap report
DPSD12D2 PDF326	2012	Albertslund	Reporting cross-sectoral UTH	0	Not available	Reports	So far; not 0 events

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF328	2012	Allerred	Statistical module view	1	Not available	hour	Expected more time; not professional control of aptitude
DPSD12D2 PDF328	2012	Allerred	Management meetings	4	Not available	meetings;	Home care / centres
DPSD12D2 PDF328	2012	Allerred	New staff	2	Not available	hold	Non-citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF329	2012	Allerred	Cross-sectoral analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF330	2012	Ballerup	Decentralised case handlers	approx. 25	Not available	Functions / Pens	Not injured
DPSD12D2 PDF330	2012	Ballerup	Searcher Network	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF331	2012	Ballerup	Core Causality Analysis	2	Not available	analyses;	Serious / fatal; not automatically 2 unique deaths
DPSD12D2 PDF333	2012	Bornholm Municipality	UTH / Print ratio	2.43	Not available	%	Formulation output relative to UTH; t counters / denominator direction unclear and raw
DPSD12D2 PDF334	2012	Springby	Medicinal products	14	Not available	days	Not 14 errors
DPSD12D2 PDF334	2012	Springby	Safety Run Decentre	2	Not available	elderly centres,	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF335	2012	Springby	Statistical publication	4	Not available	times / year	Quarterly frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF340	2012	Egedal	Theme Afternoon	2	Not available	Afternoon	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF340	2012	Egedal	Health care	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF340	2012	Egedal	EP meeting	1	Not available	meeting	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF342	2012	Fredensborg	Dated activities	3	Not available	activities;	September kick-off/November expe rience-sharing/Novemb er training; not 3 citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF343	2012	Frederiksberg Municipality	Risk Coordinate or Network	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF343	2012	Frederiksberg Municipality	Management Refers	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF343	2012	Frederiksberg Municipality	PS Conference r	2	Not available	conferences;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF343	2012	Frederiksberg Municipality	Regional development group meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF344	2012	Frederiksberg Municipality	Suicide after discharge	4	Not available	days	1 course; possible regional psychiatry 14 overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF344	2012	Frederiksberg Municipality	Medical assistance in the administration phase	59	Not available	%	Drug misnomer ended; not 59% citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF262	2011	Bornholm Hospital	Clostridium 2011	23	Not available	cases	Separate historical version / period; no add-on to 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2011	RH practice	UTH 2011	573	Not available	Reports	Separate historical version / period; no add-on to 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2011	RH practice	General / duty plant is 2011	417	573	Reports	Separate historical version / period; no add-on to 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2011	RH practice	Specialists 2011	75	573	Reports	Separate historical version / period; no add-on to 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2011	RH practice	Dentists 2011	6	573	Reports	Separate historical version / period; no add-on to 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2011	RH practice	Therapeutic / curo praktorer 2011	2	573	Reports	Separate historical version / period; no add-on to 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF288	2011	RH practice	Pharmacy 2011	73	573	Reports	Separate historical version / period; no add-on to 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF299	2007	RH Regional	HSMR2007Q1	99	Not available	standardised ratio	Separate historical version / period; no add-on to 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF304	before 2012	RH Regional	Core Causal Edianbefore 2012	110	Not available	days	Separate historical version / period; no add-on to 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF317	2010	Coastal hospital	Journalaudits 2010	4	Not available	times / year	History feature, not 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF317	2010	Coastal hospital	Sammedagskir Romanian audit take-off 2010	20	Not available	records;	Per audit take-off; non-profit-making
DPSD12D2 PDF317	2010	Coastal hospital	Inlaid audit take-off 2010	20	Not available	records;	Per audit take-off; non-profit-making
DPSD12D2 PDF318	2012	Coastal hospital	Image diagnostic audit take-off	20	Not available	records;	Forecast less than 4 d; not 20 delays
DPSD12D2 PDF384	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Medical audit parts	3	Not available	audit phases;	Journals / home survey / workflow observation; non-service groups

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF345	2012	Frederikssund	Head of Section meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	Actual
DPSD12D2 PDF345	2012	Frederikssund	Joint cross-sector analyses	0	Not available	analyses;	References for a preliminary ruling
DPSD12D2 PDF347	2012	Furesø	Management group	5	Not available	groups	2-3 meeting time 1.5 hour; not 5 errors
DPSD12D2 PDF347	2012	Furesø	Management group medevac frequency	2-3	Not available	times / year	Pre-group; no factor of derailment
DPSD12D2 PDF347	2012	Furesø	Area leader	4	Not available	weeks	0.5 h; frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF347	2012	Furesø	Centre	2	Not available	times / year	0.5 h; frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF347	2012	Furesø	Core Causality Analysis	5	Not available	analyses;	Facilitated; no citizens' sum
DPSD12D2 PDF347	2012	Furesø	Conferences	3	Not available	conferences;	1 regional 2 national
DPSD12D2 PDF347	2012	Furesø	Cluster networks	4	Not available	times / year	2 hours; frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF347	2012	Furesø	Regional Cluster Day	1	Not available	day	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF348	2012	Furesø	Newsletters	3	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF348	2012	Furesø	Transsectoral lights	0	Not available	analyses;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF349	2012	Gentofte Municipality	Cluster meetings	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF349	2012	Gentofte Municipality	Region / commune network	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF349	2012	Gentofte Municipality	Staff meeting	5	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF349	2012	Gentofte Municipality	Patient Safety Conference	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF350	2012	Gentofte Municipality	Transsectoral lights	0	Not available	analyses;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF351	2012	Gladsaxe	PH- towholder	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF351	2012	Gladsaxe	Somatotrophic sickness	2	Not available	Events	Not 2 unique citizens necessarily
DPSD12D2 PDF351	2012	Gladsaxe	Tovholder meeting	2	Not available	months	Frequency other RM

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF351	2012	Gladsaxe	Cluster meetings	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF351	2012	Gladsaxe	Regional / Commune meetings	2	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF351	2012	Gladsaxe	Anonymous PH-r reports	0	Not available	Reports	Not 0UTHellerdoku menerettrygrupport ring culture
DPSD12D2 PDF352	2012	Gladsaxe	Transsectoral light experience	0	Not available	experience;	Reporting type 1 is not 1UTH
DPSD12D2 PDF353	2012	Glostrup Municipality	Steering group meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	Aug / Oct
DPSD12D2 PDF353	2012	Glostrup Municipality	Case-handling services	2	Not available	meetings;	Aug / Nov
DPSD12D2 PDF353	2012	Glostrup Municipality	Local workshops	28	Not available	workshops	1.5 hour interval; not 28 events
DPSD12D2 PDF353	2012	Glostrup Municipality	Nuclear Research Conference	2	Not available	days	Regional overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF354	2012	Glostrup Municipality	Transsectoral lights	0	Not available	analyses;	The answer
DPSD12D2 PDF355	2012	Gribskov	Transsectoral lights	0	Not available	participation;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF356	2012	Gribskov / Hørs holm	Adoption by the Council	1	Not available	function	1.10.12; same 2 not 2 persons
DPSD12D2 PDF357	2012	Rhinoceros	External meetings	3	Not available	meetings;	Held in 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF357	2012	Rhinoceros	Individual cases	approx. 15	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF357	2012	Rhinoceros	Health agreements	Approx. 3	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF357	2012	Rhinoceros	Medicines report is	95	Not available	%	Report Not known; not 95% citizens
DPSD12D2 PDF357	2012	Rhinoceros	Regional information request	1	Not available	Contact	Not 1 error found
DPSD12D2 PDF358	2012	Rhinoceros	Report of the place of birth	1	Not available	reporting;	No union with the approval
DPSD12D2 PDF359	2012	Helsingør / Linde evang	Time of test by the medical practitioner	3	Not available	employment conditions;	Exclusive nurses; normative services
DPSD12D2 PDF359	2012	Helsingør / Bog Ehøjgård	UTH group members	9	Not available	staff	Not injured
DPSD12D2 PDF360	2012	Helsingør / Mont ebello	Dose Interval	14	Not available	days	Normal / frequency

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF361	2012	Helsingør / Montebello	Medical examination	1	Not available	time / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF363	2012	Hillerød Municipality	Theme Afternoon	2	Not available	Afternoon	No personal union; analyse / institutionsvis possible
DPSD12D2 PDF363	2012	Hillerød Municipality	DPSD- Data und Exposition Day	1	Not available	day	No personal union; analyse / institutionsvis possible
DPSD12D2 PDF363	2012	Hillerød Municipality	Cross-sector analysis	1	Not available	progress / analysis	Senior citizen; region / hospital bite ragcan overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF365	2012	Hillerød Municipality	Reporting date	7	Not available	days	Local 2011 instruction; in non-actual compliance
DPSD12D2 PDF365	2012	Hillerød Municipality	Serious / fatal analysis time limit	6	Not available	weeks	Fra reporting; normi not actual time
DPSD12D2 PDF367-368	2012	Hvidover	Status note	2	Not available	times / year	Half-yearly frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF369	2012	Høj-Taastrup	Searcher course	1	Not available	day	Number of participants
DPSD12D2 PDF369	2012	Høj-Taastrup	Core Causality Analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	No personal union; analyse / institutionsvis possible
DPSD12D2 PDF369	2012	Høj-Taastrup	Late / no emergency call response	0	Not available	Local authorities	Border examination; non-independence testing
DPSD12D2 PDF369	2012	Høj-Taastrup	Inadequate first aid reported	0	Not available	Reports	Not 0 actual events
DPSD12D2 PDF370	2012	Høj-Taastrup	Intersectoral lighting work	0	Not available	analyses;	No personal union; analyse / institutionsvis possible
DPSD12D2 PDF371	2012	Hørsholm	Newsletter	1	Not available	newsletter	Dec 12; innallkommunesturestu m
DPSD12D2 PDF373	2012	Ishøj	Coordinating nurses	2	Not available	Functions / Pens	Not injured
DPSD12D2 PDF375	2012	KK Social	UTH theme day participants	400	Not available	Leaders / Medic Eaters	Non-citizens; non-independent
DPSD12D2 PDF375	2012	KK Social	Duration	7	Not available	hours	No personal union; analyse / institutionsvis possible
DPSD12D2 PDF375	2012	KK Social	Disability Offer Dysfagiinformation	ca. 50	Not available	offers	Not 50 injuries
DPSD12D2 PDF376	2012	KK Social	Planned information columns 2013	125	Not available	columns	Week 12 / 43 modSUF14 / 44; version conflict

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF376	2012	KK Social	Cross-sectoral core causation analyses	4	Not available	analyses;	Four courses; possible overlap; non-annualunion
DPSD12D2 PDF376	2012	KK Social	Death by psyche atriskud scribes e	1	Not available	day	1 course of action; non-compulsory debt
DPSD12D2 PDF376	2012	KK Social	Medical examinations prior to perforation	3	Not available	assessments;	Same woman; not 3 persons
DPSD12D2 PDF376	Cumulative t to 2012; startdatoi not disclosed	KK Social	Internal cause of death case analyses since the start of the report	9	Not available	analyses;	Cumulative period not specified; not automatic 2012
DPSD12D2 PDF376	Stock by 2012 contribution	KK Social	Deaths with analysis needs pending	10	Not available	death	Waiting stock; non-extra 2012 death toll
DPSD12D2 PDF377	2012	Lyngby-Takel	Steering group meetings	4	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF377	2012	Lyngby-Takel	Decentralised cases	5	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF377	2012	Lyngby-Takel	Decentralised teaching services	10	Not available	lectures;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF377	2012	Lyngby-Takel	Meeting of Chambers	2	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF377	2012	Lyngby-Takel	Cluster meetings	3	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF377	2012	Lyngby-Takel	Coordination group	1	Not available	meeting	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF377	2012	Lyngby-Takel	First Aid / Place of core analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	Kanoverping shares from region / psychiatric itra
DPSD12D2 PDF378	2012	Lyngby-Takel	Transsectoral lights	0	Not available	completed analyses;	Case missing to be nalysed; not 0 events
DPSD12D2 PDF381	2012	Rødover	Cluster networks	4	Not available	meetings;	Of which 2 with regional representative
DPSD12D2 PDF381	2012	Rødover	Regional cluster meetings	2	Not available	meetings;	Part 4; not 6 sum
DPSD12D2 PDF381	2012	Rødover	Legal / management meeting	1	Not available	meeting	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF381	2012	Rødover	Home care meetings	3	Not available	meetings;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible

Source / locator	Year / Period a	Organisation	Indicator	Counter	Denomination	Unit	Limit / upper limit ap
DPSD12D2 PDF381	2012	Rødover	Regional core cause analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	Possible psychiatric overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF383	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Incentive procedure	14	Not available	days	Aug-31 Dec 12; offer, not actual participation sN
DPSD12D2 PDF383	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Tovholder meeting is	4	Not available	times / year	Frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF383	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Local areas	5	Not available	areas	Organiseringi services
DPSD12D2 PDF383	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Management cooperation	3	Not available	administration;	Monthly frequency
DPSD12D2 PDF384	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Dysphagia in local areas	2	Not available	areas	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible
DPSD12D2 PDF384	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Medical audit records	3300	Not available	medical records,	Citizens help edicdosage; not 3300 errors
DPSD12D2 PDF384	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Medical audit home visit	169	3300	citizens	Part 3300 referred to 5%; 169 / 3300 = 5.12% a frounding
DPSD12D2 PDF384	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Auditvisitssandel	5	Not available	%	Source rounding; not exact 165 visits
DPSD12D2 PDF384	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Forgotten medicine in data material	up to 90	Not available	%	The UTH data centre's selection denominator ended; IKKE90% all residents
DPSD12D2 PDF385	2012	KK Health / O m sorrows	Deficiency of the television sector analysis	1	Not available	analysis;	Final January 12; regional overlap
DPSD12D2 PDF387	2012	Tower	Transsectoral light experience	0	Not available	participation;	Access/location/reporting a possible barrier; not documented 0 incidents
DPSD12D2 PDF388	2012	Vallensbæk	Transsectoral light experience	0	Not available	experience;	No personal union; a nalyse / institutionsov is possible

Methodology and concrete evidence chain

Regions, municipalities and private treatment sites report their own activities. Regional figures may include the same events as hospital contributions. Several municipalities have more contributions. The number of analyses is not the number of independent incidents. The yearly deviation of PDF6 is maintained.

• Himmerland: Maravan is handled outside the new medicine module after severe events [DPSD12D2, PDF15]. The institution's simultaneous annual information; clinical records / fault / repair not provided.

• Thy-Mors: Spring 2012 annual report did not give any concrete areas of action [DPSD12D2, PDF18]. Self-report; no automatic end of 0 necessary bets.

• Vendsyssel / regionIT: Papiradvi abandoned while electronic X-ray advi could not be sent 6 months; Reference department was missing message [DPSD12D2, PDF21]. Documented risk description and decision chain, undetermined damage / liability / judgment.

• Vendsyssel / psychiatry: Cross-sectoral analysis after death after suicide attempt [DPSD12D2, PDF21]. No union with other analytic / psychiatric contributions.

• Patient revolving: OBS-notification of acidosis, 37-year-old deceased [DPSD12L, PDF8]. Source case description; primary clinical records not provided; no Union with Part 2.

• Frederikshavn: Halved pain patches: contacting the doctor did not produce a changed prescription; no specific patient information; unclear complaint track [DPSD12D2, PDF36-37]. The institution's contribution; separate clinical/individual redress not quantified.

• Hospitalsenheden Midt:Compliance with recommendations not systematically checked; effectiveness was a perception [DPSD12D2,PDF57]. Institution’s contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• Hospitalsenheden Vest: Safe medication reconciliation not yet established; dictation errors delayed diagnostic assessment [DPSD12D2, PDF60]. The institution's contribution; separate clinical/individual redress not quantified.

• Randers:Incorrect labelling continued after earlier measures; EPJ acknowledgment could not document actual medication administration [DPSD12D2,PDF66-67]. Institution’s contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• RM social: known information barrier for residents/relatives; the problem of analysis confidentiality was raised by the region and Patientombuddet [DPSD12D2, PDF76-78]. The institution’s contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• Herning: DPSD2 access/report module caused known caseworker and dissemination problems [DPSD12D2, PDF93]. The institution's contribution; separate clinical/individual redress not quantified.

• Holstebro: No fixed criteria for in-depth analysis [DPSD12D2, PDF95]. The institution's contribution; separate clinical/individual redress not quantified.

• Ringkøbing-Skjern: No maximum response time for emergency calls or fixed analysis criteria [DPSD12D2, PDF105-106]. Institution contribution; independent clinical / personal recovery not quantified.

• RSD practice: All responses refer to another primary-care contribution; no independent additional cohort [DPSD12D2, PDF127]. The institution's contribution; separate clinical/individual redress not quantified.

• Esbjerg: Central reporting made subsequent work in the administrations difficult to trace [DPSD12D2, PDF149]. The institution's contribution; separate clinical/individual redress not quantified.

• Middelfart: disability/psychiatric residents dependent on employee reporting; general criteria missing due to resources [DPSD12D2, PDF164-165]. The institution’s contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• Nyborg: 12 CPR identifiers linked to incorrect dose packaging; withdrawn and correct medicine the same afternoon; doctor UTH results not received [DPSD12D2, PDF169]. The institution's contribution; separate clinical/individual redress not quantified.

• Odense: Missing overview for doctor/pharmacy; alleged restriction of access not independently legally verified [DPSD12D2, PDF171-172]. The institution's contribution; separate clinical/individual redress not quantified.

• Svendborg:A fire at a care centre led to procedures; number affected not stated [DPSD12D2,PDF174]. Institution’s contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• Vejen:Two contributions; no patient information initiated and in-depth analyses not yet used [DPSD12D2,PDF182-185]. Institution’s contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• Vejle: repeated near misses not yet systematically analysed proactively [DPSD12D2, PDF187]. The institution’s contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• SygehusNord: Acidose-OBS arose from an incident in the organisation; overlaps the DPSD12L fatal case,not a new death [DPSD12D2, PDF192-193]. The institution's contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• SygehusSyd: delayed-diagnosis analysis without the GP concerned; individual process dates not stated [DPSD12D2, PDF196]. The institution's contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• HospitalValdemar: oxygen valve inaccessible from the department during a fire; correction planned Feb 13 [DPSD12D2, PDF213-214]. The institution's contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• Køge: many medication cases did not receive in-depth analysis [DPSD12D2, PDF230]. The institution's contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• Næstved:13 people with legionella,death in a fire and 4 restraint descriptions; Social Services Act→adverse-event report is not a review of legal authority [DPSD12D2, PDF236-237]. The institution's contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.

• Roskilde Municipality: new RM does not know all activities in the first 10 months; missing verification of learning must not be coded as 0 [DPSD12D2, PDF243-244]. The institution's contribution; independent clinical/personal redress not quantified.
• Amager/Hvidovre: DPSD access prevented extraction of own reports with incident locations in primary care [DPSD12D2, PDF257]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical judgment/union of individuals or actual redress.
• Bornholm Hospital: Identification wristbands discontinued after ¾ year: effect undocumented, confusion/stigmatisation stated [DPSD12D2, PDF261]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical judgment/union of individuals or actual redress.

• Bornholm Hospital: poisoned emergency-department employees; patients/relatives contacted/tested and department closed/repaired; affected N unknown [DPSD12D2, PDF262-263]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical finding/union of people or actual redress.

• Gentofte:Five analysis themes cover head trauma from falls, medication information, surgical mix-ups, discharge involving withdrawal and critical transfer [DPSD12D2,PDF268]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.

• Herlev:In-depth analyses took a long time; sustainable action plans described as difficult [DPSD12D2,PDF273]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.

• RHP: death during complex high-dose antipsychotic treatment; regional warning/root-cause analysis,overlap unknown [DPSD12D2, PDF282]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical finding/union of people or actual redress.

• Rigshospitalet/RH:Transport delays shortened dialysis time; also wrong addresses/patients left behind, the same regional course [DPSD12D2,PDF285/301]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.

• Rigshospitalet:Test results not updated in real time; DECT phones unintentionally silent/disconnected [DPSD12D2,PDF285]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.
• RH practice/regional:Metex substitution and insulin units led to national system corrections; repeated contributions are not new incidents [DPSD12D2,PDF289/300]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.

• RH regional: Complaint decisions from 2 specialties: time lag and lack of focus on preventability hindered learning; no quantified criticism proportion [DPSD12D2, PDF298]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical judgment/union of individuals or actual redress.

• RH regional: FMK→EPM weekly prescriptions became daily; further recertification errors led to a stop ordered by executive management [DPSD12D2, PDF299/302]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical finding/union of people or actual redress.

• RH regional: Changes in GTT personnel/catchment areas made comparable harm rates difficult; more experienced reviewers found more harm [DPSD12D2, PDF302]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical judgment/union of individuals or actual redress.

• RH regional:Cross-sector analysis abandoned because of a high level of conflict; the incident's clinical/redress outcome unspecified [DPSD12D2,PDF303]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.

• Københavns Privathospital:Criteria for in-depth analysis not yet developed [DPSD12D2,PDF319]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.

• Øjenhospitalet Danmark: all substantive response fields blank; must not be coded as zero incidents [DPSD12D2, PDF325]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical finding/union of people or actual redress.

• Ballerup:Frequent recurring incidents not analysed because of insufficient time [DPSD12D2,PDF331]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.

• Dragør: Two contributions; electronic reporting only from 2012, training requested and criteria incomplete [DPSD12D2, PDF336-339]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical judgment/union of individuals or actual redress.

• Egedal:Cross-sector incidents incorrectly reported to the organisation itself; birth notifications missing [DPSD12D2,PDF341]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.

• Frederiksberg Kommune: Suicide 4 days after discharge; joint action plan, the timeline is not in itself an examination of culpability [DPSD12D2, PDF344]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical judgment/union of individuals or actual redress.

• Several municipalities: patient information not selected/not prioritised/not implemented; the respective local information is not a union of individuals [DPSD12D2, PDF348/349/355/357/367-368/371/377/386/388]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical finding/union of people or actual redress.

• Hillerød Municipality: missed hip fracture in an older person with dementia; cross-sector analysis,specific treatment time/redress unknown [DPSD12D2, PDF363]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical finding/union of people or actual redress.

• KK Social:Four analyses of courses ending in death, nine internal analyses since the start and ten pending;"high-speed staffing" and confidentiality stated; no union of persons [DPSD12D2,PDF375-376]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.

• KK Social/RHP: Clozapine/polypharmacy involving a private psychiatrist and contact with Rigshospitalet may be the same case as RHP282; not an additional death [DPSD12D2, PDF376]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical judgment/union of individuals or actual redress.

• Rudersdal:Cross-sector discussions without systematic analysis; actual severity confused with potential risk [DPSD12D2,PDF380]. Institution contribution; not an independent clinical determination/union of persons or actual redress.

• KK Health/Care: medication audit found quality failures; the 90% reference has an unknown selection denominator and no population representativeness [DPSD12D2, PDF384]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical finding/union of people or actual redress.

• Tårnby: training/analyses incomplete; RM vacancy Oct 12-Jan 13 and missing discharge summaries/prescriptions [DPSD12D2, PDF386-387]. Institutional contribution; not an independent clinical finding/union of people or actual redress.

Meaning and necessary documents

Knowledge of a specific risk must be connected to the responsible decision and subsequent action. A corrected technical function does not in itself document redress for a patient already harmed. The X-ray process requires decision logs,receipt/response logs and specific patient histories to establish delays and responsibility. The Maravan process requires incident and medication logs. Person counts and reparation therefore cannot be inferred from meeting or analysis counts. This is our evidential analysis,separate from the source's activity information.

Additional original health outcomes: complaint statistics 2014 and replacement anchor 2018-2025

Controlled October 7, 2026. 122 factorows in the corresponding JSON file. Findings are decisions and sub-decisions, not unique patients or employees. PDF pages below are physically counted from the first PDF page.

Patient complaints statistics 2014: exact denominators and outcomes

Source: Statistical information on patient complaints 2014, pp. 7-9 and 13-21, tables 4-6 and 9-18.

Type of decision	Total	Outdated gene absorption view	Equipment name;	No criticism	Criticism	Insecticides a	Opposition no
Disciplinary	1.490	65	1.425	980	389	54	2
Place of treatment	1.538	40	1.498	969	529	-	-

Rightout falls	Remitted	Acceded	Modified	No criticism	Criticism	Other	Total
2014	48	403	64	34	36	10	595

The 1.682 partial decisions concerning health professionals are distributed across all 20 professional groups in JSON;including 1.377 doctor, 161 nurse and 31 social and health-care assistant decisions. Greenland/Faroe Islands: 99 partial decisions. The incident-location table comprises 3.244 partial decisions and excludes 48 rights cases; all 18 location categories are recorded. Hospital does not automatically mean public employment. Municipal rights cases are included regionally. Record registration changed in 2013. The treatment-site figure of 1.538 is retained alongside the earlier text version’s 1.537.

Replacement anchor: actual changes and subsequent court outcome

Year	Manage Ratitive amended	Printed % change ocent	José Manuel Barroso Safflower see	Case no cleared	Judgments	Amended / convicted by judgment	Original and physical pages
2018	247	12	298	Not specified	73	11	2018, 13, 17-18
2019	370	15	332	Not specified	80	18	2019, 11, 15-16
2020	365	13	361	105	37	8	2020, 12, 19
2021	288	12	333	154	52	5	2021, 10, 16-17
2022	320	13	278	208	55	18	2022, 13, 21
2023	245	10	312	160	71	13*	2023, 11, 20
2024	268	10	Not included here	213	60	7	2024, 16, 21
2025	313	11	135	131	48	13	2025, 14-16, 21

The exact denominator of the alteration rate cannot be reconstructed from a rounded percentage. 2021 excludes remittals, rejections and reopenings; 2022-2023 includes remittals. Chairperson decisions are included; from 2024 secretariat decisions are also included. An alteration can increase or reduce the patient's entitlement to compensation. Judicial review is later processing of the same trajectory and must not be added as new patients.

*The 2023 original's outcome section says »2022«, but states 13/71, while the same page gives 71 judgments in 2023. The 2022 original states 18/55. The year-label conflict is recorded separately. The 2022 original also states 13 per cent, while newer original compilations state 12 per cent historically for 2022. No silent harmonisation.

Cases withdrawn before judgment may include reopening and a new decision finding wholly or partly in the party's favour. The boards' reports do not publish an overall count for this outcome. Court cases concluded without judgment are therefore not documented losses for patients.

Patient benefit, patient disadvantage and actual time 2025

2025-original, p. 9 and 13-21:

Change direction	Number
For the benefit of the patient	152
For the benefit of the patient	140
Other change	21
Total	313

3.558 closed: 3.200 treatment, 357 medicinal-product and one access-to-records case. Decision form: 1.461 board, 135 chairperson, 1.829 secretariat and 133 without decision. The thematic graph gives 131 without decision, a separate source conflict. The dental scheme's jurisdiction changed on 1. July 2024; since then 139 dental-injury cases received and 59 decided. Average time 7,2 months; from 2025 rejections for missing the appeal deadline are excluded. Time spent obtaining records and Patienterstatningen's opinion is included. A favourable appeal decision does not in itself document later payment.

Concrete residues and measures of investigation

The open register of the Folketing documents the annual reports 2006 and 2007: Documents 490303 and 518897, respectively SUU 2006-07 Annex 556 and SUU 2007-08, second collection, Annex 363. The File API box is empty. Direct attachment pages gave 403; the historical STPS statistics links 2010 and 2013 gave 404 and are not available in the current page card. The registry entry is the documentation for the publication, not for the figures in the report.

Exact original criticism counts for 2006-2010, 2013 and 2018-2019 are still missing; annual registration of amendments favourable/adverse to patients before 2025; cessation,payment and reopened litigation with a favourable finding; public/private employment and person deduplication. Request to STPK: each year's original decision extract with case type,decision date,type of criticism,partial decision,reopening,complaining party and direction of amendment,and reconciliation with the original annual statistics. Patienterstatningen's outstanding denominators and person deduplication appear in sundhedsaar-serier.md. No request has been sent.

The Patient Complaints Board 2010: original time goals, production and historical version differences;

The scanned annual report from Patientklagenævnet has now been recovered through Patientombuddet's official archive address. Its 21 pages can be retrieved in memory; the text layer provides no readable body text. The contents page and the original's physical pages 4-5 and 9-11 have therefore actually been read visually. All values in tables 3-5 are recorded. No attestation is given of the content of all other accounting pages. This is an annual report with targets and production information; it does not replace the separate annual statistics' missing exact criticism categories. [PKNA10]

Original objectives and results achieved

Table 3, physical/printed page 9. Degree of target achievement is the authority's performance-contract classification, not the proportion of patients with a timely course.

Result requirements	Measure	Actual result	Unit	Targets %	Weight%	Weighted % result
Decommissioning	4560	4247	decisions	50	25	12,5
Case-handling product	120	114,9	Decisions / Annual Work	50	20	10
Average length of proceedings	12	12,7	months	50	20	10

Result requirements	Measure	Actual result	Unit	Targets %	Weight%	Weighted % result
Unit cost	9000	10670	DKK / closed case	0	25	0
Employee satisfaction	Measurement	Implemented	action	100	10	10

The weighted total is 42,5 per cent. The original states five performance requirements:one met, three partly met and one unmet. The well-being measurement concerns employees; it does not document patient satisfaction or redress. The original's comparison with 2009 is 65 per cent target attainment, but a decline in the contract score does not in itself prove worse actual outcomes. The measured quantities and time targets must be shown separately. [PKNA10,PDF4-5,9]

All original cells in the production matrix

Table 4, physical / printed, page 10. The same annual registration is not necessarily the same reception cohort.

Measure	2009	2010	Unit
New cases	4235	4805	cases
Assignments	3416	4147	cases
Decisions	3098	4247	decisions
Total annual work of the Secretariat	65	76,8	year work;
Annual work of the cashier	30,7	37	year work;
Decisions per total annual work	47,7	55,3	Decisions / Annual Work
Decisions per year's work	101	114,9	Decisions / Annual Work

The original's prose rounds 114,9 to 115. The target basis was 38 case-handlers' annual work × 120 = 4.560 decisions; in fact, 37 annual work is reported. These are production and capacity targets, not a count of responsible employees, errors or patients. The original indicates unit costs of DKK 10.921 in 2009 and DKK 10.670 in 2010, against a target of DKK 9.000 per case closed. [PKNA10, PDF5,10-11]

The full original time series in Table 5

Year	Average, months
2007	15,9
2008	15,1
2009	13,8
2010	12,7

The 2010 original target was no more than 12 months; in fact 12,7. A reduction from 13,8 is not the achievement of the 12-month target. The average also does not indicate how many people waited longer, maximum waiting time or time for actual treatment, compensation or payment. [PKNA10, PDF11]

Own voting for the later original statistics

The original complaint statistics 2016, May 2017 version 1.0, provides another historical activity sample. The original cells already registered shall be retained alongside the annual report; the differences shall not be explained away without the vote of the Authority.

Year	Measure	Annual Report 2010	Statistics 2016	Own difference
2009	New cases	4235	4235	0
2009	Assignments	3416	3294	122

Year	Measure	Annual Report 2010	Statistics 2016	Own difference
2009	Decisions	3098	3094	4
2010	New cases	4805	4770	35
2010	Assignments	4147	3910	237
2010	Decisions	4247	4221	26

The 237 is a recorded difference between acceptance versions, not 237 proven unrepresented victims. Statistics 2016 describes separate exclusions and subsequent recording of assumptions; they do not explain without a specific data coupling each above cell. No sum of both versions is formed. Both originals must be followed for delimitation, case type, journal ID and version date. [PKNA10, PDF10; PKNS16, PDF5 / tryt4]

Consequences, responsibilities and concrete remnants

In conclusion, the Authority had specific targets and recorded long averages even before the 2011 reform. The original describes a goal of rapid, correct and transparent decisions, while the 2010 performance contract concentrated on production and productivity. There were no performance requirements for the practice dissemination. It documents organisation and knowledge; it does not document the prevention of the actual injuries or a criminal omission of each employee. [PKNA10, PDF4]

The citizen's remedy must be measured from harm or administrative intervention to complaint, decision and actual reparation. A closed complaint may be followed by continuing loss of treatment, refused compensation or delayed payment. The specific demand concerns original decisions' outcomes and dates, known case/person linkages, public/private employment, reparation and actual effect. Proof of individual criminal responsibility is not required before an institutional accountability track can be investigated; every accountability claim must satisfy its own rule.

Remaining gaps: Exact criticism classes 2006-2010/2013/2018-2019 are not resolved by this production annual report. Folketinget’s 2006-/2007-document entries still have an empty File field. Old STPS statistics addresses, the former PKN/Patientombuddet archive registers and current publication lists have actually been examined. The archive’s PDF register for patientombuddet.dk yielded 195URL rows, with only this PKN annual report and three 2012DPSD parts among the annual-report/statistics names. This is a specific search boundary, not evidence of statistics originals never published or lost. Access failures,0 matches and unread sources are recorded separately. No external request has been sent.

Patient complaints 2006: original critical classes, actual waiting time and source conflicts;

The original statistics for 2006 document **567 critical decisions and 2 requests for redress of 2.217 cases decided without psychiatric appeal**. The other 1.648 cases stand as no criticism. These are the actual original categories; the report does not have a separate category of criticism with invigoration. A request for indictment shall document the action of a control body, not the execution of the charge, the sentence or the penalty. PKS06, p.11, Table 6.

The corresponding regional table indicates: **590 critical decisions and 2 indictment requests among 2.305 decisions including 88 psychiatric appeals**. The other 1.713 stands as no criticism. These figures are also included. The difference between 567 and 590 must not be deleted as a clerical error or simply translated into 23 new citizens. The populations are different, and the statistical original does not explain a complete case union between its critical and psychiatric codes. PKS06, p.18, Table 13; p.11, Table 6.

Cases, decisions concerning healthcare professionals and numbers of citizens

The original sets out 4.114 individual decisions, excluding 118 individual psychiatric decisions. In a complaint, several health professionals can have their own decision, and the same health person can appear in several cases. The 4.114 are therefore neither 4.114 patients nor 4.114 different employees. The table gives 18,4% under the category of offence, but does not give the exact number in the total category. Rounding must not be transformed into a fictional integer. For non-authorised professional groups, the methodological section describes the assessment of professional correctness; the common tabular heading does not prove an identical offence for any professional group. PKS06, p.12-13, Table 7-8 and delimitation sections.

72 cases gave 76 individual decisions published with names. Of these, 41 came from the National Health Service's reports and 35 from complaints. The number 76 does not document 76 different health professionals. The original tables allocate these individual decisions by subject group, specialisation, place of treatment and criterion. The hospital is not in itself a proven public employment status. PKS06, p.23-25

Psychiatric coercion and resumption

The 88 psychiatric appeal decisions comprise 56 upheld decisions, 29 amendments, 2 remittals for reconsideration and 1 annulment. The 32 decisions involving amendment, remittal for reconsideration or annulment are a delimited appeal-outcome group, not a deduplicated person count or automatically 32 criminal abuses. These interventions concern coercion and must therefore be shown separately from ordinary criticism of healthcare treatment. The original's prose says 62,5% upheld, but its table gives 56/88=63,64%; both evidentiary leads are retained, and the table counts have been visually checked. PKS06,pp.21-22,tables 15-17.

84 decisions concerned requests to reopen:68 refusals and 16 reopenings. Of the 16, 1 decision was upheld without further specification of outcome, 7 remained no breach of law, 1 psychiatric upholding was maintained, 1 was changed from no breach of law to a breach of law and 6 were changed in the opposite direction. These 84 are part of the year's production, and the 16 and their subgroups must not be added as new cases or citizens. Reopening is also not documentation of actual restoration of health. PKS06,pp.11 and 19.

The citizen's waiting time is longer than the Authority's recruitment time

The average of 13,8 months runs from the Authority's acceptance of the complaint to the decision. From the citizen's submission of the complaint, the average is 14,3 months. The original explicitly describes this second starting point after the criticism of the National Audit Office. The final objective includes a greater proportion of the time that the citizen is actually waiting for the test. None of the targets documents when the processing was corrected, an injury compensated or the citizen's rights were actually restored. PKS06, p.19, Section 3.7.

Figure 4 places 6,3 months in 2000; the prosas places the same historical minimum in 2001. The figure all 13 data points are visually read and included with the actual year location. The conflict is local and does not alter the original's documented two different timeframes for 2006. PKS06, p.19-20

Concrete data conflicts to be preserved

• Table 1 lists 2.783 admitted; the prose 2.704. The latter plus 79 admitted psychiatric appeals gives 2.783, but this calculation must not purport to explain the population in greater detail than the original does. PKS06, pp.4-5 and 21.

• Figure 3 gives 478 as the year's difference between assumed and determined. Stock increases from 2.934 to 3.372, i.e. 438. Flow difference and inventory change are not the same objective. Revocations and other changes in stocks are mentioned in the methodology footnote, but there is no complete numerical reconciliation. PKS06, p.5-6

• Annex 1's regional estimates are 2.868, whereas the main table gives 2.783. The difference 85 has been documented; it has not been identified as 85 persons, new cases or resumption. All annexes have been visually read and preserved. PKS06, p.10 and 26-27.

• Table 14's record-keeping row states 21 individual decisions and 70,8% breaches of law. The visually confirmed cells cannot represent an integer count of legal breaches with the same denominator of 21 and ordinary rounding to one decimal place. Other percentage/count rows also have discrepancies. The source cannot be repaired by back-calculating percentages. PKS06, p.19.

• The psychiatric rate, the historical time limit and several regional percentages have the discrepancies listed above. They will not be allowed to conceal the exact number of decisions given. PKS06, p.18-22

Determined coverage lift

H04's concrete remnants on original classes of criticism for 2006 are materially closed to this 27-page statistical version. The 36 reading tables / 328 numerical series comprise all the tables, the regions of the annex, the marked autonomous figures of the figures and the relevant figures of the text. Historical comparison figures before 2006 are maintained as source boundaries and are not counted as new events during the 2006-2025 period of the report. Figures without independently marked numbers do not provide additional observations.

The actual outstanding items are person deduplication, public/private employer status, the outcome following the two requests for prosecution, actual redress and the specifically identified source conflicts. They must not be filled in with assumptions. New criticism categories for other years remain a separate original-source question.

Source Cards

PKS06. Health Service Patient Complaints Board,*Statistical information 2006*,27 pages. Public original, archive capture 20070606212828. Original public authority address http://www.pkn.dk/public/dokumenter/stat_06.pdf.173.750 bytes. SHA256 651f4ac3c0496a22fd727bb1015e98db3e5a96fd7cfb7a748a1589af3017ef6d. All 27 pages read as text solely in RAM; pp.11,18,19,20,22,25,26 and 27 also visually checked. Physical and printed pages are identical. No original text, PDF or original pages have been saved. Own figures are in *patientklager2006-originale-tal.json* and reading tables in *patientklager2006-originale-tabeller.md*.

Patient complaints statistics 2006: original figures by delimitation

36 reading tables with 328 rows. PKS06 is read all 27 original pages of RAM. Physical and printed side numbers are the same. The figures are own structured transcripts; original pages or full source text are not saved.

T1 - Development of proceedings

PKS06, p.5. The annual received, inadmissible and admitted cases are not the same case population. Admitted cases in 2006 have a footnote about a further 86 reopening requests. Withdrawal after admission affects the pending caseload.

Category	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Received	2571	2489	2456	2610	2698	2949	2850	3105	3312	3381
Rejected	576	482	536	467	471	570	616	663	678	686
Assumed	1992	2003	1926	2145	2233	2357	2273	2398	2638	2783
Done	2512	2544	2191	1737	2057	2303	2219	1751	1874	2305
pending	1897	1195	876	1296	1448	1477	1527	2177	2934	3372

AFVIS - Reasons for rejection

PKS06, p.5. Receipt and rejection may take place in different calendar years.

Reason	Number
Limitation	178
Non-competence	188
County Council of Tooth	35
Patient insurance	25
Other reasons	227
Rejected before acceptance	33
Total	686

FLOW - Supply and production

PKS06, p.4. Prose 2704 + psychiatry 79 = table 2783; the identity is a calculation, not a documented population definition in the prose.

Measure	Number
General appeals	3228
Psychiatric anchor	83
Alerts from the Danish Health Service	70
Total received	3381
Reopening requests	86
Prose Reality Entered	2704
Referral decisions	1396
Decisions by the Presidency	909
Decided	2305

GROWTH - Annual approach changes

PKS06, p.4. The percentages given by the source.

Measure	2004-2005 %	2005-2006 %
Received	6,7	2,1
Assumed	10,0	5,5

F3 - Accepted minus de-decided

PKS06, p.6. The figure flow difference; not the actual change in inventory, as 2006 is 3372 − 2934 = 438.

Year	Number
2002	54
2003	54
2004	647
2005	764
2006	478

T2 - Treatment site, approach

PKS06,p.8. Hospital includes 83 received and 79 admitted psychiatric appeals. The treatment facility does not on its own document public employment.

Category	Number received	% received	Estimated number	% assumed	Rejected number	Rejected%
Hospital	2057	60,8	1698	61	389	56,7
Damage department	158	4,7	139	5	24	3,5
Specialist practice	147	4,3	141	5,1	25	3,6
Medical Officer	122	3,6	114	4,1	12	1,8
General practice	448	13,3	370	13,3	101	14,7
Residential home	25	0,7	21	0,8	5	0,7

Category	Number received	% received	Estimated number	% assumed	Rejected number	Rejected%
Prison	42	1,2	33	1,2	11	1,6
Other private practices	270	8	198	7,1	70	10,2
Municipal dental care services	30	0,9	22	0,8	9	1,3
Pharmacy	9	0,3	8	0,3	2	0,3
Ambulance	13	0,4	12	0,4	3	0,4
Home care	15	0,4	13	0,5	1	0,1
Miscellaneous	45	1,4	14	0,4	34	5,1
Total	3381	100	2783	100	686	100

T3 - Professional groups, approach

PKS06,p.9. A case may involve several professional groups. Doctors include psychiatry. The 5 admitted pharmacist cases include 3 pharmaconomists, marked by footnote 2; the figure is 5,not 52.

Category	Number received	% received	Estimated number	% assumed	Rejected number	Rejected%
Doctors	3036	88,5	2519	88,5	597	86
Dentists	123	3,6	69	2,4	53	7,6
Nurses	100	2,9	100	3,5	20	2,9
Midwives	37	1,1	35	1,2	3	0,4
Physiotherapists	24	0,7	25	0,9	1	0,1
Clinical dental technicians	27	0,8	26	0,9	2	0,3
Dentists	1	0	0	0	0	0
Meters	8	0,2	6	0,2	1	0,1
Peas (without pods)	4	0,1	4	0,1	0	0
Nursing-home assistants	7	0,2	3	0,1	3	0,4
Pharmacy	6	0,2	4	0,1	1	0,1
Kiropractors	21	0,6	17	0,6	3	0,4
Psychologists	5	0,1	5	0,2	1	0,1
Opticians	3	0,1	2	0,1	2	0,3
Social and health assistance	7	0,2	8	0,2	0	0
Ambulance editors	15	0,4	13	0,5	6	0,9
Pharmaceutical products	2	0,1	5	0,2	0	0
Ergot therapists	2	0,1	2	0,1	0	0
Bioanalysts	2	0,1	4	0,1	1	0,1
Total	3430	100	2847	100	694	100

T4 - Regional approach

PKS06, p.10. The 2007 regions will be spent behind schedule in 2006; they will not be able to match one entry year.

Region	Received	Assumed	Rejected
Capital	1267	1018	288
Zealand	515	443	83
South Denmark	653	558	125
Central Jutland	587	472	125
North Jutland	283	233	46
Greenland	62	52	13
Faeroe Islands	8	7	1
Not available	6	0	5
Total	3381	2783	686

T5 - Requests for reopening

PKS06, p.10. Requests, non-response.

Year	Number
2002	98
2003	88
2004	92
2005	83
2006	86

T6 - Classes of criticism of decisions

PKS06, p.11. Excludes 88 psychiatric appeal decisions. No separate category for formal reminders of duties. A request for prosecution is not an indictment/judgment. The no-criticism category may include remarks on appropriate conduct.

Outcome	2002 %	2003 %	2004 %	2005 %	2006 %	2006 number
No criticism	77	77,3	77,6	73,4	74,3	1648
Criticism	22,7	22,1	22,1	24,8	25,6	567
Request for an indictment	0,3	0,5	0,2	1,8	0,1	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	2217

T7 - Cases decided by subject group

PKS06, p.12. Trade unions overlap in the same case. Doctors include 88 psychiatric appeals. Pharmacopoeia 7 comprises 6 pharmacopoeia, see footnote 2; not 72.

Professional group	Number	%
Doctors	2089	83,1

Professional group	Number	%
Dentists	80	3,2
Nurses	179	7,1
Midwives	35	1,4
Physiotherapists	22	0,9
Clinical dental technicians	18	0,7
Peas (without pods)	1	0
Nursing workers	8	0,3
Dentists	2	0,1
Kiropractors	16	0,6
Psychologists	8	0,3
Bioanalysts	3	0,1
Social and health assistance	21	0,8
Radiographs	3	0,1
Pharmacy	6	0,2
Opticians	2	0,1
Pharmaceutical products	7	0,2
Ambulance editors	14	0,6
Total	2514	100

T8 - Decisions by subject group

PKS06, p.13 Excludes 118 psychiatric individual decisions. A case may have several individual decisions; repeated health professionals did not deduce. Unauthorised professional groups shall be assessed according to professional correctness; the table designation shall not prove an identical offence for all professional groups. Rounded percentages do not give exact number of criticisms.

Professional group	Number	No offence%	% offence
Doctors	3494	84,1	15,9
Dentists	108	41,7	58,3
Nurses	254	76,4	23,6
Midwives	67	77,6	22,4
Physiotherapists	30	83,3	16,7
Clinical dental technicians	28	46,4	53,6
Kiropractors	18	83,3	16,7
Social and health assistance	34	70,6	29,4
Dentists	4	0	100
Pharmaceutical	10	30	70
Pharmaceutical products	8	12,5	87,5

Professional group	Number	No offence%	% offence
Others	59	78	22
Total	4114	81,6	18,4

T9 - Class of position of hospital doctors

PKS06, p.14. 2.459 hospital doctors - individual decisions of 3.494 doctor -individual decisions; none given by category of post.

Category	No offence%	% offence	Share of individual decisions%
Chief Executive Officer	91,4	8,6	2,4
Chief medical officer	82,4	17,6	39,5
Departure doctors	82,7	17,3	10,3
1, spare doctor	86,5	13,5	6,6
Reserve doctors	86,3	13,7	17,2
Other doctors	91,5	8,5	24

T10 - Individual decisions by specialty

PKS06, p.15. Individual medical decisions; psychiatric appeals not included.

Special	Number	No offence%	% offence
General medicine	697	83,2	16,8
Anaesthesiology	101	85,1	14,9
Children's diseases	43	81,4	18,6
Children's and young people's sykiatrics	8	75	25
Gynaecology / obstetrics	205	90,7	9,3
Skin disorders	33	84,8	15,2
Internal medicine	253	84,2	15,8
Surgery	569	84	16
Cancer	50	78	22
Neurosurgery	53	88,7	11,3
Neurology	72	90,3	9,7
Orthopaedic surgery	789	82,9	17,1
Psychiatric disorders	141	85,8	14,2
X-ray	82	68,3	31,7
Tissue and cell examinations	14	71,4	28,6
Eye disorders	89	85,4	14,6
Ear and nasal disorders	96	82,3	17,7
Other	199	89,4	10,6

Special	Number	No offence%	% offence
Total	3494	84,1	15,9

T11 - Cases decided by place of procedure

PKS06, p.16 Including 88 psychiatric appeals. Unlit historical cells are empty, not zero.

Place of treatment	2002 %	2003 %	2004 %	2005 %	2006 %	2006 number
Hospital	53,7	54,3	55,1	57	58,9	1358
Damage department	5	5,8	7	5	5,4	124
Specialist	8	7,4	7,6	9	7,3	167
Medical Officer	5,3	5,5	5,4	4	4	90
General practice	14,3	13,4	11,3	14	14,4	331
Residential home	1,2	1	0,9	1	0,5	12
Home care	-	-	-	-	0,3	6
Ambulance	-	-	-	-	0,5	11
Prison	1	0,7	0,9	1	1,1	26
Other private practices	6,2	5	5,4	6	5,8	133
Municipal dental care services	1	1,5	1,7	1	1,1	26
Pharmacy	-	-	-	-	0,2	5
Miscellaneous	4,3	5,4	4,7	2	0,5	16
Total	100	100	100	100	100	2305

T12 - Critics by treatment site

PKS06, p.17 Including 88 psychiatric anchor; same total percentage as T6, but other mentions. To be protected without disguised harmonisation.

Place of treatment	No criticism%	Critical%	Assignment request%	Number
Hospital	78	22	0	1358
Damage department	73,4	25,8	0,8	124
Specialist	65,1	34,9	0	167
Medical Officer	71,1	28,9	0	90
General practice	78,5	21,2	0,3	331
Residential home	50	50	0	12
Pharmacy	20	80	0	5
Ambulance	63,6	36,4	0	11
Prison	100	0	0	26
Other private practices	46,6	53,4	0	133
Home care	66,7	33,3	0	6

Place of treatment	No criticism%	Critical%	Assignment request%	Number
Municipal dental care services	73,1	26,9	0	26
Miscellaneous	56,3	43,7	0	16
Total	74,3	25,6	0,1	2305

T13 - Critics by region

PKS06, p.18 Including 88 psychiatric appeals. Regionalization to the 2007 regions Several printed percentages do not match the printed n; the cells of the source are preserved.

Region	No criticism number	No criticism %	Critical number	Critical%	Opposition Number of	Opposition %	Total
Capital	640	73,7	228	26,2	1	0,1	869
Zealand	215	65,8	111	34,2	0	0	326
South Denmark	361	77,9	102	21,9	1	0,2	464
Central Jutland	332	78,9	89	21,1	0	0	421
North Jutland	126	73,1	46	26,9	0	0	172
Greenland	36	78,3	10	21,7	0	0	46
Faeroe Islands	3	42,9	4	57,1	0	0	7
Total	1713	74,3	590	25,6	2	0,1	2305

T14 - Medical decisions by legal theme

PKS06, p.19 Themes include parts of 3.494 individual decisions, may also include treatment; not a personal union. Record keeping 21 and 70,8% visually confirmed; percent / n-conflict must not be repaired by guess.

Theme	No offence%	% offence	Number
Record keeping	29,2	70,8	21
Information	71,6	28,4	226
Consent	77,6	22,4	126
Access to documents	71,2	28,8	52
Professional secrecy	54,5	45,5	11
Medical certificates	81,8	18,2	45

REOPEN - Reopening decisions

PKS06, p.19 The last five cells divide 16 reabsorbed; not additional 84 + 16 + 16 cases.

Outcome	Number
Rejection	68
Recorded	16
Total decided	84
Maintained decision, type unspecified	1

Outcome	Number
Continued no offence	7
Psychiatric accession maintained	1
No offence changed to offence	1
Code changed to no offence	6

TIME - Two different time targets

PKS06, p.19 Two starting points, not a version correction of the same time-scale. Prosa s.19 places 6,3 months in 2001, while Figure 4 p.20 places 6,3 in 2000.

Start Point	2006 months
From assumption to decision	13,8
From citizen's complaint to decision	14,3

F4 - Average length of proceedings, figure

PKS06, p.20 All data points visually read; figure 6,3 is 2000, not 2001 as prosa p.19

Year	Months
1994	12
1995	19,7
1996	16,2
1997	14,8
1998	11
1999	6,8
2000	6,3
2001	8,2
2002	8
2003	8,2
2004	9,7
2005	12
2006	13,8

T15 - The development of psychiatric appeals

PKS06, p.21 Complaints about coercion; access and decision-making years are different populations.

Category	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Received	114	111	110	132	83
Rejected	4	3	3	0	0
Assumed	113	109	89	129	79

Category	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Done	98	97	74	93	88

T16 - Outcome of Psychiatric Anches

PKS06, p.22 Prosa s.21 says 62,5% joined 2006; Table 56 / 88 = 63,64%. Source dispute preserved. Amendment / remittal for reconsideration is not automatically punishable as illegality.

Outcome	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Acceded	71	84	58	63	56
Modified	22	11	15	28	29
Remitted for reconsideration	1	1	1	2	2
Repealed	4	1	0	0	1
Total	98	97	74	93	88

T17 - Regional psychiatric appeal

PKS06, p.22 The 2007 regions will be spending behind schedule in 2006.

Region	Acceded	Modified	Remitted	Repealed	Total
Capital	38	8	2	1	49
Zealand	3	4	0	0	7
Central Jutland	7	6	0	0	13
North Jutland	6	6	0	0	12
South Denmark	2	5	0	0	7
Total	56	29	2	1	88

NAMED - Publication with Name

PKS06, p.23. 76 individual decisions have not been documented 76 different health professionals.

Measure	Number
Case	72
Specific decisions	76
From the Health Service reports	41
From appeals	35

T18 - Named individual decisions by subject group

PKS06, p.23. Individual decisions in 72 cases; no Union of health workers.

Professional group	Number
Doctors	39
Dentists	24

Professional group	Number
Nurses	4
Physiotherapists	1
Clinical dental technicians	1
Nursing workers	1
Social and health assistance	2
Opticians	1
Pharmaceutical products	3
Total	76

T19 - Named individual medical decisions by specialty

PKS06, p.24. Sub-set of 76 named individual decisions.

Special	Number
General medicine	10
Internal medicine	2
Surgery	5
Cancer	1
Orthopaedic surgery	10
Psychiatric disorders	1
Ear and nasal neck	1
Plastic surgery	9
Total	39

T20 - Named individual decisions by location

PKS06,p.24. Location does not on its own establish public/private employment status.

Location	Number
Hospital	12
Specialist practice	23
Medical Officer	1
General practice	10
Other private practices	27
Pharmacy	3
Total	76

T17_DUP - Naming criteria, incorrectly printed as table 17

PKS06, p.25. Prosa s.25 refers to Table 21; the table itself is printed Table 17. The printed cells are reproduced on a page rather than an individual assumption of table number.

Criterion	Number
Serious criticism	33
Critics for cosmetic treatment	10
Critics more than twice since 1 January 2006	33

B1 _ Capital - Annex 1: Capital

PKS06, p.26 Accepted figures in the Annex differ from Table 4; unexplained, not automatic retake. All cells visually controlled.

Place of treatment	Received	Assumed
Hospital	747	614
Damage department	66	58
Specialist practice	91	91
Medical Officer	41	39
General practice	143	115
Residential home	12	10
Prison	6	5
Other private practices	108	76
Municipal dental care services	15	12
Pharmacy	6	5
Ambulance	11	10
Home care	6	6
Miscellaneous	15	6
Total	1267	1047

B1 _ Zealand - Annex 1: Zealand

PKS06, p.26 Accepted figures in the Annex differ from Table 4; unexplained, not automatic retake. All cells visually controlled.

Place of treatment	Received	Assumed
Hospital	304	269
Damage department	27	25
Specialist practice	20	21
Medical Officer	15	14
General practice	73	63
Residential home	2	1

Place of treatment	Received	Assumed
Prison	2	2
Other private practices	59	51
Municipal dental care services	4	4
Pharmacy	1	1
Ambulance	0	0
Home care	3	3
Miscellaneous	5	3
Total	515	457

B1 _ Central Jutland - Annex 1: Central Jutland

PKS06, p.26 Accepted figures in the Annex differ from Table 4; unexplained, not automatic retake. All cells visually controlled.

Place of treatment	Received	Assumed
Hospital	363	311
Damage department	25	21
Specialist practice	13	14
Medical Officer	27	24
General practice	81	66
Residential home	4	4
Prison	13	7
Other private practices	47	34
Municipal dental care services	1	1
Pharmacy	0	0
Ambulance	1	1
Home care	4	2
Miscellaneous	8	4
Total	587	489

B1 _ North Jutland - Annex 1: North Jutland

PKS06, p.27 Accepted figures in the Annex differ from Table 4; unexplained, not automatic retake. All cells visually controlled.

Place of treatment	Received	Assumed
Hospital	187	156
Damage department	11	11
Specialist practice	5	4

Place of treatment	Received	Assumed
Medical Officer	14	13
General practice	48	47
Residential home	2	2
Prison	0	1
Other private practices	9	9
Municipal dental care services	0	0
Pharmacy	1	2
Ambulance	1	0
Home care	1	1
Miscellaneous	4	0
Total	283	246

B1 _ South Denmark - Annex 1: South Denmark

PKS06, p.27 Accepted figures in the Annex differ from Table 4; unexplained, not automatic retake. All cells visually controlled.

Place of treatment	Received	Assumed
Hospital	393	341
Damage department	28	26
Specialist practice	18	18
Medical Officer	25	27
General practice	97	90
Residential home	5	4
Prison	21	18
Other private practices	47	34
Municipal dental care services	10	5
Pharmacy	1	1
Ambulance	0	1
Home care	1	1
Miscellaneous	7	3
Total	653	569

B1 _ Faroe Islands - Annex 1: Faroe Islands

PKS06, p.27 Accepted figures in the Annex shall be retained without harmonisation with Table 4.

Place of treatment	Received	Assumed
Hospital	7	6

Place of treatment	Received	Assumed
Damage department	1	1
General practice	0	0
Total	8	7

B1 _ Greenland - Annex 1: Greenland

PKS06, p.27 Accepted figures in the Annex shall be retained without harmonisation with Table 4.

Place of treatment	Received	Assumed
Hospital	56	48
Damage department	0	0
General practice	6	5
Total	62	53

Source Cards

PKS06. Patientklagenævnet, *Statistical information on patient complaints 2006*,27 pages. Public original in a web archive; original address http://www.pkn.dk/public/dokumenter/stat_06.pdf. SHA256 651f4ac3c0496a22fd727bb1015e98db3e5a96fd7cfb7a748a1589af3017ef6d. All 27 pages read as text in RAM; pp.11,18,19,20,22,25,26,27 visually checked. Physical page = printed page.

H04: original access and version control of historical critical classes

Controlled October 7, 2026. This limited extension closes original statistics 2006 and specifies which other historical counters still cannot be deduced from the public sources. The actual searches are not proof that the documents have never existed or are not located in another public archive.

Materially closed 2006 and disciplinary outcome 2011

PKS06 is the original 27-page statistics, not the annual report's production table. All 27 pages are text-read in RAM, and the crucial conflict cells and regional annexes are also visually controlled. The original's three common classes of criticism are no criticism 1.648, criticism 567 and request for admissions 2, mention 2.217 without 88 psychiatric appeals. The regional table, on the other hand, has 1.713 / 590 / 2 among 2.305 including psychiatric appeals. All 36 own reading tables / 328 rows can be found in *patient complaints 2006- original -tables.md*(i) the control system; *patient complaints 2006- original control andnamescritic.md*.

H04 must therefore no longer say that the original criticism classes for 2006 are generally missing. Person deduplication, public employment status, criminal prosecution following the requests and actual redress remain missing.

In addition, the entire Folketing official text reproduction of the Disciplinary Board’s 2011 annual report has now been read, 34 pages, SDN11FT. Exact outcomes are 1.721 without criticism, 629 criticism, 86 admonitions and 1 request for prosecution, a total of 2.437 decisions. There are 100 decisions on reopening requests, including 75 dismissed and 5 amended outcomes. The separate 2011 statistics file remains a different document. All historical percentage cells for 2006-2011 and denominator criticism appear in *disciplinarnaevn2011-originale-udfald-og-bevismangler.md*.

Reported publication pages are not rediscovered statistical originals

Year	Actually read publication metadata	Identified download ID	Document control	Meaning
2010	STPK publication page, capture 20190923130030	640FFB81C5BB47889FD1D7F437EFA31B	The current root address and publication relative address on STPK / STPS as well as both STPK archive routes gave 404. GUID searches on STPK / STPS / P to the ombudg / SST found no capture.	The title and the exact old document link are covered; the criticism classes of the statistical report have not been read.
2011	STPK publication page, capture 20190923130539	5BF1AA6B038D4D978C01F2176F75196E	The exact current publication relative download route gave 404; GUID-CDX at the four relevant government domains gave no capture.	Metadata supports the retrieval trail; it is not full reading of the annual statistics. Other annual reports already read remain separate.
2012	STPK publication page, capture 20190923125856	FCCA1474E4CF45B78287FFB178925CF9	The exact current publication relative download route gave 404; GUID-CDX at the four relevant government domains gave no capture.	The same local restriction as 2011. The readable Disciplinary Report 2012 is another source.

Download routes follow the publication pages' actual relative paths ~/media/[ID].ashx. No ID has been invented. A 404 documents the specific procurement attempt, not that the statistical value is zero.

2007-2009 and 2013: public archives

The CDX check used authority domains with matchType=domain, separate checking of all PDF registrations and searching across all MIME types. Title checking was also performed in RAM after URL decoding and lowercase normalisation. This actually found stat_06.pdf, which does not contain the word statistics.

The Patient Complaints Board's PDF registry provided 283 URL registrations; the relevant named statistical files were 2000-2006, with duplicates of the older address versions. The originals 2007-2009 / 2010 were not identified in this register. A 2021 response under the address Annual Report 2007.pdf / was HTML from the later domain, not the original Annual Report PDF; it was omitted. Contemporary 2007 news routes were tried but could not be read due to connection timeouts.

All 964 URL registrations, regardless of MIME and HTTP status, were examined in the patient Ombudden Registry. The relevant 2010 finding was the 21st-page annual report, which has already been read separately in *patient complaint referred to in the 2010- original -target-and-versioner.md*. It shall not count as a recovered original critical statistic. The 2013 statistical report was not identified. The STPK registry containing all 8.349 URL records contained the rediscovered publication pages 2010 / 2011 / 2012, but did not contain these three download originals.

STPS's 6.650 PDF-URL registrations were filtered in RAM for statistics and the relevant older publication years. Five generic 2011/2013/2014 document addresses were retrieved and their title pages checked. They proved to concern medication handling, meningitis, supervision of private treatment, dose dispensing and a service review of the UTH system. They did not contain the requested annual statistics and were not read in full or introduced as new general subject sources. The precise known 2010/2013 publication paths yielded no new originals.

The parliament's already known 2006 / 2007 document - ID490303 / 518897 was tried as indexing and in narrow CDX address prefixes. The index pages could not be opened via the web tool; the archive prefixes gave no capture. The existing ODA registry entries remain release metadata. They are not a basis for reconstructing the missing original number of criticisms.

The Health Service's wide PDF registry trial got connection timeout. It is described as a failure of procurement and must not be rewritten into the fact that the whole SST register is checked without finding. Regional official web search tracks for the concrete statistics provided references to the evaluation 2015 and other known sources, but not new readable statistical originals 2007-2010 / 2013.

2018- 2019: post-registration changes the published class shares

Publication version	Year	None critique%	Critical%	Critics included in Pipe coat e%	Request for % admission	Source locator
Disciplinary Annual Report 2020	2018	85,0	14,0	0,9	0,1	Physical / printed p.12, Section 6.2
Disciplinary Annual Report 2020	2019	82,0	16,0	2,0	0,0	Physical / printed p.12, Section 6.2
STPK in figures, fixed 2023 version	2018	85,0	14,3	0,7	Not shown separately	Physical/printed p.7, graph of disciplinary decisions
STPK in figures, fixed 2023 version	2019	83,2	15,5	1,3	Not shown separately	Physical / printed s.7, same graph

The 2023 version's graph has been checked against the original in this expansion. It shows only three categories and does not give exact counts in these historical category cells. This does not document zero requests for prosecution. The count excludes rejected requests to reopen and includes dental cases taken over from the regions from 1. June 2019. The category percentages have thus already changed in a later fixed public version; the current 2026 display, excluding historically migrated cases, cannot replace a complete original annual series.

Fixed 2023 version, places of treatment;	No criticism%	Critical%	Locator
2018	68,2	31,8	Physical / printed p.8
2019	65,4	34,6	Physical / printed p.8

These shares are also retained, but do not give exact number of criticisms. An integer shall not be calculated by multiplying a rounded percentage by an activity number from another version or case limit.

Accurate residual H04delineation

For 2013,exact treatment-facility figures already exist in Patientombuddet’s 2014 annual report:1.060 without criticism and 466 with criticism among 1.526,i.e.30,5% criticism; physical/printed p.21. These must remain in the annual health series. By contrast, the separate 2014 statistics reproduce 2013 as 37,3% criticism in table 5,p.8. This is a specific version conflict that an as-yet unread original 2013 statistics report may help clarify. It must not say that all 2013 criticism figures are missing. The exact original disciplinary classes and reconciliation of the 2013 statistics version remain specific outstanding items.

The original 2006 statistics have been read and their figures supplied. Original criticism categories for 2007-2010 and 2013 and exact original 2018-2019 counts remain missing from readable annual originals. Publication metadata for 2010-2012 are now more precise, and the exact outcomes in the original 2011 disciplinary annual report have been separately recovered and read. Other originals already read and their later retrospectives are retained with version labels. The historical gap in originals itself must not be described as an absence of all health data for the years concerned.

The necessary next evidence is the identified original statistical files or a documented original annual extract with criticism categories, rejected reopenings, case type, dental-case transfers and denominator reconciliation. Cases and individual decisions must then be linked without creating new patients from the same trajectories. No request to an authority has been sent.

Sources of the specific version matrix

PKS06: Statistical information 2006, p.11-27; total source identity and hash in the 2006 module's source map.

SDN20V: Annual Report 2020, Disciplinary Board of the Health Service, p.12, Section 6.2. Here only the actual original index extract of the key figures section has been checked, not claimed new full reading of all 17 pages.

STPK23V: STPK in figures, updated 2023, p.7-8, concrete RAM PDF text widget. The document is 15 pages; this check reads the two relevant graph / method pages, not all other pages.

The three publication metadata records for 2010-2012 are linked in their respective table rows. The archive-register check can be repeated via Internet Archive's CDX interface with the stated authority domains and delimitations. Registration figures are URL entries in the procurement work, not health statistics or person counts.

Health Disciplinary Board 2011: original outages, resumption and evidence deficiencies;

Checked on 7. October 2026. Source SDN11FT is the Folketing's official HTML reproduction of the complete 34-page *Annual Report 2011 of the Healthcare Disciplinary Board*. The appendix's overall title mentions Patientombuddet and four boards; this specific file concerns the disciplinary board. It must therefore not be described as Patientombuddet's overall annual report or the separate patient-complaint statistics. The entire text reproduction has been read, including rules of procedure and membership composition. The PDF and page images could not be opened in the specific attempts; a graph without figures in the HTML text has therefore not been checked visually. The original text's figures and tables are reproduced with printed-page locators. Public original files have not been saved locally.

Limitation of the original vintage

Information	Number or share	Unit and delimitation	SDN11FT
All new patient complaints	4.893	Received by the Patient Ombudsperson; more types of complaints than treatment	p.8
Increase from 2010	2,6%	The rounded comparison of the original; amended review access is included	p.8
five years of growth	about 1.000 / 23%	Two rounded descriptions; no exact calculation of previous input figures	p.8
New Treatment Cells	3.950	Subset of 4.893	p.8
Of which for Patient Return	1.200	Elected institutional exercise	p.8
Of which to the Disciplinary Board	2.750	Elected personal examination; 1.200 + 2.750 = 3.950	p.8
Complaints of the Disciplinary Board	2.437	2011 marketing year; includes older cases taken over	p.8-9
Cases decided	barely 2.250 / more than 90%	The rounded description of the original; not an exact separate number	p.9
Decisions with criticism, all degrees	716 / 29%	629 + 86 + 1 = 716; 716 / 2.437 = 29,38%, own calculation	p.9, Table 1
Average length of proceedings	12,9 months	Cases decided; not the duration of all pending complaints	p.9
Comparison 2010	12,7 months	The Board's own review	p.9
Expert consultants at end of 2011	322	Staff consultants, uncriticised health professionals	p.11
Case processing team	7	Organisation; plus business team	p.10-11
Management of patient complaints centres	2 Head of Unit and 1 Chief Medical Officer	Not a population of responsible persons in critical cases	p.10

Complaints received and closed complaints cannot be merged into new patients. The figures 4.893, 3.950, 1.200 and 2.750 are interdependent figures. The 2.437 decisions are in a different time frame because older complaints are being finalised. More than 90% of decisions relate to cases taken over; therefore, the year 2011 does not necessarily indicate the date of the original act or injury.

All original critical classes and historical percentage cells

Year	No criticism	Criticism	Criticism with indentation	Request on address travel;	Original total	Limitation
2006	74,3%	23,3%	2,3%	0,1%	100%	Historical retrospective in Table 1, p.9
2007	77,4%	20,7%	1,7%	0,2%	100%	Same; no exact class counters
2008	78,5%	19,5%	1,9%	0,0%	100%	The same; rounded cells summer to 99,9%
2009	78,9%	18,7%	2,5%	0,0%	100%	Same; rounded cells summer to 100,1%
2010	72,2%	24,3%	3,3%	0,2%	100%	Same; published retrospective
2011, percentage	70,6%	25,8%	3,5%	0,0%	100%	Rounding hides an actual indictment request
2011, number	1.721	629	86	1	2.437	Exact number in original Table 1

The 2011 row elaborates the original disciplinary matrix already reproduced in the annual health series. These are the same 2.437 decisions, which must not be counted again. The new fuller text check adds in particular the scope of reopening, evidentiary criticism and specific patient courses. The one request for prosecution also shows why 0,0% must not be rewritten as zero cases. A request to consider prosecution is not a criminal conviction. This annual report lacks identification of the particular criminal case and its later outcome. The historical percentage cells do not permit calculation of exact counts for 2007-2010 from production figures in other reports.

The 2006 series must be read together with the already checked 2006 statistics: the general denominator of 2.217 excludes 88 psychiatric appeals, while the regional table includes 2.305. A percentage glance cannot easily replace this difference. Incorporation is a separate table class here; figures from another publication with a combined criticism class must retain their own classification.

Requests to reopen: five alterations, not a hundred reopened cases

Outcome in 2011	Number	Percentage	Denomination	SDN11FT
Request rejected	75	75%	100 decisions on applications	p.9, Table 2
No criticism changed to criticism	1	1%	Same	p.9, Table 2
Critics changed to no criticism	4	4%	Same	p.9, Table 2
Critics maintained	11	11%	Same	p.9, Table 2
No criticism maintained	9	9%	Same	p.9, Table 2
Total	100	100%	Request decisions	p.9, Table 2
Actual changes, own sum	5	5%	1 + 4; not all reuptake cycles	Calculated by Table 2
Decisions without rejection, own sum	25	25%	1 + 4 + 11 + 9; not 25 new people	Calculated by Table 2
Request decisions 2010	119	-	Historical retrospective	p.9
Rejected 2010	Undisclosed exact	70%	119, rounded part	p.9
No criticism to criticism 2010	Undisclosed exact	2%	119, rounded part	p.9
Criticism to no criticism 2010	Undisclosed exact	6%	119, rounded part	p.9

The title of the table uses the word reuptake, but the main text correctly limits it to decisions on requests. Three quarters were rejected. The statistics document one further criticism decision and four disappearances of criticism. It does not document a hundred correct patient courses or payouts. Overlap with the 2.437 ordinary decisions has not been explained enough to add all hundreds to the production total.

Evidence-sharing may mask processing errors in critical statistics

Conclusion: Criticism statistics are not a complete count of harmful or unlawful treatment acts. The original documents a specific mechanism in which lost medical records prevent review of the treatment itself.

The Authority's concrete statements and original evidence: The annual report p. 15-17 describes 22 decisions concerning the same private specialist. The complainants followed a television broadcast about possible injections without consent. The specialist's lawyer informed us that all the medical records were destroyed after the end of practice at the beginning of 2010. The Board could therefore not assess treatment and information, but criticised the record storage with indentation. One example patient was a 55-year-old woman treated from 1 July 2005 to the end of March 2010.

Discrepancy or deficiency:22 decisions are not 22 verified injections without consent. The annual report reproduces complaints, the lawyer’s explanation and the board’s assessment, but not all original records, injection information or consents. What is precisely documented is that review of treatment was precluded by missing medical records. The private practitioner must not be counted as a public employee either. The public relevance lies in the review system’s ability to establish the facts, examine and respond to citizens’ complaints.

Rule, action and deviation: The Board refers to the amendment from 1 January 2007 to ten years of record-keeping and transfer rules. In the opinion of the Board, the conclusion of practices did not remove the obligation to keep the records. The destruction described weakened both the patient's access to evidence and the Authority's ability to establish treatment responsibilities.

Result significance, responsibility and concrete requirements: A registered criticism of storage cannot replace the investigation of a possible violation of consent and physical integrity. A complete chain of responsibility requires the 22 decisions, possible police notification, supervisory response, preserved prescriptions, settlements and patients' simultaneous information. Where an authority has failed to preserve evidence or to provide information, that independent omission must be examined. No provision may be made for compensation or criminal proceedings alone from the annual report.

Another original section, p.18, describes the Ombudsman’s criticism in 2010 of a longstanding board practice concerning record-keeping. Under its earlier practice, the board could find non-compliance without expressing criticism. The record-keeping duty could not be transferred to a secretary when the healthcare professional remained responsible. This is another specific reason not to interpret “no criticism” as proof of no legal error. The original gives no overall historical denominator for all affected cases; a national under-recording percentage therefore cannot be calculated.

Hospital missing triage records: event, patient and multiple responsibilities

S.19-20 describes a 49-year-old patient with bleeding leg ulcers and blood thinners. A temporary triage schedule was not preserved. A doctor and a nurse provided contradictory information on the message regarding the removal of a bandage. The Board did not find any grounds for criticism of the nurse on the basis of the facts, but criticised a nurse in order not to ensure that the records were kept. The jury considered the triage schedule to be part of the file.

The documented consequence is the loss of simultaneous information and weakened the ability to determine the course of events. The lack of evidence must not be used as positive evidence of proper treatment. The responsibility points of two healthcare professionals tested do not create two patients either. The specific requirement is the safeguarding of original triage information, instructions, record tracks and the full decision, as well as the verification of the actions of the responsible management in relation to conservation. The annual report does not document any subsequent restoration of the patient's injury.

Information, disability and delineated competence of appeal

Progress	Documented in the original	Citizens' consistency and lack of proof	SDN11FT
Two resolutions on non-life	Critics of lack of information; example patients 74 and 59 years of age	Patients affected were not adequately informed; no automatic evidence of wrongfully caused death	p.13-14
44-year-old woman with permanent disability applied for car support	Specialist sought medical records and sent material to the municipality; electronic notices and transmission tested	The original consents, requests and access logs have not been printed; the Court's premise of consent cannot be verified against these documents here.	p.21-22
Fax obtained file in the same case	The Board refused jurisdiction in respect of this part of the procurement;	The definition of competence is not a substantive decision on the legality of the facsimile acquisition.	p.22
Kidney transplant case, patient died 22. July 2005	Appeal decision 28 April 2010; civil proceedings brought 29 October 2011; application received 19 December 2011	Journalist criticism; part of treatment not tested because the responsible doctor was dead; no response at the end of 2011	p.23-24
The Ombudsman's treatment in 2011	The panel does not report any criticism among a non-quantified number of complaints	Not zero complaints and not proof that all the Board's decisions were lawful	p.23

In the disability case, the board relied on the municipality's request as documentation of consent. The annual review does not permit verification of the consent's specific scope or actual access to the patient's information. This local evidential gap does not change other documented criticisms. In the transplant case the patient's death date is outside the 20-year period, but the complaint decision and civil proceedings are within it. Commencing proceedings in 2011 is not a final judgment or information about actual compensation.

Control, punishment and restoration of the complaint

The Rules of Procedure are reproduced on pp. 28-30. Paragraph 3 (2) provided for the possibility of police investigations prior to the processing of the name if there could be a criminal offence. Section 13 distinguishes between degrees of criticism and requests for consideration of charges. Paragraph 14 (3) requires that new material information or material procedural errors be re-examined. These rules do not document general criminal immunity. At the same time, they provide evidence that a final administrative decision does not remove the obligation to handle relevant new information and significant procedural errors.

Page 25 describes sending decisions to the employer and Sundhedsstyrelsen, intensified monitoring and return to ordinary monitoring after 12 months without further decisions involving criticism. This describes the scrutiny system, rather than a quantified number of responses or proof that every risk ceased after a year. Three criticism decisions within five years could lead to publication of a name for two years, and serious or cosmetic-related criticism had separate publication rules, p.7. Neither naming, a formal admonition nor a request for prosecution is the private citizen’s specific punishment for a comparable act. The accountability comparison must distinguish administrative criticism, personnel responses, police investigation, criminal judgment and patient compensation.

The annual report's learning section states that criticism will increase the health care provider's future vigilance. No efficacy study, patient-linked repeat rate or control of actual changes in behaviour are reported in the section. The Authority's expectations cannot therefore be recorded as documented reparation. The reported thematic reports on meningitis and CTG as well as the OBS message on Truxal are dissemination activities; they must not be counted as new patients, new injuries or completed individual redress.

Documentation account

Documented: exact outcome matrix 2011; the six historical percentage years with our own rounding; all five outcomes of reopening requests; average processing time of decided cases; specific record and information errors; limited competence; and the absence at year-end of a final judgment in the civil case described.

Investigative demands: all individual decisions in the 22 specialist cases, supervisory and criminal-case outcomes, the patient’s actual harm, original consents and record trails, and the later judgment and redress in the transplantation case. None of these demands is converted into invented person counts or presumed outcomes.

The source chain is SDN11FT → the original table or case summary → the report's own defined table and analysis. An institution summary documents what the institution published and relied on; it is not the full original patient record or the full judgment. The historical counters, which are still missing from the separate statistics, are preserved as precise remains. The 2011disciplinary matrix is already reproduced in the health year series; this check clarifies its delimitation and the entire published text context.

Psykiatrics: follow-up to waiting, coercion and change of rights

Original control and separate populations

The two final / follow-up notes C121 / 25 and C117 / 25 are now read in full: 13 and six physical PDFs pages respectively. The waiting-time figures and the information table in C121 / 25, physical pages 6, 7 and 9, as well as the mandatory table in C117 / 25, physical page 5, are also visually controlled in memory. The public originals are not stored locally. Law 1762 of 29 December 2025 has been read on both original pages. All page numbers below are physical PDFs pages; the printed page numbers of the notes are one lower.

There are three distinct populations:national quarterly diagnostic assessment courses; a random regionally distributed sample of 75 referral courses; coercive episodes per 100.000 citizens. A patient may have several courses and several interventions. None of these tables provides a national union of children, parents or patients affected by errors.

All printed national values in the waiting figures

Quarter	Diagnostic assessment over 30 days, percentage of courses	Average diagnostic assessment time, days	Original
2023, 4st quarter	67	106	C121 / 25, Figure 1-2, page 6-7
2024, 1st quarter	78	129	Same
2024, 2st quarter	87	142	Same
2024, 3st quarter	88	150	Same
2024, 4st quarter	88	158	Same
2025, 1st quarter	90	160	Same
2025, 2st quarter	91	162	Same

The figures are the printed national values of the figures. The other regional curves do not have an inscribed value for each data point; therefore the height of the curves is not read as exact cells. Underlying regional data must be obtained for a full number cell union. In addition, the note indicates the following precise objectives:

Measurement	Early period	Late period	Unit and delimitation
Valid reason for diagnostic assessment exceeding 30 days	7	5	Percentage of trajectories, 2023K4 versus 2025K2; page 7, § 9
Right to diagnostic assessment complied with overall	40	14	Percentage; includes timely assessment or a valid exception; same locator
Right to diagnostic assessment not complied with, own complement calculation	60	86	100 minus the original 40 / 14; rounded percentages, no exact national number
Region Sjælland's average diagnostic assessment time	48	190	Days, 2023K4 versus 2025K2; page 7, § 10
Increase in share over 30 days, Region Midtjylland	-	4	Percentage designation of the original; page 6; not converted into number of children
Same, Region North Jutland	-	5	Same
Historical differences in diagnostic assessment by social resources	-	Up to 11,8	Days in 2019-2022; page 11, § 21; repetition of previous report, no new victims

Measurement	Early period	Late period	Unit and delimitation
Notified economic boost to psychiatry in 2030 towards 2019	-	4,6	Mia. kr.; page 8, § 13; Ministry's future information, not a documented payment to the families concerned

Version and recording checks: The Capital Region, Zealand and Southern Denmark changed their recording in 2024. The original marks curves through 2024K3 as misleading. No breakdown separates the increase attributable to changed recording from actually longer waits. Figure 1's source note also states data as of **15. September 2024**, although the figure continues to 2025K2. This actually appears in the original image; the date is therefore retained as a specific source discrepancy requiring correction or explanation. Page 5 mentions a more accurate picture after 2024K3, whereas page 10 places the change from and including that quarter. The quarterly boundary must be clarified from the original recording versions.

The 75 progress of follow-up: the entire information table

The referrals are from **September 2024**,and the case-record review is from September 2025. Each region contributes 15 randomly selected processes; this is not a sample weighted by the regions' national patient counts. A year's interval was intended to reduce the risk that assessment was still ongoing. No complete attrition or person-deduplication list is stated. [CPsy25, pages 4 and 9]

Region	Selected courses	Informed about freely extended; Hospital choice	Evaluate bar right denominator	Not documented informed, own diffusers;
Zealand	15	0	15	15
Capital	15	6	11	5
North Jutland	15	11	15	4
South Denmark	15	13	15	2
Central Jutland	15	15	15	0
Total	75	45	71	26

Original table 1, page 9: **72** cases exceeded 30 days because of insufficient capacity and triggered the right to extended free choice of hospital. Three of Hovedstaden's 15 cases were timely. The region could not find one additional information letter: the rights denominator is 72, but the **assessable** information denominator is 71. The missing letter is a separate documentation deficiency, not a proven 27th denial of information. The 26 established deficiencies and the one unresolved case are kept separate.

For the diagnostic assessment plan, the corresponding figures are 72 entitled, one letter not found and 71 correctly informed. **Information about the right to a plan is not in itself evidence of a completed plan or treatment delivered.** Section 17 of the memorandum mentions both elements, while the confirmed follow-up on page 9 describes the information check. For each child, the actual dated plan, its content and the service start are required.

The registration review covered all 75:45 courses from the three regions with earlier registration errors and 30 from the other two. The memorandum found them registered in accordance with the guidance. This is the same sample, not 75+45+30 distinct children. Closure of the registration issue cannot be used as a finding that all 75 rights were fulfilled:the same review found capacity-related breaches of the time limit in 72 and information deficiencies in 26 assessable courses.

Force: the whole new target table

Intervention	Average 2021-2023	2024	Original percentage change
Belt restraint	78	71	−9
Maintenance	81	59	−27
Acute sedatives with compulsion	173	167	−3
Total Episodes	331	297	−10

All values are **episodes per 100.000 citizens**,not raw counts of episodes, patients or unlawful acts. The original's rounding note explains that the components' baseline totals 332,whereas the separately rounded total is 331. The figures therefore do not correct each other. The register version is 14. September 2025; the CPR version is 10. May 2025. [CTv25,page 5,table 1]

Control Point	Latest original status	What status documents
Region Capital / Nordjylland control	Completed August 6, 2021	An audit trail; not all patients concerned stop and repair
New compulsion target	Completed August 29, 2024	The target will be changed to 30% reduction by 2030 of three episodes per year. 100.000 compared to 2021-2023
Closer follow-up, task force and analysis of variation	Three separate points completed on 29 August 2024	Implementation of governance initiatives at the level of documentation of the note
Monitoring model	Closure recommended 20. October 2025	New measurement and published follow-up; not meeting the previous half-life target

The former target concerned halving the proportion of patients subjected to belt restraint in 2014-2020 and reducing overall coercion. The new target has a different baseline, three selected forms of intervention and a population denominator. A reduction of 10 per cent in the new measure is therefore not a documented halving under the old one. The episode table must be linked to board decisions on initiation and duration, specific cessation, individuals and compensation. Closure of oversight does not show this linkage.

Adopted 2026: review of both deadline and transition

Act 1762/2025 amends § 82 b of the Health Act: assessment in a child and adolescent psychiatric department must begin within **one month**,and final assessment and treatment must be offered/started within **two months**,if professionally possible. If this is not possible,a further care plan is required within the same two months. The new § 87,subsection 6,provides access to a contracted hospital if assessment has not started within one month or final assessment/treatment has not started within two. **The enacted text does not contain the bill's special initial capacity condition in § 87,subsection 6.** The original consultation or an earlier ministerial summary must not reinsert it into the law. [PsyL25, § 1, nr. 2 og 5]

The Act entered into force on 1. January 2026. Under the transitional provision,the new assessment and choice rules in § 1,points 1-6,do **not apply to referrals received before entry into force**. The 75 September-2024 processes therefore cannot subsequently be assessed as though they had only the new deadline for final assessment from the outset. Earlier breaches of law are not erased by the later amendment. The remainder of the new Act increases municipal charges for psychiatric patients who have completed treatment:2.404/4.808/7.212/9.616 kroner at the 2025 level,with separate bed-day thresholds. These are incentives between public bodies,not compensation to patients or relatives. [PsyL25, both original pages]

Legal argument and specific resale requirements

Conclusion: Repeated deadline and information deficiencies must be followed through to the child's actual assistance and loss. **Authority's statement:** All regions describe intensified information efforts; the audit recommends closing selected tracks. **Original evidence:** C121/25's 75-case methodology and regional information table, together with C117/25's changed episode/target table. **Discrepancy:** A process improvement or correct registration does not document timely diagnostic assessment, free choice, an actual plan or cessation of an unlawful intervention. **Relevant rule:** The health law applicable at the time of the event, the specific legal authority for intervention and, where the conditions are met, the ECHR's protection of life, integrity, family and remedies. **Act or omission:** Capacity-driven delay and missing information are documented with separate denominators. **Legal departure:** Each right must be examined separately; the authority's organisation does not in itself change the statutory duty. **Significance for the outcome:** Lost access and additional waiting time may lead to losses concerning treatment, schooling, income support and family life. Specific losses require contemporaneous records and dated services; the 162 days are an average, not each family's documented loss. **Responsibility:** The region's chain of action and information, together with the Ministry's separate monitoring duty; personal criminal culpability requires its own examination. **Demand:** A person-linked timeline, basis for the deadline, valid exception, actual plan and treatment, free choice offered/exercised, and independent investigation and reparation of the documented consequences.

Specifically, the still unpublished consequences register must state: receipt of the referral; professionally documented exception to the deadline; every information and plan date; diagnostic assessment and treatment start/end; actual cessation of the intervention; the child's and parents' separately documented losses; complaint, relief, compensation decision and payment. Each data gap is linked to region, case record and period. No request to an authority has been sent.

Patient insurance: supplementary historical register numbers

Controlled October 7, 2026. Source: register analysis dated 9 March 2012,, Table 20, printed / PDF page 46, and Table 6, page 19. Revisions and appeals pending may change the registries; 2011 is provisional before the annual report (page 2). This is the original data version, not a reconstructed annual register.

Year	Medicinal product Notices	Decisions	Recognition r	Published recognition p Rotent	Compensation DKK million	Notifying persons, both damage areas	Notifications personal records; ed
2006	255	321	57	17,8	30,4	4.797	5.097
2007	338	243	61	25,1	32,0	5.237	5.728
2008	312	264	94	35,6	33,0	5.125	5.817
2009	356	404	144	35,6	54,0	5.724	6.664
2010	347	425	106	24,9	51,1	6.678	7.814
2011	379	352	68	19,3	48,0	7.250	8.364

Own method: the decision denominator is actually published and directly usable; annual incoming cases form another population. Not recognised = decisions minus recognitions gives 264/182/170/260/319/284, but the original does not divide this remainder into substantive refusals, rejections or other outcomes. Compensation amounts are stated as compensation, and report pages 5/13 describe payments; award year and bank payment must still be distinguished when comparing with newer award tables. Annual claimants include pharmaceutical cases; they are not recognised injured parties. There is no identity deduplication across years or public/private employment. People and cases must not be added. The 2011 person account’s 8.364 cases differ from treatment claims of 7.993 plus pharmaceutical claims of 379 = 8.372 and the summary’s 8.375; the difference is retained as a population/version discrepancy.

Documented path to the original annual reports

The Folketing's public ODA metadata have been checked using the title words Patientforsikring and årsberetning/rapport and the relations Fil and SagDokument. All documents below have an empty Fil relation. **Subsequently, the official annual originals for 2006-2010 were actually recovered and substantively read through public archive copies of the authority's own download paths.** See patientforsikring-originaler-tid-genopretning-og-versioner.md and the two original table modules. The empty ODA relation remains a local access finding, not a current gap for 2006-2010.

Statistical year i title	Document ID	Collection / selection / annex	Registered date	Status
2006	491418	2006-07 SUU 613	21 June 2007	Annual original 2006 materially read, PFOR06; five regional originals also read
2007	523493	2007-08, 2nd Collection, SUU 434	16 June 2008	Annual original 2007 materially read, PFOR07
2009 but received 2009	563221	2008-09 SUU 555	29 June 2009	2008 annual original found and read separately, PFOR08; this ODA title's relation to 2008 original has not been verified
2009	260712	2009- 10 SUU 399	15 June 2010	Annual original 2009 materially read, PFOR09
2010	207127	2010- 11, 1st Collection, SUU 347	22 June 2011	Annual original 2010 materially read, PFOR10
2011	146810	2011-12 SUU 354	12 June 2012	Original annual report requested
2012	59754	2012-13 SUU 329	4 June 2013	Original annual report requested

ODA lookup can be replaced by the specific document ID for each row. Direct Annex Pages for 2009-2012 did not provide readable original for this check.

Remaining precise data request

To Patienterstatningen: Produce original full-year statistics/annual reviews for 2011-2012 and current revised register extracts separately. The substantively read 2006-2010 annual originals now provide precise treatment denominators, rejection categories and organisational outcomes; they are no longer requested as unread originals. For both injury areas, separately state eligibility decisions, acceptances by rule, substantive refusals, rejections/other closures, decision/notification years, changes following appeal/reopening, unique people by year/period, public/private treatment providers and actual payment years. In the 2012 analysis, table 20 still provides medicinal-product outcomes for 2006-2011 in the explicit analysis version. Outstanding items are the 2011 exact treatment denominator, medicinal products 2012,2011/12 full-year originals, the current common revision and person/payment linkage. The documented 2007/2008 reconsideration groups require separate actual follow-up. To Folketinget's archive: Clarify the title relationship in document 563221 and obtain the 2011/12 originals; metadata alone do not count as reading.

Patientforsikringen: what the 2006-2010 originals document about harm, refusals,time and redress

The historical originals document both serious health damage and deficiencies in the subsequent verification of compensation. The figures show precise decision denominators, public / private hospital groups and various grounds for refusal. They also show why a recognised injury, a changed decision and an actual restored citizen's situation must be kept in separate accounts: financial compensation can follow several years after the damage while a lost body, a child's brain injury or death persists.

This module is accompanied by 77 numerical original tables with 712 factorial rows from five annual reports and 20 regional original tables with 216 factorial rows from the official 2006 statistics. The tables overlap within and across sources. **The 928 series are documentation series, not 928 cases or persons.** All figures are in the two separate table modules. Source maps and direct archives are included in the tables' source lists and moved at the collection to the last bibliography of the report.

Precise decision denominators and locally documented audits

Year of settlement; and publication version	Treatment of Decisions	Recognised	Material ag / compensation conditions; Not achieved	Outside coverage Moat / others refusal classes;	Locator
2006 Annual Report 2006	4444	1482	2515	447 outside	PFOR06, Figure 6, printed 30 / Physical 16
2007, Annual Report 2007, legal classes	4882	1488	2798	596 outside	PFOR07, Figure 7,30 / Physical 16
2007, same publication, coverage areas	4882	1495	Not separate	3387 non-recognised total	PFOR07, Figure 4,27 / Physical 14
2008 Annual Report 2008	4659	1506	2603	550 outside	PFOR08, Figure 8,13 / Physical 7
2009 Annual Report 2009	6676	2298	3572	806 outside	PFOR09, Figure 9,17
2009, revised overview in Annual Report 2010	6733	2379	3547	583 below minimum, 150 obsolete, 74 others	PFOR10, Figure 9,15
2010 Annual Report 2010	7038	2518	3735	510 under minimum, 156 obsolete, 119 others	PFOR10, Figure 9,15

The 2009 revision's 57 additional decisions and 81 additional recognitions must neither be added to the 2009 original nor translated into 81 new individuals. The annual reports describe how reopening, appeal and judicial review can change earlier registrations; the 2010 report also mentions internal quality control. These described mechanisms do not prove the cause of each difference row. The current documentation establishes the revision difference itself.

The 2007 publication, however, contains an internal discrepancy:1495 accepted claims in the coverage matrix versus 1488 in the legal classes. Both figures and the common denominator of 4882 are retained. Neither denominator is changed by our percentage calculation. There is also a classification change from the 2010 publication's retrospective: refusals are divided into compensation conditions, minimum threshold, limitation and other. The earlier class *outside the Act's scope of coverage* therefore cannot be carried forward as an unchanged historical series without source support.

Public hospitals are a defined sub-group

Year and source version	Public: Recognised	Public: erecognised	Public: of done	Private: anerk ended	Private: Recognised	Private: dejor t	Source
2006, five regional originals	1310	2445	3755	53	89	142	PFR06H / M / N / S / Y, section 1-2; own regional funds
2007, annual original	1291	2765	4056	72	121	193	PFOR07, Figure 4,27 / Physical 14
2008, annual original	1232	2469	3701	83	107	190	PFOR08, Figure 5,10 / Physical 6
2009, annual original	1834	3288	5122	219	237	456	PFOR09, Figure 5,13
2010, annual original	1982	3337	5319	258	326	584	PFOR10, Figure 5,13

The public hospital defines the institutional injury location. The figures contain no deduplicated count of employees, patients, children or parents. Medical practices, out-of-hours doctors and private hospitals do not become public employers because the public sector funds compensation. Municipal health schemes appear separately in the originals from 2007: decided/recognised 6/2 in 2007,5/1 in 2008,13/1 in 2009 and 36/2 in 2010.2010 prose's municipal 10% is inconsistent with the same table's 2/36, rounded to 6%.

Healthcare injuries are recognised under different rules. The 2010 original's figure 8 separates 1536 decisions on suboptimal diagnosis/treatment from 7038 total decisions.1178 concern public hospitals,139 private hospitals and 2 municipal health schemes; the remaining areas follow in the reader table. The 2009 original's public group has 1057/5122 under the specialist rule and 632/5122 under the tolerability rule. A rare and serious injury qualifying for compensation does not alone prove negligence; the specific evidence of the medical or administrative act must be retained.

Misuse of practice: five drop-foot cases and radiation treatment

Five patient-compensation cases had been refused under an overly restrictive definition of foot drop. The 2007 annual report, printed page 12/physical page 7, describes Patientforsikringen requiring complete foot drop, whereas appeals-board practice also recognised partial foot drop after hip surgery. Patientforsikringen decided to reopen five cases decided in 2006 and 2007 in which compensation should nevertheless be awarded according to the report. The document thus establishes its own departure from practice and a specific duty to remedy it. It does not document dates of new decisions, actual payment or patients' full financial losses during the wait.

The same review refers to approximately 80% of cases joined, 5% changed cause of injury and 15% changed assessment of basic disease. The number of cases examined does not appear in the section. These percentages cannot be converted into national numbers or added to the five specific reallocations identified.

Appeal-body affirmation did not prevent incorrect application of a rule. The 2008 annual report, printed page 6/physical page 4, first states that appealed cancer-waiting-time decisions had previously been affirmed. Patientforsikringen then acknowledges becoming aware in autumn 2008 that radiotherapy waiting-time rules had been misinterpreted. It decided to review all waiting-time cases and issue new decisions in relevant cases in 2009. The strongest documented criticism is that an actual misunderstanding of a rule persisted within a system where earlier appeal affirmations had been emphasised as grounds not to change practice. Planned reconsideration does not document actual fulfilment of every affected patient's rights.

In the substantively read statistics, management and administration sections of the 2009/2010 annual reports, no reconciliation of this reconsideration was found: numbers of cases reviewed, amended, reimbursed or paid, and actual dates. This is a local follow-up gap, not a reservation about the acknowledged error itself.

The 2007 original provides a specific allocation of responsibility in case 07-0120, printed pages 14-15/physical page 8: referral 7. August 2006, indication for radiotherapy 10. August, treatment 11. October. The hospital notified Sundhedsstyrelsen seven days before the four-week deadline expired; according to the report, the agency did nothing. Patientforsikringen held SST responsible and awarded 10% compensation for permanent impairment for the psychological burden of a 10% worse statistical survival prognosis. This account of the decision describes specific public-authority intervention by omission, a documented health risk and compensation; it is not a full original decision text or criminal judgment.

The status of the case complex 4. April 2008 was 159 reviews, 136 decisions and 18 recognitions with just over 1,5 million DKK awarded. Eight decisions concerned the proceedings of the SST, of which three were recognised. The three are a subgroup, not another three next to 18. This cumulated group overlaps the annual registers.

Waiting time to a decision and to financial redress are different trajectories

Source version and locator	Actual time	End point / delimitation	Measure
PFOR06,34-35 / Physical 18	Approximately 275 days	Year-end average; non-documented annual average	180-200 days incl. material retrieval
PFOR07,34-35 / Physical 18	251 days	Average of the year for decision	180 to 200 days
PFOR07,7/physical 4	6 → 8,5 months	4th quarter 2004 → 4th quarter 2007; second sample	No additional year series derived
PFOR08,4/physical 3	320 days	Annual average 2008	180-200 days referred to
PFOR08,24/physical 13	332 days	From receipt to decision; same publication says second figure above	220 days at end 2009
PFOR09,7 and 30	288 days	Whole 2009	180-200 days in general; 220 days at the end of 2009
PFOR09,7	259 days	1st quarter 2010	Quarterly sample, not 2010 annual average
PFOR10,9 and 23	233 days	All 2010 to the first decision on recognition / refusal	200 days forward
PFOR10,23	202 days	At the end of 2010	180 to 200 days

The 2008 original specifically explains that closing a backlog of old cases increases an average calculated on decided cases. The same average can improve by deciding new cases while old ones remain pending. The report's examination therefore requires decision time, the age of pending cases and the time of actual redress. A fall in the mean for closed cases does not on its own document faster protection for all patients. The 2009 administration section's wording *December 2010* concerning 241 days is also a local date conflict in the 2009 report; it is not changed to December 2009 by guessing.

The amount breakdown after the year of notification shows another part of the progress: in 2010, 18% of the amounts declared relate to notifications from 2010,41% from 2009,24% from 2008,10% from 2007,4% from 2006 and 3% before 2006 (PFOR10, Figure 14,18). These are amounts, not patients' shares. The original explicitly explains that partial payments may be made before the final statement. Thus, 24% of the amounts for 2008 reviews cannot be translated into 24% of patients without compensation until 2010.2009 the original's figure 16 also uses the amounts, while the corresponding text calls 4% a patient share; the recoding is not supported by the figure.

A specific child in the 2007 report, printed page 9/physical page 5, was born with brain damage in 2003 following obstetric care the institution assessed as below specialist standard. The child received a provisional 30% permanent-impairment rating and compensation in 2005; according to the report, final calculation had to await the fifth birthday in August 2008 (05-2129). The case documents different endpoints, rather than five years waiting without any compensation. Another account concerns a woman aged 36 whose motor nerve in the hand was severed during a 2004 operation:15% permanent-impairment compensation in July 2006, continuing lost-earnings compensation during rehabilitation, while final loss-of-earning-capacity calculation was expected after education in summer 2008 (06-0402). Final dates and bank payments are not stated.

The 2008 annual report, printed page 18/physical PDF page 10, describes a child who suffered birth-related oxygen deprivation following inadequate monitoring: brain damage, paralysis of the arms/legs, and loss of visual and eating function;120% permanent impairment and 4,2 million kr. in total compensation. The amount compensates for a financial loss under the scheme's rules. It does not prove that the child's health, the family's life or opportunities for participation have been restored. The annual statistics' compensation total is therefore not an account of disabilities reversed or life-years regained.

Medication injuries, duty to provide information and rejection as time-barred

The 2006-2010 originals now give precise pharmaceutical decisions and reasons. The 2006 original has 51 / 321 recognition; 2007 retrospective 57 / 321.2007 original has 55 / 243, while 2008 retrospective has 61 / 241.2008 has 94 / 264,2009 has 144 / 404 and 2010 has 106 / 425. These audit versions are separate. 2007 broad class of the original; *obsolescence, etc.*66 is not comparable to mere obsolescence with the 2008 publication's 2007 class 34.

The clearly separate limitation counts in the 2008 publication are 34 for 2007 and 22 for 2008;the 2009 original has 25 in 2009,2010's original 15 in 2010.2010's treatment-injury matrix additionally has 156 rejections as time-barred. Medicinal-product and treatment registrations may overlap the same person; the sums are not automatically unique patients. None of the figures establishes on its own which authorised healthcare professional failed to inform a particular patient.

There is, however, a documented systemic line of knowledge. The 2007 pharmaceutical section, printed pp.18-19/physical p.10, states that many contraceptive-pill cases had been reported too late, the health authorities had been informed and information on Lægemiddelstyrelsen's website expanded. The 2008/2009/2010 sections continue to describe patients attributing late reporting to lack of awareness of the scheme, and emphasise healthcare staff's statutory duty to inform and, where necessary, help with reporting. The relevant specific investigation therefore concerns who knew of the injury and information need, what information was provided and whether a failure caused loss of access to compensation. Unrecorded cases are not numerically inferred from the registers.

The scheme excludes or refers to several groups, including some cases without physical injury, cases below minimum amounts, pre-coverage damage and treatment failures to be tested in the treatment scheme rather than the adverse reaction scheme. The 2006 annual report's child and psychiatric reports relate to the period 1996-2006 as a whole; 21 recognised child cases should therefore not be presented as 21 children during the reporting period. At the same time, the 91 alleged determinations of the psych section include two pending cases. The source conflict is maintained in the table module.

Actual source control and precise residue

The 2006 annual report's physical pages 10-18 have been substantively read;they contain pharmaceutical statistics,children/psychiatry,treatment tables and administration. Page 32/physical page 17 has also been checked visually in RAM and confirms 350607186 kr. and the public-sector 315853481 kr. The 2007 report's physical pages 4-5,7-8 and 10-18 have been substantively read;parts of the initial reading of other examples were truncated in the tool display and are not claimed as fully read. 2008 physical pages 3-13,2009 physical pages 5-30 plus 32,and 2010 physical pages 5-24 have been substantively read. The 2009 page 31 was truncated in the first display;the administrative-decisions table is verifiable at 2010 page 23,and no full reading of 2009 page 31 is claimed. Covers,contents lists and some other introductory pages have also been checked;financial-account pages outside these intervals are not claimed as fully read. All four numeric tables in the five regional 2006HTML originals have been read and saved as separate facts.

H01 is substantively complete for 2006-2010 treatment denominators by original version, not for 2011 or medicinal products 2012. H02 is expanded with public/private decision outcomes 2006-2010; a full person count and all later years' organisational delimitations do not follow from this. H03's earlier person series 2006-2011 remains, but new decision and monetary figures do not resolve person deduplication.

There are specific but still unread leads to originals for 2011/2012:ODA document 146810 (*Patient Insurance Association's annual report 2011*,12. June 2012) and 59754 (*annual report 2012*,4. June 2013) still return empty Fil lists in this check. A publicly archived official statistics page from 7. July 2016 has the precise download paths for the 2011 annual report and full-year figures for 2009-2011 and 2010-2012. Domain CDX has been checked with matchType=domain, without a MIME/status filter:2164 URL entries on patientforsikringen.dk and 4406 on patienterstatningen.dk. The old space-containing path for the 2011 annual report and the old path for the 2012 statistics appear only as later redirects. The newer hyphenated paths from the 2016 page have not yielded an actual PDF original in this check. Document titles/links are retrieval leads, not figures read from the source. The 2011 decision denominator is not reconstructed by dividing by a rounded rate of findings in the party's favour.

Reasonable pleas and necessary requirements

The strongest primary ground of appeal is the acknowledged practice error of the radiation waiting period and the five drop-foot cases: the institution knew the wrong legal boundaries and had identified a need for retreatment. The specific requirements for full liability accounts are the date of first knowledge, the list of decisions concerned, the date of resumption, the new outcome, the first and final payment, interest and any remaining losses. Previous accessions do not exempt the specific application of the rules from independent review.

Next, the documented health consequences and specialist deviations: the registers contain recognised avoidable injuries, and concrete courses describe severe disability, organ / functional loss and impaired survival forecast. A replacement decision must be verified in the original medical causality document:

the authority's knowledge and actual intervention. Any criminal act requires independent examination of the offence elements, culpability and responsible person; it is not inferred from the annual register's term *finding in the party's favour*.

Documented errors and source discrepancies are specifically delimited above: incorrect waiting-time interpretation, five foot-drop cases refused too strictly, particular internal statistical inconsistencies and clearly documented revision/classification changes. Hypotheses requiring further evidence concern an unfulfilled information duty in each time-barred individual case, the extent of unreported compensable injuries, whether planned reconsideration actually produced correct payment, and any individual criminal responsibility. None of these hypotheses downplays the errors actually acknowledged.

Patient insurance 2006-2010: original figures by source version and delimitation

The tables complement the later registry versions. Repeated historical years and case groups are overlapping versions. They must not be added together as new patients, injuries or decisions. **-** reproduces an empty tickler that has not been recoded to zero. Treatment and medicinal products are kept separate. Source cards are assembled at the end of this module and shall be moved to the final source list of the report by composition.

PFOR06 -LM-F2 · LM-F2

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed on page 18, physical PDF page 10. Some cases of dental anesthesia are referred to the second scheme. 2006 recognised 51 later revised to 57.

Type of decision	2005 number	2005%	2006 number	2006%
Recognition	81	31	51	16
Before 1 January 1996	4	2	6	2
Not physical injury	72	28	46	14
Not medicinal product	0	0	9	3
Errors or omissions	3	1	2	1
Insufficient severity	58	22	58	18
No causation	15	6	57	18
Miscellaneous	28	11	92	29
Total	261	100	321	100

PFOR06-LM-F3 · LM-F3

Source: Patientforsikringen's annual report 2006, printed page 19, physical PDF page 10. Compensation for pharmaceutical injuries; earlier years are version context.

Year	Kr
2000	4705111
2001	3987282
2002	12396375
2003	16491539
2004	14841065
2005	15867716
2006	30480027
Total	98769115

PFOR06-LM-psychiatry · LM-psychiatry

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed page 20, physical PDF page 11. 1996-2006 TOTAL, not 2006 years.91 includes 2 open; cannot be called 91 actual ended.

Limit 1996-2006	Number
Notifications	144
Outside the drug scheme, refer treatment	53
Remaining, the source calls determined	91
Recognition	12
No causation	29
Insufficient severity	48
Not yet settled	2

PFOR06-LM-children · LM-children

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed on page 22, physical PDF page 12. 1996-2006, not 21 children in 2006-2025. Subgroups overlap the total.

Limit 1996-2006	Number
Notifications children / fostetil 18 years of age	77
Decided	73
Recognised	21
Sabrilex notified	10
Sabrilex recognised	4
Deprakinia notified	5
Deprakinine recognised	4
Isotretinoic anhydride	4
Isotretinoin recognised	0

PFOR06 -LM-top 5 · LM-top 5

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed page 24, physical PDF page 13. 1996-2006. Septanest 93 / Vioxx 86 are reviews; Vioxx 82 determined in prosa. Letigen 55, Prednisolon 50, Sabrilex 46 are referred to as decisions. The column therefore deliberately does not have a common unit of counting.

Medicinal product	Reports or cases decided, according to scope	Recognition
Septanest / Septocain	93	22
Vioxx	86	7
Letigen	55	16
Prednisolone	50	8
Sabrilex	46	24

PFOR06-BH-F2 · BH-F2

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed on page 26, physical PDF page 14. Notifications. Empty historical cells are reproduced as -; they are not rencoded to zero.

Coverage area	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
General practitioners	-	-	-	116	201	226
Public hospitals	2839	3425	3605	4251	4224	4036
Private hospitals	-	-	-	91	139	184
Specialist private practice doctors	-	-	-	128	212	212
Veterinary surgeons	-	-	-	43	63	82
Other	-	-	-	66	121	108
Total	2839	3425	3605	4695	4960	4848

PFOR06-BH-F4 · BH-F4

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed on page 28, physical PDF page 15. Public hospitals. Subsequent regional breakdown applied to historical data; activity denominator is the year 2005.

Region	Notifications 2006	Per 1000 write-offs 2005	Relief 2006	Per 1000 write-offs 2005
Capital	1315	3,61	429	1,17
Central Jutland	833	3,32	308	1,18
North Jutland	377	3,21	118	1,00
Zealand	540	2,95	156	0,85
South Denmark	971	4,0	299	1,27
Total	4036	3,48	1310	1,13

PFOR06-BH-F5 · BH-F5

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed on page 29, physical PDF page 15. 2962 non-recognised cases also include cases outside the scope; see BH-F6.

Special	Decisions	Recognition	Rejection	Recognition rates
Orthopaedic surgery	1754	632	1122	36
Surgery	289	101	188	35
General medicine	220	52	168	24
Anaesthesiology	180	54	126	30
Gynaecology	159	42	117	26
Surgical gastroenterology	157	40	117	25
Neurosurgery	137	61	76	45
Internal medicine	99	28	71	28

Special	Decisions	Recognition	Rejection	Recognition rates
Ophthalmology	104	35	69	34
Oto-rhino-laryngology	113	45	68	40
Urology	85	22	63	26
Obstetrics	76	13	63	17
Thorax surgery	75	20	55	27
Cardiology	73	31	42	42
Reumatology	54	12	42	22
Diagnostic radiology	60	23	37	38
Oncology	43	8	35	19
Plastic surgery	50	15	35	30
Vascular surgery	44	10	34	23
Neurology	34	8	26	24
Pediatrics	25	3	22	12
Psychiatric disorders	21	1	20	5
Dermatovenerology	16	2	14	13
Medical gastroenterology	19	7	12	37
Jaw surgery	15	7	8	47
Nephrology	11	2	9	18
Clinical biochemistry	142	137	5	96
Other	384	71	317	18
Total	4444	1482	2962	33

PFOR06-BH-F6 · BH-F6

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed on page 30, physical PDF page 16. Year of decision; the year of notification is not common cohort.

Type of decision	2005 number	2005%	2006 number	2006%
The speciality bar	849	19	804	18
Failure of apparatus	14	0,3	15	0,3
Alternative method	17	0,4	16	0,4
The rule of proportionality	639	14	499	11
Accidents	8	0,2	9	0,2
Donors and subjects	124	3	139	3,1
Total favourable findings	1651	38	1482	33
Total refusal	2280	52	2515	57
Outside coverage	473	11	447	10,1

Type of decision	2005 number	2005%	2006 number	2006%
Total	4404	100	4444	100

PFOR06-BH-F7 · BH-F7

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed on page 30, physical PDF page 16. Figure is called payouts; text of bread calls the amounts awarded.

Year	Milo DKK
2000	140,6
2001	211,1
2002	213,9
2003	274,4
2004	328,2
2005	404,2
2006	380,0

PFOR06-BH-top-mean · BH-top-mean

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed on page 31, physical PDF page 16. No person counters in this mean value.

Special	Average DKK
Nephrology	707033
Medical lung disease	567251
Thorax surgery	409092
Obstetrics	352414
Reumatology	309925
Internal medicine	306983
Neurosurgery	260861
Cardiology	248132
Pediatrics	226066
Anaesthesiology	198838

PFOR06-BH-top-sum · BH-top-sum

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed on page 31, physical PDF page 16. Ten largest sums; not ten single patients.

Special	Collect DKK
Orthopaedic surgery	126338668
Neurosurgery	36781455
Surgery	23480134

Special	Collect DKK
Obstetrics	21849665
Anaesthesiology	20877985
Thorax surgery	19636430
Gynaecology	18503250
Internal medicine	15656145
Cardiology	13895379
Surgical gastroenterology	9969644

PFOR06-BH-Age-Mean · BH-Age-Mean

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed page 32, physical PDF page 17. Mean age; number of children / patients cannot be deduced.

Age years	Average DKK
0-9	597945
10-19	111608
20-29	101682
30-39	162714
40-49	199328
50-59	146771
60-69	85088
70-79	69150
80+	57088

PFOR06 -BH-cover -kr · BH-cover -kr

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, printed on page 32, physical PDF page 17. Internal source conflict: the sum 350607186 is not Figure 7 s 380,0 million; the table is not redated.

Coverage area	Kr
Public hospitals	315853481
Private hospitals	18657412
Specialist private practice doctors	5753656
General practitioners	3987818
Veterinary surgeons	3415013
Kiropractors	2469080
Ergo physiotherapists	158464
Peas (without pods)	78285
Other	233977

Coverage area	Kr
Total	350607186

PFOR06 administrative decisions · administrative decisions

Source: Patient Insurance annual report 2006, printed page 35, physical PDF page 18. Mixes liability decisions and assessment of compensation.7673 are NOT treatment-injury decisions alone. The 2001 price cell does not match the division.

Year	Administrative expenses	PFL-LMSL-EAL Decisions	Krprfg
2001	27477405	5028	5028
2002	30156157	5698	5292
2003	35786421	6720	5325
2004	39223823	7013	5593
2005	46108962	7746	5952
2006	50344583	7673	6561

PFOR07- - - - - - -

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed page 14, physical PDF page 8. SST3 is subgroup of 18, not 18 + 3. Cumulated case complex 2006-08 overlap annual registers.

Limit to 4 April 2008	Number
Notifications received	159
Decisions taken	136
Recognition	18
Staff case, recipient and final decision	8
Management of claims, recognised	3

PFOR07-LM-F2 · LM-F2

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed on page 18, physical PDF page 10. 2007 original 55 / 243; 2008 retrospective 61 / 241. Obsolescence v.66 is wider than later renobsoles34.

Type of decision	2006 number	2006%	2007 number	2007%
Recognition	57	18	55	23
Before 1 January 1996	5	2	4	2
Not physical injury	47	15	44	18
Not medicinal product	9	3	2	1
Errors / omissions	2	1	-	-
Insufficient severity	58	18	51	21
No causation	52	16	21	9
Obstruction etc.	91	28	66	27
Total	321	100	243	100

PFOR07-LM-F3 · LM-F3

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed on page 19, physical PDF page 10. The total of the source is reproduced without any uniformity.

Year	Kr
2000	4705111
2001	3987282
2002	12396375
2003	16491539
2004	14841065
2005	15867716
2006	30382800
2007	32009204
Total	130681092

PFOR07-LM-Omniscan · LM-Omniscan

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed page 20, physical PDF page 11. Status until 7 May 2008, not completed calendar year 2008. The source's bread text mentions 6 April 2008.28 notifications taken together.

Year	Notifications
2002	1
2003	1
2004	-
2005	-
2006	15
2007	9
2008	2

PFOR07-BH-F2 · BH-F2

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed on page 26, physical PDF page 14. Notifications. 2006 revision 4831 deviates from both 2006 original 4848 and 2008 revision 4861.

Coverage area	2004	2005	2006	2007
General practitioners	116	200	226	320
Public hospitals	4251	4230	4031	4366
Private hospitals	91	134	197	232
Specialist private practice doctors	128	212	206	248
Veterinary surgeons	43	63	83	110
Other	66	121	88	140

Coverage area	2004	2005	2006	2007
Total	4695	4960	4831	5416

PFOR07-BH-F4 · BH-F4

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed on page 27, physical PDF page 14. Empty recognition cells are reproduced -. The source's total 1495 differs from Figure 7 s 1488.

Coverage area	Recognition	Rejection	Total	Recognition rates
General practitioners	47	193	240	20
Ambulance service	-	3	3	0
Ergo physiotherapists	5	20	25	20
Kiropractors	6	21	27	22
Clinical dental technicians	-	5	5	0
Local health services	2	4	6	33
Public hospitals	1291	2765	4056	32
Private hospitals	72	121	193	37
Psychologists	-	1	1	0
Specialist private practice doctors	47	141	188	25
Educational institutions	-	1	1	0
Veterinary surgeons	21	69	90	23
Other	4	43	47	9
Total	1495	3387	4882	30

PFOR07-BH-F5 · BH-F5

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed on page 28, physical PDF page 15. 2004- 2007 OVERALL; specialities with private hospitals only. Empty tickle- preserved.

Special	Publication	Publicity a	General government	Private-determined	Private sector	Private sector
General medicine	33	9	27	1	-	0
Other	310	35	11	20	4	20
Anaesthesiology	714	265	37	18	5	28
Dermatovenerology	17	1	6	2	-	0
Diagnostic radiology	218	86	39	3	-	0
Geriatrics	5	2	40	1	-	0
Gynaecology	672	231	34	4	1	25
Internal medicine	414	128	31	1	1	100
Cardiology	252	124	49	6	5	83
Vascular surgery	186	61	33	6	1	17

Special	Publication	Publicity a	General government	Private-determined	Private sector	Private sector
Surgery	1136	420	37	19	8	42
Surgical gastroenterology	708	200	28	4	2	50
Neurosurgery	547	260	48	27	16	59
Neurology	143	39	27	1	-	0
Ophthalmology	257	88	34	17	4	24
Oncology	231	44	19	2	1	50
Orthopaedic surgery	6239	2446	39	266	124	47
Oto-rhino-laryngology	354	158	45	11	4	36
Plastic surgery	112	28	25	23	7	30
Reumatology	144	34	24	6	3	50
Thorax surgery	281	77	27	6	5	83
Urology	337	111	33	12	3	25
Total	13310	4847	36	456	194	43

PFOR07-BH-F6 · BH-F6

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed on page 29, physical PDF page 15. Orthopaedic surgery 2004-2007 combined; overlap with annual statistics. The number heading of the source is misleading as refusals are included.

Category	Public number	General government	Number of individuals	Private sector
Not optimal treatment	1166	19	61	23
Other recognition	1280	20	63	24
Rejection	3793	61	142	53
Total	6239	100	266	100

PFOR07-BH-F7 · BH-F7

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed on page 30, physical PDF page 16. The rounded percentages of the source version shall be retained.

Type of decision	2006 number	2006%	2007 number	2007%
Not optimal diagnosis / treatment	804	18	884	18
Failure of apparatus	15	0,3	13	0,3
Alternative method	16	0,4	19	0,4
Rare / severe injury	499	11	475	9
Accidents	9	0,2	18	0,4
Donors / Subjects	139	3,1	79	2
Total favourable findings	1482	33	1488	30

Type of decision	2006 number	2006%	2007 number	2007%
Total refusal	2515	57	2798	57
Outside coverage	447	10	596	13
Total	4444	100	4882	100

PFOR07-BH-F8 · BH-F8

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed on page 31, physical PDF page 16. Public hospitals only; 2006 activity year.

Region	Notifications 2007	Per 1000 write-offs 2006	Recognition 2007	Per 1000 write-offs 2006
Capital	1405	3,33	422	1
Central Jutland	962	3,52	275	1
North Jutland	405	3,53	144	1,25
Zealand	572	3,29	159	0,92
South Denmark	1022	3,93	291	1,12
Total	4366	3,5	1291	1,04

PFOR07-BH-F10 · BH-F10

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed page 32, physical PDF page 17. Later source version of 2006; no further payout in addition to the 2006 original.

Coverage area	2005 million	2006 million	2007 million
General practitioners	2	4,1	5,1
Ergo physiotherapists	0,1	0,1	0,6
Kiropractors	0,3	2,5	1,6
Public hospitals	391	345,6	318,1
Private hospitals	6,4	19,2	10,4
Specialist private practice doctors	3,2	5,2	8,4
Veterinary surgeons	1,3	3,4	6,1
Other	0,6	0,2	0,4
Total	404,9	380,3	350,7

PFOR07-BH-F11 · BH-F11

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, printed page 32, physical PDF page 17. Total 2004-2007; no count.

Coverage area	Average DKK
General practitioners	125283
Ergo physiotherapists	35563

Coverage area	Average DKK
Peas (without pods)	94803
Kiropractors	293174
Local health services	56588
Public hospitals	228838
Private hospitals	163330
Specialist private practice doctors	119354
Educational institutions	6558
Veterinary surgeons	228085
Other	84928
Total	222624

PFOR08-BH-F2 · BH-F2

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008, printed page 8, physical PDF page 5. Reviews; 2008 text of bread says 2007 private 228 while table says 232.

Coverage area	2005	2006	2007	2008
Public hospitals	4226	4029	4366	4270
General practitioners	199	229	320	394
Private hospitals	146	196	232	344
Specialist private practice doctors	204	206	248	244
Veterinary surgeons	62	82	110	119
Other	145	119	140	153
Total	4982	4861	5416	5524

PFOR08-BH-F3 · BH-F3

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008, printed page 9, physical PDF page 5. Regional table total 5490 deviates from all reviews 5524; not automatically the same population.

Region	Notifications	Share ratio	Pricing Coefficient%
Capital	1871	34	34
Central Jutland	1176	21	22
North Jutland	569	10	9
Zealand	692	13	14
South Denmark	1182	22	21
Total	5490	100	100

PFOR08-BH-F5 · BH-F5

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008, printed page 10, physical PDF page 6. Rejections include both material refusals and other grounds for rejection.

Coverage area	Recognition	Rejection	Total	Recognition rates
General practitioners	76	236	312	24
Ambulance service	0	4	4	0
Bandages	0	1	1	0
Ergo physiotherapists	3	18	21	14
Peas (without pods)	0	1	1	0
Kiropractors	5	39	44	11
Clinical dental technicians	0	2	2	0
Local health services	1	4	5	20
Public hospitals	1232	2469	3701	33
Private hospitals	83	107	190	44
Radiographs	0	3	3	0
Specialist private practice doctors	63	159	222	28
Veterinary surgeons	38	66	104	37
Other	5	44	49	10
Total	1506	3153	4659	32

PFOR08-BH-F6 · BH-F6

Source: Patient Insurance Association annual report 2008,printed page 11,physical PDF page 6. Distribution of all 4659 decisions. Overlap with the full specialty table.

Specialist group	Partial decision-making
Orthopaedic surgery	32
Surgical gastroenterology	4
Surgery	6
Anaesthesiology	3
General medicine	9
Other	46

PFOR08-BH-F7 · BH-F7

Source: Patientforsikringen's annual review 2008, printed page 12, physical PDF page 7. All treatment specialties; decisions in 2008.

Special	Decided	Recognised	Pct
General medicine	357	102	29
Other	66	10	15

Special	Decided	Recognised	Pct
Anaesthesiology	151	55	36
Children's and young people's sykiatrics	2	1	50
Children's surgery	1	0	0
Dermatovenerology	23	5	22
Diagnostic radiology	79	32	41
Geriatrics	5	0	0
Gynaecology	122	43	35
Hepatology	3	0	0
Haematology	12	3	25
Infection medicine	6	2	33
Internal medicine	96	19	20
Cardiology	49	20	41
Vascular surgery	35	15	43
Surgery	306	104	34
Surgical gastroenterology	206	54	26
Clinical biochemistry	113	100	88
Clinical physiology / nuclear medicine	3	1	33
Jaw surgery	22	4	18
Medical endocrinology	4	1	25
Medical gastroenterology	23	11	48
Medical lung disease	9	2	22
Nephrology	16	4	25
Neurosurgery	145	60	41
Neurology	56	17	30
Obstetrics	87	14	16
Ophthalmology	152	37	24
Oncology	92	25	27
Orthopaedic surgery	1523	528	35
Oto-rhino-laryngology	81	28	35
Pathological anatomy	4	2	50
Plastic surgery	26	4	15
Psychiatric disorders	31	3	10
Pediatrics	20	4	20
Reumatology	38	7	18

Special	Decided	Recognised	Pct
Thorax surgery	71	25	35
Urology	87	18	21
Not available	537	146	27
Total	4659	1506	32

PFOR08-BH-F8 · BH-F8

Source: Patientforsikringen's annual report 2008,printed page 13,physical PDF page 7. The 2007 rounding is more precise than the 2007 original; version marked.

Type of decision	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%
Not optimal diagnosis / treatment	884	18,1	873	18,7
Failure of apparatus	13	0,3	15	0,3
Alternative method	19	0,4	9	0,2
Rare / severe injury	475	9,7	491	10,5
Accidents	18	0,4	14	0,3
Donors / Subjects	79	1,6	104	2,2
Total favourable findings	1488	30,5	1506	32,3
Total refusal	2798	57,3	2603	55,9
Outside coverage	596	12,2	550	11,8
Total	4882	100,0	4659	100,0

PFOR08-BH-F9 · BH-F9

Source: Patientforsikringen's annual review 2008, printed page 13, physical PDF page 7. Distribution of 1506 successful claims; denominator changes relative to decided cases.

Grounds for recognition	Proportion granted relief, per cent
Not optimal diagnosis / treatment	58
Rare / severe injury	33
Others	9

PFOR08-BH-F10 · BH-F10

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008, printed page 14, physical PDF page 8.

Region	Recognition	Counterrecognition rate	Pricing Coefficient%
Capital	377	31	34
Central Jutland	274	22	22
North Jutland	120	10	9
Zealand	159	13	14

Region	Recognition	Counterrecognition rate	Pricing Coefficient%
South Denmark	302	25	21
Total	1232	100	100

PFOR08-BH-F12 · BH-F12

Source: Patient Insurance Association annual report 2008,printed page 15,physical PDF page 8. 2006/2007 revision versions. The source's terminology alternates between awarded/paid.

Coverage area	2006 DKK	2007 DKK	2008 DKK
General practitioners	4108229	5049820	19437898
Ergo physiotherapists	158464	600509	216858
Kiropractors	2469080	1580810	4315214
Local health services	-	82610	21325
Public hospitals	345583307	318690795	373987645
Private hospitals	19090986	10472108	17887223
Specialist private practice doctors	5177169	8612646	12335939
Veterinary surgeons	3415013	6233062	8604543
Other	319356	362514	750640
Total	380321604	351684874	437557285

PFOR08-BH-F13 · BH-F13

Source: Patientforsikringen's annual report 2008,printed page 16,physical PDF page 9. Payment cases 2005-2008 combined; year 2005 falls outside the reporting period.

Coverage area	Average DKK
General practitioners	223699
Ergo physiotherapists	60808
Peas (without pods)	94803
Kiropractors	529328
Local health services	45986
Public hospitals	240612
Private hospitals	213562
Specialist private practice doctors	119680
Educational institutions	6558
Veterinary surgeons	192500
Other	121148
Total	235055

PFOR08-BH-F14 · BH-F14

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008, printed on page 16, physical PDF page 9.

Region	2007 DKK	2008 DKK
Capital	117335478	155965285
Central Jutland	81422704	96561229
North Jutland	37260907	33934202
Zealand	43060337	57066357
South Denmark	72544473	93996602
Ministry	60975	33610
Total	351684874	437557285

PFOR08-BH-F15 · BH-F15

Source: Patient Insurance Association annual report 2008,printed page 17,physical PDF page 9. Amounts paid in 2008 by year of injury; not person counts or processing time.

Year of injury	Share payment rate
Before 2004	13
2004	11
2005	22
2006	32
2007	20
2008	2

PFOR08-LM-F2 · LM-F2

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008, printed page 20, physical PDF page 11. Medicinal products; renobsolescence is now a separate class.

Type of decision	2007 number	2007%	Number 2008	2008%
Recognition	61	25	94	36
Before 1 January 1996	4	2	6	2
Not physical injury	45	19	48	18
Not medicinal product	1	0	3	1
Insufficient severity	46	19	53	20
No causation	22	9	30	11
Limitation	34	14	22	8
Less than DKK 3000	9	4	4	2
Miscellaneous	19	8	4	2
Total	241	100	264	100

PFOR08-LM-F3 · LM-F3

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008, printed on page 21, physical PDF page 11. 2005 revised from 15867716 to 15654823.

Year	Kr
2000	4705111
2001	3987282
2002	12396375
2003	16491539
2004	14841065
2005	15654823
2006	30382800
2007	32009204
2008	32982493
Total	163450692

PFOR08-LM-Omniscan · LM-Omniscan

Source: Patient Insurance Association annual report 2008,printed page 21,physical PDF page 11. 22 patients according to the institution’s specific wording. Not an additional 22 on top of the 2007 status/annual findings in the party’s favour.

Limit to 15 April 2009	Number
Notifications	53
Decided	28
Recognition	22
Refusal	6
Still open	25

PFOR08 administrative decisions · administrative decisions

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008, printed on page 25, physical PDF page 13. Mixed decision production according to three sets of rules, not individuals; 2006 cost audit.

Year	Administrative expenses	PFL-LMSL-EAL Decisions	Krprfg
2004	39223823	7013	5593
2005	46108962	7746	5952
2006	50388035	7673	6566
2007	64947050	7909	8212
2008	68350462	7251	9426

PFOR09-BH-F2 · BH-F2

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed page 10, physical PDF page 10. Others include municipal health care / SST case handling.

Coverage area	2006	2007	2008	2009
Public hospitals	4029	4366	4270	4727
General practitioners	229	320	394	497
Private hospitals	196	232	344	513
Specialist private practice doctors	206	248	244	252
Veterinary surgeons	82	110	119	143
Other	119	140	153	185
Total	4861	5416	5524	6317

PFOR09-BH-F3 · BH-F3

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed page 11, physical PDF page 11. Exclusive municipal healthcare / SSTetc; not the same population as 6317 reviews.

Region	Notifications	Share ratio	Depreciation share 2008 %
Capital	2219	35	33,7
Central Jutland	1269	20	21,6
North Jutland	603	10	9,6
Zealand	820	13	14,5
South Denmark	1365	22	20,6
Total	6276	100	100

PFOR09-BH-F5 · BH-F5

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed on page 13, physical PDF page 13. Small groups of subjects omitted / included others. 2009 revised in 2010 original.

Coverage area	Recognition	Rejection	Total	Recognition rates
General practitioners	102	365	467	22
Ambulance service	3	20	23	13
Ergo physiotherapists	4	27	31	13
Kiropractors	4	29	33	12
Local health services	1	12	13	8
Public hospitals	1834	3288	5122	36
Private hospitals	219	237	456	48
Specialist private practice doctors	79	228	307	26
Veterinary surgeons	41	108	149	28

Coverage area	Recognition	Rejection	Total	Recognition rates
Other	11	64	75	15
Total	2298	4378	6676	34

PFOR09-BH-F6 · BH-F6

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed on page 14, physical PDF page 14. Only specialties with private hospital cases. No full patient sum.

Special	Private-determined	Private sector	Publication	General government
General medicine	2	100,0	6	17
Anaesthesiology	17	29,4	205	30
Diagnostic radiology	5	20,0	114	39
Gynaecology	12	58,3	150	43
Cardiology	5	80,0	91	41
Surgery	19	57,9	308	34
Surgical gastroenterology	12	50,0	196	30
Neurosurgery	37	35,1	179	36
Neurology	1	100,0	79	30
Ophthalmology	2	0,0	67	45
Oncology	4	75,0	95	22
Orthopaedic surgery	256	47,7	1967	38
Oto-rhino-laryngology	13	46,2	134	29
Plastic surgery	27	29,6	34	29
Reumatology	3	66,7	44	23
Thorax surgery	2	100,0	105	26
Urology	7	28,6	121	25

PFOR09-BH-F7 · BH-F7

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed on page 15, physical PDF page 15. Specialist; not all recognitions.

Hospital type	Non-optimal number	All decisions	Pct
Public hospitals	1057	5122	20,6
Private hospitals	87	456	19,1

PFOR09-BH-F7A · BH-F7A

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed on page 15, physical PDF page 15. Rare / serious damage; not automatic error or criminal offence.

Hospital type	Number of meters	All decisions	Pct
Public hospitals	632	5122	12,3
Private hospitals	127	456	27,9

PFOR09-BH-F8 · BH-F8

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed on page 16, physical PDF page 16. Donors have a special lenient criterion; column 96 has in the original footnote 1, not percentage 961.

Special	Recognised	Decided	Pct
General medicine	123	487	25
Anaesthesiology	68	229	30
Occupational medicine	0	1	0
Children's and young people's sykiatrics	0	1	0
Dermatovenerology	9	34	26
Diagnostic radiology	48	122	39
Geriatrics	3	6	50
Gynaecology	76	183	42
Hepatology	1	3	33
Haematology	6	18	33
Infection medicine	4	8	50
Internal medicine	42	166	25
Cardiology	41	96	43
Vascular surgery	19	69	28
Surgery	125	345	36
Surgical gastroenterology	67	213	31
Clinical biochemistry / donors	103	107	96
Clinical physiology / nuclear medicine	0	2	0
Clinical neurophysiology	1	3	33
Jaw surgery	8	21	38
Medical allergology	0	1	0
Medical endocrinology	4	13	31
Medical gastroenterology	12	36	33
Medical lung disease	12	26	46
Nephrology	1	20	5
Neurosurgery	77	216	36
Neurology	28	87	32
Obstetrics	25	153	16

Special	Recognised	Decided	Pct
Ophthalmology	45	116	39
Oncology	24	99	24
Orthopaedic surgery	891	2303	39
Oto-rhino-laryngology	50	178	28
Pathological anatomy	15	20	75
Plastic surgery	25	77	32
Psychiatric disorders	6	50	12
Pediatrics	8	31	26
Reumatology	16	71	23
Thorax surgery	33	108	31
Urology	32	129	25
Not available	239	739	32
Other	11	89	12
Total	2298	6676	34

PFOR09-BH-F9 · BH-F9

Source: Patientforsikringen's annual review 2009, printed page 17, physical PDF page 17. 2009 original; the 2010 retrospective has different figures and rejection classifications.

Type of decision	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%
Not optimal diagnosis / treatment	873	18,7	1334	20,0
Failure of apparatus	15	0,3	18	0,3
Alternative method	9	0,2	14	0,2
Rare / severe injury	491	10,5	812	12,2
Accidents	14	0,3	10	0,1
Donors / Subjects	104	2,2	110	1,6
Total recognition	1506	32,3	2298	34,4
Total refusal	2603	55,9	3572	53,5
Outside coverage	550	11,8	806	12,1
Total	4659	100,0	6676	100,0

PFOR09-BH-F10 · BH-F10

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed page 18, physical PDF page 18. Public hospitals.

Region	Recognition	Share ratio	Depreciation share 2008 %
Capital	604	33	33,7

Region	Recognition	Share ratio	Depreciation share 2008 %
Central Jutland	409	22	21,6
North Jutland	184	10	9,6
Zealand	254	14	14,5
South Denmark	383	21	20,6
Total	1834	100	100

PFOR09-BH-F12 · BH-F12

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed page 20, physical PDF page 20. Allocated / disbursed amounts are source names; patients' bank dates do not follow from the table.

Coverage area	2006 DKK	2007 DKK	2008 DKK	2009 DKK
General practitioners	4108229	5049820	19437898	36664253
Ambulance service	0	0	0	211778
Ergo physiotherapists	158464	600509	216858	960884
Kiropractors	2469080	1580810	4315214	2471072
Local health services	0	82610	21325	23430
Public hospitals	345583307	318690795	373987645	453139901
Private hospitals	19090986	10472108	17887223	39875168
Specialist private practice doctors	5177169	8612646	12335939	23236216
Veterinary surgeons	3415013	6233062	8604543	9768246
Other	319356	362514	750640	2100171
Total	380321604	351684874	437557285	568451119

PFOR09-BH-F13 · BH-F13

Source: Patientforsikringen's annual review 2009, printed page 21, physical PDF page 21. Combined 2006-2009; mean without a person count.

Coverage area	Average DKK
General practitioners	267290
Ambulance service	52945
Ergo physiotherapists	101932
Peas (without pods)	94803
Kiropractors	416776
Local health services	31841
Public hospitals	235090
Private hospitals	200321
Radiographs	44596

Coverage area	Average DKK
Specialist private practice doctors	217755
Personal dentists	16425
Educational institutions	3529
Veterinary surgeons	259487
Other	139709
Total	234211

PFOR09-BH-F14 · BH-F14

Source: Patient Insurance annual report 2009, printed page 22, physical PDF page 22. The Ministry's part concerns SST cancer-case handling.

Region	2007 DKK	2008 DKK	2009 DKK
Ministry	60975	33610	8621
Capital	117335478	155965285	154878765
Central Jutland	81422704	96561229	126677060
North Jutland	37260907	33934202	52350860
Zealand	43060337	57066357	80829408
South Denmark	72544473	93996602	153706405
Total	351684874	437557285	568451119

PFOR09-BH-F15 · BH-F15

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed on page 23, physical PDF page 23. Amount of payment 2009 after time of injury. The text at least 4 years 23% does not match with its own category before 2005 plus 2005; the conflict is preserved.

Year of injury	Amount of shares
Before 2005	23
2005	15
2006	27
2007	23
2008	11
2009	1

PFOR09-BH-F16 · BH-F16

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed on page 24, physical PDF page 24. Amount share is not the proportion of patients. The text calls 4% patients; no personal data supports the decoding.

Year of declaration	Amount of shares
Before 2005	4
2005	9

Year of declaration	Amount of shares
2006	19
2007	32
2008	30
2009	6

PFOR09-LM-F2 · LM-F2

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed on page 27, physical PDF page 27. 2009 source classification; 2010 revision modifies 69 → 71 and 61 → 59 but total 404 consists.

Type of decision	Number 2008	2008%	2009 number	2009%
Recognition	94	36	144	36
Before 1 January 1996	6	2	4	1
Not physical injury	48	18	69	17
Not medicinal product	3	1	2	0
Insufficient severity	53	20	77	19
No causation	30	11	61	15
Limitation	22	8	25	6
Less than DKK 3000	4	2	12	3
Miscellaneous	4	2	10	2
Total	264	100	404	100

PFOR09-LM-F3 · LM-F3

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, printed on page 27, physical PDF page 27. Medicaments without interest.

Year	Kr
2006	30382800
2007	32009204
2008	32982493
2009	53771277

PFOR09-LM-Pandemrix · LM-Pandemrix

Source: Patient Insurance annual report 2009, printed page 28, physical PDF page 28. Time-limited vaccine group; reported/closed overlap with the annual pharmaceutical register.

Limit to 1 May 2010	Number
Persons notified	12
Of these, healthcare employees	6
Decided	1

Limit to 1 May 2010	Number
Refusal	1
Closed at the patient’s request	1

PFOR10-BH-F1 · BH-F1

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed page 11, physical PDF page 11. Notifications; others include SST's proceedings.

Coverage area	2008	2009	2010
General practitioners	394	502	599
Local health services	16	21	41
Public hospitals	4262	4724	5587
Private hospitals	357	514	615
Specialist private practice doctors	238	260	344
Veterinary surgeons	119	143	170
Other	133	155	133
Total	5519	6319	7489

PFOR10-BH-F3 · BH-F3

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 12, physical PDF page 12. Public hospitals including somatic / psychiatry. Activity units, not unique patients.

Region	Notifications	Discharges and outpatient visits	Pr 1000
Capital	1877	3065176	0,61
Zealand	719	1122918	0,64
South Denmark	1272	2132383	0,60
Central Jutland	1196	1893384	0,63
North Jutland	523	737024	0,71
Total	5587	8950885	0,62

PFOR10-BH-F5 · BH-F5

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 13, physical PDF page 13. Small groups of subjects have been omitted / grouped. The municipal text 10% deviates from Table 2 / 36 = 6%.

Coverage area	Recognition	Rejection	Total	Recognition rates
General practitioners	139	379	518	27
Ambulance service	0	21	21	0
Local health services	2	34	36	6
Public hospitals	1982	3337	5319	37

Coverage area	Recognition	Rejection	Total	Recognition rates
Private hospitals	258	326	584	44
Ergo physiotherapists	9	25	34	26
Kiropractors	6	32	38	16
Specialist private practice doctors	71	209	280	25
Veterinary surgeons	47	112	159	30
Other	4	45	49	8
Total	2518	4520	7038	36

PFOR10-BH-F6 · BH-F6

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 14, physical PDF page 14. Ten selected specials. 2009 audit version.

Special	2009 decided	2009%	2010 decided	2010 pct
General medicine	515	26	521	30
Anaesthesiology	252	35	246	29
Gynaecology	183	42	216	38
Internal medicine	178	28	139	27
Surgery	355	38	351	37
Surgical gastroenterology	215	32	235	31
Neurosurgery	243	40	215	47
Obstetrics	153	16	169	25
Ophthalmology	120	39	166	37
Orthopaedic surgery	2378	41	2444	41

PFOR10-BH-F7-off · BH-F7-off

Source: Patient Insurance annual report 2010, printed page 14, physical PDF page 14. Selected public hospital specialties; not a total national hospital sum.

Special	2009 decided	2009%	2010 decided	2010 pct
Anaesthesiology	225	34	217	29
Surgery	317	35	306	37
Neurosurgery	198	40	173	46
Orthopaedic surgery	2035	40	2029	40
Plastic surgery	36	28	23	4

PFOR10-BH-F7-priv · BH-F7-priv

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 14, physical PDF page 14. Selected private hospital specialties.

Special	2009 decided	2009%	2010 decided	2010 pct
Anaesthesiology	18	33	21	33
Surgery	20	60	30	37
Neurosurgery	45	40	41	51
Orthopaedic surgery	264	49	351	45
Plastic surgery	28	32	26	27

PFOR10-BH-F8 · BH-F8

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 15, physical PDF page 15. 41 / 159 is 25,8%, not printed 28%; all original cells are retained.

Coverage area	Non-optimal number	All decisions	Pct
General practitioners	128	518	25
Local health services	2	36	6
Public hospitals	1178	5319	22
Private hospitals	139	584	24
Specialist private practice doctors	40	280	14
Veterinary surgeons	41	159	28
Other	4	142	3
Total	1536	7038	22

PFOR10-BH-F9 · BH-F9

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 15, physical PDF page 15. NEW DEVICE CODING: replaces old outside law coverage / division. 2009 revision may not be added to the 2009 original.

Type of decision	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct
Not optimal diagnosis / treatment	1351	20,1	1536	21,8
Failure of apparatus	17	0,3	31	0,4
Alternative method	16	0,2	12	0,2
Rare / severe injury	822	12,2	776	11,0
Accidents	10	0,1	16	0,2
Donors / Subjects	163	2,4	147	2,1
Total recognition	2379	35,3	2518	35,8
Conditions for compensation not met	3547	52,7	3735	53,1
Compensation less than DKK 10000	583	8,7	510	7,3
Limitation	150	2,2	156	2,2
Other refusals	74	1,1	119	1,7
Total rejection	4354	64,7	4520	64,3

Type of decision	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct
Total decisions	6733	100	7038	100

PFOR10-BH-F10 · BH-F10

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 16, physical PDF page 16. Publicly / psychologically combined; non-personriskdenominator.

Region	Recognition	Discharges and outpatient visits	Pr 1000
Capital	643	3065176	0,21
Zealand	264	1122918	0,24
South Denmark	446	2132383	0,21
Central Jutland	432	1893384	0,23
North Jutland	197	737024	0,27
Total	1982	8950885	0,23

PFOR10-BH-F12 · BH-F12

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 17, physical PDF page 17. Tom's cell is not encoded zero. 2008 / 2009 financial audits.

Coverage area	2008 DKK	2009 DKK	2010 DKK
General practitioners	19081853	36664253	30751049
Ambulance service	-	211778	221403
Local health services	21325	23430	577486
Public hospitals	374304261	448975521	536117556
Ergo physiotherapists	216858	960884	2763028
Peas (without pods)	-	0	44380
Private hospitals	18361911	39953333	50555955
Kiropractors	4315214	2471072	2401537
Specialist private practice doctors	11866686	22948415	22577936
Veterinary surgeons	9094008	9768246	13023892
Other	750640	889717	196360
Total	438012756	562866649	659230582

PFOR10-BH-F13 · BH-F13

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 17, physical PDF page 17. 2008-2010 total. Small groups omitted.

Coverage area	Average DKK
General practitioners	214102

Coverage area	Average DKK
Local health services	103707
Public hospitals	184776
Private hospitals	145745
Specialist private practice doctors	196551
Veterinary surgeons	193249
Other	211546
Total	183560

PFOR10-BH-F14 · BH-F14

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed page 18, physical PDF page 18. Amount share. Many people get part-payment earlier; no one counts for first bank payment.

Year of declaration	Share 2010
Before 2006	3
2006	4
2007	10
2008	24
2009	41
2010	18

PFOR10-BH-F15 · BH-F15

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 18, physical PDF page 18. Same 2009 figure as PFOR09F16; no additional new year population.

Year of declaration	Share 2009
Before 2005	4
2005	9
2006	19
2007	32
2008	30
2009	6

PFOR10-LM-F2 · LM-F2

Source: Patientforsikringen’s annual report 2010, printed page 20, physical PDF page 20. Decisions, not a cohort of received notifications.

Type of decision	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct
Total recognition	144	35,6	106	24,9
Before 1 January 1996	4	1,0	7	1,6

Type of decision	2009 number	2009%	Number 2010	2010 pct
Not physical injury	71	17,6	68	16,0
Not medicinal product	2	0,5	0	0,0
Insufficient severity	77	19,1	138	32,5
No causation	59	14,6	72	16,9
Limitation	25	6,2	15	3,5
Less than DKK 3000	12	3,0	13	3,1
Miscellaneous	10	2,5	6	1,4
Total rejection	260	64,3	319	75,0
Total decisions	404	100	425	100

PFOR10-LM-F3 · LM-F3

Source: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, printed on page 21, physical PDF page 21. The heading mio.kr. over the whole kr. amount; own columns use kr. according to number size / bread text. Outside interest.

Year	Kr
2008	32836255
2009	54039457
2010	51126822

PFOR10-LM-Pandemrix · LM-Pandemrix

Source: Patientforsikringen's annual review 2010, printed page 21, physical PDF page 21. Subgroups 2+2+1=5. No inference of 16 people; the entire group may overlap the 2009 status.

Limit to 20 April 2011	Number
Notifications	19
Decided	16
Recognition	5
Guillain–Barré claims recognised	2
Accepted neuritis claims	2
Hand / wrist recognition	1

PFOR10 administrative decisions · administrative decisions

Source: Patient Insurance annual report 2010, printed page 23, physical PDF page 23. 12505 also includes assessments of compensation. Not 12505 newly injured people.

Year	Administrative expenses	CEL-EAL decisions	Krprfg
2005	46108962	7746	5952
2006	50388035	7673	6566
2007	64947050	7909	8212

Year	Administrative expenses	CEL-EAL decisions	Krprfg
2008	68350462	7251	9426
2009	76332642	11340	6731
2010	86554653	12505	6922

Patient insurance 2006: regional original decision and financial statements

Five regional tables apply the later regional division to decisions from 2005/06. The year 2005 provides comparative context; it is not added to the report period's 2006-2025 figures. Findings in the party's favour/refusals and legal classes are overlapping descriptions of the same decisions. Hospital rows are not unique patients or employees.

Limit 2006	Finding in the party's favour	Rejection / others non-recognition;	Decisions
Public hospitals, total five regions Table 1	1310	2445	3755
Private hospitals, total five regions Table 2	53	89	142
All coverage areas, total five Table 3	1482	2962	4444

Public hospital amounts to DKK 315853481, and all areas total DKK 350607186. These sums match the 2006 annual report's printed page 32. They differ from the same annual report figure 7 s 380,0 mio.kr and from later 2006 registerrevision 380321604 kr. The version difference shall not be interpreted as additional payment.

PFR06H · Section 1: Public hospitals

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006,Capital Region,section 1. Blank cells reproduced as -. All figures retained in the source version.

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
Amager Hospital	20	34	54	9	42	51
Bispebjerg Hospital	26	49	75	30	57	87
Bornholms Hospital	8	13	21	21	27	48
Frederiksberg Hospital	34	41	75	24	34	58
Gentofte Hospital	60	79	139	47	103	150
Glostrup Hospital	48	84	132	40	83	123
Herlev Hospital	48	96	144	42	82	124
Hvidovre Hospital	54	63	117	46	56	102
Municipal Hospital	0	0	0	0	1	1
Montebello	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nordsjællands Hospital in Frederikssund	22	26	48	12	24	36
Hospital of North Zealand in Helsingør	21	25	46	11	21	32
Hospital of North Zealand in Hillerød	32	61	93	25	71	96
Northern Zealand Hospital in Hørsholm	24	25	49	25	12	37

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
Nordsjællands Hospital in Esbederup	0	0	0	0	1	1
The National Hospital	102	198	300	96	179	275
Sct. His Hospital	0	0	0	1	2	3
Total	499	794	1293	429	796	1225

PFR06H · Section 2: General practice, private hospitals and other areas

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006,Capital Region,section 2. Blank cells reproduced as -. All figures retained in the source version.

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
General practice	3	38	41	11	40	51
Ergo and physiotherapists	0	1	1	1	6	7
Peas (without pods)	0	2	2	1	2	3
Kiropractors	0	3	3	1	7	8
Private hospitals	34	26	60	20	38	58
Specialist services	28	66	94	26	64	90
Veterinary surgeons	3	5	8	4	10	14
Other	3	20	23	2	17	19
Total	71	161	232	66	184	250

PFR06H · Section 3: Types of legal decision

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006,Capital Region,section 3. Blank cells reproduced as -. All figures retained in the source version.

Type of decision	2005 number	2005%	2006 number	2006%
Speciality bar (§ 2, paragraph 1, point 1)	268	17,6	243	16,5
Apparatus failure (§ 2, paragraph 1, No 2)	6	0,4	3	0,2
Alternative technique / method (§ 2 (1) (3))	6	0,4	6	0,4
The rule of proportionality (Paragraph 2 (1) (4))	219	14,3	159	10,8
Accidents (§ 3 (2))	4	0,3	3	0,2
Donors, subjects (§ 4 (1))	67	4,4	81	5,5
Total favourable findings	570	37,4	495	33,6
Total refusal	787	51,6	828	56,1
Total outside the scope of the Act	168	11,0	152	10,3
Total number of decisions	1525	-	1475	-

PFR06H · Section 4: Replacement amount

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006,Capital Region,section 4. Blank cells reproduced as -. All figures retained in the source version.

Coverage area	2005 kr	2006 DKK
Public hospitals	114.555.887	102.735.113
General practice	74.750	588.791
Ergo and physiotherapists	0	50.288
Peas (without pods)	0	78.285
Kiropractors	0	347.816
Private hospitals	4.722.726	10.433.853
Specialist services	1.272.556	2.080.444
Veterinary surgeons	75.141	1.123.271
Other	213.579	151.607
Total	120.914.639	117.589.468

PFR06M · Section 1: Public hospitals

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006, Region Midtjylland, section 1. Empty cells reproduced as -. All values retained in the source version.

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
Brædstrup Free Clinic	3	9	12	5	3	8
Region sycatatria	3	5	8	1	5	6
Regional Hospital Brædstrup	2	2	4	1	2	3
Grenaa Regional Hospital	7	15	22	16	11	27
Regional Hospital Herning	38	42	80	19	41	60
Holstebro Regional Hospital	22	41	63	26	39	65
Horsens Regional Hospital	15	36	51	28	41	69
Kjellerup Regional Hospital	5	8	13	5	4	9
Lemvig Regional Hospital	1	2	3	1	0	1
Odder Regional Hospital	4	8	12	1	7	8
Randers Regional Hospital	39	45	84	33	51	84
Ringkøbing Regional Hospital	5	11	16	3	13	16

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
Silkeborg Regional Hospital	24	53	77	21	58	79
Region Hospital Skive	5	7	12	0	8	8
Tarm Regional Hospital	0	3	4	1	1	2
Viborg Regional Hospital	44	45	89	34	46	80
Samsø Regional Hospital	0	1	1	0	0	0
Aarhus University Hospital, Århus Hospital	72	158	230	72	127	199
Aarhus University Hospital, Shekby Hospital	33	53	86	41	50	91
Total	322	544	866	308	507	815

PFR06M · Section 2: General practice, private hospitals and other areas

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006, Region Midtjylland, section 2. Empty cells reproduced as -. All values retained in the source version.

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
General practice	9	29	38	8	23	31
Ergo and physiotherapists	0	0	0	2	2	4
Peas (without pods)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kiropractors	0	7	7	2	6	8
Private hospitals	3	4	7	6	16	22
Specialist services	2	15	17	7	24	31
Veterinary surgeons	5	7	12	6	15	21
Other	1	8	9	0	8	8
Total	20	70	90	31	94	125

PFR06M · Section 3: Types of legal decision

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006, Region Midtjylland, section 3. Empty cells reproduced as -. All values retained in the source version.

Type of decision	2005 number	2005%	2006 number	2006%
Speciality bar (§ 2, paragraph 1, point 1)	179	18,7	184	19,6
Apparatus failure (§ 2, paragraph 1, No 2)	5	0,5	1	0,1
Alternative technique / method (§ 2 (1) (3))	3	0,3	3	0,3
The rule of proportionality (Paragraph 2 (1) (4))	137	14,3	125	13,3

Type of decision	2005 number	2005%	2006 number	2006%
Accidents (§ 3 (2))	1	0,1	3	0,3
Donors, subjects (§ 4 (1))	17	1,8	23	2,5
Total favourable findings	342	35,8	339	36,1
Total refusal	507	53,0	517	55,1
Total outside the scope of the Act	107	11,1	84	8,9
Total number of decisions	956	-	940	-

PFR06M · Section 4: Replacement amount

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006, Region Midtjylland, section 4. Empty cells reproduced as -. All values retained in the source version.

Coverage area	2005 kr	2006 DKK
Public hospitals	75.280.894	70.141.773
General practice	232.850	953.431
Ergo and physiotherapists	0	37.350
Peas (without pods)	0	0
Kiropractors	0	88.459
Private hospitals	309.235	3.303.499
Specialist services	95.675	625.024
Veterinary surgeons	155.070	488.962
Other	116.585	0
Total	76.190.309	75.638.498

PFR06N · Section 1: Public hospitals

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006,North Denmark Region,section 1. Blank cells reproduced as -. All figures retained in the source version.

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 findings in the party's favour	2006 refusal	Total 2006
Aalborg Hospital (Aalborg, Dronningelund, Brovst)	51	83	134	59	119	178
Aalborg Psychiatric Hospital	0	1	1	0	0	0
Drill-slev Psychiatric Hospital	0	0	0	0	1	1
Hospital Vendsyssel (Hjørring, Frederikshavn, Brønderslev and Skagen Arthritis and Back Centre)	25	31	56	17	46	63
Hospital Himmerland (Farsø, Hobro, Terndrup)	7	11	18	11	23	34
Hospital Thymors (Thisted, Nykøbing)	6	24	30	4	21	25

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 findings in the party's favour	2006 refusal	Total 2006
Orthopaedic Surgery Region North Jutland	44	64	108	27	33	60
Total	133	214	347	118	243	361

PFR06N · Section 2: General practice, private hospitals and other areas

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006,North Denmark Region,section 2. Blank cells reproduced as -. All figures retained in the source version.

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
General practice	1	15	16	2	13	15
Ergo and physiotherapists	0	0	0	1	2	3
Peas (without pods)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kiropractors	0	0	0	2	1	3
Private hospitals	3	1	4	4	4	8
Specialist services	5	6	11	5	14	19
Veterinary surgeons	5	6	11	2	4	6
Other	0	3	3	0	1	1
Total	14	31	45	16	39	55

PFR06N · Section 3: Types of legal decision

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006,North Denmark Region,section 3. Blank cells reproduced as -. All figures retained in the source version.

Type of decision	2005 number	2005%	2006 number	2006%
Speciality bar (§ 2, paragraph 1, point 1)	83	21,2	68	16,3
Apparatus failure (§ 2, paragraph 1, No 2)	0	0	1	0,2
Alternative technique / method (§ 2 (1) (3))	0	0	3	0,7
The rule of proportionality (Paragraph 2 (1) (4))	52	13,3	52	12,5
Accidents (§ 3 (2))	0	0	0	0
Donors, subjects (§ 4 (1))	12	3,1	10	2,4
Total favourable findings	147	37,5	134	32,2
Total refusal	197	50,3	251	60,3
Total outside the scope of the Act	48	12,2	31	7,5
Total number of decisions	392	-	416	-

PFR06N · Section 4: Replacement amount

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006,North Denmark Region,section 4. Blank cells reproduced as -. All figures retained in the source version.

Coverage area	2005 kr	2006 DKK
Public hospitals	32.618.356	37.175.090
General practice	0	686.621
Ergo and physiotherapists	0	31.576
Peas (without pods)	0	0
Kiropractors	0	41.720
Private hospitals	457.524	239.095
Specialist services	434.133	1.608.857
Veterinary surgeons	805.040	1.074.075
Other	0	0
Total	34.315.053	40.857.034

PFR06S · Section 1: Public hospitals

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006, Region Sjælland, section 1. Empty cells reproduced as -. All values retained in the source version.

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
Paramedics Hospital	4	6	10	2	7	9
Holbæk Hospital	27	47	74	18	46	64
Former Seby Hospital	1	0	1	0	0	0
Kalundborg Hospital	6	6	12	4	7	11
Køge Hospital	53	62	115	43	57	100
Nakskov Hospital	5	6	11	2	5	7
Nykøbing F Hospital	16	27	43	24	40	64
Former Nykøbing S Hospital	4	1	5	0	1	1
Næstved Hospital	30	47	77	27	53	80
Psychiatric disorders Vordingborg	0	0	0	0	3	3
Ringsted Hospital	10	12	22	4	11	15
Psychiatric disorders Roskilde	0	0	0	0	3	3
Roskilde Hospital	14	49	63	11	35	46
Slagelse Hospital	28	51	79	20	41	61
Vordingborg Health Center	0	0	0	1	0	1
Stege Health Center	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	198	314	512	156	310	466

PFR06S · Section 2: General practice, private hospitals and other areas

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006, Region Sjælland, section 2. Empty cells reproduced as -. All values retained in the source version.

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
General practice	2	20	22	2	27	29
Ergo and physiotherapists	1	0	1	2	2	4
Peas (without pods)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kiropractors	1	2	3	0	2	2
Private hospitals	1	4	5	1	5	6
Specialist services	11	10	21	5	19	24
Veterinary surgeons	0	5	5	0	10	10
Other	2	4	6	1	9	10
Total	18	45	63	11	74	85

PFR06S · Section 3: Types of legal decision

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006, Region Sjælland, section 3. Empty cells reproduced as -. All values retained in the source version.

Type of decision	2005 number	2005%	2006 number	2006%
Speciality bar (§ 2, paragraph 1, point 1)	126	22,0	92	16,7
Apparatus failure (§ 2, paragraph 1, No 2)	1	0,2	2	0,4
Alternative technique / method (§ 2 (1) (3))	3	0,5	0	0
The rule of proportionality (Paragraph 2 (1) (4))	76	13,2	60	10,9
Accidents (§ 3 (2))	1	0,8	0	0
Donors, subjects (§ 4 (1))	9	1,6	13	2,4
Total favourable findings	216	37,6	167	30,3
Total refusal	302	52,5	325	59,0
Total outside the scope of the Act	57	9,9	59	10,7
Total number of decisions	575	-	551	-

PFR06S · Section 4: Amount of compensation

Source: Patientforsikringen Statistics 2006, Region Sjælland, section 4. Empty cells reproduced as -. All values retained in the source version.

Coverage area	2005 kr	2006 DKK
Public hospitals	44.817.471	34.162.328
General practice	48.700	92.593
Ergo and physiotherapists	24.650	26.950

Coverage area	2005 kr	2006 DKK
Peas (without pods)	0	0
Kiropractors	20.000	189.338
Private hospitals	68.524	1.003.058
Specialist services	691.048	667.394
Veterinary surgeons	0	0
Other	135.881	14.500
Total	45.806.274	36.156.161

PFR06Y · Section 1: Public hospitals

Source: Patient Insurance Association Statistics 2006,Region of Southern Denmark,section 1. Empty cells are reproduced as -. All figures are retained in the source version.

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 findings in the party's favour	2006 refusal	Total 2006
Fredericia and Kolding Hospitals	54	74	128	32	56	88
Odense Hospital (incl. Average speed)	117	158	275	88	190	278
Psychiatric Centre West	0	0	0	0	2	2
South West Jutland Hospital (Esbjerg, Brørup, Grindsted)	65	90	155	61	109	170
Hospital Funen (Ringe, Nyborg, Rudkøbing, Ærøskøbing, Svendborg, Faaborg)	29	54	83	37	55	92
Hospital South Jutland (Aabenraa, Haderslev, Sønderborg Tønder)	44	57	101	58	126	184
Vejle og Give Hospitals	26	62	88	23	51	74
Total	335	495	830	299	589	888

PFR06Y · Section 2: General practice, private hospitals and other areas

Source: Patient Insurance Association Statistics 2006,Region of Southern Denmark,section 2. Empty cells are reproduced as -. All figures are retained in the source version.

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
General practice	5	18	23	12	33	45
Ergo and physiotherapists	2	0	2	1	2	3
Peas (without pods)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kiropractors	2	6	8	0	7	7
Private hospitals	18	17	35	22	26	48
Specialist services	7	18	25	9	32	41
Veterinary surgeons	6	8	14	3	13	16

Hospital / area	2005 findings in the party's favour	2005 refusal	Total 2005	2006 relief	2006 refusal	Total 2006
Other	1	18	19	1	13	14
Total	41	85	126	48	126	174

PFR06Y · Section 3: Types of legal decision

Source: Patient Insurance Association Statistics 2006,Region of Southern Denmark,section 3. Empty cells are reproduced as -. All figures are retained in the source version.

Type of decision	2005 number	2005%	2006 number	2006%
Speciality bar (§ 2, paragraph 1, point 1)	193	20,2	217	20,4
Apparatus failure (§ 2, paragraph 1, No 2)	2	0,2	8	0,8
Alternative technique / method (§ 2 (1) (3))	5	0,5	4	0,4
The rule of proportionality (Paragraph 2 (1) (4))	155	16,2	103	9,7
Accidents (§ 3 (2))	2	0,2	3	0,3
Donors, subjects (§ 4 (1))	19	1,6	12	2,4
Total favourable findings	376	39,3	347	32,6
Total refusal	487	51,0	594	56,0
Total outside the scope of the Act	93	9,8	121	11,4
Total number of decisions	956	-	1062	-

PFR06Y · Section 4: Amount of compensation

Source: Patient Insurance Association Statistics 2006,Region of Southern Denmark,section 4. Empty cells are reproduced as -. All figures are retained in the source version.

Coverage area	2005 kr	2006 DKK
Public hospitals	82.690.532	71.639.177
General practice	1.624.044	1.666.382
Ergo and physiotherapists	65.067	12.300
Peas (without pods)	0	0
Kiropractors	255.550	1.801.747
Private hospitals	2.161.431	3.677.907
Specialist services	705.692	771.937
Veterinary surgeons	231.683	728.705
Other	161.050	67.870
Total	87.895.049	80.366.025

Health: known risk, long review and documented oversight failure

Three public originals provide concrete knowledge and responsibility chains. The patient's full clinical dossier has not been published in them. Verification of the Authority's own action and omission must therefore be kept separate from a claim that the initial treatment caused death or other damage.

A father's complaint after the son's death: 1.957 days for a decision

Conclusion: The period of documented proceedings of the Patient Complaints Board was unacceptable and repeated complaints and promises did not ensure timely review. **Concrete statement by the Authority:** The board promised to move the case forward and regretted the wait several times. **Original proof:** FOB09T, the entire Legal Information 10-page PDF, with the opinion of 22 October 2009, j.nr. 2009- 0031- 400. PDF1 is the printed cover; printed s.1-9 corresponds to PDF2-10. All pages are text read in RAM. The dates in the chronology are checked and the following days are their own calendar differences.

Event or interval	Date or time	Meaning	FOB09T
Son died.	23 June 2003	Historical event prior to the reporting period; subsequent review extends into the period	printed 3 / PDF4
Admissions	8 in just over 2 years	Clinical background; no eight documented regulatory errors	printed 1 / PDF2
Letter of complaint from the father	12 January 2004	Date of letter, not date of receipt by the Board	printed 1 / PDF2
Complaint received	23 January 2004	Start of the full administrative time account	printed 1 / PDF2
Accepted for treatment	19 April 2004	Later administrative start point	printed 1 / PDF2
Calculated average by assumption	8 months	Notice of the Board, not actual compliance	printed 1 / 8, PDF2 / 9
Preview returned	27 April 2005	Approximately one year at the medical officer institution	printed 1 / PDF2
Telephonic view of response before Christmas	2 September 2005	Reported simultaneous information by the father	printed 2 / PDF3
First express regret	18 April 2006	The Director's promise of promotion	printed 2 / 6, PDF3 / 7
Renewal of undertaking	24. May 2006	No safe time frame	printed 2 / 6, PDF3 / 7
First proposal for a decision for consultation	18 September 2006	Process step, not final decision	printed 2 / PDF3
Revised proposal for consultation	16 March 2007	The same procedure	printed 2 / PDF3
Meeting of the panel	19 November 2007	The meeting did not end the citizen's waiting time	printed 2 / 7, PDF3 / 8
Third proposal for consultation	23 November 2007	Renewed hearing after the meeting	printed 2 / PDF3
Father's speech	30 January 2008 / 20 April 2008	Corrected and supplemented information	printed 2 / PDF3
Expert opinion	28 June 2008	Received at month shift June / July; later liability period	printed 2 / 6, PDF3 / 7
Complaint to the Ombudsman	2 January 2009	Received from the Ombudsman on 5 January	printed 2 / PDF3
The Ombudsman's inquiry initiated	11. May 2009	Separate control tracks	printed 3 / PDF4
Patient-complaint decision sent	2 June 2009	No basis of criticism on the basis of the Board's assessment	printed 3 / PDF4
Ombudsman's opinion	22. October 2009	Critifies time and notification; does not test the material outcome of treatment	printed 1 / 3 / 7-9

Event or interval	Date or time	Meaning	FOB09T
Receipt → Decision	1.957 days	The entire process of complaint, start before 2006 and end before the period	Own calculation
Acceptance → Decision	1.870 days	Display of alternative start point	Own calculation
Conference → decision	561 days	The result was more than 1 ½ years after the meeting.	Own calculation
First regret → decision	1.141 days	Commitment without timely completion	Own calculation
Study → patient evaluation	22 days	Sequence; not proof of the entire reason for the timing of the decision	Own calculation
Ombudsman complaint → out of court	293 days	Controlling time, no additional clinical treatment or intervention time	Own calculation
Regrets	4	18 April 2006,7 April 2008,2 and 8 January 2009	printed 6 / PDF7
Returns of case handlers	4	Three shifts; the Ombudsman points out that shifts can also be a consequence of a long time	printed 5 / PDF6
Reporter's reply	3 to 7 days	Not criticised at response speed; the adequacy of content not studied	printed 7 / PDF8
Notification in case of delay	at least every 3 months by its own system;	The system was not followed during the test	printed 8 / PDF9

Discrepancy or deficiency: A prompt reply to a reminder is not a timely decision on the merits. Nor is a board meeting the point at which the individual's appeal is reviewed through a notified decision. The Ombudsman criticised the total time of almost 5½ years as extraordinarily criticisable, even allowing for the specifically acknowledged complexity. He did not examine substantive correctness or every investigative step. This precise limitation does not negate the separate findings on time and notification.

Relevant rule, conduct and departure: The opinion applies good administrative practice and paragraphs 206-208 of the Ministry of Justice's guidance on the Public Administration Act. Under the Ombudsman practice reproduced, general resource shortages or more cases cannot extend the objectively acceptable time. The historical benchmarks of approximately half a year for uncomplicated cases and approximately 1 year for more complicated cases are assessments from an earlier specific investigation, rather than general statutory deadlines for all healthcare cases. The board's specific conduct comprised lengthy waiting, more than half a year of inactivity and missing notifications during periods when the already adopted procedure required notice.

Significance for the outcome, responsibility and demands: The father received the formal patient-complaint decision only almost six years after his son's death. This is lost review time in a serious family case, not documentation of six years of continuing physical harm to the son. The director's promises and earlier information procedures document knowledge of the problem. The demand is to follow every identified promise and oversight finding through to actual changed handling, a decision and individual reparation. Compensation, personal criminal culpability and a connection between treatment and death are not determined in this opinion.

The original also contains earlier criticism of delay from 24. October 2006 involving 34 months' processing, case no. 2006-0697-423, and a general investigation of 60 cases from 2001/2002. Those 60 represent historical knowledge predating the period and must not be added as new cases to the 20-year accounting. In December 2006, the notification procedure was reinforced, and on 28. March 2007 the Ombudsman closed that follow-up. The later 2009 case showed another failure. Completed follow-up and a staff instruction had therefore not documented that the same protective procedural step was actually performed in that subsequent case. [FOB09T,printed4,8-9/PDF5,9-10]

The supervision of a specialist: acknowledged downgrading and lack of journalism

Conclusion: The Danish Health Authority's own account documents lack of progress and inadequate registration of concerns raised in a known patient-safety course. **Authority's specific statement and original evidence:** SSTAM13 is the account of 7. May 2013, case no.5-441-554/1, sent to the Danish Parliament. The entire official HTML text and PDF text reproduction have been read,8 pages. Page images could not be opened; no visual check is claimed. The account reproduces the authority's own case information, not all original patient records or internal messages.

Item	Number / date	Limitation and meaning	SSTAM13
Historical appeal	4 patient cycles in 2001	Before the period; known history, not new 2006-2025 events	p.3
Previous complaints until approximately 2008	6 cases, 5 of which without criticism and 1 statement criticism	Not documented that all came in after 2006; overlap with other events unknown	p.3
Communications raising concerns	From 2006; number not disclosed	Psychiatrists' communications about possible overdiagnosis/overtreatment; individual notes required	p.3
Forensic coroner	2008	The specific patient 's treatment triggered further control; cause of death not established here	p.3-4
Reporting to the Board	2 June 2009	Same coroner's programme	p.4
Additional health records	11	Study take-offs; not 11 new documented injuries	p.4
Record information received	28 April 2010	Actual case material received	p.4
Criticism in the original course	14 December 2010	Post-notification criticism by the Patient Complaints Board	p.4
Decision on further reporting	20 September 2011	7 of 11 to the Board, 4 not forwarded	p.4
Intended meeting	Never called	A technical meeting was not held.	p.4
Actual reporting	29 February 2012	7 courses of treatment transmitted	p.4
Critics with indentation	7 of 7,25-26 September 2012	Subgroup of 11; no further 7 patients	p.4
Consultation of injunctions	7 November 2012	Separate supervisory response after list criticism	p.4
Deferral requested	19 November 2012	Not date of the order	p.4
Comments received	3 December 2012	Consultation	p.4
Professional injunction	10 December 2012	Supervisory reaction; not compensation or punishment	p.4 / 8
New psychiatrist report	19 February 2013	New information; not self-proven damage	p.4
Records requested for follow-up	22 April 2013	Information requirements; undocumented final follow-up	p.4 / 8
Less-priority period, the original words	Autumn 2010 → February 2012, "20 months'	Calendar and number of votes not immediately; exact start date missing	p.7
Meetings of supervisory groups	Every 14 days	Designated new scheme; unmeasured effect in all cases	p.5 / 8
Normal demand follow-up	3 to 6 months	Process description by the Management Board; not an exact national time series	p.8
Announced inspections of treatment sites	Every 3 years	Encouraged scheme after 2012 legislation	p.7-8

Item	Number / date	Limitation and meaning	SSTAM13
Enhanced post-2006 supervision	About 10-15 annually	Rounded historical activity description; not exact annual rows	p.5
Consignment of approval in case of danger	About 2-3 a year	Same time limit	p.5
Temporary limitation	About 2-3 a year	Same; possible person overlap unknown	p.5
Professional supervision	About 800 a year	Cases, not unique risk persons	p.6
Report requested in 2008	60 health professionals	The original calls the Board of Disciplinary Board in 2008, even if it is only created 2011; defects in designation are preserved	p.6
Report requested in 2011	About 150 health professionals	Rounded, possible overlap with other controls	p.6
Conversation call	About 30 annually	Process description, non-strapantal	p.6
Expected new licensing measure	10-20 annually from 1 July 2013;	Forecast of absence of supervisory involvement, non-effective waivers	p.6

Discrepancy or deficiency: Four of 11 treatment courses were not referred to the board because the agency considered there were no grounds for criticism. This is a known excluded population; it must neither disappear from the investigation account nor be counted as four documented breaches of law. Seven formal admonitions fall within the 11, and the original post-mortem examination case is described as preceding the additional 11. An account of cases can retain these elements; a total of 12 individuals requires identities actually to be distinct. The relative's pre-period complaint and the six earlier complaints have further unknown overlap.

There is a concrete time conflict in the original: the period from autumn 2010 to February 2012 is called 20 months. This number shall not be used as an exact interval without control. The dated steps provide a more verifiable chain: reception 28 April 2010, criticism 14 December 2010, decision 20 September 2011 and transmission 29 February 2012. The dates require the original records to explain when the case was actually downgraded. The acknowledged lack of momentum is not denied by the inconsistent duration indication.

Relevant rule, conduct and legal departure: The agency describes powers of intensified oversight from 2006, temporary restriction of professional activity from 2007 and professional orders based on its own investigations from 2011. The latter change removed the requirement for a prior criticism decision for that particular response avenue. Historical legal authorities must be checked in their own statutory versions before determining which specific response should have been chosen at each point. The documented failures comprise a meeting not held, acknowledged lack of prioritisation and file notes from which the healthcare professionals concerned could not be identified. The agency also acknowledges that a case was overlooked in access to documents after 4. January 2013 and only included after the journalist's objection.

Significance for outcomes: Concern information that cannot be linked to the correct healthcare professional weakens the linking of warnings and detection of recurrence. An overlooked case weakens public scrutiny of what the authority knew. A meeting that did not take place and postponed forwarding delay the response to known problems. Specific subsequent harm and the number of patients exposed during the delay cannot be calculated from the statement. The agency's assertion that new meeting arrangements ensured prompt and effective follow-up supplies no comparable impact measurement and cannot close this element of consequences.

Responsibility and specific demand: Public accountability assessment must concern the agency's employees, management and documented duties. The specialist's employment status cannot be inferred as public from the oversight statement. Demand the original concern memoranda, case-allocation/prioritisation decisions, meeting decision and subsequent record trail, the 11 patient files, all seven board decisions and complete follow-up outcome of the order. Examine whether the responsible authority promptly used its specific protective powers after receiving sufficient knowledge. For a documented risk to life or of serious harm, the relevant ECHR2/3 duty must be applied separately. The statement alone establishes neither a Convention violation for every patient, a criminal conviction of public employees nor a specific compensation amount.

The same legal liability: the hospital doctor was exempted following an unlawful practice

Conclusion: There was a documented administrative liability exemption for a particular hospital practice which lacked legal basis. It must not be excluded as the general use of secretarial assistance, nor must it be extended to a general immunity of all public servants.

The Authority's concrete statements and original evidence: FOB10J is the Ombudsman's full original opinion 2010-4-4,25 October 2010, cf. point 2008-2276-420. All 13PDFpages are read in memory; PDF1 is printed in front and printed 1-12 corresponds to PDF2-13. A specific patient had complained about a poor record in a 2005 / 2006 course of treatment. The committee had not held the hospital doctor responsible because a secretary introduced the dictates. The Board informed 15 September 2009 that it was a long established practice based on a significant number of decisions. The National Health Service and the Ministry had known and accepted it. [FOB10J, print1,6-7 / PDF2,7-8]

Non-conformity or deficiency: The law did not distinguish in the relevant responsibility between a hospital doctor and a doctor in its own practice. The technical writing could be carried out by a secretary, but this did not change the legal record of the doctor responsible. The Ombudsman's conclusion describes 20 years of government acceptance of illegal practices. This is the duration of the described practice concept, not a count of 20 years of unique patients or 20 years within 2006-2025. Not available. [FOB10J, print9-12 / PDF10-13]

Relevant rule: Before 2007, section 13 of the Medical Practitioners Act and Executive Order 846/2003, especially sections 4,8,18-19; thereafter chapter 6 of the Authorisation Act and Executive Order 1373/2006. The reproduced rules require record-keeping, source/time identification and retention. Section 25, subsection 2, of the reproduced Authorisation Act requires retention of records relevant to a complaint, supervisory or compensation case while it remains pending. The documented statutory text is historical and must not be presented as an unchanged current rule without checking subsequent amendments. [FOB10J,printed2-5/PDF3-6]

Action and legal deviation: The supervisory body applied a practice which exempted the hospital doctor from a statutory liability on a basis which the law did not allow. The Ombudsman called for amendment and informed the Parliament's Committee on Legal Affairs and the Health Committee in accordance with Section 24 of the Ombudsman's Act on maladministration of major importance. The repetition of this practice by a later authority was not an independent evidence of legality. [FOB10J, print12 / PDF13]

Significance for the outcome: Missing records affect a necessary tool for treatment, information and later review. When the Board also fails to attribute statutory responsibility, patients' access to having that very deficiency established and explained is weakened. A quality plan, new electronic system or accreditation project is a possible future action; the original does not present a patient-linked account of reconsidered decisions or remedied losses. [FOB10J,printed8,10-12/PDF9,11-13]

Responsibilities and specific requirements: Demand identification of the decisions that used the illegal exemption from liability, full patient records and simultaneous dictatorship / control tracks, the reasons of the Board, the Ministry and the Board's knowledge dates, as well as subsequent changes and individual retreatments. Try the doctor's specific legal obligation, the hospital management framework and the Board's own actions separately. Management responsibilities do not replace personal record responsibilities. What criminal guilt, compensation or professional response is justified requires each original case and its proper historical rule. There is no individual sentence in this Ombudsman's opinion.

Comparison with private individuals: This is a particularly precise public / private comparison because the Ombudsman tries the same record rule for hospital doctors and practitioners. The proven difference was in the administrative practice of the Authority and not in a lawful general exception for public employment. The opinion does not document the actual fine imposed on a private doctor for the same incident. Such a punishment must not be constructed by equating criticism with a judgment.

At the same time, the Ombudsman maintained a specific legal demarcation: legal liability did not necessarily mean that the doctor was required to have full control and signature of all secretarial services on a case by case basis. This correction of the scope of the obligation to carry out checks did not remove the responsibility for records and was explicitly kept separate from the unlawful exemption from liability. Thus the report can conduct the documented criticism without making the requirement wider than the test rule. [FOB10J, print10-11 / PDF11-12]

In the event of an established illegality, the Ombudsman requested at least notification of the responsibility of the doctor; he accepted that, in the circumstances, a specific illegality could be registered without disciplinary criticism. It proves,

that the class of criticism and legality of statistics are different variables. This does not mean that the lack disappears or that any lack of criticism is wrong. In the overall accounts, a finding of illegality must have its own registration without criticism. [FOB10J, print12 / PDF13]

Evidence and priority action

Documented errors include the very long period of patient complaints, poor notification, the non-completed meeting, recognised downgrading, unidentifiable concern notes and a missed access case. Hypotheses about cause of death, intent, number of victims later or a common personal union require additional primary material. No administrative regret, restriction or set up meeting group is registered here as actual repair for patients or relatives.

The strongest demands, in order, are:secure contemporaneous evidence; identify the authority's specific knowledge and powers; examine omitted action and continuing risk; secure current rights; and document individual consequences, redress and responsibility. The source chain for criticism of delay is FOB09T→dated case chronology→own calendar difference. The source chain for criticism of supervision is SSTAM13→the agency's specific acknowledgment/decision information→the requested original notes and patient records. A later account of the same chain gives neither new independent evidence nor new persons.

Patient compensation: reopening, time limits and compensation interest

Primary controlled October 7, 2026. Own legal analysis is separate from short source maps. Figures relate to decisions / cases, not necessarily unique people.

1. Refusal after modified obsolescence practices and statutory reassessment

Source card L126, 2013-14: Original explanatory notes to the bill,PDF pages 11, 33, 41 and 61-62(printed 10, 32, 40 and 60-61),sections 1.2.4, 2.4, 4 and the notes to§4. Patientforsikringen changed practice in June 2011,the appeal boards in June 2012. Estimated refusals to reopen: approximately 50 in Patientforsikringen, a little over 25-30 in the Patient Injury Appeals Board and 2-3 in the Drug Injury Appeals Board. Appeal outcomes include both upheld refusals and refusals first introduced by the appeal board. Public and private hospitals are included. The notes envisage contact on the authority's own initiative with affected people following a retroactive change; people who had refrained from applying are also covered.

Source card for enacted legislation: Act no. 519 of 26. May 2014, section 2, no. 10, and section 4, subsections 1 and 6-9, PDF pages 3-4. New section 60 b: a 3-year relative limitation period from binding acceptance/assessment of compensation, possible suspension where the claimant lacks knowledge, an absolute period of 10 years after the decision and 30 years after the injury/dispensing of the medicinal product. From 1. July 2014 the amendment also applies to claims already rejected as time-barred under the transitional conditions; an additional period expires no earlier than 1. July 2015. Older patient-insurance decisions have a 5-year relative period under the transitional rule. The Act does not apply directly to the Faroe Islands/Greenland, cf. section 5.

Own conclusion → proof → meaning → rule → action → deviation → consequence → responsibility → requirements: The material shall document a limited group which lost re-admission after the change of practice and a adopted retroactive re-examination. Some 50, 25-30 and 2-3 of the notes are not the three independent groups of a person: first-time and appeal cases may be the same. A correction actually implemented requires contact, reassessment and any payment in each case; the legislative adoption alone does not document any of these events. The claim to the Patienterstatningen / STPK is a common case register with original refusal, date of contact, resumption, decision and payment, and result. It has not been demonstrated here that all the original refusals were illegal under the applicable law; evidence is the change in practice, the loss of rights and the legal reopening option.

2. Understated interest practice: the specific patient

Judgment source card: Supreme Court, BS-1564/2020-HJR, 4. December 2020,pages 10-13,reasons/result. A reported a medicinal-product injury on 11. April 2013; recognition on 8. January 2015; lost earnings of 1.057.718 kr. awarded on 26. August 2015,with interest from 9. April 2015. The Appeals Board upheld the decision on 11. May 2016. The Supreme Court brought forward the start of interest for the first loss period to 23. June 2013 and ordered the Board to pay 50.000 kr. in legal costs. The Act did not require two stages or preclude earlier information on the amount of compensation. The authority could choose two stages, but that choice did not postpone the interest time limit. Patient Compensation itself had a duty to obtain necessary information, see KEL §§ 55/33 and 58 and EAL § 16.

Own recognition of the dates of the judgment	Days	What time actually measures
Notification → recognition	637	Administrative recognition process
Notification → amount decision	867	Time for award, undocumented bank payment
Review → Judgment of the Supreme Court	2.794	Overall course of final interest rate review
Interest date forward from 9 April 2015 to 23 June 2013	655	Additional interest-bearing periods for the relevant item, not the entire duration of the compensation

Own conclusion → proof → meaning → rule → action → deviation → consequence → responsibility → requirements: The economic consequence of the decision was too little interest for the relevant period. The actual departure from the home was not the choice of two steps in itself, but to make the interest rate dependent on subsequent administrative collection, even if necessary information could be obtained earlier. The judgment shall determine the material interest rate correction. The 637 / 867 / 2.794 days document the course; the judgment does not simply classify the entire time as unlawful delay. In fact, further payment to A, tax and recovery period after the judgment requires payment material. An employment or criminal liability claim against a particular employee requires further concrete evidence.

3. Documented system follow-up, with versions preserved

Original	Short source map	Locator
Annual Report 2020	The overturned practice had been used since 2001. Almost 16.000 decisions in 8.744 cases were to be reopened; estimated additional awards of 40-45 million kr. Compensation decision-making paused during 4. December 2020-14. January 2021; recalculations began on 12. April 2021.	PDF 7-8 and 14, printed 6-7 and 13
Annual Report 2021	The same almost 16.000 decisions/8.744 cases. Recalculation took 5 % of case-handling resources; additional resources allocated in 2022. Approximately 35 million kr. in further interest expected.	PDF 8, printed 7
Annual Report 2022	Almost 16.000 decisions were dealt with in 8.785 cases. Recalculations April 2021-December 2022. approx. DKK 55 million further paid to patients; approx. DKK 7 million administrative costs.	PDF 7 and 13, printed 6 and 12
Annual Report 2025	About 8.600 cases of recalculation. PDF 12 dates the judgment at the end of 2022, but PDF 13 identifies the judgment on December 4, 2020.	PDF 12-13, printed 11-12

Own method and impact assessment: These are versions of the same correction process, not 8.744 + 8.785 + 8.600 people. More than one decision / post may belong to the same cause; different cases may belong to the same person. 2020 / 2021 amounts are expectations; the 2022 amount is described as actually further paid, but does not document each individual payment or distribution. The internal conflict of judgments of 2025 must not become a fictional second judgment. 41 days between stop / restart is own date calculation; the source documents institutional break, not that each patient was delayed exactly 41 days. About 20 months of recalculation is also not each person's waiting time. Request case / person breakdown, contacts, closing dates, gross / net correction, change in principal and actual payment date. The crucial documented system point is an unrecognised practice of financial consequence and later mass recovery / payment; the remaining defect is the actual recovery process of the citizens.

4. Subsequent pension scheme changes the legal comparison

Act no. 909 of 21. June 2022,§ 1,no. 3,and §§ 2-3:KEL §§ 24 b-24 c introduced from 1. July 2022. If payment is later than 5 weeks after the award decision, interest runs from **the date of the decision** until payment. The bill's earlier wording on interest from expiry of the 5-week time limit is not the enacted rule. § 24 b regulates compensation items by their nature with reference to EAL § 15; apply these specific rules in the calculation. The Act does not apply directly to Greenland/the Faroe Islands, but may be brought into force for the Faroe Islands by order.

Own delimitation: The new scheme must not be used retrospectively as the yardstick for decisions taken by A from 2015 / 2016. The patient compensation report describes the change in the main administrative features; legal requirements must be traced to:

the agreed wording and the rules of application of the specific period. No new system number of actual contact / resumption according to Law 519 or individual recovery time of persons is documented in the read sources.

Documented, requires further proof, and traceability

• Documented: refusal to resume in L126's delimitation; retroactive access to the law; acceptance by the Supreme Court of the date of interest; acceptance by the originals of the mass recordings and approximately DKK 55 million further paid out in the 2022 version; original version / annual conflicts.

• Requires further evidence: actual follow-up of all 2014recovery requirements, period-unique patients, financial net loss and correction date of each person, accuracy of payment and personal liability.

• Source chain: legislative observations → passed law → concrete original decisions, reproduced in the Supreme Court's explanatory statement → conclusion → annual reports with concrete follow-up figures. The self-assessment of the administrative consequences of the judgment by the annual reports is not independent evidence of legal or adequate restoration.

• Prioritised demand: full contact/reassessment checks for the 2014 group; person-identity verification and payment reconciliation for interest-related reopenings; processing and redress time for each person; then a reasoned assessment of independent responsibility. The report's general ECHR conclusion must rest on the specific right, harm and remedy, rather than automatically call every case alteration a Convention violation.

10. Personal data and historical surveillance series

The 12 years' public inquiry and complaint categories contain a total of **7.944 newly opened case records**. They contain permit applications and inquiries as well as complaints and therefore are not 7.944 established unlawful acts. Likewise, the **315 public inspection and oversight case files** are newly opened files, not necessarily 315 completed inspections.

Annual key figures with precise demarcation

Year	All new journal case	New Offe n reask rat / cla gesager,	New private f Orespire gvel / kl agesage r	New Offe n meldels Court of Justice	New Offe n view n- / kont rolmapp no	Security Subject matter, all / public	Source
2006	4368	430	646	744	24	19 / 7	Annual report; Printed pages 27-30
2007	5492	360	662	1729	34	14 / 3	Annual report; Printed pages 20-23
2008	5042	458	861	643	33	24 / 8	Annual report; Printed pages 23-26
2009	4859	508	960	375	39	30 / 13	Annual report; Printed pages 27-29
2010	5665	722	1296	384	11	52 / 21	Annual report; Printed pages 18-21
2011	5442	730	1235	437	23	51 / not separately here	Annual report; Printed pages 17-21
2012	5166	730	1332	297	24	26 / not separately here	Annual report; Printed pages 18-23
2013	6118	908	1313	755	15	14 / not separately here	Annual report; Printed pages 17-23
2014	5904	975	1265	717	32	3 / not separately here	Annual report; Printed pages 15-21
2015	5461	831	1112	756	26	17 / not separately here	Annual report; Printed pages 17-23
2016	4427	590	1083	240	32	6 / not separately here	Annual report; Printed pages 21-26
2017	5026	702	1511	168	22	2 / not separately here	Annual report; Printed pages 28-33

State, regional and local authorities

These are subsets of the public enquiry / complaint column above and may not be added to it again. The county municipalities in 2006-2007 are maintained as the original category, although the later category is regions.

Year	State	County or	Commu no	Permit no	Miscellane ous	Finish de cases: co mplaints / f Orespire ggler / u category set,%	Source
2006	113	27	145	123	22	21 / 79 / 0	Annual report; Printed pages 27-30
2007	142	20	97	97	4	8 / 92 / 0	Annual report; Printed pages 20-23

Year	State	County or	Commu no	Permit no	Miscellane ous	Finish de cases: co mplaints / f Orespire ggler / u category set,%	Source
2008	174	23	129	119	13	13.1 / 59.5 / 27.4	Annual report; Printed pages 23-26
2009	212	24	144	117	11	8.3 / 53.5 / 38.2	Annual report; Printed pages 27-29
2010	260	41	222	184	15	10 / 47 / 43	Annual report; Printed pages 18-21
2011	250	34	206	229	11	9 / 54 / 37	Annual report; Printed pages 17-21
2012	223	40	207	250	10	11 / 51 / 38	Annual report; Printed pages 18-23
2013	231	43	272	343	19	9 / 75 / 16	Annual report; Printed pages 17-23
2014	209	62	255	423	26	5 / 42 / 43	Annual report; Printed pages 15-21
2015	212	60	277	243	39	5 / 55 / 40	Annual report; Printed pages 17-23
2016	202	66	232	64	26	9 / 68 / 23	Annual report; Printed pages 21-26
2017	248	50	290	73	41	20 / 57 / 23	Annual report; Printed pages 28-33

What can actually be counted as detected error

In 2006, approximately 38 % of Datatilsynet's **completed public-sector complaints** were well-founded, and approximately 62 % unfounded. Among completed public-sector cases, approximately 21 % were complaints and 79 % enquiries. The original footnote says that the closure population also contains cases created in 2005 and a few in 2004. The number of closed complaints needed to convert 38 % into a case count is not stated. Therefore 430 new cases cannot be multiplied by 21 % and 38 % as a documented error count. Annual review 2006, p. 29, footnotes 1–2.

As of 2008, separate uncategorised closed cases occur. In 2010, it is 43% of the closed public cases. This category cannot be presumed to be legal or illegal. New files continue to leave out case work in existing folders, such as modified notifications and extended permits. In addition, in 2006, some 550 changes are reported in existing private research notifications, which are precisely outside new files. 2006, p. 27; 2010, p. 18-20.

Verification of the internal deviations of the originals

The published tables contain concrete discrepancies that are preserved as two source fields rather than being corrected by a guess:

- •2007:113 own-initiative cases, while the stated subcategories 37 +34 +41 +0 give 112. P.23.
- • 2008: 643 public notifications as a main figure, while the specified sub-categories provide 649. See p. 24 and 26.
- • 2013: municipal connections 344 in table, 341 in the following text. S. 22.

• 2014: closed public cases are indicated for 5% complaints + 42% inquiries + 43% uncategorised, total 90%, not 100%. S. 18.

• 2016: public reviews 240 in the main table, 204 in the detailed table, whose delta totals 204. See footnote 21 and 25.

• 2017: private reviews 1.271 in the main table and 1.274 in the detail text; the detail figures summed up to 1.271. S. 28 and 31.

• 2012: the original corrects its own annual report's percentage decline from 9 % to 5 %, footnote 7. P. 18.

The data file contains all published public instalments for notifications, control directories, press initiatives, online surveys and the public / private security category where it is published. The decrease in public notifications after 2015 shall be linked in the originals to joint state research notifications; it shall not be interpreted as a corresponding decrease in errors.

Knowledge and lack of follow-up

The 2010 report demonstrates that the Danish Business and Company Agency continued to follow a 2005 recommendation on police Internet access to a register; the oversight identified further significant IT security issues. There is thus a concrete five-year public knowledge chain, not just a single recent incident. 2010, p. 11.

In 2010, 64 inspections were carried out: ten public and 54 private, while 78 new inspection directories were created, of which 11 public. In 2008 and 2009, 94 and 83 inspections were carried out, of which 32 and 34 were public. The difference is explicitly documented in the 2010 footnote that not all directories led to an inspection. 2010, p. 11 and 20; 2008–2009, p. 11.

Data Protection Agency 2018- 2025 - controlled extension

Status: All eight original annual reports' activity, complaint and notification tables and eight annual administrative reports' time statistics have been read. The outcome of the sanctions shall be supplemented separately. Figures are not numbers of illegalities or unique citizens.

Year	New cases	Complaints: per ivat / offent body / spe / ew rich	Own initia teder: priv to / publici g / medium / h breath heel, see / tips / deaf rich	Bride: priv to / publici g / other	Reports to police with a fine reco mmendatio n	Original physical pages
2018	8756	1005/311/ 58/2	12/135/11/ -/61/6	Not allocated	Not reported here	Annual report, 15,18,19
2019	15090	1435/691/ 88/45	30/38/49/-/ 134/5	2019 >60% public, about 40% private	2	Annual report, 15,18,19,52
2020	17768	1708/687/ 82/30	18/64/73/1 06/137/4	3443/5304 /25	11	Annual report, 23,27,28,29
2021	17291	1437/699/ 92/9	72/58/68/1 57/152/5	3458/5068 /28	10	Annual report, 20,24,25,26
2022	16896	1159/602/ 34/22	35/94/79/1 20/176/9	2978/5807 /31	11	Annual report, 21,25,26,27
2023	18062	1184/561/ 20/2	69/46/33/1 16/235/5	3018/6471 /48	6	Annual report, 9,26,26,45
2024	18816	1213/557/- /7	47/55/29/6 5/312/10	3601/5950 /73	5	Annual report, 9,28,29,51

Year	New cases	Complaints : per ivat / offent body / spe / ew rich	Own initia teder: priv to / publici g / medium / h breath heel, see / tips / deaf rich	Bride: priv to / publici g / other	Reports to police with a fine reco mmendatio n	Original physical pages
2025	20536	2080/1040 /-/8	17/11/26/6 3/402/6	4630/5167 /52	2	Annual report, 9,26,27,39

2018 annual review: 25. May-31. December. Full year in annual report 2018, table A, physical p.10: 12.205 case-record creations, including 5.515 enquiries/complaints and 329 supervision cases; 2.722 security breaches and 1.084 older notifications of processing. The annual review's 2.780 breach notifications and the later 2.722 are retained as different document versions.

The entire summary table: newly created file cases

Category	2018 sub-year	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Legal preparation	412	521	605	730	516	688	634	626
Advice	2310	2881	2733	2628	2676	2889	3198	2867
Complaints	1376	2259	2507	2237	1817	1767	1777	3128
Own initiative / supervision	225	256	402	512	513	504	518	525
Authorisations	214	227	265	277	152	137	155	134
International	734	1151	1243	1000	935	974	1146	1572
Security breach notified	2780	7242	8773	8554	8816	9537	9624	9849
Law enforcement act	-	-	132	151	215	257	368	320
TV Monitoring	-	-	109	79	91	104	117	177
Mass media data bases	-	-	48	38	40	31	12	26
Archive law	-	-	133	123	240	254	291	320
Greenland / Faeroe Islands	42	147	53	63	45	49	25	40
Other	663	406	765	899	840	871	951	952
Total	8756	15090	17768	17291	16896	18062	18816	20536

- does not mean separately specified in that table, not zero. The category also includes its own administration and access to documents. Each actual number item has in JSON the denominator, unit, delimitation, exclusion, overlap and original page. 2024 / 2025 the links between numbers and category names are controlled with text positions. In particular 2025 own initiatives: public 11, private 17, media / contact 26.

All separately declared full years 2018

Annual Report 2018, Table A, Physical p.10	Figures
Administration	698
Law hearings	637
Enquiries and complaints	5515
Supervision	329
Break reviews	2722
International	895
Other legislation	325
Excluding treatment-injury notifications	11121
Private/public treatment claims	1084
Total	12205

Duration of proceedings

Year	Complaints are made. /50%/80%, days	Request clay	Lawyers r	Authorisations	Annual report, physical page
2018	116/87/167	46/26/80	16/14/25	-	Annual report, p.21
2019	101/49/162	43/34/63	15/12/23	60/33/74	Annual report, p. 19
2020	101/41/165	42/45/60	19/16/28	115/36/151	Annual report, p.17
2021	105/39/167	38/30/60	14/4/21	107/40/169	Annual report, p.17
2022	99/34/118	31/21/51	10/1/16	76/29/56	Annual report, p.21
2023	85/36/88	38/30/45	15/3/21	37/26/54	Annual report, p.23
2024	69/38/70	33/31/48	15/8/25	38/28/48	Annual report, p.20
2025	92/84/112	42/35/57	23/21/31	105/32/77	Annual report, p.9

2018 additional time groups, gns. / 50% / 80%: credit complaints 205 / 235 / 462; private research review 62 / 0 / 54; other private reviews 116 / 80 / 285; public reviews 75 / 35 / 427 days. The notifications here concern processing of information, not security breaches. 2018 complaints above: only other complaints. 2019 overall complaint group. 2018 omits atypical cases; journal changes can restore older cases under new start number. The names of the time measurement are not given in the tables. Time does not automatically apply to the citizen's full waiting time or to public complaints alone.

Own documentary control and statistical significance

2020 overview and sub-tables differ in concrete: legislative preparation 605 / 606, advice 2.733 / 2.567, international 1.243 / 1.231, breach 8.773 / 8.772. Public sector of the subdivisions 5.304, private 3.443, other 25 summers to 8.772; no residual person shall be calculated. 2022 authorisation period is originally indicated at 76 days, retrospectively in 2023 to 78. 2022 breaking rise is written 261, while 8.816 − 8.554 = 262.

New cases exclude reopenings and continuations. Notifications under the Law Enforcement Act lie outside the breach column. FO/GL is separate in the activity overview. January 2023 changes the incident taxonomy from 10 to 64; several categories may belong to the same incident. From 2025, administration/accounts are shared with TET; the Danish Data Protection Agency’s substantive tables 3A/4A remain separately attributable to the Danish Data Protection Agency.

The material deficiency is a single closing register. The selected cases of criticism and injunctions in the annual reports document concrete facts, but their number is not a national outcome statistic. A break notification can include many people, repeated episodes and re-notifications; public numbers can neither be added to complaints nor translated into unique citizens.

Specifically necessary registry query

Register request: all closure registrations 2006-2025 with closure date, case ID, event ID, public/private, statutory basis, all outcome markers, reopening relationship, actual compliance/date, anonymised affected-person deduplication, police report/indictment/court outcome/fine payment.

Issue not effected. Numerical registers store their own compact facts, not original texts.

Actual outcomes in defined groups of supervisors

Year	Sample	Name no	Actual outcome / subgroups	Precise demarcation	Primary Page
2018	Planned supervision, full year	147	public 135 / private 12; physical follow-up 19	Implementation of decisions not necessarily completed	Report, PDF36
2018	DPO selection	128	19 Ministries / 98 municipalities / 5 regions / 6 private hospitals	Subset 147; land list can repeat the same authority on the second theme	Report, PDF37
2018	New public oversight	135	Municipal 103 / State 20 / Regional 11 / General 1	Journals group; cannot be read as 103 unique municipalities or 11 unique regions; breakdown other than the thematic	Report, PDF19
2019	Planned supervision	67	public 37 / private 30	Public journal group 38 is a different denominator to implemented 37	Report, PDF43
2019	Insight	6	public 3 / private 3; criticism 4 / without 2	Criticism not broken down by public/private in the aggregate; continuation of outcomes at PDF46	Report, PDF44
2020	Information required for checks on employees	5	serious 3 / criticism 2; public 3 of which serious 2 / criticism 1; private 2 of which serious 1 / criticism 1	ATP / Kolding / NearenesHus public; started 2019, completed 2020; continuation PDF57	Report, PDF56
2021	Local and regional authorities	17	17 without criticism on the studied theme	Only the DPO solutions' sample; no general evidence exonerating municipalities	Report, PDF71
2022	Study of maturity	55	50 municipalities + 5 regions	Self-evaluation and control efforts; not 55 breaches of law found	Report, PDF59
2022	Local access / public clearance	5	5 criticism; Gentofte 2 of 564 letterboxes controlled; HøjTaastrup 410 persons AD- access	Outcome PDF68-69; 410 access is not 410 citizens whose information was exposed	Report, PDF67
2022	State authorities' data collection	6	critique 1 (SIRI) / without 5	Started 2021; finished Dec 2022	Report, PDF69
2023	Management of safety breaches	16	8 municipalities / 8 banks; municipal severe criticism 1 (Roskilde) / criticism 1 (Frederikshavn)	Sample selected for many/few reports; criticism of 2/8 public concerning documentation, not all 16 topics fully examined; outcome PDF37	Report, PDF36
2023	AULA	5	Impact assessment: 5 critical points; serious; missing completely 2 + injunction 2; present 3 insufficient; 2 completed only after supervisory start; risk assessment: serious 2 / criticism 3	The same 5 municipalities in two sub-issues; not 10 cases. Sixth municipality completed 2024	Report, PDF43
2024	Local authority written debate	48	77 questions / 15 subjects / response deadline 6 weeks	48 individual recommendation reports; not 48 critical decisions	Report, PDF34

Year	Sample	Name no	Actual outcome / subgroups	Precise demarcation	Primary Page
2024	Physical surveillance	2	Kerteminde critique 1 / Brøndby serious 1; BrøndbyMFaanstnov 2023,5 yearsown risk assessment	Different sample from the 48 written cases; overlap not inferred	Report, PDF34
2024	Last AULA case	1	Copenhagen City criticism 1	Sixth of original 6; former 5 belongs to 2023	Report, PDF35
2024	POLSS and control	3	Nordjylland / Funen / Bornholm criticism 3; 2 referred misunderstood to the control of the National Police	Selected by size / geography, not representative national error rate	Report, PDF78

Public fines: suspension, actual outcome and follow-up

Current primary selection expressly indicate some cases. All 19 public authority / relationship posts in this committee have been followed to their associated follow-up as of October 7, 2026; this is not a complete national criminal case statistics. 11 the date and operational conclusion of the judgment documents are checked directly in the judgment database; read scope is limited to the date of the judgment, fine / result and relevant impact / time limits.

Authority d / ratio	Set ingsda no	Set ing, kr.	First det ermine lsesda no	Departure DKK / status	Consistency and counting limits	Sources
Hørsholm Municipality	2020-03-10	50000	2022-09-12	50000; judgment of the Court of Justice	approximately 1.600 employees' information on unencrypted stolen computer	Data Protection Agency; Judgment, PDF9
Lejre Kommune	2020-06-30	50000	2022-03-09	50000; judgment of the Court of Justice	Child / adolescent material on employee portal; number of citizens not disclosed	Data Protection Agency; Judgment, PDF6
Guldborgsund Kommune	2020-12-09	50000	2022-04-08	50000; judgment of the Court of Justice	Child's residence passed on; absence of notification / notification; torture requirements refused	Data Protection Agency; Judgment, PDF7-8
Vejle Municipality	2021-06-16	20000 0	2024-03-26	50000; judgment of the Court of Justice; appeal	Protected addresses in automatic dental care letters	Data Protection Agency; Judgment, PDF4-5
Region Syddanmark	2021-07-16	50000 0	2024-12-23	1000000; joint urban judgment for two matters; appeal	More than 30.000 children in a psychiatric database; potential access for more than 1½ years	Data Protection Agency; Judgment, PDF14-16
Region Syddanmark - PowerPoint	2021-09-17	50000 0	2024-12-23	-; same urban judgment and common 1 million; counted once	3.915 patients' record data on the public website since May 2011	Data Protection Agency; Judgment, PDF14-16
Foreign agency	2021-08-17	15000 0	2024-03-18	150000; penalty payments	Lack of treatment safety	Data Protection Agency
Region of Central Jutland	2021-09-08	40000 0	2025-06-02	300000; Judgment of the Court of Justice	approximately 100.000 patient records in inadequately secured archive 2016-20; records are not unique patients	Data Protection Agency; Judgment, PDF7-8

Authority d / ratio	Set ingsda no	Set ing, kr.	First det ermine lsesda no	Departure DKK / status	Consistency and counting limits	Sources
Favrskov Municipality	2021-0 9-16	75000	2023-0 9-01	75000; Judgment of the Court of Justice	Missing encryption; ECLI- year 2024 is not the year of decision 2023	Data Protection Agency; Judgment, PDF10-11
Frederiksb erg Municipality	2021-1 2-16	10000 0	2023-0 8-16	50000; judgment of the Court of Justice; appeal	Access to protected addresses; ECLI- year 2024 is not the year of decision 2023	Data Protection Agency; Judgment, PDF2-3
National Genome Center	2022-0 3-25	50000	2024-0 4-26	50000; in case of fines	Treatment initiated without prior consultation	Data Protection Agency
Civil government	2022-0 5-12	10000 0	2022-0 9-20	100000; penalty payments	Safety and notification obligations	Data Protection Agency
Lolland Municipality	2022-0 8-11	50000	2023-1 1-17	50000; in case of fines	Access codes on mobile devices could be disconnected	Data Protection Agency
Odsherred Municipality	2024-0 1-11	10000 0-2000 00	2024-0 4-23	100000; penalty payments	Unencrypted laptops; 1.200 computers are equipment, not persons	Data Protection Agency
Hvidovre Municipality	2024-0 1-22	not less than 20000 0	2024-0 5-27	200000; penalty payments	Dental care system: protected children's / parents' addresses transmitted	Data Protection Agency
Road Municipality	2024-0 8-14	20000 0	Not dated here	200000; fine adopted by the City Court; date not disclosed in read follow-up	Five stolen laptops; not five citizens	Data Protection Agency
Gladsaxe Municipality	2020-0 3-10	10000 0	Not dated here	-; current in the current committee	20.620 citizens' information on stolen unencrypted computer	Data Protection Agency
The Royal Theatre	2024-0 1-09	25000 0	Not dated here	-; current in the current committee	Lack of rules for deletion; number of customers not disclosed	Data Protection Agency
Lyngby-Ta arbæk Municipality	2024-1 1-27	35000 0-4000 00	Not dated here	-; current in the current committee	At least 1.000 former employees retained access; about 30.000 citizens potentially; 1.022 actually accessed in at least one case; other event about 5.000 registered; overlap unknown	Data Protection Agency

Appeals	Date	Result / fine, DKK	Original
Vejle Municipality	2025-03-27	The fine imposed by the City Court was increased; 100000	Judgment, PDF4-5
Frederiksberg Municipality	2025-02-19	Judgment of the Court of Justice confirmed; 50000	Judgment, PDF3-4
Region South Denmark	2026-03-23	Database relationship conviction; PowerPoint relationship acquittal; one total fine; 500000	Judgment, PDF16-19

The two settings of the Region of Southern Denmark are grouped together in the urban judgment SS-5399 / 2023-COPD, 23 December 2024, one fine of DKK 1.000.000. Case T-113 / 2025 -VLR, 23 March 2026, dismissing PowerPoint's relationship and maintaining that:

conviction in the psychiatric-database matter with a total of 500.000 kr. The same judgment links in both follow-ups document the overlap. The appeal is separately in 2026; amounts must not be added.

Datatilsynet's reference to a judgment summary in the RegionSyd case has been replaced with the actual judgment, document 8393. Favrskov/Frederiksberg's ECLI year 2024 follows the publication record; the originals' decision dates are 1. September 2023 and 16. August 2023 respectively. RegionSyd ECLI 2025 covers a judgment of 23. December 2024. The decision date governs placement by year.

Own recognition: actually elapsed time

Authority	Configuration → First dated decision, calendar days
Hørsholm Municipality	916
Lejre Kommune	617
Guldborgsund Municipality	485
Vejle Municipality	1014
Region South Denmark	1256
Region South Denmark - PowerPoint	1193
Udlændingestyrelsen	944
Region of Central Jutland	1363
Favrskov Municipality	715
Frederiksberg Municipality	608
National Genome Center	763
Civil Service Agency	131
Lolland Municipality	463
Odsherred Municipality	103
Hvidovre Municipality	126

These are own date differences, not the average time taken by the authority to deal with the case. In the case of Vejle, both the City and the National Court refer to the long period of time as relevant for the determination of fines; Horsens rejects the reduction of the time in the Midtjylland Regional case. No calendar day here is evidence of payment of the fine or termination of the damage.

Lack of concrete documents: date of the decision and the decision itself; full imposition of fines for six named authorities; actual payment; full public sanctioning and anonymised persons key. The Committee's follow-up results, but not proof of all the amounts paid or individual staff responsibilities.

Additional primary control in the PDF15-19 of the South African Republic: the grounds calculate the CBCLs database to approximately 23.000 citizens and actually describe access to the information of five other participants, with a period of 4 January 2019-23 August 2020 (own date difference 597 days). The 2021 recommendation of the Data Protection Agency referred to over 30.000 children / data subjects; this is an unresolved delimitation / version difference, not the same verified denominator. Former URL incident notified on 25 May 2018 and serious criticism on 17 July 2020 are included in the grounds for the judgment. PowerPoint del: online exposure until 5 February 2020; indictment alone 25 May 2018 → 5 February 2020. The exemption is based on insufficient criminal evidence of a lack of adequate overall measures during that period; it does not eliminate the data exposure described. The information on actual use and demarcation of the grounds is not a national register of persons.

The separate annual and audit versions of the administrative reports

Category	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Administrator	293	300	375	391	698	591	754	898	815	858	941	945
Law hearings	519	397	469	584	637	521	607	730	516	688	634	626
Questions / Complaints	2240	1943	1673	2213	5515	5140	5240	4865	4493	-	-	-
Questions	-	-	-	-	-	2881	2734	2628	2676	2889	3198	2867
Complaints	-	-	-	-	-	2259	2506	2237	1817	1767	1777	3128
Supervision	155	150	110	73	329	256	403	512	513	504	518	525
Fractures	-	-	-	-	2722	7242	8773	8554	8816	9537	9624	9849
International lt	182	190	195	255	895	1156	1244	1000	935	974	1146	1572
Other legislation	99	123	82	69	325	548	482	455	656	708	823	890
Authorizations / processing	2413	2341	1517	1439	1084	227	265	277	152	137	155	134
Total	5901	5444	4421	5024	12205	15681	17768	17291	16896	18062	18816	20536

The figures are presented in accordance with the annual tables themselves. The combination queries / complaints is a subtotal. Historical repetitions should only be counted once after document version, not added to the original year's figure. - is not disclosed / separate row, not zero.

Publication	Table, physical side	Actual Observer an iron window,
Annual Report 2018	A, PDF10	2014-2018
Annual Report 2019	3A, PDF11	2015-2019
Annual Report 2020	3A, PDF10	2016-2020
Annual Report 2021	3A, PDF10	2017-2021
Annual Report 2022	3A, PDF11	2018-2022
Annual Report 2023	3A, PDF12	2019-2023
Annual Report 2024	3A, PDF11	2020-2024
Annual Report 2025	3A, PDF8	2021-2025

Annual Report 2018 indicates 2015 total 5.461; its rows sum 5.444, as later annual report 2019 indicates. Both versions are kept in JSON. The year 2019 shall be indicated in the annual report 15.681 and in the annual report 15.090. Own difference 591 corresponds numerically to administration 591; at the same time, the international 1.156 / 1.151 differs, so there is no substantiated explanation of only one simple delimitation. The series shall not change tacitly between the two total sets.

Annual Report 2020: Law hearings 607, queries 2.734, complaints 2.506, supervision 403, international 1.244. The annual report records 605 / 2.733 / 2.507 / 402 / 1.243 respectively; both totals 17.768. The differences are

actual publication versions. The 2024 annual report table's fall in legislative consultations−7,3% against body text−7,8%; own(634−688)/688=−7,85%, so the body text is closer to the direct calculation. The percentage difference is not harmonised.

Intelligence Oversight Board's substantive oversight account 2014-2025

Controlled October 7, 2026. **34 original annual reports, 651 compact factual rows.** The year is the year of review of the statement; publication may take place the following year. PDF locators are physical pages from the first PDF page, usually printed page number + 2. The JSON file is the detailed fact register with device, denominator, overlap and source.

What the figures document

IT documents repeated breaches of the rules on retrieval, raw data retrieval, erasure, journaling and logging, as well as delays and lack of means of retrieval which have cut off controls. A finding in a later year may relate to previous interventions or information that has still not been deleted. Therefore, years of control, period of action and actual cessation are three different sizes.

The public statements contain TET's statements and assessments. The confidential underlying control evidence has not been published and is therefore not independent in this case. Later ministerial decisions and change of competence are marked; a historical TET statement is not implicitly reclassified as a final judgment.

Controls, interventions, searches, folders, files, e-mails, information, natural persons and legal persons shall not be merged. The graph category breaches also includes internal breaches of guidelines. Critics can also be used to prevent controls. The number of critical checks is therefore not personal or criminal statistics.

2006-2013:TET did not yet exist. This is not eight years with zero breaches of law. CFCS oversight for 2014-2015 is combined; CFCS's own statistical tables nevertheless distinguish the 2nd half of 2014 from 2015. From 2025,TET oversees FE's application of the CFCS Act, whereas SAMSIK's data processing is outside TET oversight (FE 2025 physical p. 5).

Annual checks and overlaps

Graphs 2022- 2025 are visually controlled. Figures before 2022 are published in particular as sub-checks, samples and concrete findings; they cannot be filled in with zero in this aggregate table.

Service / e r	Plilla ge	Quit ed	Outcom e narrow n	Without Bemæ marking , no	Recom mendati on paint, etc.	Law / s etning line rupture	Criticis m	Stærli g criticis m;	Manage marking , sunio n	PDF Page
PET 2022	54	53	53	19	20	8	21	3	34	s 12
PET 2023	49	48	48	29	3	13	10	0	19	s 19
PET 2024	43	38	38	26	8	5	10	0	12	s 21
PET 2025	-	28	28	9	9	4	9	0	19	s 10
FE 2022	38	25	24	14	10	6	2	0	10	s 11
FE 2023	33	30	30	21	5	3	4	0	9	s 19
FE 2024	36	34	34	31	1	2	1	0	3	s 20
FE 2025	-	16	16	12	2	3	2	0	4	s 9
CFCS 2022	14	13	13	11	1	1	0	0	2	s 11
CFCS 2023	13	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	s 17
CFCS 2024	12	11	10	8	1	2	0	0	2	s 18

The Union is itself the diffuser of the original's outcome denominator and controls without comment. PET 2024 has an internal conflict; FE 2022 and CFCS 2024 have separate denominator conflict, which is not explained by an assumption. Note scale and PET competence change 2025.

Indirect insight and time to answer

Completed requests concern natural and legal persons together. A person can turn again; the years cannot be summed up to unique people. Zero deletion findings relate to investigated systems, not to all information everywhere.

Service / year	Finished acted	Deletion find	Laughs. total time	Service s time	Not applicable no systems;	PDF Page
PET 2014	16	2	95	26	-	s 23
PET 2015	10	0	74	22	-	s 23
PET 2016	18	0	38	10	-	s 32
PET 2017	14	0	42	10	-	s 31
PET 2018	152	8	107	24	-	s 25
PET 2019	128	13	81	7	-	s 25
PET 2020	52	6	72	9	-	s 29
PET 2021	35	6	183	89	-	s 30
PET 2022	45	12	172	92	5	s 31
PET 2023	24	3	107	54	-	s 32
PET 2024	21	0	67	3	5	s 34
PET 2025	39	2	75	13	4	sfys 7,9,27-31
FE 2014	8	0	83	14	-	s 21
FE 2015	9	0	65	9	-	s 16
FE 2016	10	0	42	12	-	s 29
FE 2017	5	0	41	13	-	s 25
FE 2018	125	5	107	22	-	s 21
FE 2019	86	5	126	7	-	s 21
FE 2020	35	7	75	12	-	s 17
FE 2021	25	1	200	12	-	s 24
FE 2022	34	5	199	18	-	s 26
FE 2023	22	1	97	20	1	s 31
FE 2024	10	1	80	21	1	s 32
FE 2025	20	3	85	16	1	s 22

Time is the original days; 2025 explicit working days. PET 2022: 12 deletion findings include one case where technically impossible partitioning meant continued treatment. The deletion category of the graph does not therefore prove complete termination in all 12 cases.

Specific duration and follow-up

FE 2017: four found unjustified catches lasted 20 days, 8 months, 4 days and 17 months; the year of the action was 2014- 2017 (physically s 15). FE 2020: four catches lasted 2,34,55 and 55 days; three originated from PET requests (physically p. 14). The interventions have not been documented to four different people in each year.

PET 2022 retained copies of information on the same 19 persons and 84 organisations deleted in production 2021. Similarly, PET 2024 test copy 67461 files should not be added to previous test files as new people. FE 2023 s 107 unrelieved e-mails are follow-up to 2022 promises. Continued storage is a consequence, although the number of new people is unknown.

Original conflicts

- PET 2024: 38 completed / 26 without / 13 remaining. 38 − 26 = 12; printed 13 is kept separately.
- PET 2024: 67 days 2024 and decrease 105 from 2023. PET 2023 s 32 = 107 days; diffusers 40, not 105.
- PET 2021: 183 days 2021 and increase 102 from 2020. PET 2020 p 29 = 72; diver 111.
- FE 2022: 25 completed but outcome 14 / 24. Quotas 24 are retained; no assumed explanation.
- CFCS 2024: 11 completed but outage 8 / 10. The trigger point 10 is retained.

CFCS: complaints and access to documents with a full annual delineation

CFCSs received personal data complaints are zero in all published 2014- 2025 tables; this shows the absence of registered complaints, while the control accounts contain errors. 2025 concerns the FE- Cyber sector, not all previous CFCS.

Year	Full	Partial	Refusal	No d kokime nter	Total	Keep moving. indicatio n r	Exchang e tn	Safe hedh of which: no	PDF Page
2014 (2nd half-year)	0	10	0	1	11	50	5	238	s 20
2015	0	0	0	4	4	39	14	321	s 20
2016	1	1	0	1	3	427	49	783	s 24
2017	0	0	1	1	2	104	18	1168	s 24
2018	1	0	7	2	10	109	24	912	s 16
2019	0	2	3	1	6	108	31	1162	s 18
2020	1	1	6	1	9	100	19	4980	s 22
2021	0	1	3	2	6	67	15	5677	s 23
2022	3	1	6	0	10	46	6	3077	s 21
2023	10	5	3	4	22	29	16	2464	s 27
2024	2	3	5	2	12	143	16	1727	s 27
2025 (FE)	1	6	4	2	13	137	23	867	s 29

2014-2015 disclosure figures count cases involving one or more acts; from 2016, acts. 2014-2015 incidents include interception of communications/analysis;2016 also includes other security incidents. The false-positive/no-effect category changes scope several times; separate 2022-2023 false positives are in JSON. Incidents/attacks are not public employees' breaches of law.

Source and residue register

• TET 0: PET 2024; 34 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 1: PET 2023; 22 factual rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 2: PET 2022; 29 factual rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 3: PET 2021; 21 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET4: PET 2020; 19 factual rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET5: PET 2019; 17 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET6: PET 2018; 10 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET7: PET 2017; 10 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 8: PET 2016; 8 factor rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 9: PET 2015; 11 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 10: PET 2014; 9 factual rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 11: FE 2024; 27 factual rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 12: FE 2023; 35 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 13: FE 2022; 27 factual rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 14: FE 2021; 8 factor rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 15: FE 2020; 11 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET16: FE 2019; 7 factor rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 17: FE 2018; 6 factor rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 18: FE 2017; 11 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 19: FE 2016; 7 factor rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 20: FE 2015; 7 factor rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 21: FE 2014; 8 factor rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 22: CFCS 2024; 30 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 23: CFCS 2023; 32 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 24: CFCS 2022; 33 factual rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 25: CFCS 2021; 18 factual rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 26: CFCS 2020; 18 factual rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 27: CFCS 2019; 17 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 28: CFCS 2018; 15 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 29: CFCS 2017; 18 factual rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 30: CFCS 2016; 17 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET31: CFCS 2014; 34 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 32: PET 2025; 34 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

• TET 33: FE 2025; 41 factorial rows. Tangible control, follow-up, insight and time sections read; tables / graphs controlled as above.

The rest relates to confidential denominators, personal dedup, unpublished control lists and subsequent actual rectification; precise request for TET: control ID with control year / type / exit category, request ID with natural / legal person and received / completed date, system coverage per year, action start / finding / termination and documented deletion. Please ask for a separate overlap between PET / FE / PNR and repeated follow-up. The register of the Wamberg Committee 2006-2013 is own demand for relevant ministries / TET if the material is taken over. No request has been sent.

Responsibility and demands require linkage to the specific act and applicable competence. The figures support documented systemic criticism and demands for oversight, remedial action and evidence of follow-up; they do not automatically document criminal responsibility for a specified number of employees or a count of citizens entitled to compensation.

11. Taxes: outages, stocks and time

Checked against originals: waiting-time series 2006-2013, flow/stock 2010-2013, administrative percentage matrices 2006 and 2009-2012, first-instance court outcomes 2006 and 2009-2013, the Ombudsman's LSR outcomes 2011-2013 and separate reimbursement outcomes 2009/2010/2013. The separate original modules document 2006 and 2009-2012 with precise denominators, coding rules and reading locators. Administrative 2007/2008/2013 matrices, all exact cell counts, separate remittals and hidden successful claims still require original data. Register metadata are not equated with substantive table reading.

Administrative complaints before 2014 could pass through both an appeals board and LSR; the sum does not necessarily represent unique trajectories. Court outcomes/reimbursement/FOB may overlap the same complaint and must not be added into a union of unique errors/victims. Relief is an outcome; effective payment and established responsibility require separate material.

Main analysis: known waiting time and misleading reading of targets

In 2013, the National Tax Court knew the increasing waiting period, but described the professional results as satisfactory. The exact average time was 9,46 months against the target 8,5. The 20 percent target value means 10 out of 50 contract points; it is not the proportion of citizens treated within a deadline. The 100% recovery applies to a watch which starts only with full case information. Forced reassurances have been omitted. The figures therefore do not show the total citizen's waiting time. [K509, p.5-6,8]

The stock of old FFF cases fell from 1.158 to 732, but the target was 650. The declared target of 62,5 percent is 25 out of 40 points, not an inventory of repaired tax claims. The report also states that management and statistical facilities for the new complaint structure were not yet in place. The total target result thus does not document a timely review, proper outcome or actual repayment. [K509, p.8-9]

The specific demand is linkage of receipt,time on hold,complete investigation of the case,decision and effective redress for each appeal. The financial report contains no complete administrative outcome matrix. This dimension remains open even though the report’s entire text has now been read. The tables already included below are retained without double-counting.

Reading control: K509, Annual Report 2013 of the National Tax Court, dated 4 March 2014, FT SAU 2013- 14 Annex 196, ODA document 99867 / file 193526. All 16 pages are text-read via the Danish Parliament's public PDF reproduction, line 0- 622 of this version. It shall include endorsement, report, objectives, accounts and both financial annexes. There has been no new visual check of the pixels of the pages in this delivery; no full original text or original PDFs pages are stored locally. Official original.

LSR: access, stock and corrected waiting time

Original, PDF page 5. Device: Case and average; not unique taxpayers.

Year	New cases	Stock at end	Time months
2010	3682	2550	7.2
2011	4440	2987	7.1
2012	5122	4297	7.9
2013	5652	6367	9.5

Supply and stock are different units. Time leaves out forced reassurances. These LSR figures are not the larger overall population of the CCR in recent statistics.

LSR: Actual corrected time 2006-2009

Original, PDF page 3. Unit: Average length of proceedings.

Year	Corrected time months	Before correction months
2006	10.7	11,6 in now recovered LSR06O; not disclosed in RR 2010 source
2007	11.8	approx. 13
2008	11.0	12.7
2009	9.1	not disclosed

Forced reassurances in tax proceedings, surveys and estimates as well as EU references have been omitted. 2004 is not comparable and is reported as a dash, not zero. 2005 is 12,8 months (outside the period).

2013: flow of all case groups

Original, PDF page 5.

Type of action	Entry	Departure
Income	1795	1256
Assessment	1798	798
VAT / levy / customs duties	728	632
Recovery	329	357
Other	1002	510
Total	5652	3553

Outflow is not a breakdown into favourable findings,upheld decisions,more adverse decisions,dismissals and remittals.

2013: waiting period by case type

Original, PDF page 5. Unit: Corrected average.

Type of action	Months
All together	9.5
Income	9.6
Assessment	16.2
VAT / levy / customs duties	7.2
Other	4.8
Recovery	0.7
Exit from the Tax Appeal Board	7.5

Conditions omitted. The recovery time starts only when the case is fully informed; the jump is a sub-group and cannot be added as an additional case.

2013: time-scale and more precise inventory

Original, PDF page 8. Device: Steering measures and averages.

Measure	Requirements for months	Actual months	Points	Possible Points	Targeting%
All together	8.5	9.46	10	50	20
Recovery	0.7	0.68	25	25	100

Measure	Requirements for months	Actual months	Points	Possible Points	Targeting%
Surplus	7.5	7.53	20	25	80

9,46 / 9,5 is precision / rounding of the same target, not two separate waiting times or populations.

2013: old FFF cases

Original, PDF page 9. Unit: Old deductions-for- improvements-cases.

Stock at end 2012	Targets at end 2013	In fact at the end of 2013	Points	Possible Points	Targeting%
1158	650	732	25	40	62.5

Own difference:426 fewer in this old cohort; 82 more than the target. This does not represent all new FFF cases, a count of findings in the party's favour or a figure for actual payment.

2008-2009: old LSR cases

Original, PDF page 3. Unit: Old cases.

Kohorte	End 2008	End of 2009	Resolution target%
Received before 1 January 2008	1132	297	95

The 835 of the own component diffuser; the 95% target applies to an old cohort. The original describes a large part of the remainder as being reassuring; no breakdown is given on the basis of reason.

2011-2013: Court access

Original, PDF page 6.

Year	Established by the taxpayer	Established by the Ministry
2011	291	8
2012	287	17
2013	297	26

A small part relates directly to tax decisions. The year of entry shall not be the year of closure; the figures shall not be used as a reference for the judgment of the same year.

2011-2013: all first instance outcomes, taxpayer as applicant

Original, PDF page 7. Unit: Completed first instance proceedings.

Outcome	2011	2012	2013
Rejected	26	16	19
Raised by taxpayer	68	60	49
Confirmation of the principal claim of the taxpayer	26	18	14
Judgment:wholly in the taxpayer's favour	23	13	20
Judgment: taxpayer predominantly successful	4	7	10
Judgment: full relief for the Ministry	150	170	137
Judgment: largely favourable to the ministry	11	18	7

Outcome	2011	2012	2013
Settlement:predominantly in the taxpayer’s favour	8	9	7
Settlement:predominantly in the Ministry’s favour	7	2	3
Total completed	323	313	266

Rejection, swelling, retaliation, judgment and settlement shall be kept separate. A small part relates directly to tax decisions. No number counts for unique people or automatically proves the criminal responsibility of an official.

2011-2013: all first instance outcomes, Ministry as applicant

Original, PDF page 7. Unit: Completed first instance proceedings.

Outcome	2011	2012	2013
Rejected	0	0	0
Raised by the Ministry	0	1	0
Confirmation of the Ministry's principal claim	1	1	1
Judgment:wholly in the taxpayer’s favour	3	1	2
Judgment: taxpayer predominantly successful	0	1	0
Judgment: full relief for the Ministry	5	6	10
Judgment: largely favourable to the ministry	0	0	0
Settlement:predominantly in the taxpayer’s favour	0	0	0
Settlement:predominantly in the Ministry’s favour	0	0	0
Total completed	9	10	13

Citizens granted relief on an administrative appeal may then become defendants in the Ministry's litigation. The first instance does not document the final outcome following any appeal or the timing of payment.

2011- 2013: Ombudsman's LSC cases

Original, PDF page 8. Unit: Ombudsman case closures.

Year	Total	Rejected	Reality without criticism / recommendation, etc.	Reality with criticism / recommendation, etc.
2011	26	15	10	1
2012	16	12	2	2
2013	43	34	8	1

Only Landsskatteretten in these historical columns; 2014 expands the authority population. The criticism category includes recommendations etc. and cannot be relabelled as Convention violations without reading the cases.

2009: outcomes in completed legal-cost reimbursement cases

Original, PDF page 4. Unit: Expenses across agencies.

Outcome	Case	%	Compensation DKK	Amount share%	Average DKK	Adjusted average DKK
Full relief	1015	31	60996863	45	60095	47656

Outcome	Case	%	Compensation DKK	Amount share%	Average DKK	Adjusted average DKK
Predominant success	413	13	24818600	18	60093	54577
Limited favourable finding	337	10	8722128	6	25882	25882
No favourable finding/lost	1518	46	42398262	31	27930	25529
Total	3283	100	136935853	100	41711	36021

Common reading rule for the reimbursement counts: Selected reimbursement population, not all LSR complaints. Companies/foundations lose access for cases brought later following the legislative change in 2009. Averages are adjusted by excluding large payments over 0,6 million DKK; the annual population and successful-claim proportion therefore do not become a national LSR error rate. A conto payments from earlier years may be included in reimbursement for closed cases.

2010: outcomes in closed cost-reimbursement cases

Original, PDF page 4. Unit: Expenses across agencies.

Outcome	Case	%	Compensation DKK	Amount share%	Average DKK	Adjusted average DKK
Full relief	715	30	61638029	43	86207	61612
Predominant success	286	12	28773682	20	100607	78309
Limited favourable finding	234	10	7281564	5	31118	31118
No favourable finding/lost	1127	48	45951429	32	40773	36116
Total	2362	100	143644704	100	60815	48328

See the common reading rule for the compensation accounts above.

2013: outcomes in closed cost-reimbursement cases

Original, PDF page 4. Unit: Expenses across agencies.

Outcome	Case	%	Compensation DKK	Amount share%	Average DKK	Adjusted average DKK
Full relief	472	31.5	43628975	40.0	92434	72795
Predominant success	196	13.1	21822837	20.0	111341	104046
Limited favourable finding	130	8.7	6086312	5.6	46818	46818
No favourable finding/lost	700	46.7	37550694	34.4	53644	50430
Total	1498	100	109088818	100	72823	64124

See the common reading rule for the compensation accounts above.

LSR: reimbursement of costs in the notified closed cases

Original, PDF page 1.

Year	Case	%	DKK	Amount share%	Average DKK	Adjusted average DKK
2009	1667	50.8	78086275	57.0	46842	40637

Year	Case	%	DKK	Amount share%	Average DKK	Adjusted average DKK
2010	1323	56.0	77499746	54.0	58579	49874

These instance rows are subsets of the totals of the drop tables. The common outcome table is not cross-tabulated at instance; outcomes cannot be applied to the LSR rows by percentage calculation.

2013: LSR series in the same later original version

Original, PDF page 1.

Year	Case	%	DKK	Amount share%	Average DKK	Adjusted average DKK
2013	664	44.3	44427569	40.7	66909	61725

664 is a subset of the year's 1.498 compensation cases, not the total outflow of 3.553. No table of findings in the party's favour by level of jurisdiction in this annex.

LSR:subsequent adjustment following a finding in the party's favour at a later level of jurisdiction

Original, PDF page 6. Unit: Reported post-adjustments.

Year	Case	DKK	Average DKK
2009	127	3152914	24826
2010	74	2059860	27836

Where overall success changes, reimbursement for an earlier instance may rise from 50% to 100%. The adjustment is recorded only at the instance triggering the change; one case may encompass several earlier instances. No addition as new unique cases to the original successful-claim counts.

2013: post-adjustment by all agencies

Original, PDF page 6.

Court of Justice	Case	DKK	Average DKK
LSR	35	1962388	56068
Taxation Council	-	-	-
City Court	13	674454	51881
National law	9	984405	109378
Højesteret	3	1543663	514554
Total	60	5164910	86082

A case may relate to several former bodies; placed on the triggering body. Blindline is retained and is not rewritten to a verified zero.

LSR: accounting costs for reimbursement

Original, PDF page 10. Unit: payments in the accounts.

Year	LSR million DKK	Syn / estimate LSR million DKK
2006	61.4	2.5

Year	LSR million DKK	Syn / estimate LSR million DKK
2007	88.3	6.8
2008	79.4	2.8
2009	84.9	5.3
2010	84.3	9.8

Includes a conto, closed cases, retroregulation and reimbursement. This is a different year from the cost of completed reimbursements; no compensation for the unlawful tax requirement itself is derived.

LSR: historical accounting costs, later source version

Original, PDF page 9. Unit: Accounting disbursements.

Year	LSR million DKK	Syn / estimate LSR million DKK
2011	61.2	5.0
2012	59.4	5.5
2013	53.1	3.6

Separated from closed cases. Example 2013: 53,1 million accounts compared to 44.427.569 DKK completed cases; scopedifference, not automatically an error in the report.

Year-by-year coverage

Later supplies of originals for 2006 and 2009-2012 fill those years' administrative percentage matrices and the court outcomes for 2006/2009/2010. The table here has been updated to this content. The originals' percentage cells have not been back-calculated into observed favourable-finding counts.

Year	Administrative full outcomes	Waiting time	Court outturn	Compensation results
2006	Four group percentages and exact N checked in LSR06O; affirmance includes closures with possible actual relief. Cell counts/remittal unresolved	Original fact 11,6 and corrected 10,7; separate subgroups controlled	All original categories of organiser / judge / conciliatory / referee controlled; own 55 / 283 citizen-friendly, of which 18	The original indicates not yet specified 2006; precise registration requirements
2007	Not primarily controlled; the complete exit table is missing	Primary controlled: RR 2006-09 and LSR 2013 historical table 2010- 13	Original year-end table missing	The year's separate outcome documents are missing
2008	Not primarily controlled; the complete exit table is missing	Primary controlled: RR 2006-09 and LSR 2013 historical table 2010- 13	Original year-end table missing	The year's separate outcome documents are missing
2009	Four administrative group percentages + exact N checked against primary sources in LSRH11/12; exact cell counts/remittal codes missing	Primary controlled: RR 2006-09 and LSR 2013 historical table 2010- 13	Full First Institution Table Primary Controlled in LSRH11 / 12	Primary-Controlled Separate Reimbursement
2010	Four administrative group percentages + exact N checked against primary sources in LSRH11/12; exact cell counts/remittal codes missing	Primary controlled: RR 2006-09 and LSR 2013 historical table 2010- 13	Full First Institution Table Primary Controlled in LSRH11 / 12	Primary-Controlled Separate Reimbursement
2011	Four administrative group percentages + exact N primary controlled i	Primary controlled: RR 2006-09 and LSR 2013 historical table 2010- 13	Full First Institution Table checked	The year's separate outcome documents are missing

Year	Administrative full outcomes	Waiting time	Court outturn	Compensation results
	LSRH11/12; exact cell counts/remittal codes missing			
2012	Four administrative group percentages + exact N checked against primary sources in LSRH11/12; exact cell counts/remittal codes missing	Primary controlled: RR 2006-09 and LSR 2013 historical table 2010- 13	Full First Institution Table checked	The year's separate outcome documents are missing
2013	Not primarily controlled; the complete exit table is missing	Primary controlled: RR 2006-09 and LSR 2013 historical table 2010- 13	Full First Institution Table checked	Primary-Controlled Separate Reimbursement

Found longer originals and financial reports

Year	Official registry item	Material status
2006	ODA document 488209	Longer 64 pages original now retrieved from archiveetSKM; relevant pages 1-19 / 30-46 read, all reproduced numbers visually controlled; 31 tables 146 rows ilSR06O modules
2009	ODA document 249337	Official registration localized; longer original not retrieved and material outreach
2010	ODA document 201843	Official registration localized; longer original not retrieved and material outreach
2011	ODA document 142923	Further original now retrieved from official host via Wayback; case statistics / matrices / method / time controlled in the separate LSRH11 / 12 module
2012	ODA document 53631	Further original now retrieved from official host via Wayback; case statistics / matrices / method / time controlled in the separate LSRH11 / 12 module
2012	ODA document 54511	Separate financial report recorded; no automatic equivalence with longer annual statistics
2013	ODA document 99867	16-page financial annual report: the whole text read, p.1-16; flow, time, stock and target tables re-checked. No full administrative outcome matrix in the report; this dimension remains open

The contemporaneous official 2010 transmission identifies aarsrap2010.pdf, and the property valuation appeals boards' public historical register identifies LSR aarsrapp 2011 til web.pdf. The 2011 original has now been retrieved from the archived official host and checked for case statistics together with the 2012 original;the 2010 annual original remains a specific outstanding access issue. This does not prove that its figures never existed. TAX.dk was used only as a search trail to longer annual reports; no secondary percentage was reverse-calculated into an original case count.

Specific remaining registry request

Skatteankestyrelsen/the National Tax Tribunal is requested to disclose all longer annual reports and underlying version-dated annual tables for 2006-2013: counts upheld,reduced/wholly/partly favourable,increased,remitted,dismissed,discontinued,withdrawn,reopened/refused reopening; total and sample by case type/deciding authority. Include non-board cases,amendments on reconsideration and cases without a substantive ruling,and precise information about every excluded population. Supply both corrected and uncorrected waiting time,number of cases on hold and their duration,all court outcomes at each instance,and unambiguous anonymous case linkage from the first decision to effective repayment/interest compensation/adjustment. The Ministry of Taxation is requested to supply missing compensation outcomes for 2006-08 and 2011-12 with version breaks,natural/legal persons and a cross-table of instances. No request has been sent.

Depreciation and consistency

The three taxpayer-initiated first-instance columns reconcile to 323/313/266; the Ministry-initiated columns to 9/10/13. Reimbursement outcomes reconcile to 3.283/2.362/1.498, but these are different case samples. They cannot be used to infer the number of people subjected to tax without legal authority. Periods on hold and the time before a collection complaint is fully documented are specifically excluded from the published adjusted times. Before 2014 the same case could appear before both an appeals board and LSR. A ruling granting relief therefore does not necessarily end the citizen's actual financial burden either; effective alteration of demands, repayment, interest and later litigation require linkage of the case trajectory.

Own stock reconciliation of LSR's 2013 numbers: 4.297 beginning + 5.652 entry − 3.553 departure = 6.396, while the original returns 6.367 end. The discrepancy is 29 cases. The original flow table does not provide any separate correction or movement category explaining the difference. It shall be aligned with the movement and audit information of the register; it shall not be designated, without further proof, as 29 unlawful decisions or lack of citizens.

National tax law: original knowledge of guarantee breaches and waiting time in 2006-2007

Population and period

FOB 2007.525 examines 40 complaint cases closed during 16. March-30. June 2004, with 20 employee-tax cases and 20 VAT/excise cases. The events precede the report period; preliminary criticism on 21. August 2006, ministerial/court statements in 2006 and the final 2007 account document knowledge and response within the period. The 40 are therefore not added as new error trajectories in 2006-2025. [LSRFOB07,PDF3-4]

The sample excludes wholly favourable findings,continuing correspondence and cases reviewed by courts,the ministerial department or other authorities,including EU bodies. Case processing by lower instances and the Customs and Tax Administration is not independently examined,although the agency was involved in 18 cases. One described linked process was not received. The study examines administrative procedure,not the substantive basis of every decision. This is a specific sample,not a national error rate. [LSRFOB07,PDF3-4,134]

The 40 outcomes comprise 30 upheld decisions, 7 partial findings in the party’s favour, 1 refusal to reopen and 2 formal dismissals. Procedural errors may therefore be found in upheld decisions without being counted as administrative overturnings. The 20 VAT/excise cases cover both individuals and companies; 40 cases are not 40 natural persons. [LSRFOB07,PDF10]

All time series: first answer

Measured from the receipt stamp,including faxes outside office hours,to the dated reply. These acknowledgement times do not document decision time,payment or redress. [LSRFOB07,PDF97-98]

Days	Case	Case ID
0	7	04,06,07,18,29,33,34
1	6	03,08,11,15,25,28
2	6	13,19,26,30,32,35
3	5	02,09,22,37,40
4	3	14,16,39
5	4	01,17,24,36
6	2	12,31
7	2	05,10
10	1	21
13	1	20
14	1	23

Days	Case	Case ID
22	1	27
30	1	38

The sum is 40.35 cases less than 10 days; 36 are not more than 10 days, and 4 over 10 days. The original formulation "within 10 days" and the subsequent clarification of 4 over 10 days are therefore separated by an explicit limit.

All time series: total treatment

The ranges are open: above the first and below the last month's figure. Not displayed ranges are not added as new source rows. [LSRFOB07, PDF98, visually controlled]

Monthly	Case	Case ID
1-2	1	20
2-3	1	39
3-4	2	18,40
4-5	1	19
6-7	3	15,16,38
7-8	2	14,37
8-9	6	10,12,13,33,35,36
9-10	3	08,09,11
10-11	1	07
11-12	4	05,06,32,34
12-13	1	04
14-15	2	03,30
15-16	1	31
16-17	1	29
17-18	1	17
18-19	1	27
19-20	2	02,28
22-23	4	01,24,25,26
26-27	1	23
33-34	1	22
35-36	1	21

The sum is 40.5 cases were decided within 6 months; 35 took longer. In 2 of the long cases, expert inspection and assessment took place with suspension of the separate direct-action deadline. Full calendar time and adjusted administrative time must be retained separately. Average full time was 396,75 days:310,8 for the 20 tax cases and 482,7 for the 20 VAT/duty cases. The contractual target then in force was an average and cannot be treated as an individual statutory deadline. [LSRFOB07,PDF99]

Expected and final criticism

Wanted waiting time	Case ID count	Case ID	Start Point
6-12 months	7	01,21-26	Material received from subbody
9-15 months	19	04,06-10,12-16,18-20, 33-37	Not uniform expressed as material acceptance
9-15 months	10	02,03,05,17,27-32	Material received from subbody
No stated expectation	4	11,38-40	Separate review; absence is not automatic criticism

Source:LSRFOB07,PDF114-115.36 received a general expectation; 24 cases' actual processing time fell just within the stated range. These figures do not certify lawful processing or sufficient ongoing information.

The preliminary timeline included 16 cases. Following the Authority's opinion, Case 32 was removed, **the final time-critical concerned 15 out of 40 cases;**. For the time being 16 and finally 15 are versions of the same control, not 31 cases of error. 17 cases exceeded the relevant contract averages; this is another classification. I8 identified cases constituted periods without external expeditions at least half of the time. [LSRFOB07, PDF112-114]

The initial 16-ID list contains 3 tax and 13 tax cases, while the text of the bread says 3 + 12. The sum of 3 + 12 is 15. This local discrepancy is not implicitly altered; the final separate 15-criticism of PDF114 is the relevant end result. On PDF112, the example of case 34 appears to change in "real 'and" actual' time; the case review on PDF111 indicates over 11 calendar months and about 3 months of effective treatment. The different terms of reference shall be kept visible.

Guarantees: self-criticism of the Authority's premise

Conclusion: Absence of court actions does not prove substantive correctness and cannot replace investigation of safeguard breaches. **The authority's specific statement:** The ministry's reproduced 2006 statement presumes substantive correctness because complainants did not seek further review. **Original evidence:** The study's sample specifically excludes cases reviewed by courts,and the final statement primarily examines the process. **Deficiency:** A selection criterion is used as evidence of a decision's correctness without examining the individual's opportunities or substantive evidence. [LSRFOB07,PDF3,134,139]

Relevant rule: According to the actual legal assessment of the statement, the appeal body must deal with apparent breaches of guarantees and their possible illegality even if the citizen did not want such a review. **Action; or non-compliance:** The authorities dispute this obligation in their opinions; the Ombudsman maintains it in the final outcome. **Legal deviation:** Known guarantee deficiencies cannot be ignored simply by referring to the delimitation of the complaint or the absence of legal proceedings. **Result significance:** Deficient guidance, evidence preservation and review can leave the citizen with a loss of justice without a timely new decision. **Responsibility:** The decision-making chain of the Board of Appeal and the documented response of the Ministry shall be tested separately. **Requirements:** Check the guarantee, the original error and its concrete legal consequences; resume where the conditions are met; documents actual change, payment and liability. Personal liability cannot be deduced from the search alone. [LSRFOB07, PDF135,137-139]

The summary also documents 6 cases with an incorrectly stated legal basis,1 breach of confidentiality,1 incorrectly conducted hearing of the parties,1 missing letter to the citizen and 2 rejections without an assessment of relief under the guidance then in force. These overlapping criticisms are not distinct new people and must not be summed with 15 criticisms concerning time. [LSRFOB07,PDF136-137]

The crucial point of impact is which cases were actually reopened, which right was changed, when the citizen was paid and what the response to responsibility was. An indication of a new folder or process project merely documents the undertaking. No request for authority has been sent.

Taxes 2009-2012: original outages, hidden changes and actually waiting time

Conclusion: Two lengthy annual originals previously not obtained have now actually been retrieved and read in RAM. They fill the four administrative outcome groups for 2009-2012 and the complete first-instance litigation outcomes for 2009/2010 that were absent from the earlier expansion. The other checked annual extracts overlap existing material and are counted once. These are specific new source deliveries; annual statistics still provide no national person or loss linkage.

Original, locator and device

LSRH11 has 30 physical PDFs pages with two printed pages on most notices. LSRH12 has 31 physical pages with corresponding notices. It is therefore wrong to use printed page 44 as physical PDF page 44. The reading delineation here is the specific case, method, time and outcome sections. No certificate of completion shall be provided for all sections of the accounts, staff and members.

The administrative case outcomes state rounded percentages and an exact total case count. **The percentage is not multiplied by the denominator and presented as an observed number of successful complaints.** The exact cell count must be provided from the case register. “Reduction” includes full or partial relief. “Other” includes several closure codes and, according to the original's own note, cases with an actual reduction as well. Affirmance/reduction may therefore be hidden in the overall other category. In valuation cases, the other category for 2011/2012 is described mainly as affirmance; this does not automatically apply to the other groups.

The experience-based statement of approximately 40 % full and 60 % partial reductions is not a separate observed outcome table. Remittal is specifically described in the 2012 target chapter, but does not appear as a separate count in the four outcome tables. A zero in a new remittal column would therefore be invented.

Reader tables

Income: administrative outcome matrix 2009- 2012

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 18 / 20; printed pages 34-35 / 38-39. 2009 from LSRH11; 2010-2012 from LSRH12. The duplicate 2010 / 2011 cells of the two originals have been checked as the same; only one annuity is counted.

Year	Stamping%	Reduction%	% increase	Other%	Number of cases
2009	49,0	32,4	2,5	16,1	2356
2010	47,6	35,4	0,4	16,6	1556
2011	49,1	31,6	0,5	18,8	1426
2012	47,4	29,5	0,3	22,8	1203

Assessment: Administrative Outcome Matrix 2009-2012

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 18 / 20; printed pages 34-35 / 38-39. 2009 from LSRH11; 2010-2012 from LSRH12. The duplicate 2010 / 2011 cells of the two originals have been checked as the same; only one annuity is counted.

Year	Stamping%	Reduction%	% increase	Other%	Number of cases
2009	19,8	73,0	0,0	7,2	328
2010	15,6	73,6	0,0	10,8	462
2011	13,3	77,1	0,0	9,6	905
2012	19,5	77,9	0,0	2,6	1049

VAT, tax and customs duties: administrative outcome matrix 2009-2012

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 18 / 20; printed pages 34-35 / 38-39. 2009 from LSRH11; 2010-2012 from LSRH12. The duplicate 2010 / 2011 cells of the two originals have been checked as the same; only one annuity is counted.

Year	Stamping%	Reduction%	% increase	Other%	Number of cases
2009	46,1	30,2	0,4	23,3	760
2010	55,7	21,6	0,2	22,5	797
2011	49,3	27,9	0,0	22,8	949
2012	56,3	19,0	0,0	24,7	752

Other, including recovery: administrative outcome matrix 2009- 2012

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 18 / 20; printed pages 34-35 / 38-39. 2009 from LSRH11; 2010-2012 from LSRH12. The duplicate 2010 / 2011 cells of the two originals have been checked as the same; only one annuity is counted.

Year	Stamping%	Reduction%	% increase	Other%	Number of cases
2009	70,7	13,2	0,1	16,0	706
2010	73,5	12,3	0,3	13,9	763
2011	69,5	11,9	0,1	18,6	717
2012	70,3	12,3	0,1	17,3	775

Departure flow and outcome indicators

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 15-18 / 17-20; printed page 28-35 / 32-39. The last column is the own addition of the four original denominators; not new cases. 2010 has a specific difference of 17 between departure and exit population.

Year	Total departure	Income, flow	Assessment, flow	VAT etc., flow	Other, flow	Sum vents tables, N
2009	4150	2356	328	760	706	4150
2010	3595	1559	464	798	774	3578
2011	3997	1426	905	949	717	3997
2012	3779	1203	1049	752	775	3779

Proceedings in the underlying appeals board

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 14 / 16; printed page 27 / 31. Inputs, not errors or persons; some cases later pass on to the National Tax Court.

Year	Tax Appeals Board	Engine Anchors Board	Assessment Appeal Board	Total
2009	2028	1159	10218	13405
2010	1771	3049	4333	9153
2011	1595	1161	4552	7308
2012	1874	960	5121	7955

Entry of the National Tax Court by instance

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 14 / 16; printed page 27 / 31. 2012 s two empty annual cells are due to new case management system from 1 September. Only the first eight months have 463 tax returns; 463 is not an annual statement.

Year	Treasure board, 2. instance	Engine board, 2. instance	Assessment fist n, 2nd instance	Surplus	Other 1st instance	Total
2009	746	39	392	422	1924	3523
2010	797	45	697	344	1799	3682
2011	648	41	1518	377	1856	4440
2012	-	31	1568	400	-	5122

Court of Justice: two simultaneous 2009 versions

[LSRH11/LSRH12] Physical PDF page 14,21 / 16,23; printed page 27,40 / 31,44. 2009 p 17 and own sum 306 from the submission overview kept separate from the entry table's 7/296. The source does not explain the difference; no speculative correction.

Year and Locator	Tax payer	Ministry	Total, enlightened or own sum
2009, LSRH11 printed 27	289	7	296
2009, LSRH11 printed 40	289	17	306
2010	296	11	307
2011	291	8	299
2012	287	17	304

Court of First Instance cases brought by the taxpayer

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 21 / 23; printed pages 40-41 / 44-45. Completed legal proceedings, not necessarily the same year's entry. A small part relates directly to SKAT. 2011 / 2012 already overlaps the controlled Sagp -2014 table; no new counting of this overlap.

Outcome	2009	2010	2011	2012
Rejected	21	26	26	16
Raised by the applicant	68	56	68	60
Confirm to Refill	21	24	26	18
Judgment:wholly in the taxpayer's favour	17	20	23	13
Judgment: taxpayer predominantly successful	5	4	4	7
Judgment: full relief for the Ministry	126	120	150	170
Judgment: largely favourable to the ministry	11	19	11	18
Settlement:predominantly in the taxpayer's favour	2	7	8	9
Settlement:predominantly in the Ministry's favour	3	5	7	2

Outcome	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total	274	281	323	313

Cases before the Court of First Instance

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 21 / 23; printed pages 40-41 / 44-45. Confirmed to reply this table applies to the Ministry's principal claim. The same nine exit classes as above; actual repayment does not appear.

Outcome	2009	2010	2011	2012
Rejected	0	0	0	0
Raised by the applicant	0	1	0	1
Confirm to Refill	0	1	1	1
Judgment:wholly in the taxpayer’s favour	1	0	3	1
Judgment: taxpayer predominantly successful	0	0	0	1
Judgment: full relief for the Ministry	7	9	5	6
Judgment: largely favourable to the ministry	0	0	0	0
Settlement:predominantly in the taxpayer’s favour	0	0	0	0
Settlement:predominantly in the Ministry’s favour	0	0	0	0
Total	8	11	9	10

Case-law of the Ombudsman

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 22 / 24; printed page 42 / 46. 2011 cells are first found in LSRH12; 2012 stands as not yet available in this original and is not filled in with zero. The separate newer original has 2012 and 2013.

Year	Completed	Rejected	Reality without criticism	Reality with criticism
2008	42	26	14	2
2009	37	27	9	1
2010	37	18	19	0
2011	26	15	10	1
2012	-	-	-	-

Change in stocks

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 3 / 4; printed page 4 / 6. The age limit before 2008 is maintained; no personal union.

End of year	All pending	Income before 1.1.2008
2008	3171	1132
2009	2474	297
2010	2550	132

End of year	All pending	Income before 1.1.2008
2011	2987	67
2012	4297	43

Corrected average by type of case

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 17 / 19; printed pages 32-33 / 36-37. Forced cases have been omitted from the corrected objective. 2012's missing case types are not due to restored management statistics; they are not zero or common averages.

Group	2009 months	2010 months	2011 months	2012 months
All	9,1	7,2	7,1	7,9
Income	11,2	9,3	8,3	-
Assessment	5,0	6,3	7,3	-
VAT, tax and customs duties	11,0	7,9	7,0	-
Other	4,7	3,4	3,5	-
Surplus	6,4	6,2	6,1	7,1
Received after 1.1.2008	6,2	6,6	7,0	7,9

Calendar time versus corrected time

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 17 / 19; printed page 32 / 36. The 2012 uncorrected figures were not available after the change of system. The original prose indicates 8,7 months in 2011; table 9 is a rounding.

Year	Uncorrected, rounded months	Corrected, rounded months	Exactly uncorrected prose
2009	12	9	-
2010	10	7	-
2011	9	7	8,7
2012	-	8	-

2011: age at end

[LSRH11] Physical PDF page 17; printed page 33. The source indicates rounding. Shares summer at their own expense to 102, while the separately printed accumulated final value is 100; both versions are retained. No raw case counter is recalculated.

Months	Share%	Printed accumulated%
0-3	30	30
4-6	22	51
7-9	16	67
10-12	11	78
13-15	7	83
16-18	5	89

Months	Share%	Printed accumulated%
19-21	3	92
22-24	2	94
Exceeding 24	6	100

2012: age at end

[LSRH12] Physical PDF page 19; printed page 37. Completed trajectories; continued ongoing long trajectories are not the same population. The source indicates rounding.

Months	Share%	Printed accumulated%
0-3	40	40
4-6	19	59
7-9	11	70
10-12	10	80
13-15	7	87
16-18	3	90
19-21	3	93
22-24	2	95
Exceeding 24	5	100

Phase times, Annual version of the 2011 report

[LSRH11] Physical PDFs page 7; printed pages 12-13. Full-year version. The figures shall not be silently replaced by the 2012 specific office / eight-month version.

Phase	2010 days	Target 2011 days	2011 days
Consultation	18	17	19
Distribution	16	15	21
Procedure	96	91	105
Head of Division	7	7	5
Votation	22	21	19

2012: Office 1-6, special time take-off

[LSRH12] Physical PDF page 8; printed pages 14-15. The change of system means that the 2012 column only covers the first eight months. The division between offices does not in itself explain all the differences to LSRH11.

Phase	2011 comparator days	Target 2012 days	First eight months 2012
Consultation	17	16	15
Distribution	16	15	8
Procedure	105	100	94
Votation	19	18	17

2012: Office 7, special time take-off

[LSRH12] Physical PDF page 8; printed pages 14-15. The change of system means that the 2012 column only covers the first eight months. The division between offices does not in itself explain all the differences to LSRH11.

Phase	2011 comparator days	Target 2012 days	First eight months 2012
Consultation	26	24	21
Distribution	37	37	70
Procedure	105	105	175
Votation	19	17	15

FFF's holdings at the beginning of 2012

[LSRH12] Physical PDFs page 8; printed page 15. Year of submission, not closing year or number of different owners. The 171 from 2006-2010 is a subset of 745.

Year of submission	Uncompleted 5.1.2012
2006	2
2007	1
2008	15
2009	47
2010	106
2011	547
2012	27
Total	745

FFF's holdings at the end of 2012

[LSRH12] Physical PDFs page 9; printed page 16. Four old cases dating back from 2006-2010; total stocks increased anyway. The original text indicates 793 cases received by the ESF in the target chapter, but 795 in the volume chapter; both figures are retained.

Year of submission	Uncompleted end 2012
2009	1
2010	3
2011	399
2012	755
Total	1158

Hearing and separate February surveys

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 19-20 / 21-22; printed page 36-38 / 40-42. Assistance is measured by February's entry, not by all the completed cases of the year. 2013's assistance is a subsequent measure of annual report 2012, not 2013's decision statistics.

Year	Delivered at the hearing	Assistance in case of case%	Assistance in non-judicial cases%
2009	586	-	-
2010	435	85	45
2011	463	86	47
2012	349	89	48
2013	-	92	46

February survey: representation groups

[LSRH11/LSRH12] Physical PDF pages 19-20 / 21-22; printed pages 37-38 / 41-42. The 2012 office average is affected by a group from one consultancy. The 2013 non-board figure was visually checked on physical page 22:15 % lawyer and 14 % consultant; the numerical order in the text extraction alone did not identify the labels.

Year and Case Group	No%	Auditor%	Lawyer%	Adviser, etc.%
2011, Board	14	23	55	8
2012, name	11	20	64	5
2013, Board	8	14	76	2
2011, not name	53	17	21	9
2012, not name	52	4	9	35
2013, not name	54	17	15	14

Reimbursement of costs: annual reports' contemporaneous version

[LSRH11 / LSRH12] Physical PDF page 20 / 22; printed page 39 / 43. Compensation cases have their own denominator; the amount per case is not the loss of all completed tax cases. Later recalculated annual accounts in the previous module shall be kept as separate versions.

Year	All agencies DKK million	National tax law DKK million	Pr. LSC case kr.
2008	132,8	76,4	48104
2009	136,9	78,1	46842
2010	143,6	77,5	58579
2011	132,1	63,5	74848
2012	-	-	-

Largest Entry Groups 2011

[LSRH11] Physical PDFs page 16; printed page 31. The source indicates these ten groups as 45% of the entrance; none of the groups alone can be described as illegal decisions.

Location	Subject	Entry
1	Land improvement deduction	887
2	Commercial real estate	254
3	Counterpart / recovery	166

Location	Subject	Entry
4	Estimation/setting aside of accounts	145
5	VAT / estimates	113
6	Tax Control Act surcharge	105
7	VAT / GNI-based own resource	103
8	Commercial condominium units	82
9	Foreign vehicles	75
10	Kommanditists	67

Maximum Entry Groups 2012

[LSRH12] Physical PDF page 18; printed page 35. The source informs these ten groups as 50% of the entry; groups are subpopulations and must not be added to the total entry.

Location	Subject	Entry
1	Land improvement deduction	795
2	Commercial real estate	557
3	Estimation/setting aside of accounts	219
4	Tax Control Act surcharge	191
5	Parcel houses / owner's apartments	162
6	Interest / fees	146
7	VAT compensation	132
8	Counterpart / recovery	119
9	VAT / estimates	116
10	Reimbursement of costs	110

Depreciation and precise discrepancies

1. **2010 s populations:** The flow groups are 1.559 / 464 / 798 / 774 = 3.595; the precipitation tables are 1.556 / 462 / 797 / 763 = 3.578. The difference is 17 case records, not 17 proven errors or citizens. The originals do not provide a joint case ID vote.

2. **2009 court intake:** the same LSRH11 original has the ministry’s 7 on printed page 27 and 17 on printed page 40. These intake figures are also separate from the 8 closed actions brought by the minister. Intake/outflow shifted across years must not be used as an automatic explanation for two different intake figures.

3. **2012 FFF:** the target chapter’s intake 793 differs from the specialist statistics’795. The backlog’s 745→1.158 and old sub-backlog’s 171→4 also show that meeting the clearance target for old cases does not mean clearing the overall queue.
4. **Duration of 2011:** rounded shares sum to 102%. The accumulated row of the original ends at 100% and has several values other than an addition of the rounded parts. The source's rounding note is retained; raw counters and percentages are required for precise reconstruction.

5. **2012's statistical break:** the year of tax return, uncorrected calendar time and several case type averages were not available after the change of system. A 7,9-month target for corrected cases does not prove that all taxpayers waited 7,9 months. The sorted-off cases and the unfinished stock are specifically relevant to the citizens' total waiting time.

Legal meaning and requirements

Conclusion → Original proof → meaning: The known percentage of change is not fully visible in the standard column "reduction 'and the time target hides parts of the calendar period during which a citizen may be bound by a disputed tax decision. The proof is the original code and reassurance notes as well as the actual system breaches. It requires an independent adjustment and time balance rather than a reading of the second category as unchanged decisions. [LSRH11 -LSRH12]

Rule → act/omission → departure: The legal analysis rests on the specific decision's legal authority, factual basis, reasons and effective review; FOB 2007.525 establishes in the separately checked original that an appeal body cannot ignore safeguard errors capable of invalidating the lower authority's decision. A statistical favourable-finding percentage proves neither that every upheld decision is lawful nor that every favourable finding triggers personal criminal responsibility. The specific case record must identify the error and the period during which the intervention had effect.

Consequence → responsibility → specific demand: For citizens and enterprises affected by errors, the register must be linked to assessment/collection, deferral, actual repayment, interest and compensation. The demand is a de-identified extract with a stable case/person key, all closure codes including reconsideration/withdrawal reason, exclusion flag, receipt, periods on hold, decision and actual financial implementation. It must show management's and the employee's specific knowledge and response before personal responsibility is concluded. No data request has been sent.

LSRH12's target chapter shows an actual cross-cutting analysis of the high rate of favourable findings in valuation cases and specific remittals in 2011 cases. It describes an onward-appeal rate of approximately 50 %,with uncertainty about allocation by period, against a target of 10-20 %. At the same time, the target activity scores 100 for target achievement. An activity score is thus not an actual count of corrected decisions, repayments or remedied loss. [LSRH12,physical 9,printed 16-17]

Tax requirements and EMRK: specific scope;

Under the Ferrazzini judgment, ordinary tax disputes fall outside Article 6's civil scope. Financial effect is insufficient. Tax sanctions must be examined separately as autonomous criminal charges; the Vegotex judgment is a specific example of Article 6 applying in a tax and sanction case. The established waiting time therefore requires precise legal classification. [FXTAX01-FXTAX02]

This local delimitation does not remove requirements of legal authority and reasons or protection of property under Article 1 of the First Additional Protocol. A documented unlawful tax intervention must be examined for actual collection, proportionality, loss and effective reparation; Article 13 presupposes a procedurally relevant, arguable Convention claim. State responsibility and domestic liability for damages are examined independently. [R04,R11,R19]

What is now closed and what actually requires more

The four-group administrative matrix 2009- 2012, all nine outcome classes 2009- 2012, simultaneous ombudsman numbers 2008- 2011, selected case flows, time denominators and exclusions are now primarily controlled. Judgment results 2011 / 2012 overlap with previous deliveries; 2013 is already in the newer original.

Administrative outcomes for 2006-2008 and 2013 still lack original table material; the longer 2006/2009/2010 records were not retrieved by the archive check carried out. These percentage tables do not provide precise administrative counts of relief/remittals or internal codes. Court outcomes for 2006-2008 and separate reimbursement outcomes in the previously described outstanding years require their respective originals. A union of unique individuals, actual payment, unlawful period and individual responsibility are separate linkage requirements. None of these outstanding items is turned into a general reservation about the cells documented above.

Landsskatteretten 2006: administrative outcomes, hidden successful claims and actual waiting time

The recovered original annual report closes the specific access gap for the National Tax Tribunal's administrative outcomes in 2006. It also documents a significant limitation in the authority's own coding:some appeals in which the original decision was changed in the citizen's favour are placed under "upheld". Counting this entire category as correct authority decisions or cases lost by citizens would therefore be wrong. **The original does not give the exact count of these hidden findings in the party's favour.** This is a specific finding of missing data that remains after full reading of the relevant outcome tables. LSR06O, pp. 35–37.

Outcome and denominator actually available

Administrative Working Group 2006	Findings	Stamping%	Reduction%	% increase	Original page
Income	3551	63,9	35,7	0,4	35
Assessment	61	49,1	50,9	0,0	35
VAT, tax and customs duties	451	72,7	27,1	0,2	36
Other, including recovery	603	83,6	16,2	0,2	37
Total outflow, not an overall rate of findings in the party's favour	4666	-	-	-	31

Reduction includes both wholly and partly favourable findings. The annual report's remark that roughly half are wholly and half partly favourable is an experience-based description; it is not a count of the two categories among the 2006 cases actually closed. The percentages shown are rounded. Multiplication by the denominator therefore does not produce a documented number of favourable decisions. LSR06O, pp.35–37.

Affirmance also includes rejected, withdrawn, discontinued and lapsed cases, and refused reopening. For VAT/excise/customs, the report explains that withdrawals and discontinuances may result from the customs and tax region or tax centre itself reopening the case and wholly or partly amending the decision in line with the appellant's claim. Such cases are then closed in Landsskatteretten and included in the broader affirmance category. There is therefore a **documented overlap between this category's contents and actual reductions**; its extent cannot be derived from the table. LSR06O, pp. 35–36.

For other cases, the original describes many complaints concerning tax-control surcharges that were closed: applications for exemption had not been examined at first instance. The report itself states that some may subsequently have been granted by SKAT, but documents neither the number nor individual redress. **What is established is closure following absent first-instance examination; later exemption is an assumption in the annual report.** These evidential levels remain separate. LSR06O, p. 37.

Time for testing and time to be removed from target

All 4666 closures have 11,6 months actual average compared to 10,7 months in the corrected statement. The correction removes compulsory reassurances in tax proceedings, surveys and estimates, as well as references to the EU Commission or the EU Customs Code Committee. For the time course of the citizen, uncertainty does not cease because an interval is removed from the control target. Nor is the uncorrected average time for actual repayment or final closure after a subsequent trial. LSR06O, p. 10-13.

Population 2006	Actual months	Corrected months	Findings	Page
All	11,6	10,7	4666	10
Name processing	13,1	12,1	4021	12
Income	12,9	12,1	3551	13
Assessment	6,6	6,6	61	14

Population 2006	Actual months	Corrected months	Findings	Page
VAT, tax and customs duties	14,7	12,2	451	14
Exit from the Tax Appeal Board	4,7	4,7	170	16
Recovery	1,5	0,8	151	17

Name and skipper are not additional populations, which must be added to the four case groups. Recovery is part of others. The corrected clock of recovery shall not begin until full case information has been provided. The surplus also leaves out cases of hearing; the report states that the 170 cases closed did not have such hearings or reassurances. LSR06O, p. 12-17.

The rounded age shares show that 10% of the closures were after more than 24 months. Cases of hearing have 20,4 months average, sight and estimate 31,2 months and are suspended for 43,0 months in criminal proceedings. These sub-groups may overlap; no separate number of cases is given for all reasons. None of the averages automatically document breaches of conventions in each case, but they show why national average time alone cannot bear a conclusion on timely effective review. LSR06O, pp. 11-12 and 38.

In the table on p. 11, 0-3 and 4-6 months rounded positions are 21% + 12% to 33%, while the cumulative cell of the original is 34%. Both original sizes have been preserved. A calculated integer number based on these percentages would provide an accuracy that the original does not provide.

Proceedings, audits and checks without automatic person count

The original divides High Court cases by claimant, judgment, settlement, acknowledgment, withdrawal and dismissal. In 2006, 273 taxpayer-initiated and 10 Ministry-initiated cases were concluded. Taxpayers obtained findings wholly or predominantly in their favour by judgment in 17 of the first and 1 of the second population. In addition, there were 27 acknowledgments of the claim and 10 settlements predominantly in the taxpayer's favour in taxpayer-initiated cases. **Own category counting therefore gives 55 of 283 closures with these expressly citizen-favourable outcomes, of which 18 by judgment.** The 55 must not be relabelled as 55 judgments establishing unlawfulness, unique taxpayers or documented compensation. A smaller proportion of the table's cases concern SKAT's decisions directly. LSR06O, pp. 42–43.

The 2005 column contains a specific registration revision:46 settlements favourable to the Minister, including 45 identical share-premium cases closed in 2005 but registered only after submission of the 2005 annual report's figures. The 45 are not 2006 cases and not a documented number of different persons. The original also describes ongoing work to improve the data basis of registrations. LSR06O, p 43.

The Ombudsman's 2006 outcomes and 2006 reimbursement of legal costs were not yet counted in this original. Hyphens are retained as missing information. An ongoing investigation of 40 selected complaint cases 2005-06 is not 40 established criticism findings. Reimbursement of legal costs is not automatically compensation for an authority error. LSR06O, pp.41 and 44.

Documented errors, investigation requirements and residues

The strongest sustainable criticism is the statistics' lack of transparency concerning favourable findings: **the annual report's upheld code includes cases of actual reduction**. The evidence is the original category footnotes and the explanation about reopening by the first authority; the significance is that corrections favourable to individuals cannot be counted fully in the published outcome account. A reduction by an authority is not in itself sufficient evidence of every alleged breach of law or individual criminal guilt. A legal assessment of responsibility requires the decision before correction, the grounds for amendment, the specific rule breached, the responsible person's act or omission and documented loss. This local evidential limit does not remove the demonstrated coding problem.

The specific requirements for a subsequent account are to separate withdrawn and shelved cases by their actual reason, separately document full and partial relief, retain both unadjusted and adjusted times, and link correction to actual repayment, interest and any compensation. Registers at different instances must be connected through case and person identity before calculating a union across administrative complaints, courts and the Ombudsman.

This delivery closes the 2006 original for administrative outcomes, relevant case flow, court outcome and time. It has 31 reading tables with 146 rows, including the historical comparison columns of the original and future time targets.

These are tables and rows, not 31 or 146 new mistakes / citizen cases. Read material: Annual Report 1-19 and 30-46; all reproduced tables are visually checked because the PDF's text layers mix up several digits. Accounting and personnel of 20-29 / 47-64 are not fully controlled in this defined delivery. Original pages, text layers and images are not permanently stored.

2007,2008 and the administrative outcome breakdown for 2013 remain specific gaps in obtaining originals. Historical 2007/08 averages have already been read in Rigsrevisionen's follow-up; these years must not again be called entirely unknown. The 2013 financial annual report of 16 pages documents flow and time, but the known table does not break down administrative outcomes. The separate historical 2011/12 originals are now substantively checked in landsskatteretten-2009-2012-originale-udfaldsmatricer.md:26 tables,154 rows. Their administrative 2009-2012 columns and 2009/2010 court outcomes are therefore no longer metadata alone.

National tax law 2006: original case, result and time tables

All figures below are our own structured reproductions of the recovered public original. Pre-2006 material is historical comparison material, and 2007/08 time targets are future targets; they are not added to the 2006-2025 error account. **None of the tables documents unique taxpayers.**

LSR06T01 - Income tax cases: administrative outcomes

Original, physical and printed page 35

Outcome	2003	2004	2005	2006
Stamping%	61,4	60,5	62,0	63,9
Reduction%	38,0	39,0	37,0	35,7
% increase	0,6	0,5	1,0	0,4
Total cases	3281	3055	2807	3551

Outcome key for LSR06T01-T04: Upheld includes dismissed, withdrawn, discontinued, lapsed and refused reopening; some involve an actual reduction. Reduction includes wholly and partly favourable findings. No inference of exact outcome counts from rounded percentages. Other outcomes before 2006 not counted.

LSR06T02 - Assessment cases: administrative outcomes

Original, physical and printed page 35

Outcome	2003	2004	2005	2006
Stamping%	46,3	43,3	51,7	49,1
Reduction%	53,7	56,7	48,3	50,9
% increase	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Total cases	346	201	116	61

See the LSR06T01-T04 outcome key above.

LSR06T03 - VAT, tax and customs matters: administrative outcomes

Original, physical and printed page 36

Outcome	2003	2004	2005	2006
Stamping%	78,7	72,0	73,0	72,7
Reduction%	19,7	27,7	26,0	27,1
% increase	1,6	0,3	1,0	0,2

Outcome	2003	2004	2005	2006
Total cases	457	383	449	451

See the LSR06T01-T04 outcome key above.

LSR06T04 - Other cases: administrative outcome

Original, physical and printed page 37

Outcome	2003	2004	2005	2006
Stamping%	-	-	-	83,6
Reduction%	-	-	-	16,2
% increase	-	-	-	0,2
Total cases	-	-	-	603

See the LSR06T01-T04 outcome key above.

LSR06T05 - Entry and departure of proceedings: all cases

Original, physical and printed page 31

Year	Entry	Departure
2003	4110	4084
2004	3646	3639
2005	4189	3419
2006	4165	4666

Case records, not unique people. The rest include recovery; the sub-group must not be added.

LSR06T06 - Input and departure of proceedings: income

Original, physical and printed page 31

Year	Entry	Departure
2003	3351	3281
2004	3189	3055
2005	3433	2807
2006	2936	3551

Case records, not unique people. The rest include recovery; the sub-group must not be added.

LSR06T07 - Admission and departure of proceedings: assessment

Original, physical and printed page 32

Year	Entry	Departure
2003	331	346
2004	71	201
2005	87	116

Year	Entry	Departure
2006	106	61

Case records, not unique people. The rest include recovery; the sub-group must not be added.

LSR06T08 - Access to and departure from proceedings: VAT / tax / customs

Original, physical and printed page 33

Year	Entry	Departure
2003	428	457
2004	386	383
2005	473	449
2006	514	451

Case records, not unique people. The rest include recovery; the sub-group must not be added.

LSR06T09 - Entry and departure of proceedings: others

Original, physical and printed page 33

Year	Entry	Departure
2003	-	-
2004	-	-
2005	196	47
2006	609	603

Case records, not unique people. The rest include recovery; the sub-group must not be added.

LSR06T10 - Recovery: entrance and departure

Original, physical and printed page 33

Year	Entry	Departure
2006	163	151

Subgroup of others.

LSR06T11 - Ten main incoming case groups

Original, physical and printed page 34

Location 2006	Location 2005	Type of action	Case number
1	1	Discretionary assessment, disregard of accounts	280
2	-	Tax surcharge	203
3	2	Operating expenditure, general	190
4	3	Taxation of capital gains on real property	184
5	9	Kommanditists, K / S	164
6	5	Travel and subsistence expenses	160

Location 2006	Location 2005	Type of action	Case number
7	4	Group ratio, co-taxation / trade / merger / grants / loans	110
8	7	VAT deduction	91
9	6	Companies / shareholders, distributions and dividends	88
10	-	Taxation of gains on shares	88

The original informs 37% of the entrance. - in the 2005 position is the original (-), not rank 0.

LSR06T12 - National legal proceedings instituted

Original, physical and printed page 42

Construction by	2003	2004	2005	2006
Tax payer	268	243	280	266
Ministry of Taxation	1	9	13	8

A small part relates to SKAT directly, not the National Tax Court; entries and closures are different annual population.

LSR06T13 - Completed national proceedings brought by the taxpayer

Original, physical and printed page 42

Outcome	2003	2004	2005	2006
Rejected	13	15	11	21
Raised by taxpayer	75	64	106	80
Confirming to retaliate against the taxpayer's principal claim	19	24	12	27
Judgment:wholly in the taxpayer’s favour	11	12	8	11
Judgment: taxpayer predominantly successful	6	1	3	6
Judgment:wholly in the Ministry of Taxation’s favour	107	123	111	106
Judgment: Skatteministeriet predominantly successful	3	9	8	10
Settlement:predominantly in the taxpayer’s favour	18	18	18	10
Settlement: Skatteministeriet predominantly successful	6	1	3	2
Completed cases	258	267	280	273

Tax-direct cases are included to a lesser extent. Judgment, conciliation, retaliation, withdrawal and rejection are kept separate; no personal union.

LSR06T14 - Completed national proceedings brought by the Ministry of Taxation

Original, physical and printed page 43

Outcome	2003	2004	2005	2006
Rejected	0	0	0	0
Raised by the Ministry of Taxation	0	0	1	1

Outcome	2003	2004	2005	2006
Confirmed to respond to the Ministry of Taxation's principal claim	2	2	2	0
Judgment:wholly in the taxpayer's favour	0	0	4	1
Judgment: taxpayer predominantly successful	0	0	0	0
Judgment:wholly in the Ministry of Taxation's favour	5	5	4	8
Judgment: Skatteministeriet predominantly successful	0	0	1	0
Settlement:predominantly in the taxpayer's favour	0	0	0	0
Settlement: Skatteministeriet predominantly successful	0	0	46	0
Completed cases	7	7	58	10

The 2005 conciliation 46 is an audit: 45 identical court cases were closed 2005, but registered after the 2005 annual report. Keep the version; not 45 new 2006 cases.

LSR06T15 - The Ombudsman's closed LSC cases

Original, physical and printed page 44

Outcome	2003	2004	2005	2006
Total cases	22	17	19	-
Rejected	15	13	18	-
Reality without criticism / recommendation etc.,	6	4	1	-
Reality with criticism / recommendation etc.,	1	0	0	-

The 2006 figures were not available; - does not mean zero. Separate study 40 selected cases 2005-06 were not yet completed and are not counted as 40 critical findings.

LSR06T16 - Cases decided at hearing

Original, physical and printed page 38

Year	Case
2003	450
2004	434
2005	457
2006	440

The 2006 average 20,4 months also include suspension due to sight / discretion and criminal proceedings.

LSR06T17 - Publication of orders

Original, physical and printed page 45

Year	Orders
2003	174
2004	148

Year	Orders
2005	159
2006	222

Selected orders of principle or representative orders. A project covering, in principle, all decisions was still in the planning/tender phase; no evidence of publication of all decisions.

LSR06T18 - Professional assistance in case of a given case: February samples

Original, physical and printed page 39

Year	Share with professional assistance%
2004	83
2005	84
2006	85
2007	77

One month's entrance; unknown sample contests. Not all-year cases / persons or legal expenses coverage.

LSR06T19 - Professional assistance: February sampling

Original, physical and printed page 39

Category	Name feb 2006%	Name feb 2007%	Without name feb 2007%
No representative	15	23	46
Auditor	55	40	29
Lawyer	22	26	21
Adviser, etc.,	8	11	4

Third column on p 40. No given N; possible composition differences are highlighted in the original.

LSR06T20 - Reimbursement of costs, current prices

Original, physical and printed page 41

Unit	2003	2004	2005	2006
Total mill, DKK	92,4	106,1	128,9	-
Of which LSR mill, DKK	53,0	55,0	63,8	-
Kr, pr, LSC case	37300	30400	38280	-

The 2006 figures were not available; reimbursement of costs is not a substitute for unlawful regulatory behaviour.

LSR06T21 - All cases: average time

Original, physical and printed page 11

Year	Uncorrected months	Corrected months
2003	13	-
2004	14	-

Year	Uncorrected months	Corrected months
2005	14	13
2006	12	11

LSR06T21-T26 time key: The corrigendum omits the compulsory suspension; the overdraft also omits the hearing. The corrected watch of recovery starts with full case information. Table rounding is maintained; prosatal is more accurate, not new populations.

LSR06T22 - Referral: average time

Original, physical and printed page 13

Year	Uncorrected months	Corrected months
2003	13	-
2004	14	-
2005	14	13
2006	13	12

See the time key for LSR06T21-T26 above.

LSR06T23 - Income: average time

Original, physical and printed page 13

Year	Uncorrected months	Corrected months
2003	14	-
2004	14	-
2005	14	13
2006	13	12

See the time key for LSR06T21-T26 above.

LSR06T24 - VAT / levy / customs duty: average time

Original, physical and printed page 15

Year	Uncorrected months	Corrected months
2003	14	-
2004	17	-
2005	16	15
2006	15	12

See the time key for LSR06T21-T26 above.

LSR06T25 - Surplus: average time

Original, physical and printed page 16

Year	Uncorrected months	Corrected months
2003	-	-

Year	Uncorrected months	Corrected months
2004	-	-
2005	-	-
2006	5	5

See the time key for LSR06T21-T26 above.

LSR06T26 - Recovery: average time

Original, physical and printed page 17

Year	Uncorrected months	Corrected months
2003	-	-
2004	-	-
2005	-	-
2006	1,5	0,8

See the time key for LSR06T21-T26 above.

LSR06T27 - Assessment: average time

Original, physical and printed page 14

Year	Uncorrected months
2003	8
2004	10
2005	9
2006	7

No reassurances to correct for.

LSR06T28 - 2006 exact averages and population delimitation

Original, physical and printed page 10

Population	Completed cases	Uncorrected months	Corrected months	Page
All	4666	11,6	10,7	10
Name	4021	13,1	12,1	12
Income	3551	12,9	12,1	13
Assessment	61	6,6	6,6	14
VAT / levy / customs duties	451	14,7	12,2	14
Surplus	170	4,7	4,7	16
Recovery	151	1,5	0,8	17

Overheads and boards are transversal / subgroups. Recovery is subgroup of others. No sum across this table.

LSR06T29 - 2006

Original, physical and printed page 12

Population	Average months
With hearing	20,4
Without hearing	10,6
Syn and discretion	31,2
Bero for criminal proceedings	43,0

The courtroom population may also include the other reasons; no N for vision / estimation / penalty suspension and no personal union.

LSR06T30 - Age of proceedings at end 2006, all types of proceedings

Original, physical and printed page 11

Age	Proportion of all cases%	Cumulative%
0-3 months,	21	21
4-6 months,	12	34
7-9 months,	14	48
10-12 months,	13	61
13-15 months,	11	72
16-18 months,	9	81
19-21 months,	6	86
22-24 months,	4	90
Over 24 months,	10	100

N 4666. Rounded percentages and original cumulative percentages are maintained; 21 + 12 = 33, while cumulatively 34. No recuperation to precise numbers.

LSR06T31 - 2005-2008 time results and future management targets

Original, physical and printed page 10

Type of action	2005 months actually	In fact, 2006 months	Objective 2007 months	Objective 2008 months
All boards	13,0	12,1	9	8
Income	12,9	12,1	9	8
Assessment	8,8	6,6	9	8
VAT / levy / customs duties	14,6	12,2	11	10
Surplus	-	4,7	7	7
Recovery	-	0,8	1	1

Targets are not legal deadlines. Actual figures are the corrected populations. 2007 / 08 are future targets in the 2006 Annual Report, not subsequent actual time.

Source basis

LSR06O. National Tax Court, Annual Report 2006,64 pp. Public original at the Ministry of Taxation's historical address; archive copy 20070630025107. Read in memory, without storage of public original pages. SHA256: 396aa84fdb6177929c5614c1786010f420a1b33dc022aa8865820ea2615096e2. Relevant material reading coverage and residue are shown in the JSON card.

National Tax Law 2007, 2008 and 2013: concrete original access after 2006-found

Controlled October 7, 2026. The task is limited to original annual reports or statistical annexes with: **administrative Outcome 2007 / 2008 / 2013**. Original 2006 has been recovered and its relevant 31 tables / 146 rows have been delivered in the National Tax Court -2006-original -tables.md / .json. The negative searches below mean that the original requested was not obtained by the studied means; they do not mean that the original or the authority's underlying figures have never existed.

Checked access route	Actual result	Limit of proof
Public archive, exactly old annual report page nationskatretten.dk / maal _ o g _ results / rsreporta.html	Annual captures 2004 / 2005 / 2007 found. The latest 20070108152045 has been read for links; since refers to 2001-2005, not 2007 / 2008 / 2013.	The site is a historical index, not an updated full list for 2013.
Accurate old statistical page nationskatrett en.dk / maal _ and _ results / selecteactuelles tatistikker.html	Annual captures 2004 / 2005 / 2007 registered. No capture 2013 or later in this precise query.	Recording captures is not material reading of an 2013outcome table.
CDX Domain National Tax Retten.dk, status 200, publication names yearsreport / report / statistics, all MIMEs types	Official 2002-2005 and 2011/12 PDFs, including test hostnames, are found. No 2007/2008/2013 annual original among this filter's results.	2011 / 12 is separately materially controlled in the coordinator's delivery. No claim of full historical publication based on archive coverage.
CDX Domain lsr.dk, corresponding publication filter	Clear result. Separate annual search in the 194 relevant series of the host register found none of the requested annual originals.	Empty search relates to the exact filters; it is not proof that this alternate host has never provided statistics.
CDX domain skm.dk, status 200, national tax / lsr / aarsrap / rsreport, all MIMEs	46 URL registrations. The 2006 original identified at /public/dokumenter/landsskatteretten 2006.pdf. No corresponding 2007/2008/2013 annual original in the result. A 2007 page on shorter case-processing time is another study.	The actual 2006 find has been read. The title of the time evaluation is not annual statistics 2007.
CDX domain skm.dk, status 200, PDF, year 2007 / 2008 / 2013, also generic filenames	62 URL registrations; no desired LSR annual original among the annual report / report names.	Name filter cannot identify a statistics file without a recognisable name; the archive is not the authority's complete document system.
CDX domain skat.dk, status 200, publication names as above	105 URL registrations; no desired LSR year original with year 2007 / 2008 / 2013.	No material year-end reading results from this catalogue result.
Precise possible mirror addresses skm.dk / publi c / documents / national tax law 2007.pdf and national tax law 2008.pdf	Both precise CDX requests resulted in empty results.	The file names were justified search tracks from the working 2006 address; existence is not assumed.
Folketingets ODA Document Register, title contains National Tax Law and Report, top 300	14 official titles, no additional performance page. Annual reports 2006 / 2009 / 2010 / 2011 / 2012 / 2013 are identified, but no title with the requested 2007 / 2008 annual report.	The title index cannot exhaust attachments under another title. The 14 are metadata deposits, not 14 bugs or annual reports.
Genius variant of the ODA registry National Tax Court and Report	Six titles; no independent 2007 / 2008 -original.	Separate search variant, not six new reports.

Checked access route	Actual result	Limit of proof
Annual report of the ODA registry + 2007 / 2008 + Tax / tax	Eight titles, all irrelevant questions concerning other annual reports or companies; no requested original authority annual report.	These eight are not statistical populations.
2013 financial report, FT SAU 20131 Annex 196, document 99867, file 193526	The official 16-page original has now been read in full as text through Folketing's reproduction, pp.1-16/lines 0-622. Existing flow, time, backlog and target tables have been checked. No complete administrative favourable-finding/dismissal/remittal matrix in the report.	The year 2013 is not completely uncovered; the missing dimension is precise administrative distribution and subsequent restoration.
FT 20171 SAU Annex 209,1904358: Evaluation of the complaints structure	Official 69-page PDF available. Targeted text checks of the relevant content / method passages show time, production and court review; search results for confirmation / reduction were empty.	Not the entire 69-page original materially read in this task; not evidence of a full 2013administrative outcome matrix.

For 2007 / 2008, corrected and uncorrected average time is already primary controlled in Follow-up by the National Auditor 6. May 2010, p. 3: 2007 corrected 11,8 months and actually approximately 13; 2008 corrected 11,0 and actually 12,7 months. The concrete remainder is therefore: **all administrative outcome matrices and full annual originals;**, not lack of knowledge of any control or waiting time in these years.

The annual processing time for 2013 in the known annual report is an adjusted 9,5 months, with a more precise measured value of 9,46. This is not the time for a deduplicated trajectory through both administrative instances then in existence. The relevant methodology read in the evaluation, printed pp. 37-38, separately explains that the 2013 time cannot be calculated for cases passing through two instances, and that the 2013 LSR population also contains case types handled by Skatteankestyrelsen after 2014. This narrow methodology check cannot be used to declare all tables in the evaluation checked. Evaluation, methodology pp. 37–38.

The later complete binary CDX search without a filename filter found 41/1/121 URL occurrences on LSR/lsr.dk/SANST. Three generic files were actually opened:2006 annual report hash-identical,2007 writing guide not an annual report, and a 22.2.2007 interim report of 31 pages, now all read as text/diagrams visually. The new process/knowledge source is integrated separately; no 2007/2008/2013 administrative outcome matrix was found. The earlier filename-filter scope has thus been expanded.

The remaining register requirement is version-dated 2007/2008/2013 outcomes by case group, with separate counts of full/partial relief, increases, remittals, rejections, shelving, withdrawal, discontinuance and refusal to reopen, and the actual reasons for those closures. The 2006 original's criticism of coding shows why the final categories must be included: complaints closed after alteration by the first authority may otherwise disappear from the account of successful claims. No external enquiry has been sent in this task.

National Tax Law 2007: documented management knowledge, leisure time and process changes;

A new file search without filename filter found 41 published binary URLs on the National Tax Court's historical domain, one on lsr.dk and 121 on the Danish Tax Appeals Board's domain. These are metadata occurrences, not report, error or case figures. Three generic files were subsequently opened in RAM: 5705-2006 materie.pdf is hashentical with the already used 2006 annual report and adds no new cases; 5707 samnp.pdf is a writing guide from 2007, not the annual report; Mid-Term report.PDF is a 31-page original from 22 February 2007 on complainants' waiting time. All 31 pages of the last page are text read, and PDF9 / 26 / 28 / 29 is visually controlled, including characters with incorrect text coding. No original copies are saved. [LSRLEAN07]

Sage and capacity: all cells in the original population table

Target PDF9	End of 2005, background	Ultimojuni 2006	End of 2006	Unit
Total number of cases	4.844	4.944	4.353	Cases pending, not year-end
Cases not analysed	1.177	467	388	Sub-quantity of total stock
Case handlers	47	72	77	Yearworks, not necessarily employed persons
Cashier in Case	103	69	57	The rounded ratio of the original
Cases not dealt with per caser	25	6	5	The rounded ratio of the original

The stock decreased by 491 from end 2005 to end 2006 and 591 from June to end 2006; undistributed 789 and 79 fell from the respective starting points. These are own differences between stock reductions. They are not the number of complaints closed: new entrances and other movements can be included between the basis.388 disadvantages are also not 388 proven unlawful decisions. They document an actual outstanding work population. The table shall not be added to the 2006 annual report's closing tables.

All key target figures and their demarcation

PDF	Distinguished number or interval	What the source measures or plans
3	13,7 → 8 months	The objectives of the profit and loss contract from 2004 onwards to the end of 2008 for all cases on the list; not achieved in this mid-term report
3	13,6 → 8 months	Corresponding income tax targets; type of case
3	40 appeals	The Ombudsman selected the 2005-2006 review; not an additional error union
4	2 areas of action	Internal working procedures and cross-cutting interactions / rules; the report only covers the former
5-7	7 work tracks and 7 groups	Case technique, piles, hearings, decision / preparation, intervals, office file and main file
5/26	4 phases of the project	Organisation process; not four citizens' cohorts
6	19 employees	Training seminar 5 September 2006; not 19 cases decided
8	3 to 6 months	Planned interval until follow-up on an event on case-handling procedures
9	3 months	Last scheduled start for three types of case piles; not total decision deadline
9	1 month	Office Head of Unit Time Planned; not total time of the citizen
10	14 + possibly 14 days	Consultation deadline and extensions for SKAT and the complainant; extension frequency not counted
12-13	Not more than 7 days	Votation time of each member of the court after a letter has been sent; non-documented performance in all cases
13	4 cases of 45 minutes	Existing legal model
13	5 easier cases 30 minutes	Experimental proposal; own difference 25% more cases, 150 as against 180 meeting minutes; no measurement of quality loss or gain
14	3-4 weeks	Specified normal preparation for hearing; often longer according to source
14	1 ½ week response	Specified example of inability to fill a free meeting time; no trigger denominator
16	3 new reports	Planned tools for ranges, internal / external time and pile management
18	About 50 questions / 8 replies	Internal office journal survey; rounded number of questions and denominator of staff
18	2 office pupils	Expected extension autumn 2007; undocumented effect
19	4 employees	The specified staff of the main journal
25	9 permanent steering group members;	The Commission indicates 3DEP + 3LSR + 1SKAT + 1 Appeal Secretary + 1 Head of Justice; PDF4's list of names has 8 and the difference is not harmonised
27	2 workshops	Project activities; not two independent legal studies
28	8 solution tracks	The Annex to the consultation against the main report's 7; decision-making / preparation is divided into the figure
29	4 cases per office in February / April	Planned sample of case-handling techniques; actual sample and results not stated
30	80% within 14 days	Planned follow-up targets for consultation time ultimoApril; absolute N and actual fulfillment shortcomings
30	At least 1 office	Scheduled experience with self-determination first quarter 2007; not independently documented measurement

The figures’ date axes on PDF28-29 run from 1. December through 1. January,1. February and 1. March to 1. July in the implementation plan. They show planned status meetings, decisions and follow-up, not achieved effect targets. The original’s four phases on PDF26 are visually confirmed. Recurring plan milestones in the main text and annexes must not be counted as new checks every time they are repeated.

Responsibilities and concrete deadlines for the plan

PDF	Planned action or control	Deadline / effect	Specified liability
4-5	Initiation / first meeting of steering group	3 May 2006 decision; 17th May approval versus 16th May before the first meeting	Department / steering group; day difference retained
8	Tools and knowledge sharing	1 April 2007	Chef group
8	Priority of other tool proposals	1. May 2007	Chef group
8	Follow-up to the case	1 June 2007	Souschefer
8	Library Project	1 June 2007	Chief / Library Group
10	Bulk metering	1 February 2007	Secretariat
10	Implementation of bunkers' lines	1 July 2007	Chef group
11	Direct tax consultation amended	11 December 2006	LSR / SKAT; indicated initiated, effect still expected
12	Standard letter for complaints / move / measurement	1 February 2007	Secretariat
13	Votation measurement	1 February 2007	Secretariat
13	Self-determination where possible	May 2007	Chef group
13	Attempts to deal with five cases of easier proceedings	May 2007	Presidents
13	Visitation / priority	1 January 2007	Heads of Division
13	Electronic weighing	No date	IT section; winnings not documented
15	Correspondence letter, newsletter and cancellation statistics	1 February 2007	Secretariat
17	New case placement codes	1 February 2007	Secretariat
17	Three measurement / control reports	1 February 2007	IT section
17	Code information meeting	1 February 2007	Secretariat
17	New code / journal structure	Awaiting period shift mid-2007	Secretariat
19	Daily record tasks and verification	1 February 2007 / May 2007	Newspapers / Chief Group
19	Replacement scheme	1 July 2007	Secretariat / journal masters
19	Holiday / Departure Tool	1. May 2007	Secretariat / IT section
19	Remove coffee accounting	1 January 2007	Secretariat; administrative activity, not civil correction
19	Library project launched	1 February 2007	Chef group; different milestone from June on PDF8
19	Monthly journal knowledge meetings	1 February 2007	Secretariat
19-20	Quarterly main / office journal meetings	1 April 2007	Secretariat
19	Telephone / calendar instructions	1 April 2007	IT section
20	The main journal's task descriptions	Immediately	Main Journal
20	List of authorities / knowledge meetings	1 February 2007	Secretariat

PDF	Planned action or control	Deadline / effect	Specified liability
20-21	Reporting	January / July 2007; management seminar May	Steering Group / Management, further Minister / Audit / Committee
21	User satisfaction survey	End of 2007	LSR; results not in the report
29-30	Procedure technique / consultation / data test	February / April 2007; evaluation May	Offices/management; planned sample and interview

Dates are a chain of responsibility for the planned work. They do not demonstrate that each milestone was implemented or that a complainant got his right or money back. The main text and annexes contain repetitions of the same approach. No aggregate sum of these rows is referred to as implemented regulatory controls.

Independent review of procedural change and civil proceedings

Conclusion: The document proves specific knowledge of time awaiting action, bottlenecks, variation in records and the need for better quality; it does not prove timely or lawful review was achieved. **Authority's statement:** The Minister for Taxation's appendix acknowledges that funding priorities contributed to increased processing time. The terms of reference require changes without deterioration in legal safeguards or decision quality. **Original evidence:** PDF22-25 containing the ministerial statement and terms of reference, read with the internal process description in PDF9-21. **Deficiency:** The report publishes no subsequent measurement of legal safeguards, the individual citizen's actual loss or payment. The budget explanation is the minister's explanation of priorities; it does not document that every delay was legally acceptable.

Relevant rule: The duty of sound processing on a sufficiently established factual basis, the specific statutory access to procedure and hearings, and the right actually covered by the complaint. The Ferrazzini delimitation in the report's tax analysis must continue to apply: ordinary tax claims do not automatically receive the civil protection of Article 6; sanctions and other rights require their own rules. **Act or omission:** PDF11-12 proposes that the complainant must reply within the consultation deadline to retain an oral hearing, otherwise the case proceeds to a written vote; PDF14 narrows the possibility of a new hearing following cancellation. **Legal departure:** A workflow or standard letter cannot alone establish legal authority to deprive the complainant of a procedural right. The examination must show the legal basis then in force, specific information, a valid reason for non-attendance, the party's understanding, the authority's reasons and the actual form of decision. The report documents the plan, not a particular citizen's unlawfully denied hearing.

Significance for outcomes: Less meeting time, self-voting and faster flow must be examined against genuine participation and decision quality. Numbers of closures do not in themselves prove improved lawfulness. **Responsibility:** The department, minister, tribunal management, senior-management group and named responsible roles are documented actors in the governance chain described; individual culpability requires the specific decision and knowledge. **Specific demand:** Produce the planned monthly interval/backlog reports,2006/2007 cancellation statistics, actual self-voting/hearing samples, subsequent measurement of legal safeguards, final 2007 reporting and affected citizens' case histories with financial effects. Examine whether known waiting periods were eliminated and whether changed letters and meeting procedures had proper legal authority and specific consequences. [LSRLEAN07;FXTAX01;FXTAX02;R04]

Remaining exactly after this finding

Administrative outcome matrices for 2007/2008/2013 were not found in these three files. The full binary archive search closes an earlier filename-filter gap and supplies an actual primary source for management knowledge and the process plan, but no new annual findings in the party's favour. The hash-identical republication of the 2006 annual report is counted once. The writing guide's first three pages were read for source identification; no full reading of its 28 pages or use as statistics is claimed. Final linkage of courses and losses still requires case-record/register data.

Tax appeals:outcomes, hidden remittals for reconsideration and time

All 12 years of original exit tables 2014- 2025 are read and numerically aligned with their own totals. The tables include the Motor, Tax and Valuation Appeal Board, the National Tax Court and the Danish Tax Appeals Board. The full breakdown of government figures is retained in the data file; the table below shows the total cases of the same year.

All annual outcomes with the original denominator

Year	Medh old he lt / delvi t	Stadf unladen	Sharpe n a	Tail cold	Other o utcome	Remitted for reconsi deration separately	Completed before the debut; sestudi stability	Name no	Original source
2014	1792	2072	29	816	2477	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	7186	Case statistics; PDF p. 4
2015	2985	3669	38	1722	2779	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	11193	Case statistics; PDF p. 8
2016	3968	3801	249	2077	2869	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	12964	Case statistics; PDF p. 12
2017	4182	5317	211	2828	3245	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	15783	Case statistics; PDF p. 10
2018	3120	6977	118	2400	2130	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	14745	Case statistics; PDF p. 12
2019	3197	4080	214	1430	2288	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	11209	Case statistics; PDF p. 11
2020	3071	3238	150	1011	1575	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	9045	Case statistics; PDF p. 9
2021	2553	2940	225	877	1734	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	8329	Case statistics; PDF p. 8
2022	2873	3005	155	1410	1446	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	8889	Case statistics; PDF p. 8
2023	2970	3114	253	1566	1986	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	9889	Case statistics; PDF p. 8
2024	2302	4075	230	750	1933	are included in the second category;	are included in the second category;	9290	Case statistics; PDF p. 8
2025	2746	4606	235	is included in the second category .	698	253	2039	10577	Case statistics; PDF p. 9

In 2016-2024, “other outcome” includes cases declared inadmissible, closed, lapsed, reopened and remitted for reconsideration, and refused reopening; in 2021-2024, court cases bypassing the appeal body are also described. In 2014-2015, the footnote instead mentions inadmissible, closed, lapsed and refused reopening. None of these combined categories may be interpreted as zero remittals for reconsideration or zero errors. In 2025, 253 remittals for reconsideration are now separate, “other outcome” is narrowed to inadmissible/refused reopening, and 2.039 are concluded before the decision-making authority. The categories’ changed content makes a mechanical trend curve misleading.

In addition, in 2025 approximately 2.200 complaints are concluded administratively without or with limited treatment; they are outside the 10.577 exit table. The group may include, inter alia, the resumption of the first instance at the beginning of the year.

consultation. It must not disappear from the coverage account, nor may it be added to favourable findings as documented errors without further breakdown. 2025,pp.2–3 and 7–8.

Entrance, departure and stock

Year	Received	Decided / Decrease g in the table	Stock end	Original
2012	13077	14453	16372	Case statistics; PDF p. 3
2013	15777	14591	17467	Case statistics; PDF p. 3
2014	15158	7186	25404	Case statistics; PDF p. 3
2015	15155	11193	29720	Case statistics; PDF p. 3
2016	12909	12964	31216	Case statistics; PDF p. 3
2017	8072	15783	24677	Case statistics; PDF p. 3
2018	6886	14745	17350	Case statistics; PDF p. 3
2019	6359	11209	12925	Case statistics; PDF p. 3
2020	7766	9045	11902	Case statistics; PDF p. 3
2021	11987	8329	14458	Case statistics; PDF p. 4
2022	8872	8889	13180	Case statistics; PDF p. 4
2023	9002	9889	11317	Case statistics; PDF p. 4
2024	9663	9290	10556	Case statistics; PDF p. 4
2025	13649	10577	11480	Case statistics; PDF p. 4

The stock should not be calculated mechanically as last year's stock + approach - determined. The originals shall document administrative closure, post-registration, amended decision authority and the splitting of one complaint number into several complaints. In addition, the 2015report has rounded parts of the older population.

The actual reported treatment time and what it omits

Year	Engine	Honey.	Assessment	LSR	SANST	Original and delimitation
2011	10,8	9,3	26,6	7,1	-	Case statistics; PDF p. 3; months, pending cases omitted
2012	15,8	9,7	25,1	7,9	-	Case statistics; PDF p. 7; months, pending cases omitted
2013	17,5	8,9	18,3	9,5	-	Case statistics; PDF p. 7; months, pending cases omitted
2014	11,7	10,6	12,8	15,5	4,5	Case statistics; PDF p. 7; months, pending cases omitted
2015	13,4	15,2	20,4	22,7	6	Case statistics; PDF p. 7; months, pending cases omitted
2016	20,3	18,1	26,6	26,1	9,1	Case statistics; PDF p. 9; months, pending cases omitted
2017	16	19,3	22	29,6	6,1	Case statistics; PDF p. 9; months, pending cases omitted
2018	21,1	23,1	32,9	35,6	5,1	Case statistics; PDF p. 9; months, pending cases omitted
2019	13,9	20,6	37,6	36,8	5,1	Case statistics; PDF p. 9; months, pending cases omitted
2020	13,9	19,4	40,9	33,9	5,7	Case statistics; PDF p. 11; months, pending cases omitted
2021	8,9	24	11	29,7	4,9	Case statistics; PDF p. 10; months, pending cases omitted
2022	8,6	21	11,5	32,9	4,9	Case statistics; PDF p. 10; months, pending cases omitted
2023	10,3	19,8	17,8	31,4	9,4	Case statistics; PDF p. 10; months, pending cases omitted
2024	10,3	17,2	9,1	28	5,6	Case statistics; PDF p. 10; months, pending cases omitted
2025	13,7	14,8	7	24,6	3,2	Case statistics; PDF p. 10; months, pending cases omitted

The average of assessment cases is 40,9 months in 2020 and the 36,8 months of the National Tax Court in 2019; the reported averages leave out cases suspended, for example due to criminal proceedings or surveys and estimates. This is a concrete understatement of the citizens' total waiting time. Recovery proceedings shall be measured only from the date of full disclosure. Therefore, their short average cannot be used as a time from the first regulatory intervention or the first complaint. 2011- 2013 LSR includes non-case cases and appeal times omitting revoked complaints; historical times are not directly comparable after the change in competence in 2014.

For 2025, the board stresses that 98,8% of "civil matters" meet the 12-month target. The target population omits, among other things, the suspension of proceedings in principle, the request for a hearing, the absence of cooperation and the rejection of the complainant. Assessment cases are not included at all in the category "near to the citizen." The proportion is therefore not evidence that 98,8% of all citizens' tax complaints will be decided within 12 months. 2025, p. 6.

Historical predecessors and current remains

On 1 January 2014, the decisions of the Boards of Appeal were no longer the subject of a general appeal to the National Tax Court and the Board of Directors took over certain competences. This changes both the person overlap, the case population and measured times. 2014, p. 2–3.

2006-2010 and the complete outcomes for 2011-2013 still require originals from the National Tax Tribunal and the appeals boards then in existence. This is a specific remaining historical source component, not an assumed zero. Intake/outflow for 2012-2013 and times for 2011-2013 have already been checked as historical tables in the newer originals.

Historical administrative matrices now provided

The LSRH11/LSRH12 originals complete the administrative percentage matrices for four case groups in 2009-2012 and the full first-instance court outcomes for 2009/2010. The included rounded percentages and exact denominators, and hidden reductions within other outcomes, are in the separate module landsskatteretten-2009-2012-originale-udfaldsmatricer.md. Remaining administrative years 2006-2008/2013 and raw cell counts/remittal codes are kept separate from the substantive review completed.

12. Foreigners and asylum: verification and compliance

What the statements document

The original statistics sections show both amended decisions and an extensive number of remittals. The figures must be retained as separate outcomes: a remittal closes the board's registration, but does not document that the individual obtained a residence permit, received a residence card or reunited with their family. The board's own 2025 report, physical PDF page 6,also states that the board can correct procedural errors and decide a case with criticism. An upheld decision is therefore not in itself documentation of an error-free process either. New information may also lead to remittal; each remittal's grounds must be recorded to count original legal errors. Original 2025.

The checks shall include statistical sections, tables, method passages and the relevant picture figures. It does not imply an allegation that all the individual case reports have been read. The Board began in 2013; the Ministry's previous complaints series 2006-12 must be treated as a separate predecessor.

All outcomes in the original tables 2013- 2021

The unit is person-cases/closures. The same citizen may occur in a later reopening or new decision. The family table also includes, among other things, permanent residence and administrative expulsion; its name must not be rewritten to mean family-reunification cases alone.

Year	Sagsgrupp a	Ambient t	Stadfoe Stated	Home t	Rejected	No decision	Total	Original / Physical PDF page
2013	Family care etc.	229	1416	293	35	142	2115	Report p.203
2013	Business, etc.	34	701	165	66	102	1068	Report p.204
2014	Family care etc.	202	1254	242	83	117	1898	Report p.334
2014	Business, etc.	31	680	165	162	77	1115	Report p.334
2015	Family care etc.	159	1172	302	124	160	1917	Report p.361
2015	Business, etc.	26	345	104	118	54	647	Report p.361
2016	Family care etc.	166	1233	383	160	178	2120	Report p.283
2016	Business, etc.	20	303	109	130	49	611	Report p.283
2017	Family care etc.	166	1744	402	166	287	2765	Report p.391
2017	Business, etc.	36	292	76	72	62	538	Report p.391
2017	Visum	5	50	17	4	34	110	Report p.391
2018	Family care etc.	69	1479	409	187	218	2362	Report p.417
2018	Business, etc.	14	242	35	83	72	446	Report p.418
2018	Visum	11	241	25	8	28	313	Report p.418

Year	Sagsgrupp a	Ambient t	Stadfoe Stated	Home t	Rejected	No decision	Total	Original / Physical PDF page
2019	Family care etc.	49	1075	453	163	179	1913	Report p.480
2019	Business, etc.	7	199	22	56	67	351	Report p.480
2019	Visum	5	158	21	8	50	242	Report p.480
2019	EU	1	37	43	0	13	94	Report p.481
2020	Family care etc.	73	1005	384	130	169	1761	Report p.791
2020	Business, etc.	1	227	25	55	57	365	Report p.792
2020	Visum	9	120	41	5	40	215	Report p.792
2020	EU	17	119	85	6	60	287	Report p.793
2021	Family care etc.	396	743	401	83	180	1803	Report p.717
2021	Business, etc.	42	178	51	48	65	384	Report p.718
2021	Visum	7	175	57	6	56	301	Report p.718
2021	EU	59	238	121	4	97	519	Report p.719

Requests to reopen are counted separately below. They are not new, independent citizens, and granting reopening is not itself a residence permit.

Year	Without Decision	Meeting ed take	Refusal	All requests n	Original / Physical PDF page
2013	12	14	140	166	Report p.204
2014	22	30	181	233	Report p.335
2015	29	27	121	177	Report p.362
2016	10	37	148	195	Report p.283
2017	7	17	143	167	Report p.392
2018	11	145	115	271	Report p.418
2019	16	75	107	198	Report p.481
2020	28	113	100	241	Report p.793
2021	14	39	176	229	Report p.719

The sum of the published “Total” fields for 2013-21 is **26.260** closures excluding requests to reopen. The individual outcome categories total **26.266**:the difference of six is in the original family-reunification table for 2019. The categories include **1.834 overturnings** and **4.431 remittals for reconsideration**. In addition, there are **1.877 requests to reopen**,of which **497 granted**. The totals are registration events; distinct persons require separate deduplication. Both the difference of six in 2019 and the difference of ten between outcomes and annual outflow in 2020 are retained visibly in the account.

Selected result figures 2022-2025

The figures show only three outcomes in selected areas of activity. The exact figures and their exact denominators are not published in the figures. **Rounded percentages have therefore not multiplied by the year-end to produce exact number of cases.** Rejected cases and closed cases without a decision must be kept in the overall coverage account even if they are missing from the figures.

Year	Zone	%	Stated %	Remitted %	Original / Physical PDF page
2022	Family associations	11	51	38	Report p.63
2022	Open-ended stay	12	38	50	Report p.63
2022	Administrative decision-making	3	82	15	Report p.63
2022	Occupation	12	70	18	Report p.63
2022	Study	11	77	12	Report p.63
2022	EU	8	67	25	Report p.63
2022	Visum	3	90	7	Report p.63
2023	Family associations	17	53	30	Report p.64
2023	Open-ended stay	11	64	25	Report p.64
2023	Administrative decision-making	2	93	5	Report p.64
2023	Occupation	8	71	21	Report p.64
2023	Study	5	76	19	Report p.64
2023	EU	6	78	16	Report p.64
2023	Visum	2	88	10	Report p.64
2024	Family associations	33	40	27	Report p.75
2024	Open-ended stay	10	49	41	Report p.75
2024	Administrative decision-making	2	93	5	Report p.75
2024	Occupation	8	69	23	Report p.75
2024	Study	6	71	23	Report p.75
2024	EU	12	70	18	Report p.75
2024	Visum	4	86	10	Report p.75
2025	Family associations	21	42	37	Report p.79
2025	Open-ended stay	11	41	48	Report p.79
2025	Administrative decision-making	11	85	4	Report p.79

Year	Zone	%	Stated %	Remitted %	Original / Physical PDF page
2025	Occupation	6	71	23	Report p.79
2025	Study	7	75	18	Report p.79
2025	EU	9	66	25	Report p.79
2025	Visum	6	80	14	Report p.79
2025	Ukraine (special law)	2	72	26	Report p.79

Total approach and departure

Year	Supply	Departure including without a decision	Original / page
2013	3528	3349	Original p.202
2014	3000	3246	Original p.333
2015	3278	2741	Original p.360
2016	3287	2926	Original p.282
2017	3568	3580	Original p.390
2018	3990	3392	Original p.416
2019	3105	2798	Original p.478
2020	3138	2859	Original p.790
2021	3667	3236	Original p.716
2022	3752	4199	Original Annual statistics 2022, updated 28.2.2023
2023	4299	5919	Original p.62
2024	4116	4076	Original p.73
2025	4134	3759	Original p.74

Time to completion of the Board

The board's average must not be rewritten as total time before authorities. It does not necessarily include preceding first-instance processing, excluded historical EU waiting time or subsequent implementation. The 2021 original, physical page 716, expressly excludes time before transfer of EU cases on 1. April 2019. This temporal registration boundary must accompany every use of the figure.

Year	Zone	Days	Original / Physical PDF page
2013	Family reunification etc.	134	Report p.211
2013	Business, etc.	184	Report p.211
2013	Resumption	135	Report p.211
2013	All	150	Report p.211
2014	Family reunification etc.	110	Report p.342
2014	Business, etc.	125	Report p.342

Year	Zone	Days	Original / Physical PDF page
2014	Resumption	133	Report p.342
2014	All	116	Report p.342
2015	Family reunification etc.	143	Report p.369
2015	Business, etc.	137	Report p.369
2015	Resumption	142	Report p.369
2015	All	142	Report p.369
2016	Family reunification etc.	194	Report p.291
2016	Business, etc.	185	Report p.291
2016	Resumption	181	Report p.291
2016	All	191	Report p.291
2017	Family reunification etc.	226	Report p.399
2017	Business, etc.	225	Report p.399
2017	Visum	60	Report p.399
2017	Resumption	194	Report p.399
2017	All	219	Report p.399
2018	Family reunification etc.	220	Report p.426
2018	Business, etc.	196	Report p.426
2018	Visum	185	Report p.426
2018	Resumption	149	Report p.426
2018	All	205	Report p.426
2019	Family reunification etc.	311	Report p.491
2019	Business, etc.	270	Report p.491
2019	Visum	225	Report p.491
2019	EU	126	Report p.491
2019	Resumption	149	Report p.491
2019	All	213	Report p.491
2020	Family reunification etc.	385	Report p.803
2020	Business, etc.	291	Report p.803
2020	Visum	350	Report p.803
2020	EU	274	Report p.803
2020	Resumption	232	Report p.803

Year	Zone	Days	Original / Physical PDF page
2020	All	345	Report p.803
2021	Family reunification etc.	384	Report p.728
2021	Business, etc.	334	Report p.728
2021	Visum	301	Report p.728
2021	EU	323	Report p.728
2021	Resumption	359	Report p.728
2021	All	355	Report p.728
2022	Udlændingestyrelsen	511	Report p.64
2022	SIRI	425	Report p.64
2022	Visum	444	Report p.64
2022	EU	247	Report p.64
2022	All	404	Report p.64
2023	Udlændingestyrelsen	349	Report p.65
2023	SIRI	396	Report p.65
2023	Visum	155	Report p.65
2023	EU	181	Report p.65
2023	All	288	Report p.65
2024	Udlændingestyrelsen	183	Report p.76
2024	SIRI	183	Report p.76
2024	Visum	103	Report p.76
2024	EU	177	Report p.76
2024	All	183	Report p.76
2025	Udlændingestyrelsen	195	Report p.80
2025	SIRI	185	Report p.80
2025	Police	130	Report p.80
2025	All	192	Report p.80
2025	Home Travel Agency	214	Report p.80

Documented source differences and omissions

• 2019: The original outcome of the family table 49 + 1075 + 453 + 163 + 179 = 1919, but total of the original 1913. Unmatched source difference 6; original figures are retained. Original, physical PDF page 480.

• 2017: Footnote 37: Decisions on age and identity omitted from the tables for statistical reasons. Original, physical PDF page 385.

• 2019: The same original indicates all-case types 286 days in text and 213 days in table. Both are preserved; no automatic correction. Original, physical PDF page 478,491.

• 2020: Total outflow 2859, sum of outcome categories 2869. Family-reunification flow 1751 against outcome table 1761. Difference 10 retained as an unreconciled source difference. Original, physical PDF page 788,790,791,792,793.

• 2021: Time before the transfer of EU cases to the Board 1.4.2019 is excluded. The citizens' full historical wait is therefore greater than the objective of these cases. Original, physical PDF page 716.

• 2022: The report 404 days; annual statistics 405 days. Version difference 1 day is maintained. Original, physical PDF page 64.

• 2025:Procedural errors may lead to remittal for reconsideration or be remedied by the Board through a decision and any criticism. New information may also lead to remittal for reconsideration. Outcome figures therefore do not capture all errors, including among upheld decisions. Original,physical PDF page 6.

•2025: The processing-type table's 3158+visa closures 581=3739 versus total closures 3759. Selected areas and the scope of reopenings require reconciliation; a difference of 20 is not 20 documented unique citizens. Original, physical PDF pages 74,77,78.

Concrete progress: first remittal for reconsideration followed by another inadequate refusal

A Moroccan mother, her Danish spouse and their two Danish children moved to France in 2019 and back to Denmark in 2020. Udlændingestyrelsen in November 2020, refused a derogation from the expiry of the residence permit. In November 2022, the Board referred back to the Court of Justice for review following judgments of the European Court of Justice of 5 May 2022, C-451 / 19 and C-532 / 19. The board refused again in April 2023. The Board of Appeal found on 28 May 2024 that the Board of Directors had not assessed the case in accordance with the remittal for reconsideration and amended the decision. The children were 10 and 6 years old.

The documented trajectory lasted approximately 3½ years from the first refusal to alteration of the decision and approximately 18 months from remittal. Responsibility also concerns the agency's omission after the specific correction. The board considered ECHR Article 8 and EU law and sent the case to the agency for a new residence card. The original documents neither the card's issue date nor an actual family separation. Those consequences require separate evidence; they must not be filled in by assumption. KEN9715 of 28. May 2024/ERH 2024/35, physical pages 1-3.

Next Level of Documentation

For a complete account of consequences, each relevant course must be linked to the original decision, reason for remittal for reconsideration, new decision, actual residence permit, physical return, reunification, loss and any compensation. Parliamentary reply UUI421 of 13. August 2025 discusses actual residence permits in 2019-1. June 2025 following board amendments and remittals for reconsideration; the full table must be checked before its figures are compiled as a national account of redress. Reply.

The Refugee Board: decisions, cases concerned and waiting period 2006-2025

Appeal review shows specific amendments to asylum and removal decisions. A favourable finding or remittal must be examined for cause and consequence: changed country information, new information and errors in the first decision can all lead to amendment. The outcome tables identify review results; they count neither all unlawful interventions nor all different people. The statistics cover the board's registered appeals and reopenings; people whose authority decision does not reach the board are outside this review.

1. Breaking of accounts and double counting

2006 counts cases. As of 1 January 2007, at the request of the Ministry (2007-original, physical PDF page 223), the named persons in the cases count. A family history can therefore change from one case to several personal cases. A person may enter several times upon reopening and in different types of decision. All totals should be referred to as cases / persons with this limitation.

From 2022,the main overview includes remittals. Older original annual overviews place remittals among closures without a decision; later five-year overviews rework historical years. The new 2022 overview states 2.410, 1.951, 1.123 and 1.073 for 2018-21 versus the original 2.174, 1.726, 1.023 and 933. These are different source versions and scopes. They are not added together. In 2021, 140 remittals are stated separately and a further 116 closures without a decision. From 2024,other complaint types are listed separately outside the main table.

2. All 20 years of original summaries

Year	Main act erterm	Spontane ous cases including gene recorded	New	Genopta Figs	Outer no decision a	Through mean a sylbeha ndling, days	Original and Physical PDF page
2006	491	451	389	62	75	127	Annual report 2006, summary p. 191; time p. 199
2007	351	295	273	22	32	137	Annual report 2007, summary p. 224; time p. 231
2008	495	461	360	101	55	118	Annual Report 2008, summary p. 244; time p. 251
2009	466	435	367	68	55	121	Annual Report 2009, summary p. 290; time p. 299
2010	1089	1066	1045	21	121	128	Annual report 2010, summary p. 361; time p. 370
2011	1329	1292	1285	7	153	186	Annual Report 2011, summary p. 306; time p. 314
2012	1537	1490	1441	49	260	233	Annual Report 2012, summary p. 355; time p. 364
2013	1706	1649	1505	144	325	155	Annual Report 2013, summary, p. 449; time p. 458
2014	1808	1794	1733	61	242	126	Annual Report 2014, summary p. 472; time p. 481
2015	1441	1334	1252	82	155	103	Annual Report 2015, summary p. 547; time p. 555
2016	1660	1427	1344	83	252	101	Annual report 2016, summary p. 545; time p. 554
2017	2181	2058	1951	107	656	184	Annual report 2017, summary p. 529; time p. 533
2018	2174	1964	1912	52	795	348	Annual Report 2018, summary, p. 619; time p. 623
2019	1726	1312	1264	48	453	367	Annual Report 2019, summary p. 692; time p. 696
2020	1023	755	707	48	222	254	Annual report 2020, summary, p. 586; time p. 589
2021	933	494	408	86	116	187	Annual report 2021, summary p. 556; time p. 565
2022	957	504	-	-	-	168	Annual report 2022, summary p. 590; time p. 2024 -original p. 513
2023	642	416	-	-	-	98	Annual report 2023, summary p. 538; time p. 2024 -original p. 513
2024	504	340	-	-	-	113	Annual report 2024, summary, p. 510; time p. 513
2025	604	466	-	-	-	166	Annual report 2025, summary, p. 532; time p. 535

»-« is not zero. The 2006 figures are cases; the other rows are registrations of cases concerning individuals. Spontaneous cases are already included in the main overview. Closures without a decision appear separately and, in older years, overlap remittals in the later revised overviews. The 2024 main overview has a further 229 other complaint cases and 2025 a further 244: the reported categories sum respectively to 733 and 848 before any closures without a decision.

3. The actual outcome of Spontaneous Agents

Year and delimitation	Stadfoe Stated	§ 7(1)	§ 7(2)	§ 7(3)	Home t	Public ed total	Original
2006; all spontaneous cases, including resumed; cases	365	55	31	-	-	451	Original, p. 196
2007; all spontaneous cases, including reopened; persons cases	227	28	40	-	-	295	Original, p. 228
2008; all spontaneous cases, including resumed	305	109	47	-	-	461	Original, p. 249
2009; New spontaneous cases	296	22	49	-	-	367	Original, p. 296
2010; New spontaneous cases	776	140	129	-	-	1045	Original, p. 367
2011; The table has the total for all spontaneous cases, despite caption of new	885	212	195	-	-	1292	Original, p. 312
2012; New spontaneous cases; categories summed up to 1440, published total 1441	1070	202	168	-	-	1441	Original, p. 361
2013; New spontaneous cases	1092	170	243	-	-	1505	Original, p. 456
2014; New spontaneous cases	1497	121	115	-	-	1733	Original, p. 479
2015; New spontaneous cases; Table total 1253 against Table 1252	1041	144	68	-	-	1253	Original, p. 554
2021; new spontaneous cases; remittals for reconsideration outside the table	344	54	10	-	-	408	Original, p. 558
2022; All spontaneous cases, including reopened and remitted	283	112	14	4	91	504	Original, p. 592
2023; All spontaneous cases, including reopened and remitted	162	141	3	0	110	416	Original, p. 540
2024; All spontaneous cases, including reopened and remitted	189	85	15	2	49	340	Original, p. 512
2025; All spontaneous cases, including reopened and remitted	270	92	2	3	99	466	Original, p. 534

Outcome of reopened cases: to be included once after delimitation

Year	Stadkæst a	§ 7(1)	§ 7(2)	Total	Overlap with Table above	Original
2008	9	72	20	101	Yes	Original, p. 250
2009	8	41	19	68	No; above only new	Original, p. 298
2010	10	10	1	21	No; above only new	Original, p. 369
2011	0	6	1	7	Yes	Original, p. 313
2012	7	27	15	49	No; above only new	Original, p. 363
2013	12	94	38	144	No; above only new	Original, p. 457
2014	8	40	13	61	No; above only new	Original, p. 480
2015	11	67	4	82	No; above only new	Original, p. 555
2021	20	52	14	86	No; above only new	Original, p. 559

2016-2020: percentages shall not be converted into fictitious accurate counters

The following new case tables shall publish rounded percentages. Each percent has its own annual denominator, which is shown in the table. Multiplication with the denominator does not recreate precise counters.

Year	New: confirmed / § 7(1)/§ 7(2)/§ 7(3), %	Recorded: same order,%	Original physical PDFs pages
2016	83/12/5/-	-/-/-/-	Original, p. 551, 553
2017	83/10/7/-	50/46/3/1	Original, p. 531, 532
2018	84/10/6/0	54/36/10/0	Original, p. 621, 622
2019	85/9/6/-	69/21/10/-	Original, p. 694, 695
2020	83/14/3/-	48/44/8/-	Original, p. 588, 589

The 2016 reopening table states 67/4/11 and a total of 82, while the overview states 83 reopened cases. That table requires separate reconciliation of unit and version errors before category counts are used. No constructed count has been saved for 2016.

4. Requests for revision, separate from subsequent decisions

Year	Allowed g enoptaget ed	Refusal	Rejected	Remitted for recons ideration separately	Other Ter mination	Total	Original
2006	83	296	75	-	-	454	Original, p. 198
2007	63	285	36	-	29	413	Original, p. 229
2008	122	321	48	-	27	518	Original, p. 251
2009	53	234	39	-	14	340	Original, p. 298
2010	13	79	7	-	10	109	Original, p. 369
2011	27	208	44	-	24	303	Original, p. 313
2012	65	198	29	-	29	321	Original, p. 363
2013	190	383	84	113	25	795	Original, p. 457
2014	63	391	109	102	21	686	Original, p. 480
2015	94	490	42	50	20	696	Original, p. 555
2016	84	240	92	48	10	474	Original, p. 553
2017	118	287	111	37	16	569	Original, p. 532
2018	49	183	30	150	57	469	Original, p. 622
2019	78	122	42	44	3	289	Original, p. 695
2020	86	191	32	33	14	356	Original, p. 589
2021	107	74	11	-	13	194	Original, p. 559
2022	220	88	26	-	-	334	Original, p. 598
2023	241	90	16	-	-	347	Original, p. 547
2024	125	101	16	-	-	242	Original, p. 519
2025	125	92	12	-	-	229	Original, p. 541

2006 is a case. 2007-21 uses the controlled tables of personal cases; 2022-25 refer to the figures as cases. More recent "resumed" also includes reopening for the purpose of remittal for reconsideration back. A successful application and its subsequent decision of substance may relate to the same person and may not be counted as two people. The residence permit or return actually obtained requires separate documentation.

5. Dublin: Full and defined control accounts

Year	Stadf unladen	Omgja rt	Home t	Rejecte d	Without determi ne lse	Total	All the time of the case;	Fast the time of the case;	Original
2014	852	4	44	0	24	924	21 days	16 (95 %)	Original, p. 481
2015	904	4	37	2	15	962	18 days	13 (95 %)	Original, p.556
2016	1110	9	280	12	164	1575	50 working days	40 (95 %)	Original, p. 554
2017	463	17	38	9	77	604	30 working days	15 (80 %)	Original, p. 534
2018	174	1	30	1	40	246	27 working days	13 (80 %)	Original, p. 624
2019	167	12	2	6	48	235	37 working days	18 (80 %)	Original, p. 698
2020	82	14	1	2	16	115	48 working days	27 (80 %)	Original, page 591
2021	139	9	1	2	27	178	33 working days	16 (80 %)	Original, p. 563
2022	146	1	23	4	-	174	- weekdays	- (80 %)	Original, p. 597
2023	179	16	15	-	-	210	47 working days	23 (80 %)	Original, p. 545
2024	130	34	5	-	-	169	99 working days	47 (80 %)	Original, p. 517
2025	127	49	19	-	-	195	131 working days	64 (80 %)	Original, p. 539

The 2021 total is 178. The separate country distribution has only 148 decisions on the merits (139 affirmances and nine alterations/remittals); the 30 other outcomes must be retained. For 2022-25 the newer tables shown exclude closures without a decision. The rows therefore do not document the same total outflow as 2014-21. For 2014-15 time is described as »days«; from 2016 as »working days«. No conversion is made without a calendar basis.

6. Children, Implications and Concrete Time Loss

The 2021 original (physical PDF pages 564- 565) lists 45 age complaints: 25 confirmed, one overturned, three remitted and 16 closed without a decision because the complainant had disappeared. These are persons who claimed to be children; a refusal of the alleged age is not proof that all the complainants were adults. There were no decisions on § 9c (3) or accompanying assessment. Two identity complaints were confirmed. Of 18 travel documents, one was overturned, three were remanded and 14 were closed upon resignation.

The 2022 original, physical PDF page 598, documents an unaccompanied minor's section 9 c(3)(2) complaint in which the decision was overturned and two identity complaints in which both decisions were overturned. There were no complaints concerning accompaniment assessments or travel-document decisions. Children also appear in family cases and international complaints; category counts must not be added as distinct children.

Waiting time is an independent loss of time in uncertainty, which must be linked to the actual consequences of each person. The average of the Asylum Board for 2018- 19 was 348 and 367 days and by 2025 it was 166 days. For the fastest 95% of the 2025 cases, the average was 151 days against target 110; the target was not reached and the target for 2026 was set at 130. Dublin increased from an average of 33 working days in 2021 to 131 in 2025. These times begin and end at the time of the Board's treatment; the time at first instance, re-treatment and for actual residence or return is added. These aggregated tables do not contain a measure of the citizens' entire cycle.

7. Concrete inconsistencies and remnants of the originals

• The 2010 overview indicates 823 cases, while the table has 825; the original explains two different decisions in the same case. There are not two new people for that reason.

• The 2009 and 2010 prose states an overall overturning rate of 24 % for each, while the checked new/reopened outcomes give 131 of 435 and 280 of 1.066 respectively. Scope or source error has not been reconciled; both source statements must remain visible.

• The title of the 2011 table on new spontaneous cases has a total of 1.292, which includes seven reopened; the seven must not be added again.

• The 2012new table has one more in published total than in the three exit categories. The category of one has not been documented.

• The 2015-new-total is 1.252 in the table and 1.253 in the table of accounts.

• The 2016- resumed is 83 in the table as opposed to 82 in the separate table.

• The 2024 percentage table indicates 55 / 30 / 15, with the exact total row of the year rounded to 56 / 30 / 14. Exact counters shall be retained; the percentages shall not be copied as harmonised values.

• Requests for reopening in 2021 are stated as 194, but the categories of 107 reopenings, 74 refusals, 11 rejections and 13 terminations total 205. A further 29 requests concerning revocation cases (15 reopened, 12 refusals, one rejected and one terminated) are counted separately on p. 560. The specific difference of 11 is not repaired. Other appeal types' outcomes across 20 years, overall closures without a decision from 2022 and the complete historical child/age series have not yet been reconciled. Original annual reports have been located for all 20 years; missing fields are stated specifically and filled through further checks of originals.

13. EMD: judgments, complaints and various rightholders;

Checked on 6. October 2026 in the Court's original annual tables. The unit is judgments delivered in the calendar year. The event, intervention and submission of the complaint may be earlier. The table covers cases against Denmark; geographical or sectoral distribution is not shown in these statistics. A judgment may concern several complaints, applicants and articles. Several judgments may belong to the same case trajectory, including Chamber and Grand Chamber. The table must therefore not be presented as the number of unique individuals or Danish authority events.

All 20 years

Year	Judgments Total	At least one pitcher celse	No DKK thinking;	Reconciliation etning	Others judgments	Non-zero artik electricity columns;	Original and locator
2006	2	2	0	0	0	Article 6, length of proceedings: 1; Article 11: 1	Annual Report 2006, fysisk PDF s. 106, trykt s. 107, tabellen »Violations by Article and by country (2006)«, Denmark
2007	2	0	1	1	0	None	Annual Report 2007, fysisk PDF s. 142, tabellen »Violations by Article and by country (2007)«, Denmark
2008	2	2	0	0	0	Article 6, length of proceedings: 2	Annual Table 2008, p. 1, Denmark
2009	3	3	0	0	0	Article 6, length of proceedings: 3; Article 13: 2; P1-1: 1	Annual Table 2009, p. 1, Denmark
2010	0	0	0	0	0	None	Annual Table 2010, p. 1, Denmark
2011	6	1	5	0	0	Article 8: 1	Annual Table 2011, p. 1, Denmark
2012	1	0	1	0	0	None	Annual Table 2012, p. 1, Denmark
2013	0	0	0	0	0	None	Annual Table 2013, p. 1, Denmark
2014	2	0	2	0	0	None	Annual Table 2014, p. 1, Denmark
2015	0	0	0	0	0	None	Annual Table 2015, p. 1, Denmark
2016	3	1	2	0	0	Article 14: 1	Annual Table 2016, p. 1, Denmark
2017	2	0	2	0	0	None	Annual Table 2017, p. 1, Denmark
2018	3	0	3	0	0	None	Annual Table 2018, p. 1, Denmark
2019	2	2	0	0	0	Art. 2 / 3 column: 1; Art. 5: 1	Annual Table 2019, p. 1, Denmark and footnote 3
2020	1	1	0	0	0	Article 3, unmenn immediate / downv exhilarating treatment: 1	Annual Table 2020, p. 1, Denmark
2021	7	3	4	0	0	Article 8: 3	Annual Table 2021, p. 1, Denmark
2022	4	1	3	0	0	Article 8: 1	Annual Table 2022, p. 1, Denmark
2023	5	3	2	0	0	Article 3, unamenable / degrading treatment: 1; Article 3, lack of effective investigation: 1; Article 8: 2	Annual Table 2023, p. 1, Denmark
2024	9	4	5	0	0	Article 3, lack of effective investigation: 1; Article 8: 4	Annual Table 2024, p. 1, Denmark

Year	Judgments Total	At least one pitcher celse	No DKK thinking;	Reconciliation etning	Others judgments	Non-zero artik electricity columns;	Original and locator
2025	5	2	3	0	0	Article 2, deprivation of life: 1; Article 10: 1	Annual Table 2025, p. 1, Denmark
Sum	**59**	**25**	**33**	**1**	**0**	**30 non-zero artikel / under category finding; including one conditional find**	Sum of the 20 non-overlapping calendar years in the above table

Blank fields in a row with a known judgment total are reproduced here as 0 after checking the specific column position and reconciling the row. The publisher's original blank fields and coordinates are preserved in the compact positional annex. 2020 has a text layer in which entries of 1 in two neighbouring columns can merge into »11«; the original judgment total is 1, not 11. The table has been checked against the original column positions and the ECtHR's own text extract.

Voting: 25 + 33 + 1 + 0 = 59. The number of article finds is greater than the number of infringement sentences, because the same sentence may find more violations. In particular, in 2009, 2023 and 2024, Article columns may not be added to the infringement judgments as new cases. "Conditional 'means a finding that an intervention such as broadcast would infringe Articles 2 and / or 3; it is not evidence that the broadcast was actually carried out.

Total breakdown of article / sub-category findings

Article / category of publisher	2006-2025	Counting
Article 2, deprivation of life	1	2025
Article 3, inhuman / degrading treatment	2	2020 + 2023
Article 3, lack of effective investigation	2	2023 + 2024
Conditional Article 2 / 3 column	1	2019
Article 5	1	2019
Article 6, length of proceedings	6	2006:1 + 2008:2 + 2009:3
Article 8	11	2011:1 + 2021:3 + 2022:1 + 2023:2 + 2024:4
Article 10	1	2025
Article 11	1	2006
Article 13	2	2009
Article 14	1	2016
Additional Protocol 1, Art. 1	1	2009
Sum colony fund	**30**	No number of unique judgments, complaints or people

What the numbers show and next exact datatrin

The annual tables document 25 judgments finding Danish violations delivered during the 20-year period. They do not count all human rights violations in Denmark. They do not include all national judgments, matters not brought before the Court, authorities' own admissions, domestic remedies or complaints rejected before examination on the merits. Absence of an ECtHR violation judgment is therefore no measure of national legality.

The separate 20-year series from "Analysis of Statistics" for allocated, communicated, rejected / deleted complaints and by judgment is now checked and is in Chapter 7B. Personal counts continue to require a HUDOC list of the specific Danish judgments with complaint numbers, number of applicants and finality. A judgment may include several appeal numbers / persons. The annual table above is fully 20-year-wide for **judgments**; the number of judgments and appeals does not complete the sum of persons.

Source of definitions: EMD, Understanding the Court's statistics, March 2019, p. 5-6, paragraphs 2.3.1 and 3.1.1. Annual statistics can record chamber judgments before maturity; use HUDOC for specific final case outcomes.

EMD: Danish complaints and process steps 2006-2025

Controlled October 6, 2026. All 20 years are covered by original EMD annual tables or the same years retrospective Danish diagrams. The permanent data are own numbers with source and locator; original documents and tabular images are only read in memory.

Unit and delimitation: The figures are the number of complaints / applications and annual procedural events. The figures therefore do not count as unique citizens. Allocated complaints are complaints distributed to a judicial body and do not include all administrative cancellations before distribution. Communicated complaints are not detected violations. Rejected / deleted cases may have different procedural or substantive grounds; they are not one category of orders stating that Danish practice was lawful. The columns cannot be merged because the same complaint can occur in several stages and years. The closure of the year does not necessarily relate to the complaints received during the year.

Year	Allocated	Communisted	Rejected / deleted a	Complaints determined by: Judgment	Original and locator
2006	68	4	96	3	Annual analysis 2008, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2007	45	7	73	4	Annual analysis 2008, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2008	73	5	56	2	Annual analysis 2008, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2009	63	7	34	3	Annual analysis 2011, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2010	96	26	36	0	Annual analysis 2011, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2011	111	16	99	6	Annual analysis 2011, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2012	103	8	201	1	Annual analysis 2014, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2013	84	6	88	0	Annual analysis 2015, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2014	66	5	60	2	Annual analysis 2016, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2015	44	0	48	0	Annual analysis 2017, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2016	47	2	51	3	Annual analysis 2017, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2017	58	4	60	2	Annual analysis 2017, physical / printed s.25, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2018	37	2	38	5	Annual analysis 2020, physical / printed p.26, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps

Year	Allocated	Communisted	Rejected / deleted a	Complaints determined by: Judgment	Original and locator
2019	59	8	48	2	Annual analysis 2020, physical / printed p.26, Denmark, diagram Major Procedural steps
2020	63	1	53	1	Annual analysis 2022, physical / printed p.13, Table 4, Denmark
2021	67	6	47	8	Annual analysis 2023, physical / printed p.14, Table 4, Denmark
2022	97	22	100	4	Annual analysis 2024, physical / printed p.14, Table 4, Denmark
2023	87	12	86	5	Annual analysis 2025, physical / printed p.14, Table 4, Denmark
2024	65	9	66	9	Annual analysis 2025, physical / printed p.14, Table 4, Denmark
2025	92	6	90	5	Annual analysis 2025, physical / printed p.14, Table 4, Denmark
Kolonnesum	**1425**	**156**	**1430**	**65**	Separate process events; not a total

Complaints settled by judgment (65) must be kept separate from the 59 judgments and 25 judgments with at least one infringement in the field -Denmark -2006- 2025.md. For example, five complaints were settled by three Danish judgments in 2018. The summary table of judgments cannot be used without a specific list of complaints / persons to distribute the 65 complaints on the number of people injured.

Maintain reports audits

The annual reports of the EMD indicate different historical values for each year. Both reports shall be retained; they shall not be counted as new cases. The main table uses the later controlled value. The reason for the audit has not been documented here.

Statistical years and objectives	First controlled value	Later value	Sources and locators
2006, allocated	66	68	Previous source, p.98; later source, p.25, Denmark
2007, rejected / deleted	72	73	Previous source, p. 138; later source, p.25, Denmark
2013, allocated	85	84	Previous source, p.25; later source, p.25, Denmark
2014, allocated	65	66	Previous source, p.25; later source, p.25, Denmark
2015, allocated	45	44	Previous source, p.25; later source, p.25, Denmark

The 2006 annual report p.98 also states 108 applications lodged and 4 admissibility decisions. The 108 are a separate inflow measure and must not be added to the 66/68 allocated cases. A complete 20-year series of all applications lodged, including administrative discontinuances before judicial allocation, has not been established in this note.

The method follows the ECtHR's distinction between applications, applicants, judgments and decisions: Understanding the Court's statistics, pp.5-6, §§ 2.3.1 and 3.1.1. The figures document international review activity. They cannot calculate unrecorded Danish rights violations or a national error rate.

EMD: judgments, complaint numbers, applicants and finality

Controlled October 7, 2026 by original judgment PDFs and HUDOC metadata. The entire series is aligned with the 59 English case files.

59 judgments; 57 cases; 63 different complaints; 99 human applications and one Deathman. Biao and Savran are repeated in chamber and large chamber treatment: the known repetitions removed give 96 registered human identities and one estate of death. This is a corpusus count after public identification, not a register of all the deported Danes. The applicant may be left behind while the person directly affected is deceased.

25 judgments with at least one violation in the annual statistics become 24 finally decided case trajectories with violations. Savran's Chamber judgment from 2019 was replaced: the Grand Chamber found no Article 3 violation, but an Article 8 violation. Historical annual statistics and a count of current final outcomes answer different questions.

The October/November 2025 judgments in Naser, Mortensen and Rasmussen became final in 2026. The decision year is retained in the 2006-2025 series, while finality is shown separately. All 57 case courses were finally decided as at the verification date. A final judgment does not automatically document payment, return home, reunification or other individual redress actions.

Judgment / complaint r	Delivered	Endeli g	Subject Shoulder apply is forek omster	Information / demarcation	Original and locator
SØRENSE N AND RA SMUSSEN, 52562 / 99; 5 2620 / 99	2006-0 1-11	2006-0 1-11	2	2 natural applicants identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
IVERSEN, 5989 / 03	2006-0 9-28	2006-1 2-28	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
BROSTED, 21846 / 04	2007-0 3-15	2007-0 3-15	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
CUSTERS, DEVEAUX AND TURK, 118 43 / 03; 1184 7 / 03; 11849 / 03	2007-0 5-03	2007-0 8-03	3	3 natural applicants identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
HASSLUN D, 36244 / 06	2008-1 2-11	2009-0 3-11	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
MOESGAA RD PETER SEN, 32848 / 06	2008-1 2-11	2009-0 3-11	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
CHRISTEN SEN, 247 / 07	2009-0 1-22	2009-0 4-22	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
VALENTIN, 26461 / 06	2009-0 3-26	2009-0 6-26	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
NIELSEN, 44034 / 07	2009-0 7-02	2009-1 0-02	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
P.K., 54705 / 08	2011-0 1-20	2011-0 6-20	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
T.N. AND S.N., 36517 / 08	2011-0 1-20	2011-0 6-20	2	2 natural applicants identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
S.S. AND OTHERS, 54703 / 08	2011-0 1-20	2011-0 6-20	4	§ 1 incorrect number 54705 / 08; front page and HUDOC 54703 / 08. Four applicants, of whom two children. Do not add up with P.K.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
T.N., 20594 / 08	2011-0 1-20	2011-0 4-20	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL

Judgment / complaint r	Delivere d	Endeli g	Subject Shoulde r apply is forek omster	Information / demarcation	Original and locator
N.S., 58359 / 08	2011-0 1-20	2011-0 4-20	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
OSMAN, 38058 / 09	2011-0 6-14	2011-0 9-14	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
J.M., 34421 / 09	2012-1 1-13	2013-0 2-13	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
BIAO, 38590 / 10	2014-0 3-25	Replace t of GC	2	The same two applicants and complaint as Grand Chamber 2016; chamber replaced.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
M.E. 58363 / 10	2014-0 7-08	2014-1 1-17	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
BIAO, 38590 / 10	2016-0 5-24	2016-0 5-24	2	Two spouses; repeat of chamber 2014.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
SALEM, 77036 / 11	2016-1 2-01	2017-0 4-24	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
JENSEN, 8693 / 11	2016-1 2-13	2017-0 3-13	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
R.L. AND OTHERS, 52629 / 11	2017-0 3-07	2017-0 6-07	4	Four persons, of whom two children; not one person on the basis of a complaint number.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
FRESH AND JENSEN, 19657 / 12	2017-1 2-05	2018-0 3-05	2	2 natural applicants identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
S., V. AND A., 35553 / 1 2; 36678 / 12; 36711 / 12	2018-1 0-22	2018-1 0-22	3	3 natural applicants identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
LEVAKOVI C, 7841 / 14	2018-1 0-23	2019-0 1-23	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
ASSEM HASSAN ALI, 25593 / 14	2018-1 0-23	2019-0 1-23	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
TIM HENRIK BRUN HANSEN, 51072 / 15	2019-0 7-09	2019-1 0-09	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
SAVRAN, 57467 / 15	2019-1 0-01	Replace t of GC	1	Chamber judgment on Article 3 replaced by the 2021 Grand Chamber judgment: no Article 3 violation, an Article 8 violation.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
AGGERHO LM, 45439 / 18	2020-0 9-15	2020-1 2-15	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original, Procedure § 1; cover FINAL
MUNIR JOHANA, 56803 / 18	2021-0 1-12	2021-0 4-12	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL

Judgment / complaint r	Delivere d	Endeli g	Subject Shoulde r apply is forek omster	Information / demarcation	Original and locator
KHAN, 26957 / 19	2021-0 1-12	2021-0 5-31	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
ROSE NLIND, 258 02 / 18; 2733 8 / 18	2021-0 2-02	2021-0 9-06	2	2 natural applicants identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
M.A., 6697 / 18	2021-0 7-09	2021-0 7-09	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
ABDI, 41643 / 19	2021-0 9-14	2022-0 1-17	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
AVCI, 40240 / 19	2021-1 1-30	2022-0 4-04	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
SAVRAN, 57467 / 15	2021-1 2-07	2021-1 2-07	1	The same person / complaint as chamber judgment 2019.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
LINGS, 15136 / 20	2022-0 4-12	2022-0 7-12	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
MØRCK JENSEN, 60785 / 19	2022-1 0-18	2023-0 1-18	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
The President AND OTHERS, 25212 / 21	2022-1 2-06	2023-0 3-06	3	Three applicants; Article 8 violation concerning the two children's private life, not all three on every Article 8 ground.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
BRIDGE, 11227 / 21	2022-1 2-13	2023-0 3-13	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
NOORZAE, 44810 / 20	2023-0 9-05	2023-1 2-05	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
SHARIFI, 31434 / 21	2023-0 9-05	2023-1 2-05	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
AL-MASID I, 35740 / 21	2023-0 9-05	2023-1 2-05	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
GOMA, 18646 / 22	2023-0 9-05	2024-0 2-19	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
EL-ASCAR, 27753 / 19	2023-1 0-03	2024-0 1-03	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
WANGTHA N, 51301 / 22	2024-0 4-09	2024-0 7-09	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
NGUYEN, 2116 / 21	2024-0 4-09	2024-0 7-09	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
SARAC, 19866 / 21	2024-0 4-09	2024-0 7-09	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
DAUGAAR D SORENS EN, 25650 / 22	2024-1 0-15	2025-0 1-15	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL

Judgment / complaint r	Delivere d	Endeli g	Subject Shoulde r apply is forek omster	Information / demarcation	Original and locator
LINDHOLM AND THE ESTATE AFTER LEIF LIND HOLM, 25636/22	2024-1 1-05	2025-0 3-17	1	A natural person (the wife) and the estate of death. The deceased is directly affected, but the estate is not an additional living candidate.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
SHARAFA NE, 5199 / 23	2024-1 1-12	2025-0 3-17	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
AL-HABEE B, 14171 / 23	2024-1 1-12	2025-0 3-17	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
WINTHER, 9588 / 21	2024-1 1-12	2025-0 2-12	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
SAVURAN, 3645 / 23	2024-1 1-12	2025-0 3-17	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
KALKAN, 51781 / 22	2025-0 5-27	2025-0 8-27	1	The mother is an applicant; the deceased son is directly affected by the Article 2 incident. Two people in the consequence chain, one applicant.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
MIARI, 2852 / 24	2025-0 7-15	2025-1 0-15	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
ABDULAAL NASER AND OTHERS, 46571 / 22	2025-1 0-21	2026-0 1-21	21	21 people in the annex. Substantive Article 3 issue rejected for lack of Danish jurisdiction; procedural Article 3 rejected; Article 6 no violation. Not a decision that no ill-treatment occurred.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
MARCH EN, 16756 / 24	2025-1 0-21	2026-0 1-21	1	One physical applicant identified in the applicant section of the original; anonymisation shall be retained.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL
RAMMUSS EN AND OTHERS, 2390 / 24	2025-1 1-25	2026-0 3-23	3	Three applicants (mother, wife and child of the deceased); the deceased person is directly concerned.	Original§ 1 / Procedure or § 1-3 and Annex; cover FINAL

Specific decision and follow-up chains

Green Desert: Abdulaal Naser and Others. 21 applicants, application 46571/22; judgment 21. October 2025,final 21. January 2026. §§ 108,131-132 and 143 dismiss separate Article 3/length-of-proceedings complaints;§§ 165-166 find no violation of Article 6 concerning access to court/equality of arms;§§ 169-171 dismiss Article 13. The result is not a factual finding that no ill-treatment occurred. The original's introduction describes the group collectively as Iraqi, whereas person 11 in the annex is stated to be Danish; the nationality discrepancy must not be concealed. Original,§§ 1,108,131-132,143,165-171 and the personal-details annex.

Savran / Abdi. The Ministerial Committee concluded the oversight 19 September 2024 by CM / ResDH (2024) 182 following the Government Action Report DH-DD (2024) 679. The resolution documents the completion of the oversight and provides payment in Savran; Abdi did not get exactly satisfaction. An end to supervision alone is not a statement of actual return, health damage or the continued loss of the family. Original Resolution, the table and the operational sections.

Control rules

Complaint numbers, judgment documents, applicant occurrences, identified persons and people directly affected by consequences are separate units. Article overlap is counted according to the judgment’s operative outcome. Committee monitoring is recorded separately with action, date, actual individual effect and documentation; missing implementation information is never translated into established compliance.

EMD decisions: full public register and person count

All 110 English decision documents with Denmark as respondent State and adoption date 2006-2025 have been checked against originals. A decision may be partial, a rejection, settlement or discontinuance; it is not automatically a judgment finding no violation. The 110 documents contain 136 distinct application numbers and at least 846 natural-person occurrences before documented overlap. Unpublished single-judge rejections are not in this public register.

Critical counting points

• Hingitaq 53: 428 people and a group, EMD control in 2006 of relocation in 1953. These are the figures for the control period, not a figure for new actions in 2006.

• Z.K. and 27 others: 28 **applications**. This includes the 22 remaining members of the NHS Group and 14 remaining members of the OAM Group, in addition to 26 applications. Hence at least 62 people. NHS / OAM's previous sub-decisions originally include 33 and 15 people and end 11 and one respectively; these 12 may not be deducted from the total number of persons concerned.

• M.A. / K.M. comprises five people, S.H.I.E.L.N. / M.N. three and H.H. four; the initials of the case do not count the children completely.

• Estates of deceased persons, associations, companies and Latvia as a State are recorded separately from human beings. A mother complaining about her daughter’s compulsory restraint counts as one applicant and one additional directly affected daughter.

• Several sub-decisions are followed by a judgment. The same people and application numbers may not be counted again when the document series are merged. Anonymisation means that, across different applications, the overall personal union cannot be determined on the basis of initials alone.

Original list

Adopted	Decision and application number;	Physical pep rsonforek omster	Original output Age registration	Source and locator
2006-01-12	HINGITAQ 53 AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 18584 / 04	428	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-72219; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-03-14	HUSSEIN v. ALBANIA AND OTHERS; 23276 / 04	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-72789; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-04-10	COMERT v. DENMARK; 14474 / 03	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-75419; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-05-09	CUSTERS, DEVEAUX AND TURK v. DENMARK; 11843 / 03; 11 847 / 03; 11849 / 03	3	Partly admissible composition under Art. 7; Partly inadmissible	HUDOC 001-75548; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-05-15	STATUS OF CREST FILTENBORG MORTENSEN v. DENMARK; 1338 / 03	0	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-75655; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-05-29	HANSEN AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 26194 / 03	3	Inadmissible (no longer victims)	HUDOC 001-75939; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-06-26	FRUENSGAARD v. DENMARK; 23013 / 02	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-76660; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-06-26	UGILT HANSEN v. DENMARK; 11968 / 04	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-76591; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-07-06	PRIYA v. DENMARK; 13594 / 03	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-76777; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-08-30	BROSTED v. DENMARK; 21846 / 04	1	Partly admissible; Partly inadmissible	HUDOC 001-76900; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-08-30	OVLISEN v. DENMARK; 16469 / 05	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-76921; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-09-04	POULSEN v. DENMARK; 8305 / 04	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-76979; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-09-11	LOFT CHRISTENSEN v. DENMARK; 19651 / 04	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-76985; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-10-16	LAGERGREN v. DENMARK; 18668 / 03	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-77707; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-10-16	BIGUM AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 2404 / 05	3	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-77874; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2006-12-11	BEN EL MAHI AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 5853 / 06	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-78692; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2007-01-22	KILIC v. DENMARK; 20730 / 05	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-79612; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2007-01-22	PETERSEN v. DENMARK; 11292 / 05	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-79613; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2007-01-22	KILIC v. DENMARK; 20277 / 05	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-79614; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX

Adopted	Decision and application number;	Physical pep rsonforek omster	Original output Age registration	Source and locator
2007-04-03	LYNGE v. DENMARK; 33838 / 04	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-80347; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2007-10-09	MOESGAARD PETERSEN v. DENMARK; 32848 / 06	1	Admissible	HUDOC 001-83095; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2008-01-22	VALENTIN v. DENMARK; 26461 / 06	1	Partly admissible; Partly inadmissible	HUDOC 001-84941; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2008-06-03	PINDSTRUP MOSE USE A / S v. DENMARK; 34943 / 06	0	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-87267; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2008-09-02	LUNDQUIST v. DENMARK; 880 / 07	1	Partly inadmissible	HUDOC 001-88498; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2008-09-09	BOIVIN v. 34 MEMBER STATES OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE; 73250/01	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-91461; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2008-09-16	GAVRIC v. DENMARK; 23890 / 06	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-88767; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2009-03-03	HYSENA BAJRAMAJ v. DENMARK; 40125 / 06	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-91816; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2009-09-29	LUNDQUIST v. DENMARK; 880 / 07	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-95239; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2009-10-13	PANJEHEIGHALEHEI v. DENMARK; 11230 / 07	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-95460; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2010-03-09	WULFF v. DENMARK; 35016 / 07	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-97938; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2010-03-09	SANTOS HANSEN v. DENMARK; 17949 / 07	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-97940; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2010-09-30	ARTEMI ET GREGORY v. CYPRUS, AUSTRIA, BELGIUM, THE CZECH REPUBLIC, DENMARK, ESTONIA, FINLAND, FRANCE, GERMANY, HUNGARY, IRELAND, ITALY, LATVIA, LITHUANIA, LUXEMBOURG, MALTA, THE NETHERLANDS, POLAND, PORTUGAL, SLOVAKIA, SLOVENIA AND SWEDEN; 35524 / 06	2	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-101378; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2011-01-06	N.H.S. AND 32 OTHERS v. DENMARK; 54298 / 10	33	Partly structural out of the list; Partly willing	HUDOC 001-103074; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2011-01-25	The President AND 14 OTHERS v. DENMARK; 67411 / 10	15	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-103497; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX

Adopted	Decision and application number;	Physical pep rsonforek omster	Original output Age registration	Source and locator
2011-05-24	ENLARGEMENT AND CHRISTENSEN v. DENMARK; 22918 / 08	2	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-105086; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2011-08-23	The President AND 88 OTHERS v. DENMARK; 52975 / 10	89	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-106254; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2011-08-23	S.P. v. DENMARK; 75285 / 10	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-106255; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2011-08-23	Z.K. AND 27 OTHERS v. DENMARK; 37199/10;1417/11;184/11;2676/11;2926/11;38522/10;38798/10;39675/10;39686/10;40429/10;41010/10;4220/11;42459/10;43188/10;43287/10;44021/10;44982/10;49094/10;51474/10;51480/10;54298/10;57976/10;59025/10;63417/10;67411/10;70347/10;71561/10;73448/10	≥62	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-106261; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2011-08-23	The President AND 63 OTHERS v. DENMARK; 53482 / 10	64	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-106253; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-05-22	B.A.S. v. DENMARK; 32936 / 10	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-111358; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-05-22	F.A.X. v. DENMARK; 34718 / 10	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-111359; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-05-22	S.S. v. DENMARK; 34022 / 11	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-111363; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-05-22	A.M.A. v. DENMARK; 34032 / 11	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-111365; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-05-22	A.M.O. v. DENMARK; 34036 / 11	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-111367; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-06-12	HAIDARI v. DENMARK AND GREECE; 18483 / 11	4	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-111711; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-10-16	K.A. v. DENMARK; 50990 / 10	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-114470; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-10-16	FARAH v. DENMARK; 15103 / 11	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-114493; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-10-16	MAHAMUD v. DENMARK; 20972 / 11	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-114500; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-10-16	AHMAD v. DENMARK; 31585 / 11	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-114504; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-10-16	MOHAMED v. DENMARK; 36849 / 11	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-114507; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-10-16	NUUR v. DENMARK; 47864 / 11	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-114528; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2012-10-16	P.T. v. DENMARK; 21376 / 09	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-114537; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX

Adopted	Decision and application number;	Physical pep rsonforek omster	Original output Age registration	Source and locator
2012-11-27	M.S.M. AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 25404 / 12	4	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-115695; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2013-04-09	A.H. AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 58271 / 12	4	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-119823; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2013-11-05	EDLEV-CHRISTENSE N v. DENMARK; 51153 / 09	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-138920; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2014-06-24	SAEED v. DENMARK; 53 / 12	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-145773; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2015-03-31	ANDREASEN v. THE UNITED KINGDOM AND 26 OTHER MEMBER STATES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION; 28827/11	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-154210; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2015-10-13	A.H. v. DENMARK; 15035 / 13	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-158733; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2015-12-08	HH. v. DENMARK; 9624 / 14	4	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-159830; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2015-12-08	S.H.I.E.L.N., AND M.N. v. DENMARK; 16359 / 14	3	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-159832; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2015-12-08	M.A. AND K.M. v. DENMARK; 17913 / 14	5	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-159837; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2015-12-08	The President AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 53757 / 14	4	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-159840; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2015-12-08	B.M. AND OTHERS. v. DENMARK; 4346 / 12	3	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-159928; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2015-12-08	The President AND F.R. v. DENMARK; 18136 / 14	4	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-159838; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2016-04-26	A.T. AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 19790 / 14	6	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-163311; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2016-04-26	A.I. AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 20570 / 14	5	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-163312; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2016-04-26	Z.A. AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 20617 / 14	3	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-163313; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2016-04-26	A.M. AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 53045 / 14	4	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-163320; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2016-06-28	N.A. AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 15636 / 16	3	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-165469; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2016-06-28	JØRGENSEN AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 30173 / 12	4	Inadmissible (Art. 35) Admissibility criteria; (Art. 35-1) Exhaustion of domestic remedies; (Art. 35-1) Six-month period	HUDOC 001-166578; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX

Adopted	Decision and application number;	Physical pep rsonforek omster	Original output Age registration	Source and locator
2016-09-06	NAZARI v. DENMARK; 64372 / 11	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-167813; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2016-09-13	The President AND OTHERS v. DENMARK; 20159 / 16	3	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-167323; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2016-12-13	H.P. v. DENMARK; 55607 / 09	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-170625; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2017-05-16	HAMESEVIC v. DENMARK; 25748 / 15	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-174547; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2017-06-06	ALAM v. DENMARK; 33809 / 15	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-175216; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2018-04-17	ROJ TV A / S v. DENMARK; 24683 / 14	0	Inadmissible (Art. 35) Admissibility criteria; (Art. 35-3-a) Ratione materiae	HUDOC 001-183289; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2018-05-29	MALVER v. DENMARK; 56619 / 15	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-184343; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2018-11-20	MOHAMMAD v. DENMARK; 16711 / 15	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-188708; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2018-11-20	YURDAER v. DENMARK; 42517 / 15	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-188709; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2019-01-22	SAID ABDULE SALAM MUBARAK v. DENMARK; 74411 / 16	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-191222; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2020-06-16	LATVIA v. DENMARK; 9717 / 20	0	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-203914; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2021-06-22	AZIZ THAMER AL-EBRAH v. DENMARK; 32834 / 18	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-211317; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2021-11-10	DAM v. DENMARK; 1349 / 21	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-214157; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2022-02-01	AHMED v. DENMARK; 16588 / 20	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-216317; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2022-02-01	JOHANSEN v. DENMARK; 27801 / 19	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-216316; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2022-02-22	HUSSAIN v. DENMARK; 31572 / 19	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-216583; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2022-02-22	ABDURY v. DENMARK; 20579 / 20	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-216585; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2022-02-22	BAJRAMI v. DENMARK; 24379 / 20	2	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-216586; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2022-03-22	LARABA v. DENMARK; 26781 / 19	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-217052; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2022-03-29	MAVRIC v. DENMARK; 17803 / 20	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-217311; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX

Adopted	Decision and application number;	Physical pep rsonforek omster	Original output Age registration	Source and locator
2023-02-07	M.G. v. DENMARK; 7921 / 20	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-223630; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2023-02-28	HANSEN v. DENMARK; 54155 / 21	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-223836; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2023-06-29	RESTTIN v. DENMARK; 61203 / 19	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-226141; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2023-06-29	ILHAN v. DENMARK; 41157 / 20	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-226143; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2023-06-29	M.P. v. DENMARK; 25263 / 22	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-226144; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2023-07-12	A.A. v. DENMARK; 6041 / 23	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-227647; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2023-11-21	HUSSEINI v. DENMARK; 14270 / 21	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-229798; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-01-25	CAKMAK v. DENMARK; 21783 / 22	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-231272; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-01-25	FATEH v. DENMARK; 60766 / 19	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-231265; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-01-25	BELGIUM v. DENMARK; 61126 / 19	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-231266; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-01-25	PAYAM v. DENMARK; 32739 / 21	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-231267; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-01-25	KURLAND v. DENMARK; 54157 / 21	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-231269; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-01-25	DAVUD KIBAR. DENMARK; 11093 / 22	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-231270; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-04-04	TASKIRAN v. DENMARK; 19840/23	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-233533; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-04-04	AHMADI v. DENMARK; 26597 / 23	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-233534; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-05-21	DIAN v. DENMARK; 44002 / 22	1	Inadmissible (Art. 35) Admissibility criteria; (Art. 35-3-a) Ratione materiae	HUDOC 001-234499; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-07-02	ASSOCIATION AGAINST ILLEGAL SURVEILLANCE v. DENMARK; 37050 / 22	0	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-235811; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2024-10-03	QUASIMI v. DENMARK; 38589 / 23	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-237904; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2025-07-03	DISEASE v. DENMARK; 6553 / 25	1	Inadmissible	HUDOC 001-244833; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX
2025-12-04	KLEIN v. DENMARK; 5855 / 25	1	Structure out of the list	HUDOC 001-248072; party identification under THE FACTS / FACTS AND PROCEDURE; short table decisions: APPENDIX

Precise party and overlap points

• 18584 / 04: 428 persons and an applicant group; the move from Thule took place in 1953, while the EMD decision dates from 2006.

• 1338 / 03: Dødbo is an applicant; the son represents the estate and is not himself an applicant.

• 5853 / 06: One natural person and two associations.

• 34943 / 06: Company limited liability company.

• 880 / 07: Same person and application number as the Lundquist decision 2009.

• 880 / 07: Same person and application number as the Lundquist decision 2008.

• 54298 / 10: 33 original applicants; this sub-decision closes 11 of their complaints. 22 will continue later in the Z.K decision.

• 67411 / 10: 15 original applicants; this sub-decision closes an applicant's complaint. 14 will continue later in the Z.K general decision.

• 37199/10;1417/11;184/11;2676/11;2926/11;38522/10;38798/10;39675/10;39686/10;40429/10;41010/10;4220/11;42459/10;43188/10;43287/10;44021/10;44982/10;49094/10;51474/10;51480/10;54298/10;57976/10;59025/10;63417/10;67411/10;70347/10;71561/10;73448/10: 28 applications, not 28 people. These include NHS with 22 remaining and OAM with 14 remaining, plus 26 other applications. At least 62 people; the published original document has no person annex, even though the cover refers to an application annex.

• 18483 / 11: Two adults and two children, total 555.000 DKK settlement; actually returned to Greece 9.9.2010 and later returned to Denmark on unclaimed date.

• 16359 / 14: Three people: couples and daughter; the title has only two initial groups.

• 17913 / 14: Five people: couples and three children; the title has only two initial groups.

• 24683 / 14: A company.

• 9717 / 20: Intergovernmental case; Latvia is an applicant, no natural person as an applicant.

• 54155 / 21: Same person as Tim Henrik Bruun Hansen- judgment 51072 / 15.

• 37050 / 22: An association.

• 5855 / 25: A mother as an applicant, the daughter as directly affected. Adopted 4.12.2025; notified 8.1.2026. EUR 15.000 compensation and EUR 3.000 costs, government commitment to discussion in the Task Force.

14. Enforcement of human rights judgments

The 24 independent final break-up proceedings groups from judgments handed down between 2006 and 2025 have per capita 7 October 2026 **16 completed and eight still pending enforcement cases**. The eight are Aggerholm, Noorzae, Sharifi, El- Asmar, Nguyen, Sharafane, Kalkan and Mortensen. All are under standard supervision. The number is limited to these judgments and expresses neither all historical Danish breaches nor all current Danish enforcement cases.

Savran's chamber judgment from 2019 was replaced by the Grand chamber judgment from 2021; the final case is included once. Judgments handed down late in 2025 can only become final in 2026. Naser became final on 21 January 2026, but is a judgment without established breach and is therefore not included in this enforcement account.

Full status of the 24 final infringement proceedings for the period

Case and application no.	Judgment	Final	Status 7.10.2026	Original closure / document	State of payment s in register
SØRENSEN AND RASMUSSEN; 52562 / 99; 52620 / 99	2006-01-11	2006-01-11	Completed	2007-02-28; CM / ResDH (2007) 6; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	N / A
IVERSEN; 5989 / 03	2006-09-28	2006-12-28	Completed	2011-12-02; CM / ResDH (2011) 199; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
HASSLUND; 36244 / 06	2008-12-11	2009-03-11	Completed	2011-12-02; CM / ResDH (2011) 199; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
MOESGAARD PETERSEN; 32848 / 06	2008-12-11	2009-03-11	Completed	2011-12-02; CM / ResDH (2011) 199; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
CHRISTENSE N; 247 / 07	2009-01-22	2009-04-22	Completed	2012-06-06; CM / ResDH (2012) 73; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
VALENTIN; 26461 / 06	2009-03-26	2009-06-26	Completed	2012-06-06; CM / ResDH (2012) 73; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
NIELSEN; 44034 / 07	2009-07-02	2009-10-02	Completed	2012-06-06; CM / ResDH (2012) 73; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
OSMAN; 38058 / 09	2011-06-14	2011-09-14	Completed	2012-09-26; CM / ResDH (2012) 117; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
BIAO; 38590 / 10	2016-05-24	2016-05-24	Completed	2018-04-10; CM / ResDH (2018) 155; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
TIM HENRIK BRUN HANSEN; 51072 / 15	2019-07-09	2019-10-09	Completed	2020-12-08; CM / ResDH (2020) 312; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
AGGERHOLM; 45439 / 18	2020-09-15	2020-12-15	Verser	Verserer; status cards,	Paid
M.A.; 6697 / 18	2021-07-09	2021-07-09	Completed	2023-06-07; CM / ResDH (2023) 119; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
ABDI; 41643 / 19	2021-09-14	2022-01-17	Completed	2024-09-19; CM / ResDH (2024) 182; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	noJS
SAVRAN; 57467 / 15	2021-12-07	2021-12-07	Completed	2024-09-19; CM / ResDH (2024) 182; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
The President AND OTHERS; 25212 / 21	2022-12-06	2023-03-06	Completed	2025-06-12; CM / ResDH (2025) 140; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
NOORZAE; 44810 / 20	2023-09-05	2023-12-05	Verser	Verserer; status cards,	Paid
SHARIFI; 31434 / 21	2023-09-05	2023-12-05	Verser	Verserer; status cards,	noJS
EL-ASCAR; 27753 / 19	2023-10-03	2024-01-03	Verser	Verserer; status cards,	Paid
NGUYEN; 2116 / 21	2024-04-09	2024-07-09	Verser	Verserer; status cards,	Paid

Case and application no.	Judgment	Final	Status 7.10.2026	Original closure / document	State of payment s in register
SARAC; 19866 / 21	2024-04-0 9	2024-07-0 9	Completed	2025-11-07; CM / ResDH (2025) 329; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
DAUGAARD SORENSEN; 25650 / 22	2024-10-1 5	2025-01-1 5	Completed	2026-04-29; CM / ResDH (2026) 73; declaration of acceptance and the form of case	Paid
SHARAFANE; 5199 / 23	2024-11-1 2	2025-03-1 7	Verser	Verserer; status cards,	noJS
KALKAN; 51781 / 22	2025-05-2 7	2025-08-2 7	Verser	Verserer; status cards,	Paid
MORTENSEN; 16756 / 24	2025-10-2 1	2026-01-2 1	Verser	Verserer; status cards,	Paid

Why completion and payment do not count as full actual restoration

The Committee of Ministers' original resolutions themselves make the distinction: under ECHR Article 46, in addition to paying compensation, the State may be obliged to take individual measures ending the violation and remedying its consequences, and general measures against recurrence. A final resolution shows the committee's closure of supervision. It does not in itself show that family separation, illness, deprivation of liberty or lost time have been undone. M.A., CM/ResDH(2023)119, preamble.

Aggerholm, Noorzae, El- Asmar, Nguyen, Kalkan and Mortensen are registered with paid compensation, while enforcement is still pending. Sharifi and Sharafane are registered without compensation. The payment accounts must therefore stand alongside the accounts for concrete actions, public knowledge and lasting consequences. HUDOC-EXEC, full Danish extract and individual status cards.

Voting against the overall system of enforcement

The Committee of Ministers' Annual Report 2025 sets Denmark as four new, nine cases pending at the end of the year and four cases closed. Five pending cases were under standard supervision; none were under reinforced supervision. The figures are a different delineation from the status above: Daugaard Sørensen was still open by the end of 2025 and was completed on 29 April 2026; Mortensen was not final until 2026. Annual Report 2025, Danish Country Field, p. 67.

HUDOC-EXEC's current total Danish caseload also includes Klein (settlement decision adopted 4. December 2025,notified 8. January 2026) and new 2026 judgments Poulsen and Makki. They are kept separate from the 2006-2025 judgments' 24 final violation-case groups. Klein concerns a mother's complaint about her daughter's belt restraint:15.000 EUR compensation, 3.000 EUR costs and the Government's commitment to raise the course with the Danish Health Authority's Task Force. Such a settlement is not a judgment finding a violation and is counted separately. Klein 5855/25,pp. 1–3.

Date documentary check

The originals have been read for all 11 distinct closing resolutions covering the 16 completed cases. In several instances, HUDOC-EXEC status cards give the start of a meeting rather than the original's specific adoption date. The report uses the original adoption date: for example, Sørensen/Rasmussen 28.2.2007, Iversen/Hasslund/Moesgaard 2.12.2011, Christensen/Valentin/Nielsen 6.6.2012, Osman 26.9.2012, M.A. 7.6.2023, Savran/Abdi 19.9.2024 and K.K. 12.6.2025. Biao 10.4.2018 and Tim Henrik Bruun Hansen 8.12.2020 have likewise been checked against originals. The K.K. resolution has a typographical error in the parenthetical part of its number in the original heading; it is identified as CM/ResDH(2025)140 in the committee's other official register.

15. United Nations: control, complaints and knowledge

Controlled October 6, 2026. This sub-note provides documented international control findings and precise next source link. Final observations from UN committees and CPT visit reports are not EMD convictions or convictions. They can document the actual criticism, warnings and recommendations of authoritative control bodies and the state's knowledge of problems; each fact claim must continue to be traced to its primary basis. No sum of committee recommendations is called the number of Danish breaches of the Convention.

Fund of particular importance for the order

Document	Controlled find	Locator and original	Meaning of proof and source
United Nations Children's Committee, CR C / C / DNK / CO / 4, 2011	The Committee states that previous recommendations, including on data and alternative care, were not sufficiently implemented.	Original§ 6-7, adopted 4 February 2011, issued 7 April 2011	Documented previous criticism; not proof of the number of concrete invalid decisions.
United Nations Children's Committee, CR C / C / DNK / CO / 5, 2017	§ 26(c) mentions certain Copenhagen decisions in placement sequences without a legal basis and without, among other things, consultation with the parties, appeal guidance, contact assessment and an action plan; similar problems are described as reported elsewhere. §§ 26(d),(f) concern inadequate involvement and use of force/access to complaints.	OriginalParagraph 26-27, adopted on 29 September 2017, issued on 26 October 2017	Concrete evidence of legal basis. The source does not contain the number of children. The municipal original must show whether the lack of home space relates to the removal itself or to a decision on, for example, supervised relationships; the two cannot be renamed each other.
UN Disability Committee, CRPD / C / DNK / C O / 2-3, 2024	§ 63 highlights inadequate or late support for parents with disabilities, possible significance for parenting-capacity assessments and increasing adoption without consent. § 64 requires timely support. §§ 7-8 criticise inadequate application of the Convention; §§ 57-58 discuss distance from family/language when moving from Greenland to Denmark.	Original, § 7-8, 57-58, 63-64; adopted 3 September 2024, issued 8 October 2024	Specifically documented warning about the chain lack of support → parenting capacity assessment → loss of parental responsibility. The committee does not quantify the number of families affected by errors in these sections.
United Nations Torture Committee, CA T / C / DNK / CO / 8, 2023	§ 40-41 criticises few criminal proceedings after police reports and investigations with too narrow a focus of guilt. The committee also requests that it be examined whether abuse / torture has actually taken place. § 7 identifies earlier recommendations in § 13,21,37 as not implemented.	Original, § 7,40-41; adopted 22 November 2023, issued 8 December 2023	The absence of evidence of individual criminal liability shall not automatically replace the investigation of the act and the State's liability for protection. This supports separate traces of incident, state responsibility and criminal guilt.
United Nations Women's Committee, C EDAW / C / DNK / C O / 9, 2021	Paragraph 12 states that previous observations were sent to relevant ministries with responsibilities. Clauses 20-21 highlight protection against violence, especially women with disabilities, and lack of disaggregated data. Paragraphs 14-15 refer to insufficient legal protection and definition.	Original, § 12,14-15,20-21, adopted during session 15-25 February and 4 March 2021	§ 12 is a concrete level of dissemination / knowledge. The prevalence of violence is not simply a violation of the law by public servants; public negligence must be identified separately.

CPT: repeated investigations and concrete duration of coercive action

The CPT country page lists six visits in 2006-2025: 2008, 2012 (Greenland), 2014, 2019, 2024 and 2025 (Greenland). Four were periodic, two ad hoc. This is the number **visits**, not number of breaches of law. The Government's response in 2007 to a 2002 visit is a source of knowledge / reaction during the period, but not a new visit. Original Country Page, the Activity section.

Visits	Report	Reaction in the register
11-20 February 2008	CPT / Inf (2008) 26	CPT / Inf (2009) 12
25-27 September 2012, Greenland	CPT / Inf (2013) 3	CPT / Inf (2013) 11
4-13 February 2014	CPT / Inf (2014) 25	CPT / Inf (2015) 16
3 to 12 April 2019	CPT / Inf (2019) 35	CPT / Inf (2020) 10 and full response CPT / Inf (2020) 26
23 May - 3 June 2024	CPT / Inf (2024) 38	CPT / Inf (2025) 19
14-16 January 2025, Greenland	CPT / Inf (2025) 14	CPT / Inf (2025) 28

The original of the 2024 visit provides the following defined observations:

• Aarhus: 1.167 restraints in 2022, 569 in 2023 and 239 in January-May 2024; 33 in 2023 and 17 in 2024 exceeded 48 hours. Longest durations since the beginning of 2023 were 16, 13 and 8 days.

• Glostrup: 138 restraints in 2022, 66 in 2023 and 31 in January-May 2024. Longest in 2024 were 10, 8 and 5 days.

• Aarhus child/adolescent psychiatry: 18 patients aged 14-17 restrained 237 times in January 2023-May 2024.

• Some inmates in Nyborg / Vestre spent 21-23 hours daily in the cell over months, sometimes years.

CPT/Inf (2024) 38, sections 143-144,147 (physical PDF pp.61-62; printed pp.61-62) and summary p.7/section 73. These are institutional, time-bounded observations. Restraint episodes are not unique patients; overall restraint practice cannot be relabelled as the same number of unlawful episodes without specific scrutiny under the rules.

The 2024 Report is dated 12 December 2024; the Government's reply was published on 23 June 2025. The government's answer, CPT / Inf (2025) 19. The data chain is visit → report / warning → state response → subsequent practice. The last link must be supported by new concrete measures or data, not the government's declaration of its own compliance.

The time for reunification is an independent legal issue

The Grand Chamber judgment **Strand Lobben and Others v. Norway**, no.37283/13, 10. September 2019, establishes in §§ 205,208 that authorities must promote reunification as soon as reasonably feasible and that the obligation increases during placement. Time can irreparably damage family ties. Where the authorities' failure caused the breakdown, they must not justify adoption on the absence of those ties. Original judgment, §§ 205,208-209, physical PDF pp.68-69, printed pp.66-67.

The judgment concerns Norway. It is here a primary source of law on Article 8 and is not counted as a Danish infringement judgment. Paragraph 8 states that Denmark submitted a written third-party submission; it is a specific Danish level of knowledge on the legal issue. It does not prove that any subsequent Danish intervention violated the judgment's requirements.
The report shall measure for each documented process: decision on action → remittal for reconsideration / repeal → new decision → actual cessation / reunification. If contact is restricted, the frequency / duration should be recorded in parallel. Completed administrative cases may thus have continued material consequences.

Current evidence and necessary next level of evidence

1. Copenhagen's original study, sample and thematic figures are verified in chapter 17. The next evidential link is the individual original decisions behind the deficiencies in legal basis and competence.

2. The international registers include 20 periodic UN observations, 265 individual decision documents and three completed UPRs with 620 recommendations. Next evidence is full individual follow-up, staff association and actual implementation, not a new title list.

3. The CPT register includes all six visits and seven replies. The concrete residue includes the material content of the scanned 2013response, the original and point-by-point actual compliance of the 2020part product. No year's institution take-off is extrapolated to the entire period.

4. The HUDOC accounts comprise 59 judgment documents and 110 decisions. The next evidentiary step is anonymised linkage of persons and actual redress in each course; administrative removals before judicial allocation are a different register population.

Historical UN source map: documented criticism and state problem knowledge

Controlled October 6, 2026. The source cards contain their own, defined paraphrases. They document the findings, recommendations and follow-up requirements of the committees; they do not represent a count of legitimate convictions or uniquely violated persons. The actual facts must be verified against Danish originals, and assessments of applicable law today must not copy a historical point of criticism without legal control.

2007: police investigations and isolationpractices

Source: The United Nations Committee on Torture, CAT/ C / DNK / CO / 5, adopted 14 May 2007, issued 16 July 2007. Original§ 14-15, physical / printed p.4.

Section 14 criticises solitary confinement of minors and prolonged solitary confinement even after reductions in permitted time limits. Section 15 calls for prompt, impartial investigation of alleged police abuse and appropriate redress. The point includes criticism of the investigation system; it does not establish that all reported incidents were proved.

Meaning: The source places documented international problem knowledge early in the period under investigation. For current claims of responsibility, criticism is linked to concrete reception, follow-up and continued incidents. An event from 2002 referred to in the 2007 observations shall not be moved into the event figure for the years 2006-2025.

2014: disability, coercion, support and lack of effective redress

Source: United Nations Disability Committee, CRPD / C / DNK / CO / 1, adopted 2 October 2014, issued 30 October 2014. Original.

Locator	Controlled paraffase	Importance of the report
§ 12- 13, p.2-3	Insufficient knowledge among government, regional and municipal officials; need concrete guidance for municipalities.	The distribution of municipal powers cannot replace the State's implementing responsibilities.
§ 14- 17, p.3	Gaps in protection against discrimination, remedies and disaggregated data.	Missing data are independent control findings; no calculation of unknown person numbers.
§ 20-21, p.3-4; § 68, p.10	Criticism of forced hospitalisation / treatment of children and specific follow-up requirements within 12 months.	Children and their actual exposure to coercion are recorded separately.
§ 36-39, p.5-6	Deprivation of liberty linked to disability and compulsory treatment, including restraint exceeding 48 hours.	Duration and consent are substantive issues.
§ 40-43, p.6	Violence, inaccessible protection, lack of data, institution building and forced relocations.	Consequences: isolation, choice of accommodation and protection against abuse.
§ 54-55, p.8	Independent access to complaints in the case of inadequate special education varies according to the length of time required for the aid.	A rights and review problem, not merely service quality.
§ 69-71, p.10	The observations must be sent to government, parliaments, ministries and local authorities and disseminated to citizens.	An identifiable knowledge / dissemination trail.

These committee assessments do not automatically mean an EMD finding in accordance with the same provisions.

2015 / 2016: foreign military practices, asylum, police and psychiatry

Source: The United Nations Committee on Torture, CAT/ C / DNK / CO / 6-7, adopted 30 November 2015, **issued 4 February 2016**. Original.

Locator	Controlled paraffase	Meaning
§ 12- 15, Incorporation / Fundamental safeguards sections	Criticism of non-incorporation and reports of violation of guarantees from the start of detention.	Control of actual access to lawyer, doctor and relatives.

Locator	Controlled paraffase	Meaning
§ 18- 19, Transfer of detainees	The decommissioning of the Iraqi / Afghan Commission left the issue of international breaches unresolved; demands for independent, completed investigation.	Failure to complete the investigation shall not be communicated as proven acquittal.
§ 20-25, Deportation / Screening / Detention	Criticism of sending vulnerable minors, lack of torture screening and long-term detention of asylum seekers.	Identifiable duty of protection and specific subsequent consequences.
§ 32-33, Solitary construction	Criticism of the isolation of children and long isolation periods.	Duration and citizens' group shall be recorded.
§ 40-43, Coercive measures / Intersex persons	Criticism of psychiatric coercion and irreversible intervention on intersex children.	The damage shall not automatically cease at the end of the proceedings.
§ 48-49, Data collection	Missing aggregate/disaggregated data on abuse complaints, investigations, prosecutions, judgments and redress.	Official complaint numbers don't give you a full assault count.

Follow-up chain: § 50 requests answers to § 13,21,23,37. The Government's response is CAT/ C / DNK / CO / 6-7 / Add.1, received 9. December 2016, issued 30. December 2016: original follow-up letter. CAT/ C / DNK / CO / 8, 2023, § 7 continues to mention non-implemented recommendations in § 13,21,37. The response of the State is documented, not in itself proof of adequate compliance.

2016: unimplemented individual UN decisions and protective holes

Source: United Nations Human Rights Committee, CCPR / C / DNK / CO / 6, adopted 7 July 2016, issued 15 August 2016. Original.

Locator	Controlled paraffase	Meaning of proof
§§ 11-12	Some individual committee decisions were not implemented, in particular broadcasting cases.	Specific decisions and subsequent actions must be listed; the source does not indicate a total number.
§§ 19-20	Delays in data on rape complaints, investigations, criminal prosecution and sanctions; heterogeneous police practices.	The protective effort and the measuring basis shall be tested separately.
§§ 23-24	Criticism of child isolation and long disciplinary isolation periods.	Continuous with previous warnings.
§§ 25-26	Concern about psychiatric coercion and restraint exceeding 48 hours.	Concrete temporal problem repeated from previous checks.
§§ 27-28	Clarification of terrorism, surveillance and removal of dual citizenship.	Include legislative and policy responsibilities with a law version.
§§ 31-32,35-36	Asylum guarantees and a long wait for family reunification.	Time is a material family intervention.

Total use and remaining sources

These findings extend international control sources to 2007-2024 and show repeated warnings about coercion, testing and data gaps. They document a problem history; responsibility for a particular subsequent attack requires the clutch warning → competent recipient → duty → concrete action / omission → damage.

The lists are now established in the following sections:20 periodic observation documents,265 individual decision documents in 2006-2025 and three completed UPR cycles with 620 recommendations. Full follow-up, unique person linkage and actual redress are separate outstanding items. The 2026 State report is not a completed fourth UPR review. The ECtHR series for allocated applications and procedural stages has been checked; unallocated administrative discontinuances concern a different population and require separate information.

UN: complete inventory of observations and historical knowledge chains

Checked on 7. October 2026 against the UN's official Denmark register and original documents. **20 concluding observation documents in 2006-2025:** CAT 3, CCPR 2, CEDAW 4, CERD 4, CESCR 2, CRC 2, CRPD 2 and CRC-OPSC 1. Committee years are adoption years; issuance is shown separately when later. Registration dates must not replace the original date. Two 2005 documents provide background for the State's pre-existing knowledge and are kept outside the 20-year count. Documents are not numbers of violations, events or citizens.

List

Year of control	Document ID	Original / locator	Specific document delineation;
2006	CEDAW / C / DEN / C O / 6	Original, front page 25.8.2006; § 1	Sixth Report; Women's Rights in the Kingdom.
2006	CERD / C / DEN / CO / 17	Original, § 1, adopted 18.8.2006, published 19.10.2006	17th racism/discrimination report.
2006	CRC / C / OPSC / DN K / CO / 1	Original, § 1, adopted 29.9.2006, published 17.10.2006	First report on the sale of children, sexual exploitation and assault material.
2007	CAT/ C / DNK / CO / 5	Original, front / § 1; historical -fn-source map. md	Fifth report; torture / abuse, detention and effective investigations.
2008	CCPR / C / DNK / CO / 5	Original, § 1, adopted 28.10.2008, published 16.12.2008	Fifth report: civil and political rights.
2009	CEDAW / C / DEN / C O / 7	Original, front page 7.8.2009, § 1	Seventh report.
2010	CERD / C / DNK / CO / 18-19	Original, § 1, adopted 26.8.2010, published 20.9.2010	Combined 18-19 report, one observation document.
2011	CRC / C / DNK / CO / 4	Original, § 1, adopted 4.2.2011, issued 7.4.2011	Fourth child report.
2013	E / C. 12 / DNK / CO / 5	Original, § 1, adopted 17.5.2013, issued 6.6.2013	Fifth economic / social / cultural report.
2014	CRPD / C / DNK / CO / 1	Original, front / § 1; historical -fn-source map. md	First disability report.
2015	CEDAW / C / DNK / C O / 8	Original, front page 11.3.2015; session 16.2.-6.3.2015	Eighth report.
2015	CERD / C / DNK / CO / 20-21	Original, § 1, adopted 13.5.2015, issued 12.6.2015	Combined 20-21 report, one observation document.
2015	CAT/ C / DNK / CO / 6-7	Original, § 1, adopted 30.11.2015, issued 4.2.2016	Combined 6th-7th report; to be included in the 2015year of control.
2016	CCPR / C / DNK / CO / 6	Original, front / § 1; historical -fn-source map. md	Sixth report.
2017	CRC / C / DNK / CO / 5	Original, § 1, adopted 29.9.2017, released 26.10.2017	Fifth child report.
2019	E / C. 12 / DNK / CO / 6	Original, § 1, adopted 18.10.2019, published 12.11.2019	Sixth Economic / Social / Cultural Report.
2021	CEDAW / C / DNK / C O / 9	Original, front / § 1; international fund and time effect.md	Ninth report.
2021	CERD / C / DNK / CO / 22-24	Original, § 1, adopted 30.11.2021, released 1.2.2022	Combined 22-24 report, to be included in 2021 year of control.
2023	CAT/ C / DNK / CO / 8	Original, front / § 1; international fund and time effect.md	Eighth report.
2024	CRPD / C / DNK / CO / 2-3	Original, front / § 1; international fund and time effect.md	Combined 2nd-3rd report, one observation document.

CED: No final observation recorded in 2006-2025. Denmark's first report, CED / C / DNK / 1, was received on May 3, 2025 and released on July 15, 2025; it is the State's own report and is not counted as committee fund. § 1 specifies:

the entry into force of the Convention 12 February 2022 and the territorial derogation for Greenland / Faeroe Islands. Original initial report;, front / § 1. CED / C / DNK / Q / 1 from 2026 belongs to the update.

Background before the period: CRC / C / DNK / CO / 3 and CRC / C / OPAC / DNK / CO / 1 from 2005 are included as sources of already available problem knowledge, not as new control findings in 2006-2025. No report numbers or combined years provide additional documents / persons.

Additional source maps: State knowledge, action and missing data

The following are their own defined paraphrases. The other years of control have been developed in historical source maps and international fund and time effects. The case of practice is committee fund until the underlying Danish originals are checked; the repetitions of the committees are a track of knowledge and no additional person count.

2006: violence, family life and public reporting obligations

CEDAW / C / DEN / CO / 6: § 28-29 criticises the fact that foreign spouses' fears of loss of residence prevent them from leaving a violent partner and requires a rapid change of administrative practice. Clauses 30-31 require the assessment of the impact of the 24-year rule on women and point to a lack of figures on forced marriage. § 9 addresses ministries / parliament; § 35 requires communication to civil servants and politicians; § 36 follow-up in the next report. Demarcation: women in the realm, no affected number of persons. Original§ 9,28-31,35-36, p. 2,5-6.

CERD/C/DEN/CO/17: sections 13-15 criticise missing judicial appeal in asylum cases, families living in centres for years, protection gaps for foreign spouses subjected to violence, the 24-/28-year rules and age limit 15 for family reunification. Sections 18-19 criticise discrimination in benefits and education. Section 24 requires a reply within one year on sections 11,13,15. Actors: government, prosecution, asylum authorities and municipalities. Delimitation: protection against discrimination; no aggregate person count. Original, sections 11,13-15,18-19,24, pp. 3-6.

CRC / C / OPSC / DNK / CO / 1: § 9-14 criticises insufficient coordination, training and data. § 19- 20 warns about the importance of the municipal / police reform for early detection and support. Paragraphs 23-24 refer to Tønder and ask whether public employees know the notification requirement; labour pressure and resource shortages may delay response. § 35 requires submission to the State Council, Folketing and local authorities; § 37 follow-up through the next children's report. Limitation: sexual exploitation, no new case / person; the case may overlap with Danish case material. Original§ 9-14,19-24,35-37, p. 2-4.

2008-2010: foreign operations, municipal management and impunity risk

CCPR/C/DNK/CO/5: section 9 requires investigation and publication concerning possible Danish participation in unlawful transfers through airports/airspace; section 10 on diplomatic assurances does not exempt the State from human rights, humanitarian and refugee obligations. Section 11 criticises prolonged solitary confinement, including of minors. Sections 8,15 require follow-up within one year on violence against women and solitary confinement. Actors: government, police and judiciary. Delimitation: the findings count neither flights, victims nor proved criminal culpability. Original, sections 8-11,15, pp. 2-4.

CEDAW/C/DEN/CO/7: §§ 11-12 identify unimplemented 2006 criticism. §§ 18-19 mention that only 6% of municipalities had a coordinated gender-equality strategy; §§ 22-23 state 8% female mayors; § 24 states 13% female professorships. These are defined distribution measures, not percentages of breaches of law. §§ 30-31 criticise insufficient legal protection for foreign spouses experiencing violence; §§ 40-41 repeat family-life criticism. § 10 addresses ministries/parliament/the judiciary; § 48 requires follow-up within two years on§§ 15,31. Original, §§ 10-12,18-25,30-31,40-41,48, pp. 3-7,9,11.

CERD/C/DNK/CO/18-19: § 9 criticises the prosecution’s extensive powers to close cases and requires independent, multicultural supervision. §§ 13-14 reiterate protection against violence and family-reunification problems. § 18 notes the Equal Treatment Board’s lack of provision for oral witnesses/party testimony. § 26 requires follow-up within one year on §§ 13,15,18,19; § 27 prioritises §§ 8-11. Actors: government, prosecution, boards and municipalities. Delimitation: no total number of closed cases or affected citizens. Original, §§ 9,13-14,18,26-27, pp. 2-6.

2011-2015: lack of support, loss of home and insufficient redress

CRC / C / DNK / CO / 4: § 41-42 criticises the inadequate registration, support and follow-up of children in crisis centres. § 43-44 criticises the lack of local guidance / supervision and children placed without individual action plan; the State must ensure support for families. Paragraphs 45 to 46 concern the support and participation of disabled children. § 70 requires transmission to the Head of State, Højesteret, Folketing, Ministries and Local Authorities. Limitation: child protection and known system problems; no number of persons or automatic homelessness in any placement. OriginalParagraph 41-46,70, p. 7-9,14.

E / C. 12 / DNK / CO / 5: § 4 criticises rare court applications and lack of direct review. § 13 criticises insufficient support for less than 25 years of age and possible loss of pension access for persons with disabilities under 40; § 15 concerns children and appropriate care; § 17 housing barriers, homelessness and many deferrals; § 18 basic healthcare to marginalised. Article 26 requires the provision of information to public servants and courts. Actors: legislator, employment / social authorities, municipalities and health services. Limitation: social rights findings without quantified infringement or person numbers. Original§ 4,13,15,17-18,26, p. 2-6.

CEDAW / C / DNK / CO / 8: § 3 identifies the interministerial delegation; § 9 actually describes the dissemination of previous observations. § 13-14 criticises a lack of municipal strategies; § 17-18 a lack of split violence and protection. Clauses 19-20 relate to up to 72 hours of confinement of possible traffickingo victims. § 45-46 requires comparable data; § 52 requires follow-up to § 18 within two years. Limitation: national / regional / municipal implementation; no count of forced or violent incidents. Original§ 3,9,13-20,45-46,50,52, p. 1,3-5,10-12.

CERD / C / DNK / CO / 20-21: § 13 reproduces that 709 residents were rejected during combined rental, but only 28 received the municipality's mandatory alternative residence. It is a source-printed housing committee, not 709 different unlawful decisions verified here; the remaining 681 is the difference, not an independent find of criminal offences. § 17 criticises the lack of compensation following successful individual UN complaints and continues to make a written mention process. § 29 requires a one-year follow-up to § 10,15. Actors: municipalities, government, boards and law enforcement. OriginalParagraph 13,17,29, p. 5-6,9.

2019-2021: regulatory criticism and specific data gaps

E / C. 12 / DNK / CO / 6: § 6-7 criticises the compatibility of adopted laws with the Treaty and requires regulatory / impact control. Paragraph 41-42 calls for an impact assessment of early retirement / fleksjobreform 2012. § 43-44 criticises the investigation and statistical basis of sexual violence; § 51-52 concerns discriminatory housing / ghetto legislation and coercive elements; § 56-57 psychiatric coercion, including children under 15. § 76 addresses national / regional / municipal level; § 77 requires 24 months follow-up on § 13,17,19. Limitation: rights / legislation findings, no unique persons. Paragraph 4's reference to former section 5 by incorporation is not precise: the incorporation finding of the 2013original is in section 4. Original, § 4,6-7,41-44,51-57,76-77, p. 1-2,6-8,11.

CERD/C/DNK/CO/22-24: §§ 4-5,8-9 and 18-21 reiterate missing ethnicity/criminal-case data, underreporting and racial profiling. § 28 reports 453 foreign nationals among 459 persons charged under the camping provision up to 1. July 2019; these are charges/persons according to the source's wording, not 453 established unlawful police acts. § 36 reports 116 board cases in 2019-2020, including 18 findings in parties' favour; they may overlap with the board series. § 42 also addresses municipalities; § 43 requires one-year follow-up on §§ 19(b),27,31. Original, §§ 4-9,18-21,28,36,42-44, pp. 2,4-8.

How the knowledge chain is used in the responsibility analysis

For each replicate point, the first identified warning → responsible authority / intermediary body → State response → later control findings → documented changed or continued practice → specific persons / interventions → responsibility and requirements. A follow-up letter proves that the answer was given; it does not prove that the problem ceased. Repeated committee reference to the same practice must not be added to new cases or new people. The legal consequences shall be examined in accordance with the rules in force at the time of the event.

The present list of documents is complete for the final observations of the committees indicated in the United Nations Register of Denmark. It does not automatically include all follow-up letters, state reports, shadow reports or individual complaints; these have their own records and document IDs.

UN individual complaint decisions against Denmark,2006-2025;2026 separately

Control 7 October 2026. The list is complete for the decision documents of the Danish public register during the period. The personnel statement and compliance are defined, as specified specifically below.

Count unit and vote

OHCHR land register: 308 series of registers, 304 different raw document names. Seven aliases / corrigendum pages are omitted as autonomous decisions.297 decision documents remain = 265 in 2006-2025 + 5 in 2026 + 27 before 2006. All 265 period decisions and 5 in 2026 are original outflows checked. Two of the 27 previous documents (CERD 23 / 2002 and CCPR 72 / 1980) could not be opened originally; their exclusion from the period follows the date of the register and the session number, not an alleged original date verified. Three precise dates require version clarification; conflict and justified years are preserved.

265 decision-making documents relate to 263 committee / communication numbers. The CCPR 2475 / 2014 has three cessation documents. The CCPR 2497 / 2014 ceased due to double registration. Each unit is preserved; 263 is therefore not a number of unique citizen cases. The unit is not employees, sanctions, families or persons.

Committee	Positive reality	Without breakage	Pure rejection	Clean Termination	Mixed	Documents
CAT	7	10	5	4	0	26
CCPR	31	31	35	72	1	170
CEDAW	3	3	26	8	0	40
CERD	6	1	3	0	0	10
CRC	8	0	5	4	0	17
CRPD	2	0	0	0	0	2
Total	57	45	74	88	1	265

The 57 favourable Views on the merits include established errors and prospective protection against removal that would violate the Convention. They are not 57 completed removals. CAT 743/2016 is inadmissible but contains a separately established Article 22 violation through actual removal despite interim measures (§ 8.2), outside the 57. CCPR 2342/2014 § 13(a) declares inadmissibility, while § 13(b) discontinues B. R.'s/children's part following a residence permit. The document is counted once as mixed. Alternative outcome count: 75 with inadmissibility and 89 with full/partial discontinuance, overlap 1.

Annual breakdown

Decision year	Positive	Without breakage	Rejected	Termination	Mixed	Documents
2006	1	0	0	0	0	1
2007	1	0	2	0	0	3
2008	0	0	1	0	0	1
2009	0	1	0	0	0	1
2010	3	0	2	0	0	5
2011	0	0	0	0	0	0
2012	2	1	0	0	0	3
2013	0	1	5	0	0	6
2014	1	1	2	0	0	4
2015	9	5	9	8	0	31
2016	9	8	15	13	0	45
2017	8	14	6	9	0	37
2018	6	7	6	9	0	28
2019	4	4	10	10	0	28
2020	1	0	6	5	0	12
2021	3	3	4	6	0	16
2022	4	0	2	13	0	19
2023	4	0	2	8	1	15
2024	1	0	2	5	0	8
2025	0	0	0	2	0	2

The year 2017 includes CPR 2625 / 2015 with date conflict; 2021 contains CPR 3781 / 2020 without original verified exact day; 2023 contains CPR 3187 / 2018, whose original writes 2013 despite 137. session 2023. Annual censuses do not verify the open day dates.

Appeals

Denmark's treaty profile:CAT, CCPR-OP 1,CERD, CEDAW-OP, CRPD-OP and CRC-OPIC have relevant individual procedures. CESCR-OP and CED Article 31 are marked **NO**. Their country reports/recommendations are therefore not individual decisions. The CRC procedure entered into force on 7.1.2016; CRPD-OP on 23.10.2014. Concluding observations are never counted as individual violations.

People, children and identities

The person column shows a documented minimum of people indicated in the case; not unique persons across the register. Children are counted when the complaint is lodged and can be adults when the decision is taken.? means untold, not zero. A named complainant is not the whole family; a lawyer is not an additional citizen. The total number of parents, people with disabilities and unique persons has not been established.

The CAT subregister has 38 occurrences of complainants/represented people, including 8 children in 3 explicit families. F. K.580/2014 and 743/2016 are the same person (743/2016 §§ 1.3, 4.11, 9.3-9.6); after this deduction, 37 different CAT complainants/represented people. CERD has 13 petitioner occurrences in 10 cases. CRPD has 3 complainants in 2 cases, 2 complainants with disabilities and one further identified child. These figures are not national population estimates.

CRC 32 / 2017 is the same family as CCPRR 2602 / 2015, express CRC § 6.4. CRC 33 / 2017 and CCPR 2344 / 2014 have the same initials / birth details, but final identity reconciliation is open. CCPR 2475 / 2014 must be deduced as the same communication / family despite three dispositions. Other identical initials are not identity certificates.

Grounds for discontinuation

All 89 documents with complete or partial cessation have been reread for the reason for discontinuation. Stay in a termination proceedings has not been established at the same time as a breach of the Convention.

Documented ground	Documents
Abandoned Denmark / other protection	3
Residence / asylum granted	19
Lost contact / missing response	40
Agreement / expulsion risk terminated; type of stay not defined	22
New Trial; Stay Undocumented	1
Withdrawal / request for termination	2
Disclosure decision repealed	1
Double registration	1

CCPR 2788/2016 ended after reconsideration without documented residence. CCPR 2812/2016 ended after the transfer decision was annulled on 6.6.2018. The 40 documents concerning lost contact/missing responses do not document redress.

Original-controlled actual follow-up

The year below is the controlled follow-up report, not an assumed end status 7.10.2026. The follow-up of the other positive decisions has not been fully updated.

CRPD 2025 - CRPD / C / 32 / 3. § 43-46 / 84-87; published 5.5.2025.

• 61 / 2019: The State of 1.3.2024 rejects individual remedy. The Committee notes in section 87 non-implementation of individual and general recommendations. 2025: closed, C (non-compliance).

• 39 / 2017: Re-recorded 3.10.2018; amended 19.11.2018; temporary stay 5.3.2019; permanent stay 21.7.2022; legal aid 28.518, 75 DKK excluding VAT 7.5.2019. 2025: closed, A (compliance).

CRC 2025 - CRC / C / 98 / 2. A.2-A.5, X. C. et al.; published 5.3.2025.

• 31 / 2017: Re-recorded 4.11.2020; new asylum result 17.8.2021; residence refusal 6.1.2022; family in Avnstrup. Committee A.5: non-broadcast, continued broadcast risk; dialogue open. 2025: dialogue open; resumption without documented restoration.

CCPR 2016 - CCPR / C / 118 / 3. Title by communication number; 118th session 2016.

• 2389 / 2014: Re-recorded 25.11.2015; asylum 13.4.2016. Test A, non-repeat B 1. Closed satisfactory, 118session 2016.

• 2343 / 2014: Re-recorded 22.9.2015; new refusal 26.5.2016; continued exit obligation. Dialogue open, 118th session 2016.

• 2288 / 2013: Recorded 17.9.2015; new refusal; residence under retreatment. Test and broadcast window A, policy change B 1. Closed satisfactory, 118session 2016.

•2370/2014: Reopened 19.8.2015; actual return 14.9.2015; asylum 7.1.2016. Return A, compensation B1; payment not documented. Closed satisfactorily, 118th session 2016.

CERD 2023 - A / 78 / 18. IX table after § 70; historical status.

• 58 / 2016: 2023-table: partially satisfactory; dialogue open.

- 46 / 2009: 2023 table: partially satisfactory; dialogue open.
- 43 / 2008: 2023-table: partially satisfactory.

The CRC follow-up writes Views 28.9.2022; the original has 28.9.2020. The date is not tacitly harmonised. The CERD table status of Gelle 34 / 2004 and Is 40 / 2007 requires a single check in A / 62 / 18 and A / 63 / 18; four old cases are grouped into a common series.

F. K. follow-up:the subsequent original CAT 743/2016,§§ 4.33, 8.2, 9.3-9.6,documents reopening after 580/2014,oral consideration on 14.3.2016,a new refusal on 17.3.2016 and later actual removal despite interim measures. The same person; later dismissal does not extinguish the separate Article 22 violation.

Own analysis of the documented actions: resumption is not actually restoration. Dialogue closure is also not proof of compliance: CRPD-closure A and C have opposite assessments. Individual return, stay, continued obligation to leave and compensation paid shall each follow its source documented event.

Full decision register 2006-2025

People / Children are minima or?. CAT-zero in children means no children, no children affected. Material articles are found in a positive reality or in a separate breach of procedure; the legal basis of the refusal is not counted as a breach. JSON contains direct original URL, format, registry / publication date, notification date when extracted, identity link and follow-up. Absence of precise sub-sections is visible; localisation to the closing section is not an alleged verified paragraph number.

CAT

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Articles	Subject happen / b eagle	Dispositiv	Controlled follow-up / termination soil
2010-11-15	CAT/ C / 45 / D / 339 / 2008	Said Amini	Favourable Views on the merits	3 (prospective)	1/0	9.9	Not separately controlled
2012-11-13	CAT/ C / 49 / D / 412 / 2010	A. A. A.	No breach established	-	1/0	8	Not separately controlled
2012-11-23	CAT/ C / 49 / D / 464 / 2011	The President	Favourable Views on the merits	3 (prospective)	1/0	9	Not separately controlled
2013-11-11	CAT/ C / 51 / D / 429 / 2010	Mallikathevi Sivagnanaratnam	No breach established	-	1/0	11	Not separately controlled
2014-05-14	CAT/ C / 52 / D / 466 / 2011	Nicmeddin Alp	No breach established	-	1/0	9	Not separately controlled
2015-08-10	CAT/ C / 55 / D / 555 / 2013	Z.	No breach established	-	1/0	9	Not separately controlled
2015-08-10	CAT/ C / 55 / D / 571 / 2013	The President	No breach established	-	1/0	9	Not separately controlled
2015-11-23	CAT/ C / 56 / D / 580 / 2014	F. K. v. Denmark	Favourable Views on the merits	3 (prospective protection); 12 read with 16 (observed fracture)	1/0	8	Documented later on in CAT 743/2016 §§ 4.33, 8.2, 9.3-9.6.
2016-04-29	CAT/ C / 57 / D / 709 / 2015	The President	Rejected	-	1/0	5	Not separately controlled
2016-05-06	CAT/ C / 57 / D / 593 / 2014	I. M. and V. Z.	Rejected	-	2/0	7	Not separately controlled
2016-05-13	CAT/ C / 57 / D / 628 / 2014	The President	Favourable Views on the merits	3 (prospective)	1/0	8	Not separately controlled
2016-08-12	CAT/ C / 58 / D / 607 / 2014	The President	Rejected	-	1/0	7	Not separately controlled
2016-11-25	CAT/ C / 59 / D / 634 / 2014	M. B., A. B., D. M. B. and D. B.	Favourable Views on the merits	3 (prospective)	4/2	10	Not separately controlled
2017-04-28	CAT/ C / 60 / D / 602 / 2014	S. S. B.	No breach established	-	1/0	9	Not separately controlled
2017-05-12	CAT/ C / 60 / D / 653 / 2015	A. M. D. et al.	Favourable Views on the merits	3 (prospective)	5/3	10	Not separately controlled
2017-08-10	CAT/ C / 61 / D / 625 / 2014	The President	Favourable Views on the merits	3 (prospective)	1/0	9	Not separately controlled
2018-05-17	CAT/ C / 63 / D / 647 / 2014	C. Y.	No breach established	-	1/0	11	Not separately controlled

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Articles	Subject happen / b eagle	Dispositiv	Controlled follow-up / termination soil
2018-05-17	CAT/ C / 63 / D / 703 / 2015	I. U. K. et al.	No breach established	-	5/3	9	Not separately controlled
2018-08-03	CAT/ C / 64 / D / 693 / 2015	The President	No breach established	-	1/0	9	Not separately controlled
2018-08-03	CAT/ C / 64 / D / 733 / 2016	The President	Termination	-	1/0	unnumbered final cessation decision	Termination: Lost k ontact / lack of answers
2019-05-03	CAT/ C / 66 / D / 735 / 2016	The President	Termination	-	1/0	unnumbered final cessation decision	Termination: Abandoned Denmark / Other protection
2020-12-30	CAT/ C / 70 / D / 743 / 2016	The President	Rejected	22; procedure refraction § 8.2	1/0	10	New complaint concerning the same person after reopening of the asylum case; inadmissibility and a separate Article 22 violation.
2021-07-19	CAT/ C / 71 / D / 792 / 2016	The President	No breach established	-	1/0	16	Not separately controlled
2024-07-12	CAT/ C / 80 / D / 1068 / 2021	A. A. A.	Rejected	-	1/0	7	Not separately controlled
2024-07-12	CAT/ C / 80 / D / 985 / 2020	The President	Termination	-	1/0	unnumbered final cessation decision	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2024-11-01	CAT/ C / 81 / D / 1113 / 2021	The President	Termination	-	1/0	unnumbered final cessation decision	Termination: Stay / asylum granted

CCPR

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2008-04-01	CCPR / C / 92 / D / 1487 / 2006	Kasem Said Ahmad and Asmaa Abdol- Hamid	Rejected	-	2/?	7	Not separately controlled
2010-07-22	CCPR / C / 99 / D / 1554 / 2007	Mohamed E-Hichou	Favourable View on the merits	23, 24	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2010-07-26	CCPR / C / 99 / D / 1868 / 2009	Fatima Andersen	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2013-11-01	CCPR / C / 109 / D / 1879 / 2009	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2014-03-26	CCPR / C / 110 / D / 2007 / 2010	X	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	9.5	Not separately controlled
2015-04-01	CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2001 / 2010	Q	Favourable View on the merits	26	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2015-04-01	CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2272 / 2013	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2015-04-01	CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2369 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2015-04-01	CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2497 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: double registration
2015-04-01	CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2515 / 2014	X	Rejected	-	1/?	5	Not separately controlled
2015-04-01	CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2523 / 2015	X	Rejected	-	1/?	5	Not separately controlled
2015-07-15	CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2329 / 2014	Z	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2015-07-16	CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2370 / 2014	The President	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	9	Closed satisfactory, 118th session 2016
2015-07-16	CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2393 / 2014	K	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2015-07-22	CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2360 / 2014	Warda Osman Jasin	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	9	Not separately controlled

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2015-07-22	CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2389 / 2014	X	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	8	Closed satisfactory, 118th session 2016
2015-07-23	CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2288 / 2013	Osayi Omo-Amenaghawon	Favourable View on the merits	6, 7	1/?	8	Closed satisfactory, 118th session 2016
2015-07-23	CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2343 / 2014	The President	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	9	Dialogue open, 118session 2016
2015-07-23	CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2363 / 2014	S. S. Z.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2015-07-23	CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2426 / 2014	N	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2015-07-23	CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2428 / 2014	A. et al.	Rejected	-	3/2	7	Not separately controlled
2015-11-02	CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2320 / 2013	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2015-11-02	CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2344 / 2014	The President	Rejected	-	4/2	9	Not separately controlled
2015-11-02	CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2351 / 2014	R. G. et al.	Rejected	-	4/2	8	Not separately controlled
2015-11-02	CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2492 / 2014	H. G. G. et al.	Termination	-	2/1	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2015-11-02	CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2514 / 2014	G. G. K. et al.	Termination	-	3/2	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2015-11-02	CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2553 / 2015	H. M. et al.	Termination	-	2/1	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2015-11-02	CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2605 / 2015	A.b. H.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2015-11-04	CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2258 / 2013	Jenirthan Rasappu and Jenarthan Rasappu	Favourable View on the merits	7	2/2	8	Not separately controlled
2016-03-11	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2422 / 2014	Z	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2016-03-22	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2347 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2016-03-29	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2402 / 2014	A. A. I. and A. H. A.	Rejected	-	2/?	8	Not separately controlled
2016-03-29	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2409 / 2014	Abdilafir Abubakar Ali and Mayul Ali Mohamed	Favourable View on the merits	7	2/?	8	Not separately controlled
2016-03-30	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2039 / 2011	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2016-03-30	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2357 / 2014	A	Rejected	-	1/?	7.7	Not separately controlled
2016-03-30	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2447 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2016-03-30	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2488 / 2014	Z. S. and M. S.	Termination	-	2/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2016-03-30	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2506 / 2014	Y. A. H. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2016-03-30	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2513 / 2014	H. F. A. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2016-03-30	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2516 / 2014	S. P. B. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2016-03-30	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2571 / 2015	N. M. S. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2016-03-30	CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2646 / 2015	Z	Rejected	-	1/?	5	Not separately controlled

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2016-07-01	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2469 / 2014	The President	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2016-07-04	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2464 / 2014	The President	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2016-07-07	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2378 / 2014	A. S. M. and R. A. H.,	No breach established	-	2/?	9	Not separately controlled
2016-07-07	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2379 / 2014	Ms. Obah Hussein Ahmed	Favourable View on the merits	7	5/4	14	Not separately controlled
2016-07-08	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2493 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2016-07-12	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2462 / 2014	The President	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2016-07-13	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2291 / 2013	A and B	No breach established	-	2/?	9	Not separately controlled
2016-07-13	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2443 / 2014	S. Z.	No breach established	-	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2016-07-14	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2350 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2016-07-14	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2376 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2016-07-14	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2415 / 2014	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2016-07-14	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2559 / 2015	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2016-07-14	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2611 / 2015	G. B. S. J. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2016-07-14	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2633 / 2015	S. D. et al.	Termination	-	4/3	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2016-07-14	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2745 / 2016	V. R. and N. R.	Rejected	-	2/?	5	Not separately controlled
2016-10-26	CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2204 / 2012	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	12	Not separately controlled

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2016-10-28	CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2569 / 2015	B. M. I. and N. A. K.	No breach established	-	2/?	9	Not separately controlled
2016-10-28	CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2608 / 2015	R. A. A. and Z. M.	Favourable View on the merits	7	2/?	8	Not separately controlled
2016-11-03	CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2115 / 2011	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2016-11-03	CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2282 / 2013	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2016-11-03	CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2440 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2016-11-03	CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2468 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2017 [date u clarify t]	CCPR / C / 120 / D / 2625 / 2015	S. Z.	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2017-03-10	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2512 / 2014	Raziyeh Rezaifar	Favourable View on the merits	7	3/1	10	Not separately controlled
2017-03-10	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2681 / 2015	Y. A. and F. H. M.	Favourable View on the merits	7	2/?	8	Not separately controlled
2017-03-16	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2253 / 2013 paras. 119	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2017-03-16	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2530 / 2015	F and G	Favourable View on the merits	7	2/?	9	Not separately controlled
2017-03-17	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2240 / 2013	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2017-03-20	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2593 / 2015 paras. 119	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2017-03-27	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2602 / 2015	Z. H.	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2017-03-28	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2293 / 2013	D and E	Rejected	-	2/?	6.9	Not separately controlled
2017-03-28	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2336 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2017-03-28	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2338 / 2014	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2017-03-28	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2352 / 2014	Z. H.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2017-03-28	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2473 / 2014	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2017-03-28	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2738 / 2016	S. N. H. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2017-03-28	CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2763 / 2016	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: withdrawal / request for termination
2017-07-13	CCPR / C / 120 / D / 2640 / 2015	R. I. H. and S. M. D.	No breach established	-	2/?	9	Not separately controlled
2017-07-27	CCPR / C / 120 / D / 2601 / 2015	M. S. aka M. H. H. A. D. M.	Favourable View on the merits	6(1), 7	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2017-07-28	CCPR / C / 120 / D / 2470 / 2014	Hibaq Said Hashi	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2017-07-28	CCPR / C / 120 / D / 2784 / 2016	B. C. A. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2017-11-07	CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2594 / 2015	The President	No breach established	-	2/?	8	Not separately controlled
2017-11-07	CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2770 / 2016	The President	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/1	9	Not separately controlled
2017-11-08	CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2419 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	12	Not separately controlled
2017-11-08	CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2467 / 2014	F. M. and M. H. D. et al.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2017-11-08	CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2585 / 2015	The President	No breach established	-	2/?	9	Not separately controlled
2017-11-08	CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2600 / 2015	Y. M. H. and N. Y. A.	Termination	-	2/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2017-11-08	CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2624 / 2015	K. A. and H. M. A.	Termination	-	2/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2017-11-09	CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2612 / 2015	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2017-11-09	CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2643 / 2015	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2018-03-22	CCPR / C / 122 / D / 2595 / 2015	A. A. A.	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2018-03-26	CCPR / C / 122 / D / 2642 / 2015	S.	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2018-03-26	CCPR / C / 122 / D / 2753 / 2016	C. L. and Z. L.	Favourable View on the merits	7	2/?	9	Not separately controlled
2018-04-06	CCPR / C / 122 / D / 2485 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Agreement / export risk terminated; type of stay not defined
2018-07-09	CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2328 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2018-07-13	CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2575 / 2015	Bayush Alemsered Araya	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2018-07-16	CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2423 / 2014	The President	Favourable View on the merits	6, 7	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2018-07-27	CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2353 / 2014	G. X. G.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2018-07-27	CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2408 / 2014	A. S. I.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2018-07-27	CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2812 / 2016	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: decision repealed
2018-07-27	CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2949 / 2017	Y. F.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2018-10-18	CCPR / C / 124 / D / 2734 / 2016	Fahmo ῑud Hussein	No breach established	-	1/?	10	Not separately controlled

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2018-11-02	CCPR / C / 124 / D / 2449 / 2014	A. Y.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2019-03-14	CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2345 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2019-03-14	CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2494 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2019-03-18	CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2373 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2019-03-29	CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2439 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2019-03-29	CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2475 / 2014	A. H. M., S. H. C. et al.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2019-03-29	CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2672 / 2015	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2019-03-29	CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2791 / 2016	M. S. B et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2019-07-08	CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2603 / 2015	The President	Favourable View on the merits	7	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2019-07-24	CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2346 / 2014	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2019-07-24	CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2685 / 2015	The President	Favourable View on the merits	6, 7	2/?	10	Not separately controlled
2019-07-25	CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2421 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2019-07-25	CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2472 / 2014	A. B. M.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2019-07-25	CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2531 / 2015	Nimo Mohamed Aden and Liban Muh ammed Hassan	Favourable View on the merits	17, 23	2/?	11	Not separately controlled

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2019-07-25	CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2786 / 2016	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: withdrawal / request for termination
2019-07-25	CCPR / C / 126 / D / 3620 / 2019	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	6	Not separately controlled
2019-11-08	CCPR / C / 127 / D / 2654 / 2015	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2019-11-08	CCPR / C / 127 / D / 3224 / 2018	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Abandoned Denmark / Other protection
2020-03-13	CCPR / C / 128 / D / 2255 / 2013	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2020-07-24	CCPR / C / 129 / D / 2562 / 2015	B. M. A. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2020-07-24	CCPR / C / 129 / D / 2596 / 2015	A. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2020-07-24	CCPR / C / 129 / D / 2597 / 2015	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2020-11-06	CCPR / C / 130 / D / 2671 / 2015	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2020-11-06	CCPR / C / 130 / D / 2752 / 2016	The President	Rejected	-	2/?	8	Not separately controlled
2020-11-06	CCPR / C / 130 / D / 2946 / 2017	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2021 [date u clarify t]	CCPR / C / 131 / D / 3781 / 2020	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	6	Not separately controlled
2021-03-25	CCPR / C / 131 / D / 2475 / 2014	A. H. M., S. H. C. and others	Termination	-	2/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2021-03-25	CCPR / C / 131 / D / 2781 / 2016	C. J. and Y. H.	Termination	-	2/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2021-07-22	CCPR / C / 132 / D / 2651 / 2015	A. M. F. and A. M.	Favourable View on the merits	6, 7	2/?	11	Not separately controlled
2021-07-22	CCPR / C / 132 / D / 2787 / 2016	The President	No breach established	-	2/?	11	Not separately controlled
2021-07-22	CCPR / C / 132 / D / 3188 / 2018	The President	Favourable View on the merits	6, 7	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2021-07-23	CCPR / C / 132 / D / 2591 / 2015	A. F. A.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2021-07-23	CCPR / C / 132 / D / 2649 / 2015	A. H. H. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2021-07-23	CCPR / C / 132 / D / 3711 / 2020	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2021-10-19	CCPR / C / 133 / D / 2510 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2021-10-27	CCPR / C / 133 / D / 3325 / 2019	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2021-11-05	CCPR / C / 133 / D / 2458 / 2014	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2021-11-05	CCPR / C / 133 / D / 2722 / 2016	Z. M. H.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2021-11-05	CCPR / C / 133 / D / 2816 / 2016	A. F.	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2022-03-24	CCPR / C / 134 / D / 2475 / 2014	A. H. M., S. H. C. et al.	Termination	-	1/?	Page 1	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2022-03-24	CCPR / C / 134 / D / 2557 / 2015	D. J. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Stay / asylum granted

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2022-03-24	CCPR / C / 134 / D / 2563 / 2015	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2022-03-24	CCPR / C / 134 / D / 2788 / 2016	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: new review; stay not documented
2022-07-27	CCPR / C / 135 / D / 2460 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2022-07-27	CCPR / C / 135 / D / 2889 / 2016	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2022-07-27	CCPR / C / 135 / D / 3046 / 2017	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2022-10-25	CCPR / C / 136 / D / 2754 / 2016	The President	Favourable View on the merits	26	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2022-11-04	CCPR / C / 136 / D / 2459 / 2014	The President	Termination	-	2/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2022-11-04	CCPR / C / 136 / D / 2527 / 2015	D. Y. H. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2022-11-04	CCPR / C / 136 / D / 2774 / 2016	Y	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2022-11-04	CCPR / C / 136 / D / 3048 / 2017	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Abandoned Denmark / Other protection
2022-11-04	CCPR / C / 136 / D / 3707 / 2020	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2023 [date u clarify t]	CCPR / C / 137 / D / 3187 / 2018	A. H. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2023-03-16	CCPR / C / 137 / D / 2858 / 2016	Elezjana Elezai	Favourable View on the merits	6, 7	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2023-03-22	CCPR / C / 137 / D / 2748 / 2016	A. B.	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2023-03-22	CCPR / C / 137 / D / 2795 / 2016	Z	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2023-03-22	CCPR / C / 137 / D / 2852 / 2016	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2023-03-22	CCPR / C / 137 / D / 3710 / 2020	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2023-03-22	CCPR / C / 137 / D / 4125 / 2022	A. A. A.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2023-07-19	CCPR / C / 138 / D / 2342 / 2014	The President	Rejected + part-cessation	-	2/?	13(a)-(c)	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2023-07-19	CCPR / C / 138 / D / 3282 / 2019	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2023-07-19	CCPR / C / 138 / D / 4144 / 2022	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2023-10-31	CCPR / C / 139 / D / 2592 / 2015	I. A. A. and others	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2024-03-28	CCPR / C / 140 / D / 3316 / 2019	H. M. et al.	Termination	-	0/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response
2025-03-25	CCPR / C / 143 / D / 4255 / 2022	A. A. A.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Lost ko ntact / missing response

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	Human r / children	Dispository	Controlled Up leaking / cessation; reason
2025-07-17	CCPR / C / 144 / D / 4713 / 2024	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer rather final settlement	Termination: Stay / asylum granted

CEDAW

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	People / Children	Dispositiv	Controlled Placing / Oph Desert soil
2013-07-15	CEDAW / C / 55 / D / 33 / 2011	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2013-07-22	CEDAW / C / 55 / D / 40 / 2012	The President	Rejected	-	4/2	8	Not separately controlled
2013-07-26	CEDAW / C / 55 / D / 35 / 2011	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2013-10-18	CEDAW / C / 56 / D / 44 / 2012	The President	Rejected	-	2/1	7	Not separately controlled
2014-10-24	CEDAW / C / 59 / D / 59 / 2013	Y. C.	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2014-11-03	CEDAW / C / 59 / D / 37 / 2012	The President	Rejected	-	3/2	13	Not separately controlled
2015-03-02	CEDAW / C / 60 / D / 51 / 2013	Y. W.	Rejected	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2015-07-23	CEDAW / C / 61 / D / 50 / 2013	The President	Rejected	-	2/1	7	Not separately controlled
2015-11-09	CEDAW / C / 62 / D / 56 / 2013	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2015-11-19	CEDAW / C / 62 / D / 53 / 2013	A.	Favourable Views on the merits	2 (c), (d)	1/?	11	Not separately controlled
2016-02-22	CEDAW / C / 63 / D / 46 / 2012	The President	Favourable Views on the merits	2 read in conjunction with 1, 5(a), (b), 16(1)(d)	2/1	6	Not separately controlled
2016-07-11	CEDAW / C / 64 / D / 57 / 2013	V.	Rejected	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2016-07-19	CEDAW / C / 64 / D / 64 / 2013	The President	Rejected	-	2/1	8	Not separately controlled
2016-11-07	CEDAW / C / 65 / D / 61 / 2013	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2016-11-11	CEDAW / C / 65 / D / 71 / 2014	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	10	Not separately controlled
2017-02-28	CEDAW / C / 66 / D / 54 / 2013	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	12	Not separately controlled
2017-07-21	CEDAW / C / 67 / D / 70 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2017-07-21	CEDAW / C / 67 / D / 77 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2017-07-21	CEDAW / C / 67 / D / 78 / 2014	The President	No breach established	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2017-11-06	CEDAW / C / 68 / D / 79 / 2014	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	People / Children	Dispositiv	Controlled Placing / Oph Desert soil
2017-11-06	CEDAW / C / 68 / D / 93 / 2015	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummereret afslutte de oph ørsbesl utning	Termination: Lost contact / missing end answer
2018-02-26	CEDAW / C / 69 / D / 80 / 2015	A. S.	Rejected	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2018-02-26	CEDAW / C / 69 / D / 85 / 2015	The President	Rejected	-	2/1	10	Not separately controlled
2018-07-09	CEDAW / C / 70 / D / 113 / 2017	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummereret afslutte de oph ørsbesl utning	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2018-07-09	CEDAW / C / 70 / D / 76 / 2014	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2018-10-29	CEDAW / C / 71 / D / 101 / 2016	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2018-10-29	CEDAW / C / 71 / D / 73 / 2014	X.	Termination	-	1/?	Unummereret afslutte de oph ørsbesl utning	Termination: Agreement / sending price not terminated; type of stay not defined
2018-10-29	CEDAW / C / 71 / D / 81 / 2015	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	11	Not separately controlled
2019-02-25	CEDAW / C / 72 / D / 96 / 2015	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	10.2	Not separately controlled
2019-07-15	CEDAW / C / 73 / D / 109 / 2016	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummereret afslutte de oph ørsbesl utning	Termination: Agreement / sending price not terminated; type of stay not defined
2019-07-15	CEDAW / C / 73 / D / 84 / 2015	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummereret afslutte de oph ørsbesl utning	Termination: Lost contact / missing end answer
2019-07-15	CEDAW / C / 73 / D / 86 / 2015	R. S. A. et al.	Favourable Views on the merits	2 (d), (e), (f) read with 1	3/2	9	Not separately controlled
2019-07-15	CEDAW / C / 73 / D / 94 / 2015	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2019-11-04	CEDAW / C / 74 / D / 82 / 2015	The President	Rejected	-	6/5	10	Not separately controlled
2020-02-17	CEDAW / C / 75 / D / 108 / 2016	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Article r	People / Children	Dispositiv	Controlled Placing / Oph Desert soil
2022-02-23	CEDAW / C / 81 / D / 144 / 2019	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2022-02-23	CEDAW / C / 81 / D / 163 / 2020	C. A. A. (represent t by Niels- Erik Hansen)	Termination	-	1/?	Unummereret afslutte de oph ørsbesl utning	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2023-02-23	CEDAW / C / 84 / D / 151 / 2019	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummereret afslutte de oph ørsbesl utning	Termination: Lost contact / missing end answer
2024-05-31	CEDAW/C/88/D/161/2020	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	9	Not separately controlled
2024-10-11	CEDAW / C / 89 / D / 147 / 2019	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummereret afslutte de oph ørsbesl utning	Termination: Stay / asylum granted

CERD

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Articles	Human r / children	Dispense sitive	Controlled follow-up / termination soil
2006-03-06	CERD / C / 68 / D / 34 / 2004	Mohamed d Hassan Gelle	Favourable View on the merits	2(1)(d), 4, 6	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2007-08-08	CERD / C / 71 / D / 36 / 2006	The President	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2007-08-08	CERD / C / 71 / D / 37 / 2006	A. W. R. A. P.	Rejected	-	1/?	7	Not separately controlled
2007-08-08	CERD / C / 71 / D / 40 / 2007	Murat Is	Favourable View on the merits	2 (1) (d) 5 (e) (v), 6	1/?	8 (PDF p.10)	Not separately controlled
2009-08-21	CERD / C / 75 / D / 41 / 2008	Ahmed Farah Jama	No breach established	-	1/?	8	Not separately controlled
2010-08-13	CERD / C / 77 / D / 43 / 2008	Saada Mohamad Adan	Favourable View on the merits	2(1)(d), 4, 6	1/?	8	2023 Table: partially satisfactory
2010-08-13	CERD / C / 77 / D / 44 / 2009	Nicolai Hermansen, Signe Edrich and Jonna Vilstrup	Rejected	-	3/?	7	Not separately controlled
2012-03-06	CERD / C / 80 / D / 46 / 2009	Mahali Dawas and Yousef Shava	Favourable View on the merits	2(1)(d), 6	2/?	8 (PDF p p.11-12)	2023 Table: partially satisfactory; dialogue open
2018-12-13	CERD / C / 97 / D / 58 / 2016	The President	Favourable View on the merits	5(d)(iii), 6	1/?	8	2023 Table: partially satisfactory; dialogue open
2022-12-01	CERD / C / 108 / D / 62 / 2018	Momodou Jallow	Favourable View on the merits	4 (a) read with 6	1/?	8	Not separately controlled

CRC

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Articles	Subject spas / børn	Disposaled	Controlled Placing / Oph Desert soil
2018-01-25	CRC / C / 77 / D / 3 / 2016	The President	Favourable opinion on the merits	3, 19	2/1	11.10	Not separately controlled
2018-05-31	CRC / C / 78 / D / 7 / 2016	Z. Y. and J. Y.	Rejected	-	3/1	9	Not separately controlled
2019-09-18	CRC / C / 82 / D / 32 / 2017	Z. H. and A.H.	Rejected	-	5/3	9	Not separately controlled
2019-09-25	CRC / C / 82 / D / 33 / 2017	The President	Rejected	-	4/2	9	Not separately controlled
2019-09-26	CRC / C / 82 / D / 36 / 2017	A. S.	Rejected	-	2/1	10	Not separately controlled
2019-09-27	CRC / C / 82 / D / 43 / 2018	Z. R. and QS.	Termination	-	6/4	8	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2020-02-07	CRC / C / 83 / D / 52 / 2018	A. H. A. et al.	Termination	-	6/6	6	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2020-09-28	CRC / C / 85 / D / 31 / 2017	The President	Favourable opinion on the merits	3; 6, 8 upon removal	4/3	9	2025: dialogue open; resumption without documented restoration
2020-09-28	CRC / C / 85 / D / 49 / 2018	The President	Rejected	-	2/1	6	Not separately controlled
2021-02-04	CRC / C / 86 / D / 83 / 2019	The President	Favourable opinion on the merits	3, 19	2/1	8.9	Not separately controlled
2022-05-27	CRC / C / 90 / D / 96 / 2019	S. S. F.	Favourable opinion on the merits	3, 19	2/1	8.9	Not separately controlled
2022-06-01	CRC / C / 90 / D / 99 / 2019	The President	Favourable opinion on the merits	3, 6, 22, 37(a)	2/1	8	Not separately controlled
2022-09-12	CRC / C / 91 / D / 85 / 2019	A. S. A. M.	Termination	-	2/1	8	Termination: Stay / asylum granted
2023-05-16	CRC / C / 93 / D / 140 / 2021	The President	Favourable opinion on the merits	3, 19	3/1	7.9	Not separately controlled
2023-09-19	CRC / C / 94 / D / 145 / 2021	The President	Favourable opinion on the merits	3, 9	4/3	8.8	Not separately controlled
2024-05-24	CRC / C / 96 / D / 169 / 2021	The President	Favourable opinion on the merits	3; 19, 37 (a) for the date of issue	3/2	8.8	Not separately controlled
2024-09-02	CRC / C / 97 / D / 103 / 2019	The President	Termination	-	2/1	6	Termination: Stay / asylum granted

CRPD

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Articles	People / Children	Dispositiv	Controlled record gelling / cessation gru nd
2018-08-31	CRPD / C / 20 / D / 39 / 2017	Iuliia Domina and Max Bendtsen	Favourable opinion on the merits	5 (1), (2) alone and read with 23 (1)	3/1	9	2025: closed, A (compliance)
2023-08-25	CRPD / C / 29 / D / 61 / 2019	Søren Mikkelsen	Favourable opinion on the merits	14 and 17 read with 25	1/?	10	2025: closed, C (non-compliance)

2026 separately

Date	Document / original access	Complainants	Outcome	Articles	People / children	Disposia ed	Controlled follow-up / up hearth
2026-01-19	CRC / C / 100 / D / 97 / 2019	N. M. I. A. and Nu. The President	Favourable opinion on the merits	3, 9	2/2	7.8	Not separately controlled
2026-02-17	CEDAW / C / 92 / D / 227 / 2024	A. A. A.	Termination	-	1/?	3	Not separately controlled
2026-03-16	CCPR / C / 145 / D / 3726 / 2020	?	Termination	-	?/?	1	Not separately controlled
2026-03-16	CCPR / C / 145 / D / 4440 / 2023	The President	Termination	-	1/?	Unummer a futten g	Not separately controlled
2026-04-17	CAT/ C / 84 / D / 1150 / 2022	The President	Termination	-	1/?	1	Not separately controlled

2026 has 5 documents up to the time of the check: 4 termination, 1 positive CRC opinion. The year is incomplete and does not form part of the 20th Annual Totals.

Alias / Versions Control

Raw name	Canon original	Management
CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2531 / 2015 / C ORR.1	CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2531 / 2015	Absence of an autonomous decision: same original / corrigendum
CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2351 / 2014	CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2351 / 2014	Absence of an autonomous decision: same original / corrigendum
CCPR / C / 137 / D / 2795 / 2015	CCPR / C / 137 / D / 2795 / 2016	Absence of an autonomous decision: same original / corrigendum
CCPR / C / 138 / D / 3781 / 2020	CCPR / C / 131 / D / 3781 / 2020	Absence of an autonomous decision: same original / corrigendum
	CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2378 / 2014	Absence of an autonomous decision: same original / corrigendum
CEDAW / C / 55 / 35 / 2011	CEDAW / C / 55 / D / 35 / 2011	Absence of an autonomous decision: same original / corrigendum
CEDAW / C / 55 / 40 / 2012	CEDAW / C / 55 / D / 40 / 2012	Absence of an autonomous decision: same original / corrigendum

CCPR 2475 / 2014: 125. session 29.3.2019 / Italy; 131. session 25.3.2021 / Somalia; 134. session 24.3.2022 / Italy. All three originals read. The same number / complainant initials, different countries specified; the Secretariat must clarify the version ratio. None of the documents have been deleted by a presumption.

Specific outstanding items and enquiries to authorities

Residual	Information required	Authority
Three precise dates	Authentic adoption date / correction for CCPR 2625 / 2015, 3187 / 2018, 3781 / 2020; relation to 3781-alias	OHCHR CCPR Secretariat / Petitions Section
Repeated 2475 / 2014	Separate dispositions or error versions; authentic country / complainant group in 125., 131., 134. session	The same Secretariat
Full compliance	Latest follow-up uspots, state complaints, complainant commentary and committee evaluation for each positive case, and CAT 743 / 2016 procedural breach; verification to 7.10.2026	Six committee secretariats and Danish representative authorities
Full personal vote	Non-identifying number of complainants / represented, children / adults when submitting, families, disabilities and cross-identity links; exception of lawyer	OHCHR and Danish journal authorities
Actual restoration / duration	Date of return, stay, reunification, continued intervention, compensation paid, first knowledge / end date	Udlændingestyrelsen, The Refugee Board, Ministries of Government, Courts, Municipality / Region

Traceability and limits of evidence

Documented: the outcome of the originals, special sign CAT 22 breakage, explicit personnel minima, localised follow-up and grounds for discontinuation. **Clarification / hypotheses:** additional identity duplicates, version / date errors and unknown compliance. These are not counted as further established breaches.

The strongest sustainable application is to link the state's concrete knowledge, documented procedural / protection errors, in fact, continued strain and individual legal consequences in each case. A Convention opinion shall not automatically document the criminal guilt of a particular staff member. The chain of action and the time course must follow the specific primary documents.

16. CPT and UPR: repeated findings and reactions

Controlled October 7, 2026 against CPT's Official Danish Inventory. This period includes: **six visits: four periodic and two special visits to Greenland;**. There are six visitor reports and seven responses relating to these visits because the 2019 visit has both an urgent and a full response. A further response from 2007 relates to the visit in 2002 and is only recorded as knowledge and follow-up during the period. The 13 January 2025 talks are not a seventh visit. Reports, recommendations and government responses are separate control actions; they are not individual convictions, citizens or new abuses.

Full list

Visits	Report and publication	Government response and publication	Limitation
11-20 February 2008	CPT / Inf (2008) 26, 25.9.2008, front page	CPT / Inf (2009) 12, 13.3.2009, front page	Police, prisons and psychiatry in Denmark.
25-27 September 2012	CPT / Inf (2013) 3, 22.1.2013, front page	CPT / Inf (2013) 11, 3.7.2013, front page	Greenland: police, institutions and psychiatry. The answer is a scanned original. All 31 pages are now visually read in RAM; 31 answered paragraphs, 30 speech / time series and accurate follow-up remains are documented in cpt-2013-Danish -reply-full-original control.md.
4-13 February 2014	CPT / Inf (2014) 25, 17.9.2014, front page	CPT / Inf (2015) 16, 3.3.2015, front page	Police, prisons, secure youth institution and psychiatry.
3 to 12 April 2019	CPT / Inf (2019) 35, 7.1.2020, front page	CPT / Inf (2020) 10, 3.3.2020, Reply to § 117; CPT / Inf (2020) 26, 1.9.2020, front page	Police, prisons, immigration detention and psychiatry. The urgent track concerning section 117 must not be counted as additional visits.
23 May - 3 June 2024	CPT / Inf (2024) 38, 12.12.2024, front page	CPT / Inf (2025) 19, 23.6.2025, front page	Police, prisons, foreigners and psychiatry.
14 to 16 January 2025	CPT / Inf (2025) 14, 14.5.2025, front page	CPT / Inf (2025) 28, 8.8.2025, front page	Greenland: the closed department in Nuuk.

The 2007 response to the 2002 visit: CPT / Inf (2007) 46. The historical visit report is counted outside the period. Original urgency 2020: registered on CPT Country Page, during the 2019 visit. One document copy; is identified; this module does not build a material conclusion on the copy.

2008: warning of recurrent coercion and insufficient police guarantees

CPT's § 4 documents meetings with Minister of Justice Lene Espersen, ministry officials, police, the Prison and Probation Service, regional psychiatry and the Ombudsman. §§ 5-6 document earlier communication and inadequate action against prolonged restraint. § 10, note 11, states **95 dog-injury incidents in 2006, including 34 open wounds**; these are incidents, not identified unique citizens. § 15 finds continuing problems with systematic compliance with safeguards for detainees after the circular had existed for six and a half years. Original: CPT/Inf (2008) 26, §§ 4-6, 10 and 15.

The Government expressly declares that illegal police force may trigger compensation, disciplinary and criminal penalties. At the same time, it recognises that abuse was not a separate category of complaint statistics and that the further results of criminal proceedings were not recorded in the statistics provided. Thus, the absence of a separate maltreatment counter is not evidence of the absence of maltreatment. CPT / Inf (2009) 12, printed s.4 and 6-9, reply to § 11-12.

Police 2006- 2007accounts in original government replies

Figures below are derived from CPT / Inf (2009) 12, printed p.6-9. Received and determined are different yearscohorts; disciplinary proceedings may overlap with appeals and criminal proceedings and arise from previous years. They shall not be summed up to unique persons or incidents.

Counter	2006	2007
Cases received	989	1.023
of which: conduct / criminal proceedings	405 / 584	457 / 566
Of which traffic in criminal matters	277	214
Cases decided	906	1.140
of which: conduct / criminal proceedings	379 / 527	489 / 651
Behaviour: notice / withdrawal / deadline / rejected / regretted / criticism / others	129 / 12 / 5 / 210 / 7 / 8 / 8	147 / 18 / 9 / 272 / 8 / 14 / 21
Criminal proceedings: complaint rejected / investigation stopped / indicted abandoned / indictment / critical -regret / others	74 / 258 / 4 / 173 / 7 / 11	69 / 383 / 5 / 168 / 14 / 12
Appeals under the Criminal Code	8	14
Disciplinary proceedings: new / decided	77 / 86	46 / 39
Ill-treatment disciplinary cases among those decided	5	4

Allegation is not the number of convictions. Disciplinary outcome 2006: farewell 9, workplace 2, department 2, fine 27, reprimand 15, warning 13, terminated without penalty 16. These outcomes are: **non-documented mutual; exclusive**Two of the abuse cases gave rise to both relocation and fine. Departure 2007: farewell 1, Section 1, fine 9, reprimand 6, warning 16, without penalty 6. The original's total amount must be retained even when the outcome does not summon unambiguously.

2012: concrete intervention and Danish / Greenlandic responsibility sharing

The CPT's §§ 6-7 document urgent communications concerning a 17-year-old held in isolation in police custody, a woman placed among men and a woman with an acute need for psychiatric treatment; the State replied on 31. October 2012. § 8 assigns responsibility for policing to Denmark; § 45 assigns psychiatric services to Greenland's self-government. Psychiatric restraint involved **15 % of patients in 2010 and 14 % in 2011, averaging five days** (§ 47, note 42); there were **14 compulsory admissions in 2007, 29 in 2008 and 36 in 2009** (§ 49, note 44). Percentages without patient counts cannot be converted into citizens; admissions may involve the same patient repeatedly. CPT/Inf (2013) 3, §§ 6-8 and 45-49, printed pp.20-21 for the psychiatric figures.

2013response: corrected figures and recognised protection deficiencies

All the Danish answer **CPT / Inf (2013) 11, all 31 pages**, is now visually original -read through the public archive copy of CPT's official file from November 6, 2013. Full section matrix, 30 numerical rows, archive identity and sidelocators are shown in **cpt-2013-Danish-reply-full-original control.md**. The original response date is July 3, 2013; it includes police, asylum and psychiatry in Greenland.

The reply to section 17, physical p.8, **corrects disciplinary sanctions for 2010 from 2 to 3 and for 2011 from 1 to 2**. In 2012 there were 16 new police complaints board cases:6 conduct,7 criminal,1 death/serious-injury case under section 17(2) and 2 note cases. 6 disciplinary sanctions are reported, including 2 arising from a police complaints board case. Revisions and overlap are retained; neither 2→3,1→2 nor 16+6 represents new unique citizens. Outcomes and actual redress for all 16 complaints board cases are not stated.

The reply to § 31, physical p.16, describes medical examination normally in the **first week**, whereas the CPT required 24 hours. For § 38, pp.19-20, it acknowledges **no reliable extract of isolation figures** and **no statistics on requested visits that did not take place**. The 132 reported person registrations for remand detention on grounds of risk of collusion in 2012 must not be called 132 isolated persons or 132 visit refusals. For §§ 48/54, pp.25/27-28, the State maintains at least daily medical assessment of restraint and states that no independent psychiatrist can be obtained, whereas the CPT required review by two doctors after 6 hours. For § 51, p.28, an ECT register and purchase of EEG equipment are only planned. These departures are documented in the State's own reply and require actual follow-up and individual intervention/injury courses.

2014: repeated warning and documented interministerial knowledge

§ 5 finds continuing inadequate follow-up concerning contact restrictions on pre-trial detainees, restraint in prisons and prolonged psychiatric restraint. The report's summary also describes prolonged room confinement of children upon arrival at Grenen. § 115 addresses Denmark's plan of May 2014 to halve belt restraint by 2020. Verification of actual results must be demanded when the same intervention is criticised again. CPT/Inf (2014) 25, § 5, summary printed pp.6-8 and § 115.

The government's reply states that a permanent interministerial human rights committee was established in October 2014 under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to map recommendations and follow-up. The reply to § 9 reiterates the possibility of civil, disciplinary and criminal police liability. These are specific statements of knowledge and responsibility, not documentation that all recommendations were implemented. CPT/Inf (2015) 16, replies to §§ 5 and 9, printed pp.1-3.

2019: people detained under inferior conditions and prolonged incarceration

The report's summary finds no progress on central police safeguards since 2014. §117 requires urgent measures at Ellebæk and Nykøbing: conditions were unacceptable, and CPT required renovation or closure. §111 states that Ellebæk had **117 detainees, including 24 women**; approximately **1.100 admissions in 2018**,averaging 32 days, one in six over four months and one person 12 months. §174 states that **14 of 30 patients at Sikringen** spent all or most of the day locked up, sometimes for years. Backlog counts, admissions and duration are different measures. CPT/Inf(2019)35,summary, §§111, 117 and 174,printed pp. 53, 55 and 75.

The government's full reply reports new outdoor areas in Ellebæk from late March 2020, information on rights in more languages and complaint mailboxes from August 2020. This documents the State's reply and measures introduced; actual improvement for patients or detainees must be documented separately. CPT/Inf (2020) 26, reply to sections 119, 126 and 128, printed pp.70 and 74-75.

2024: repeated coercion against children and adults and lack of duration data

Unit and target	2022	2023	Jan-May 2024	Original
Aarhus: restraint incidents	1.167	569	239	CPT / Inf (2024) 38, § 143
Aarhus: of which over 48 hours	-	33	17	See also Section 143
Glostrup: restraint incidents	138	66	31	See also Section 144
Glostrup: chemical compulsion	753	380	211	See also Section 144

§ 147: **18 young people aged 14-17 were restrained 237 times in January 2023-May 2024**. 18 are persons within this local scope; 237 are repeated interventions. § 73 describes up to 21-23 hours of daily cell confinement over months or years. CPT/Inf (2024) 38, §§ 73 and 143-147.

The 2025 reply acknowledges that reliable national figures on the duration of restraint in prisons cannot be extracted without manual review; nor can the connection to mental illness, self-harm or suicide attempts. The annex's tables 8-9 state **167 restraints in 2023 and 155 in 2024**; men 154/144, women 13/11. 2024 is provisional. The reply to § 148 states a legislative amendment from June 2024 under which interventions involving under-15s are registered as coercion even when their parents have consented; previously these were registered as use of force. The recording discontinuity must accompany every time series. CPT/Inf (2025) 19, reply to §§ 111 and 148, printed pp.67-68, 84 and 99-100.

2025: Greenland - continuing specific separation, occupancy and restraint

§ 7: Nuuk had **83 inmates against a capacity of 76**; closed unit A had 45 against a capacity of 40, including 23 in preventive detention, three determinate sentences and 19 in pre-trial detention, four women. The open unit had 38, including eight women. §§ 13-14 describe two women's repeated transfers every other day to police cells to avoid encounters with men, inadequate heating and lack of hot food. §§ 19-20 concern the absence of designated medical responsibility and admission examinations. §§ 31-32 describe restraint lasting over 23 hours and stays in observation cells of 18 and 25 hours. The population may overlap the annual statistics and does not document that all 83 experienced all the conditions. CPT/Inf (2025) 14, §§ 7, 13-14, 19-20 and 31-32.

The reply states a plan for 70 new places and approximately 45 % increased capacity; this is future capacity. The reply to § 31 maintains observation through a window during restraint, whereas the CPT had required direct continuous supervision. The reply to § 32 describes attempts to obtain tear-resistant clothing. These statements document that a reply or plan does not in itself prove full implementation of the recommendation. CPT/Inf (2025) 28, replies to §§ 9 and 31-32, printed pp.1 and 12.

Consequences and responsibilities

Each repeated restraint, cell confinement, family/contact restriction and move must be linked to a specific person, date, actual duration and legal basis before an individual legal conclusion is demanded. The documented warnings from CPT and the government's own replies support examination of the institutions' knowledge and continuing omissions. A full assessment of harm additionally requires case records, incident logs, medical documentation, complaint cases and actual redress. Different review years must not reduce one citizen's repeated interventions to one abstract error; nor may they be multiplied into different citizens.

Greenland 2013: State's full response, lack of control and concrete guarantees

The response of the Danish State demonstrates both known protection deficiencies, correction of its own previous figures and more measures that were only planned. It can now be read point by point together with the CPT's visit report. A rule referred to, a declaration by an authority on the work done and the protection actually achieved by a citizen shall be recorded separately.

Whole **CPT / Inf (2013) 11, all 31 physical PDFs pages**, are visually read on October 7, 2026 in memory. S.1 is front page, p.2 blank, p.3-31 contains the answer. Public archive copy of the then official file was archived on 6 November 2013; the front page indicates Strasbourg, **3 July 2013**, visit **25-27 September 2012** and the document number. The current official document reference; and the CPT's country registry identifies the same response. The SHA256 of the archive file is 21cdcd4c12f9195cfe7fbc3bf5fd8b661816a59dc35c95cd0076cf2318008f9f; the page number is aligned with the document view of the Council of Europe. No official original files or original pages are stored locally.

All locators below are: **physical PDF pages**"§" in the first column refers to: **the paragraph of the CPT's visitor report, which is reproduced in the reply;**Not a new piece of legislation. The government's response is in italics in the original; the CPT's recommendations are in front of the answer. This difference has been retained in the analysis.

Figures, populations and time limits

Information in the original	Number or time	Population, delimitation and significance	Locator
Police complaints board cases received in 2010 and 2011	18 / 18	Arriving cases reported at the CPT visit; not documented personal union.	§ 17, p. 8
Disciplinary sanctions 2010: previously disclosed → corrected	2 → 3	The explicit correction of the CPT report by the State.	§ 17, p. 8
Disciplinary sanctions 2011: previously disclosed → corrected	1 → 2	Both versions are preserved as source chain; they are not summed.	§ 17, p. 8
Police complaints board cases received in 2012	16	6 conduct cases + 7 criminal cases + 1 case under section 17(2) concerning death/serious injury + 2 note cases =16.	§ 17, p. 8
Disciplinary sanctions 2012	6, of which 2	Two of them came out of a police conference. The six are not added to the 16 as new events or persons.	§ 17, p. 8
Nuuk Police Detention 2012	18	The original calls the device people. No identity list or control of repeated stay; not national personal union.	§ 20, p. 10-11
Stay over 24 hours, less than 2 days	9	The open interval designation of the original shall be retained.	§ 20, p. 10
More than 2 days, less than 3 days	4	Same demarcation.	§ 20, p. 10
More than 3 days, less than 4 days	4	Same demarcation.	§ 20, p. 11
More than 4 days, less than 5 days	0	Same demarcation.	§ 20, p. 11
Over 5 days, under 6 days	1	9 + 4 + 4 + 0 + 1 = 18. The original text also mentions arrest less than 24 hours, but the table has no separate such cell. Frontier cases cannot be reconstructed.	§ 20, p. 10-11
Remand justified by risk of collusion in 2012	132	The chief of police denotes the unit persons. It is **not 132 isolation course;**Not 132 refusal of visitors and not all in custody.	§ 38, p. 19
Complaints about refusal to visit the chief of police 2012	0 supplied	There are also no known court cases. Absence of complaints does not replace the absence of action / waiting times.	§ 38, p. 20
The Ombudsman's visit to Nuuk police detention / asylum	1993,1999,2001,2006	Historical series of visits in the State's response; only 2006 is in the reporting period. New visit was scheduled September 2013.	§ 18, p. 8-10
OPCATs-appropriate institutions and planned annual visit activity	Over 1.000 / approximately 75 from 2013	Institution population versus **a plan** for visits to approximately 75 institutions annually. This is not an actual visit count or documentation of completed supervision of 75 different institutions.	§ 18, p. 10
Greenland visit: State frequency description	Average 5 years	The Ombudsman's justification for the supervisory frequency; not an inventory of undiscovered relationships between visits.	§ 18, p. 10
New Nuch-anstalt: planned capacity	76 of which 40 closed	Construction start 2015, finished 2017 was the plan in 2013, not completed capacity at the time of response.	§ 22, p. 12-13
Women's section shielded	6 seats, in service November 2012	Information from the Department of Investigation on the successful offer. It does not document the safe stay of all women.	§ 27, p. 14
Training in the Nouc institution	2 teams daily; typically 5-8 per team; 25 lessons per week	Tender / teaching objectives, not 25 unique pupils or actual participation.	Paragraph 29, p. 15
Recreation to secure / arrest section	Sport 3, school 2, handwork 3 times / week	Tender frequency, non-persons or completed activity.	§ 29, p. 15-16

Information in the original	Number or time	Population, delimitation and significance	Locator
Drug treatment in Nuuk	8 inmates in the ongoing course	Cooperation agreement August 2012; not evidence of treatment outcome or 8 different courses of damage.	§ 33, p. 18
On-arrival medical examination: CPT → State practice	24 hours → usually first week	A concrete discrepancy between the protection requirement and the practice described.	§ 31, p. 16
Restraint in prisons: duration and oversight	More than 24 hours only exceptionally; daily medical orientation; check after 48 / 72 hours	Described rules / follow-up, not actual durations; no one counts for exceptions.	§ 42, p. 23
Prison restraint: observation notes	At least every 15 minutes	Notation interval does not replace direct continuous monitoring.	§ 42, p. 24
Psychiatric restraint: CPT's review requirements	After 6 hours, 2 doctors	CPT recommendation; not a numerator for performed medical assessments.	§ 48, p. 25
Psychiatric restraint: the State's reply	At least 1 medical assessment daily	The State considers that daily assessment is sufficient; independent psychiatrist is reported not to be available.	§ 48 / 54, p. 27-28
Maximum capacity of the psychiatric ward	12 patients	The State's justification for less frequent review; not annual counts or restrained patients.	§ 48, p. 27
Continued psychiatric detention: reassessment	Day 3,10,20,30, then at least every 4 weeks	Legal guarantees are reproduced in the reply; actual compliance is not measured.	§ 54, p. 28
Psychiatric Board of Appeal: decision	14 days; in case of suspensive effect 7 working days	Described timelimits; the reply does not contain any actual procedural time or time limit.	§ 54, p. 29
Patient advisor: first and later visit	Within 24 hours of appointment; at least 1 time/week and as needed	Reported guarantee; actual contact for the individual patient has not been calculated.	§ 57, p. 30

All answered sections: action, residue and protection of the citizen

CPT Clause and locator	What the State specifically answers	The importance of the proof and the remaining material review;
11, p. 3-4	The police order requires information from relatives when the conditions are appropriate and the purpose of the arrest permits it. At less than 18 years of age, social security authorities must always be informed and the home as far as possible. Orientation is recorded. The chief doesn't know cases without feedback.	The answer contains a conditional practice description. It does not document an unconditional, formally recognised right from the start of detention or the CPT's request for justified, written and approved deferral. "Not known 'is not an incident register.
12, p. 4-6	Rules of law and guidance from the entry into force of the Act 1.1.2010 are reproduced. The defendant is informed of the defence; the defence is self-elected, and the police district decides on the appointment. Interview may continue without defence if the defendant wishes to make a statement. The notified additional guidelines will later be deemed unnecessary.	The CPT requested effective access from first detention, quality and independence. The answer does not actually document timely, independent assistance. The legal translations reproduced are state statements and are not independent controls of each legal link.
13, p. 6 -7	The daily recommendation requires health assessment in case of suspected illness, injury, suicide risk or serious exposure. If a doctor is missing locally, a nurse / other health representative may be used. The state states that there are no private doctors and that no citizen can choose a particular doctor.	Access in certain situations of danger is not evidence of a general effective right to medical examination in detention. The absence of an option is explicitly stated.
14 p. 7	The provision of guidance is prescribed. An English version has been requested for consideration; more evidence of extradition will be considered for future review.	Translation and better documentation are **considerations;**, not completed securing understanding and signed reception. The answer refers to guidance in January 2000, while § 11 refers to January 2002; the version difference is retained.
16, p. 7-8	The self-government had no plans to ask Denmark to change policy rules; the subject had not yet been politically discussed in Greenland.	Specifically, the absence of a change initiative, not evidence that the existing review scheme provided effective protection.
17, p. 8	Earlier disciplinary figures are corrected and the 2012 cases, case types and disciplinary sanctions stated. The National Commissioner of Police received disciplinary competence in November 2011.	The contemporaneous correction must be included in the statistical account. No full outcome distribution is stated for all 16 complaints-board cases, nor actual compensation/redress.
18, p. 8-10	The Danish Ombudsman oversees the state's police detention / institutions; the Greenlandic Ombudsman with the psychiatrist of self-government. Please describe visits, OPCATs population, future visits and risk assessment.	The state's knowledge of competence and control capabilities has been documented. It is not a full OPCATT visitor register or original control of all ombudsman reports.
20, p. 10-11	The Chief of Police gives the 18th person table and refers to the day order for only short-term police detention in exceptional cases.	One stay is more than 5 and less than 6 days. The answer does not give persons identity, individual legal basis or judicial review, so that neither national personal dedup nor individual legality can be inferred.
21, p. 11 - 12	Renovation of Nuuk police station was decided March 2012. Project sent to the municipality 10.1.2013; no earlier than 4 months after approval, distributed 2 months plan / approvals + 1 month notice + 1 month establishment. Early start May 2013 and expected delivery June 2014 after about 1 year construction.	All times are a project plan in this answer. The actual completion and improvement of the detainees has not been documented here.
22, p. 12 -13	Location / program selected; competition started December 2012, proposal March 2013, winner 17.5.2013. New institution planned 2015- 17 with 76 seats / 40 closed as well as activities, treatment, community and visitor facilities. The return of Greenlandic inmates from Herstedvester is intended.	Getting closer to languages, family, culture and the environment is recognised as a concrete consideration. The plan is not actual repatriation or restoration for identified prisoners.
23, p. 13	The Department of Investigation says that concrete inappropriate tone and violence between inmates is always followed up; staff is taught in respect and dynamic security, and CCTV is installed.	Complete installation is provided, but no complaint, violence, sanction or damage figures document the claim of "always."
25, p. 13-14	Greenlandic Crime Service reported 7.5.2013 that ventilation and toilet / bath renovation had been completed. Double coating is avoided as far as possible, but continues to be used when needed. Minor changes to the building / screen have been made.	Concrete completion statements, but not independent post-control or double coating cessation.

CPT Clause and locator	What the State specifically answers	The importance of the proof and the remaining material review;
27 p. 14	Women's section with 6 places in service November 2012; the institution considers that it can eliminate the need for mixed sections.	The existence of the measure is enlightened. The actual cessation of mixed placement and the consent / safety of all women have not been documented.
29, p. 15 - 16	Work, school, leisure and leisure frequencies are described. Art workshop opened December 2012. The State recognises the general lack of sufficient work; further initiatives are assessed in the light of the planned new institution 2017. The basic amount is payable to inmates in the event of a lack of duties.	A lack of work is explicitly known. Tender frequency is not actually outdoor / community time or sufficient employment in secure / arrest sections.
31, p. 16	No health workers in Greenlandic institutions; use of the general health care system. Hospital is informed of arrival and examination is usually given before the first week; in case of acute suspicion, immediate action is taken.	The CPT required a doctor / qualified nurse within 24 hours. The normal time limit described does not meet this requirement. No number of delayed studies, disease progression or sequelae is reported.
32, p. 17	No own psychologist / psychiatrist; treatment by public health services to a limited extent. Counselling from the psychiatric department and psychologist with Herstedvester experience is described. As far as possible, future specialist capacity must be established at a new facility.	Limited treatment access is an explicit indication of the current situation. Future capacity is not evidence of the treatment of current inmates.
33, p. 17 - 18	Collaboration with Katsorsaavik August 2012; ongoing trajectory for 8 inmates and possibility of AA.	Concrete course of treatment informed; nationwide needs, access and outcome missing.
34, p. 18	The D.A. 's office rejects health information in their own files and says that CPT must have seen a hospital receipt for a commissioned investigation.	A concrete discrepancy between the CPT observation and the Authority's explanation. The receipt and the file are not provided; the state's explanation does not prove its own correctness.
35, p. 18	The CPT asked for a daily nurse and preferably a responsible doctor at least weekly. The answer refers only to Paragraph 31.	The reference does not document the introduction of the desired permanent health care personnel.
38, p. 18-20	Control of visits, collusion risk, individual proportionality and access to a court are described. The Chief of Police acknowledges that police systems cannot provide reliable solitary-confinement figures and no statistics are kept on requested visits that do not take place.132 collusion registrations and no known complaints in 2012 are stated.	One **documented data relief;** for contact and isolation. "Very few refusals" without numerator / denominator does not document small loss of actual contact or short deferrals.
39, p. 20 - 21	Rules on contact, visits, letters and court access are reproduced. In particular, the CPT required written reasons and a separate periodic review of restrictions.	A general legal representation is not concrete evidence of new instructions, reasoned decisions or actually separate retests.
41, p. 21-22	New call system is provided installed. Very limited daylight in two observation cells is recognised; windows made smaller / shielded. Artistic light improvement and floor / loom revision are decided for later execution.	Call system is an enlightened implemented action; light / renovation work is in the future. Missing daylight is an acknowledged current situation.
42, p. 22-24	Rules on necessity, proportionality, doctor, report, complaint and duration are described. No written guidelines; new report / observation forms prepared. Fixed duty is usually invisible outside the cell; notes at least every 15 minut.15.5.2013 were requested for subsequent calls.	Rules and schedules do not determine compliance. Hidden guard shall not be equated with the continuous direct contact / monitoring required by the CPT without specific control. The call offer is a request, not documented conversation.
44, p. 24	The answer to the independent supervision of the institutions refers to Paragraph 18.	No new visitor or person population; no double counting.
45, p. 24	Psychiatric law adopted by Inatsisartut autumn 2012; copy of the law is attached.	The 31 published pages end with section 58 and do not contain the legal text itself as a subsequent annex. The precise wording of the law is checked separately by legal submission; the representation of the defence is not fully legal.

CPT Clause and locator	What the State specifically answers	The importance of the proof and the remaining material review;
48, p. 25 - 27	The least intrusive means, consent, treatment plan, registration, patient adviser and continuous observation are described. CPT's two-doctor review after 6 hours is answered with at least daily medical assessment and the department's small size; no independent psychiatrist can be obtained. 12 patients is maximum capacity.	The specific difference in protection is documented. Staff shortages/small patient numbers are **the State's express justification**, not a hypothetical authority defence and not proof that longer restraint is necessary.
51, p. 28	The ECT register must be established as soon as possible; the EEG requires a new device and possible purchases / costs are investigated.	Known lack of registration and monitoring. Register and EEG apparatus have not been documented in the reply.
54, p. 28 - 29	Deprivation of liberty must be reassessed on days 3/10/20/30 and at least every 4th week; restraint at least daily. The complaints board's composition,14-day time limit,7 working days where there is suspensive effect, access to courts and appointment of counsel are described.	Legal proceedings are reported, but actual review, legal contact, time, outcome and termination of proceedings are not recorded. Action time cannot therefore be deduced from time limits for appeals.
55, p. 29-30	Information, recall of consent, reflection time, minimum means and indications of coercion are reproduced.	In fact, understandable information, valid consent and concrete necessity have not been proven solely by the reproduction of law.
57, p. 30-31	Patient advisor within 24 hours of appointment, at least weekly and if necessary; free personal / written / telephone communication, appeal to the board / court / ombudsman and supervision by the national physician.	Specifically described safeguards and competent forums; no patient-level compliance or redress figures.
58, p. 31	The function of the Greek Ombudsman's NPM is attributed to Section 17 of Inatsisartutlov 8 of 3.12.2009; the psychiatric department visited March 2012, report prepared and reasonable later intervals intended.	One specifically informed NPM visit is an entrance to original control. It does not close the national OPCATs registry or show that all subsequent recommendations have been implemented.

Consistency and responsibility

The State's knowledge of specific protection deficiencies is documented no later than this reply. The Realm's police/prisons and self-government's psychiatry are identified separately in the reply to section 18, pp. 8-9. The State knew of insufficient healthcare staffing, no reliable isolation counts, missing registration of lost visiting contact, very limited daylight and insufficient work. In psychiatry it knew the requirement for brief restraint, prompt review of continuing coercion and independent medical oversight. The reply's precise wording makes these knowledge points verifiable.

The citizen's loss cannot be replaced by the authority's plan. A possible institution in 2017 did not mean an inmate in 2013 had received treatment, contact or an opportunity to return home. A possible ECT device did not mean EEG monitoring during the treatment in question. Access to a complaint did not document visits received, ended isolation, release or compensation. The strongest sustainable demands are therefore broken down by intervention: actual start/end, legal basis and reasoning, attendance and repeated review, comprehensible information, avenue of complaint and outcome, actual treatment/contact and demonstrated injury and redress.

CPT's recommendations and the State's statements are not themselves Danish criminal convictions or ECtHR judgments. In assessing responsibility, documented departures must be linked to the specific applicable rule and intervention. Missing follow-up may strengthen the knowledge and investigation requirement; it does not, on its own, show that every specific restraint constituted torture under criminal law. This local delimitation does not change the documented oversight deficiency.

Closed reading test and precise residue

The previously identified gap **"CPT/Inf 2013/11 not substantively read" is closed**. All 31 pages and all 31 answered CPT paragraphs have now been read. The remaining CPT catalogue is still a visit/reply register specifying the sections actually reviewed; this full reading of the 2013 reply does not make the other replies fully read. Genuine remaining gaps are actual verification of subsequent compliance with individual promises, the originals of the mentioned Ombudsman visits and statutory annex, and person deduplication, harm trajectories and redress. The statistics on the 16 police complaints board cases still lack all decision outcomes.

UPR: three control cycles, all recommendations and changed responses

The numbered recommendations of the originals have been counted individually. Compact registry: upr-accounting-compact.json, with **133 + 199 + 288 = 620 recommendation numbers**. It is a documentary account; the same problem of rights can be repeated between countries and control cycles. Therefore, 620 are neither 620 different violations, incidents or individuals. Accepted recommendations have also not been automatically implemented. The Government's claim that the law in force complies with the conventions must be tested against practical practices and subsequent findings of control.

Original balance sheet

Cycle and study,	Original answer	All status categories	Sum
2011, 2 May	A/HRC/18/4/Add. 1, 13.9.2011, paragraphs 106.1-106.133, UN original; document copy read	82 accepted; 49 rejected; 2 partially accepted, Nos 106.80 and 106.119.	133
2016, 21 January	A/HRC/32/10/Add. 1, 21.6.2016, §§ 120.1-120.199, UN original; advance version read	120 accepted; 21 accepted in principle; 14 partially accepted; 44 noted. These four counters are confirmed in United Nations Session Report A / HRC / 32 / 2, § 771.	199
2021, 6 May	A/HRC/48/10/Add. 1, 16.7.2021, §§ 1-3 and numbers 60.1-60.288, UN original; document copy read	202 accepted; 86 noted.	288

The UN originals document ID, date and original sender are checked; technical reading is done on identified copies when the UN direct distribution link did not deliver the PDF. The hosts of the copies are registered separately. The status of each recommendation is its own metadata; original full text or PDF is not stored.

2014: 102 is a follow-up figure, not the 2011 initial acceptance figure

Government mid-term report 2014, final table printed p. 64-65, compares the same **133** recommendations: fully accepted; **82 in 2011 and 102 in 2014**; rejected **49 and 16**. The rest includes partial or unfinished answers and must be read in the table's own categories. The mid-term report does not document 20 new recommendations or 102 proven implementations. It also names responsible ministry for each recommendation, including the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for CIA flights and family rules. This gives a concrete evidence of knowledge and responsibility.

2018: proven version difference and change in numbering

The Government’s June 2018 midterm report, printed p.1, states **122 originally accepted and four additionally accepted**. This must be shown alongside the 2016 original’s **120 + 21 + 14 + 44**, rather than replacing those figures. The report uses **121. xx**, whereas Add. 1 uses **120. xx** for the same recommendation. Cross-references therefore retain both document ID and number. The report’s reply to 121.140, printed p.31, declares placed children’s right to contact with both parents and their network; this is the State’s specific legal statement, to be compared with documented contact restrictions. The midterm report was coordinated within the Government’s human-rights committee with Greenland and the Faroe Islands and circulated for consultation.

2023: status change within the same 288 recommendations

The government’s cover letter to the December 2023 midterm report, p. 1, confirms **202 of 288 accepted in September 2021**. The follow-up covered May 2021-May 2023. Nine previously noted recommendations were accepted; one noted recommendation was partially accepted, and one previously accepted recommendation was changed to partially accepted. New status account: **210 fully + 2 partially accepted**, and by our subtraction **76 remaining noted**. The total remains 288. The follow-up is not a fourth review cycle. The document identifies interministerial coordination and consultation with the human rights institute and civil society.

Material verification of the Government's response

The 2011 reply rejects incorporation of the UN conventions and an overall human rights plan, and describes existing child institutions as sufficient. At the same time, dissemination of the CRC observations is accepted and translation/follow-up dialogue initiated. These are specific government statements that subsequent municipal findings and committee criticism can test. Original: A/HRC/18/4/Add. 1, replies 106.26-106.29, 106.38-106.42 and 106.51, notes 29,37,41 and 43,original copy read.

The 2016 reply to 120.46-120.47 places review of national and international recommendations in an interministerial committee. Replies 120.134-120.135 reject an absolute ban on solitary confinement of under 18-year-olds;120.130 maintains exceptions allowing psychiatric coercion.120.190 accepts the family-rights recommendation, but describes a three-year postponement of family reunification. An acceptance category must therefore not be read as cessation of separation. Original: A/HRC/32/10/Add. 1, printed pp. 4,6 and 8.

The 2021 response to 60.255-60.257 notes the family-reunification recommendations and refers to M.A. as pending. The document is dated 16. July 2021, while the ECtHR Grand Chamber judgment of 9. July 2021 had already found an Article 8 violation. This documents outdated wording in the response issued; it cannot be used as evidence that no judgment existed. 60.262-60.263 maintains that conditions in Ellebæk comply with international obligations; this claim must be examined specifically against CPT's findings. 60.226 states **19 known Danish children in Al-Hol/Roj**, including five children whose return was conditional on consent from three mothers. This is a geographical and temporal stock delimitation, not 19 additional ECtHR applicants. Original: A/HRC/48/10/Add. 1, printed pp. 6-7; M.A., 6697/18, judgment 9.7.2021.

Updating 2026

The fourth cycle is kept outside 2006-2025. The new national report A/HRC/WG. 6/52/DNK/1 must be recorded as the State’s own account, not a new UN judgment. Note 2 expressly explains the earlier numbering difference 120. xx/121. xx. New recommendations and final replies must have their own document IDs and dates; an expected or announced investigation must not be counted as completed scrutiny.

UPR 2026: the entire original basis, Denmark's knowledge and compliance

Conclusion and reading scope

The UN’s fourth Universal Periodic Review adds a current knowledge link to the historical national findings. The entire working-group report and all three completed underlying reports have actually been read as text in memory:26+21+10+10=67 PDF pages. This is the final national document dated 20. February 2026, not the consultation draft from November 2025. The originals are not saved locally. New figures from this process belong in the 2026 supplement.

The review took place on 7. May 2026; the working group adopted its report on 15. May. The final report A/HRC/63/10 is dated 10. July.98 delegations made statements, and the report contains 265 numbered recommendation positions 125.1-125.265. Several countries support the same position; for example, six countries are listed at 125.1 and two at 125.4.265 therefore counts numbered positions, rather than unique problem types, rights violations, victims or contributing States. Paragraph 126 states that recommendations express the positions of the submitting States and/or the State reviewed. They do not constitute 265 convictions. [UPR26-WG,PDF2/9-24]

Complete numbering vote

The table covers all 265 positions without overlap. The themes are the report's own brief reading references; the intervals may not be used as precise thematic totals because one position may have several topics. Each original formulation and recommended state can be found at the number shown.

Original positions	Number of positions	Own reading reference
125.1-125.6	6	Conventions, complaint protocols and cooperation
125.7-125.8	2	Racism plan and human rights institutions
125.9-125.9	1	Equal pay

Original positions	Number of positions	Own reading reference
125.10-125.41	32	Racism, discrimination, police, housing and legal remedies
125.42-125.42	1	Gender equality
125.43-125.58	16	Racism, discrimination, data and remedies
125.59-125.61	3	Separate criminalisation of torture
125.62-125.62	1	Prevention of juvenile crime
125.63-125.71	9	Preservation, isolation, prison conditions and torture
125.72-125.72	1	Combating terrorism
125.73-125.79	7	Detention, alternatives, access to justice and torture
125.80-125.84	5	Religion, integration and expression
125.85-125.91	7	Demonstration, privacy and digital police means
125.92-125.95	4	Family reunification and family / parental law
125.96-125.105	10	Trafficking in human beings, protection, punishment and repair
125.106-125.111	6	Integration, work and equal pay
125.112-125.117	6	Poverty, social conditions and housing
125.118-125.118	1	Psychocracy and compulsion
125.119-125.124	6	Reproductive health and inclusive education
125.125-125.130	6	Climate, environment and digital accessibility
125.131-125.134	4	Development and international cooperation
125.135-125.166	32	Equality, violence, protection, family law and repair
125.167-125.174	8	Child violence, placement, consent, minorities and isolation
125.175-125.205	31	Disability, education, law, coercion, guardianship and consent
125.206-125.206	1	Original people and colonial consequences
125.207-125.224	18	Racism, housing, registration, police and legal remedies
125.225-125.227	3	Intersex children and sexuality-related treatment
125.228-125.247	20	Foreigners, family, freedom, asylum, custody and stateless persons
125.248-125.265	18	Greenland, Faeroe Islands, treatment, children and control access
Total	265	All original numbers, once each

The most direct recommendations on interventions, families and actual protection

Position and Recommendation State	Own paraffase	Concrete impact on the chain of responsibility
125.15, Finland	Avoid discrimination in the case of algorithms in welfare services	Check the decision-making basis, functional limitations, human review and actual benefit
125.18, Malaysia; 125.34, Bahamas; 125.222, Rwanda	Legally defined police practice, data and control of ethnic profiling	Registration and investigation shall follow the specific action of the citizen;
125.51, Belarus	Effective remedies against discrimination in work and housing	A right of appeal shall be able to remedy the relevant loss;
125.63, Switzerland; 125.67, Luxembourg; 125.75, Spain	Limited care and long isolation, with alternatives and time control	Actual action days and contact restrictions shall be tested separately;
125.85, Georgia; 125.86, Tunisia	Examine reported interventions against peaceful demonstrations	The claim requires proof of events, legal basis, use of force and subsequent review
125.91, Chile	Precise regulation of police biometric technologies	Technical access or political agreement does not replace legal basis
125.92, Uruguay	Remove waiting times during family reunification and protect 15-18-year-olds	The separation period shall be measured as an actual consequence;
125.93, Philippines	The concept of parental alienation shall not undermine the protection of the child and the victim of violence;	The justification of family law must be tested against original violence material.
125.94, Brazil	Strengthen legal certainty and coordination in family matters in cultural matters	The mutual representation of authorities shall not replace documentation;
125.99, Ireland; 125.103, Qatar	Examine human trafficking and ensure repair, compensation and support	Established liability and effective remedy have different dates
125.121, Iraq	Including school and prevention of institutional violence against persons with disabilities	The absence of aid and the resulting damage must be linked in concrete terms.
125.150, Australia	Strengthen protection during investigations, including by social workers and legal practitioners	The investigation's own approach may have an adverse effect
125.156, Estonia	Violence and assault charges must be tested in custody and in contact;	Rejection requires an actual document check
125.157, Iran	Responsibility for violence and the killing of women, including police and case management failures	Absence shall be linked to knowledge, duty of action and result;
125.169, Botswana	Children in social care should not be placed with children serving	The grounds of care and the basis of penalties shall not be blurred;
125.171, India	Try child corruption in minority families culturally and without discrimination	Test, consent and original justifications shall be checked
125.173, Poland; 125.174, Slovenia	Abolition of child isolation	The state's well-known child intervention requires individual time and legal records
125.183, South Korea; 125.184, Cyprus; 125.185, Uruguay	Effective legal access and process support for persons with disabilities	Formal redress must be linked to actual availability
125.186, Peru; 125.189, Rwanda	Resources for the timely handling of disability complaints	Long time of complaint is a separate control point

Position and Recommendation State	Own paraffase	Concrete impact on the chain of responsibility
125.193, Costa Rica; 125.194, Ghana; 125.195, Burundi	Prevent violence and coercion in institutions	Early warnings must be followed to action and actual cessation
125.200, Costa Rica	Remove rules on sterilisation, contraception and abortion without your own consent under guardianship	Guardians do not automatically replace the consent of the person
125.201, Bulgaria	Available alternatives to digital public service	Digital barriers must be followed to actual loss of rights
125.203, Dominican Republic	Legal capacity to act through guardianship reform	Reductions in function and competence must be accurately assessed
125.225, Iceland; 125.226, Netherlands	Protect the self-determination of intergender children and expose irreversible non-acute interventions	Consent, necessity and irreversible loss shall be documented;
125.232, Ecuador; 125.245, Germany; 125.246, Mexico	Child families, deprivation of liberty, exit centres and family life	Duration and actual living conditions require own profit and loss account
125.238, Switzerland	Individual necessary and proportionate contact restrictions in custody	Family contact must be established alongside detention
125.247, Montenegro	Nationality for otherwise stateless children born in the country	Application and waiting time must be linked to the child's real legal position
125.259, Moldova; 125.263, India	Complaint for children and persons with disabilities throughout the Kingdom	Territorial limitations and practical access shall be visible;

Final national report: speak with their true meaning

All the information below is the state's own statements in UPR26-NAT. The alleged initiative is not in itself evidence of the implementation of individual protection.

Locator	Original figures or time-scale	Names, status and numbers
§ 6-8	8 of 9 key conventions; 13 January 2022 ratification; ILO190 in 2024	Treaty status; not a compliance percentage. No individual complaint under the Convention on Enforced Disappearance; the ICESCR complaints protocol has not been acceded to
§ 16	24 weeks of eligible leave per parent	Legal arrangement statements; not number of families
§ 19	40 / 60 target; 30 June 2026 deadline	Board targets for largest listed companies; not quantified actual target performance
§ 21/47	Up to 37 hours per week; introduced 2025	Employment regulations; repetition is the same initiative
§ 22	17 initiatives; 41 alliance members	Contractual and organisational figures; 17 non-detached abuses
§ 23	At least 35 employees and at least 10 men and 10 women in the same function	Thresholds for gender-broken wage statistics; non-observed complainant's denominator
§ 26-27	18 years for legal gender change; child counselling since 2016	Legal / administrative conditions as described by the State
§ 35	DKK 25,7 million 2025-2028; 8 new initiatives; 15.000 more in jobs 2030	Budget, initiatives and future disability-employment target; not actual entry into employment
§ 37	approx. 470 million DKK 2026-2029; 155 million annually thereafter	Budget statements on pedagogical competences; non-counted support for specific children

Locator	Original figures or time-scale	Names, status and numbers
§ 46	Up to 5 years of free language teaching	Timetable of the scheme; not actual delivery
§ 49-50	Arbitration plan 2023-2026; DKK 4,0 million 2024-2027	Planned period and budget to prevent abuse of adults with disabilities
§ 57	10 Night Life Initiatives 2025	Number of measures; not harm/redress statistics
§ 58	Trauma course 2022; special teams in all policy areas 2021	Organisation; impact on each notification not listed here
§ 62	No Ellebak overlay since 2022, according to the state's statement.	Institutional statements; not independently tested capacity series
§ 72-73	118,2 million DKK 2022-2025; new plan 2026-2029 in preparation	Budget and then planning status; WG § 121 mentions later launch January 2026
§ 79	More than 2.000 additional prison places expected 2036	Future capacity; non-directed overcrowding per unit 2026
§ 80-81	14 days; up to 4 weeks exceptional; minors usually not more than 7 days	Disciplinary frames with specified exceptions; not actually total isolation time
§ 82	First report on disappearances submitted 3 May 2025	State report date; not decision in an individual case
§ 87-88	10-year plan; 30% forced reduction 2030; change of law not earlier than 2027	Future target and possible change; not currently documented 30% reduction
§ 89	Compulsory education 6 or 7 to 16 years	Age of the scheme; not number of children without actual education
§ 96	Law of the child applicable 1 January 2024	The State's assurance of compliance, to be tested against actual practice
§ 108	70% reduction 2030 against 1990; 110% 2050	Climate Goal; Not Actual Meeting
§ 110-113	12 initiatives June 2024; 17 December 2025; 36 racist initiatives; of which 12Greenland; 12 further June 2025	Partial volumes, different plans and versions. Of which 12 may not be added to 36
§ 115	At least 0,7% GNI for more than 45 years	Development aid statements; does not waive domestic protection obligations
§ 126	6 Greenlandic strategic focus areas	Policy area number; not 6 documented corrections
§ 129	Greenlandic rape plan 2023-2027	Planned period; actual aid / cessation not measured
§ 132	Treatment clinic with waiting list from the opening	State recognizes demand / capacity problem; no number / day published here
§ 146	22 historical children; 250.000 kr.	Historical 1951interventions and subsequent repairs; not 22 new interventions in 2006-2025
§ 147	354 women; 488 reporting events; expected compensation law 1 June 2026	Different units; more incidents per woman. Legitimate expectations do not document actual payment
§ 151	Approx. 55.000 Faroese inhabitants; 1.556 European / Nordic residents without Denmark; 1.961 others	Population estimates; not number of rights violations
§ 154	6 ministries; about 130 annual works	Size of administration; not exemption from responsibility
§ 157	Expected 16 out of 20 violence initiatives in 2026	Expectations; unverified implementation
§ 159	7,9% childhood risk at 60% median; 3,0% at 50% median	Faroese relative income targets; not the same definition of poverty / denominator
§ 161	Faroese prison agreement 2022; expected completion 2030	Unsatisfactory conditions are acknowledged; new construction is a future response

Additional figures in the work group's representation of Denmark

Locator iUPR26-WG	Number and period	Unit and status
§ 118	More than €3 million; scheduled for January 2026	LGBTQI + budget declared by the State; not number of displaced victims
§ 119	31 million euro; 2023-2026	Budget for the partner-rapist plan specified by the State; no conversion DKK-total added to the national report
§ 120	30% future target 2030; 10% fewer most intrusive coercive forms 2021-2023	Different time periods and objectives.10% is a state statement, not a new independently tested yearseries
§ 120	Abortion limit 12 → 18 weeks; 15-year-olds and older without parental consent in 2025	Legal statements reproduced by the Working Group; non-interventions
§ 121	7th Action Plan 2026-2029; launched January 2026	Version statements on trafficking in human beings; § 73 of the National Report still says in preparation
§ 122	Criminal Code amendment effective 1. January 2025	Statement by the delegation on torture, war crimes and crimes against humanity; Convention / territorial scope requires legal review
§ 124	At least 0,7% GNI for more than 45 years	Repeat state aid statements; no additional year series

UN compilation of Convention material: a precise chain of knowledge

UPR26-UN summarises earlier committee findings and questions. Findings concerning 2021/2023/2024 remain the same findings when they recur in 2026 and must not be counted as new individual violations. Nor is a question in CCPR's list of issues a determined violation.

UPR26-un locator	Original source in the footnote	Specific control point
§ 5-10	CERD 2021, § 4-5 / 8-13 / 18-21	Unregistered discrimination, registration gaps, housing criteria and ethnic profiling
§ 11	CRPD 2024 § 21-22	Long periods of disability complaints and insufficient resources
§ 12-20	CAT 2023,§§ 8-9/12-13/16-21	Torture, overlay, care, contact, health and isolation
§ 18	CAT 2023,§§ 20-21	Recommended maximum 15 days and termination of child isolation; not a statement of actual days
§ 21	CRPD 2024 § 41-42	Process support and access to justice in Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe Islands
§ 24/26-27	CCPR 2025, QPR / 7, § 21- 23	Questions about statements, demonstrations and rights defenders
§ 28-29	UNHCR contribution, p.4; CCPR 2025, § 15	Waiting time and 15-18-year-olds during family reunification
§ 30-31	CAT 2023, § 28-29; CEDAW 2021, § 22-23	Trafficking in human beings, limited conviction, protection and repair
§ 33	CRPD 2024 § 65-66	Seggovernment and disabled children's involuntary school absences
§ 35-37	CAT 2023, § 26-27 / 30-31; CEDAW 2021, § 20-21	Violence protection and children in secured offers with serving children
§ 38-44	CRPD 2024 § 17-18 / 39-40 / 43-50 / 55-56	Forced, institutions, violence, contraception, guardianship and adaptation
§ 45	CAT 2023,§§ 32-33	Irreversible intervention on intersex children and repair
§ 47-52	CAT 2023,§§14-15/24-25; UNHCR; separate CAT follow-up 62843	Asylum outsourcing, insurance, administrative freedom and repeated status testing

UPR26-un locator	Original source in the footnote	Specific control point
§ 53	UNHCR, p.4-5; CEDAW 2021, § 28-29	Citizenship of stateless children
§ 54-60	CEDAW 2021 § 17 / 20-21 / 34-35 / 43; CCPR 2025 § 3 / 25	Access to justice, violence, reproductive health and suicide
§ 61	CAT 2023,§§ 34-35	Investigate all claims of involuntary contraception even after 1991; responsibility and repair
§ 62/65	CCPR 2025, § 25	Initial children's removal, culture, language and self-determination; the last original footnote refers collectively to § 25 and must be checked in QPR when used
§ 63-64	CRPD 2024 § 11-12 / 57-58	Measured disability protection and Greenlandic reference to Denmark, which makes family visits difficult

Stakeholders' figures and source limitations

UPR26-CSO summarises 16 submissions: 11 individual organisations, 2 joint contributions, 1 national human rights institution and 2 regional intergovernmental contributions. A joint contribution can involve many organisations; 16 are not 16 independent evidence chains or cases. The statements made by the national institution and the submissions made by the stakeholders shall be followed to their original documentation.

Locator	Number or concrete statement	Precise status
§ 3/29-30	Up to 23 hours in the cell; up to 28 days of disciplinary isolation	Reproduction of DIHR / CPT / JS2 information; 23 hours is daily register description, 28 days legal exemption
§ 4	DIHR criticises frequent closure of police complaints and proposes human rights review	Institutional assessment; no total of appeal outcomes in this section
§ 10	The DIHR describes significantly increased bogey requirements and requires reliable data	No number series published here; must be connected to the original series
§ 27	30% reduction 2030	The same political psychiatric objective as in the National Report; not a new reduction
§ 37	37 hours of duty referred to as 2023 rule on non-western	The Stakeholder's reproduction is in conflict with the 2025- and residence / employment delineation of the National Report. The legal basis must determine the practical application
§ 38	49.500 poor people; estimated income loss for 11.000 children; 6 years of gradual child benefit	JS2's statement / estimate. No statement of identity or proof of 49.500 breaches of public law
§ 42	Approximately 3,2 billion USD development assistance 2024; 0,7% GNI	MAAT reproduction; non-original national financial statistics
§ 44	47,5% women with violence / threats in the category described	MAAT reproduction; exact year of survey, sample and denominator not presented in the composition
§ 47	12,3% gender gap 2023	IPWR's reproduction; not an established illegal pay gap in each appointment
§ 48	Get psychological violence cases despite surveillance findings	JS2 statements; no numbers that can be invented
§ 51	Repeated allegations of irreversible action without impartial investigation	JS2's criticism, not evidence of a certain number of children
§ 54-55	Long-term administrative detention and indefinite stay for children	JS2's criticism; individual start / end dates are missing
§ 56	Citizenship revoked year after regulatory error	JS2's criticism; original decisions are required for the individual citizen

Locator	Number or concrete statement	Precise status
§ 60-62	Spiral courses, historical child transfers and culturally unsuitable parental tests	JAI / MAAT statements. Repeals may not be counted as new families
§ 66-67	Possible deterioration of rights through Faroese structural changes and limited children's access to complaints	MEGD investigation / legal certainty track; possible future damage is not a recorded actual loss

Documented source errors and necessary response documents

The final national report's footnote 2 on PDF18 describes earlier recommendations with 120 / 121 numbers and refers to the 2016document A / HRC / 32 / 10 / Add.1, while the introductory paragraph 3 deals with the follow-up to 2021 and the subsequent footnotes actually use 60 numbers. The conflict is also found in the final UN document. It is therefore not enough to replace the draft consultation alone. The right recommendation must be matched by number, year and wording; a false source reference must not create a false chain of succession. [UPR26-NAT, PDF2 / 18-21]

The UN's automatic printout from 25 September 2026 indicates 174 supported and 91 listed recommendations: 174 + 91 = 265, own calculation 65,66% and 34,34%. The statement is presented by both the Danish delegation at the 1: 51 and the delegation at 2: 27: 41. The printout explicitly states that it is not an official UN protocol. The total is therefore marked as meeting statements in an automatic print; the final status of each recommendation number is not verified here. [UPR26 -MODEL]

The written response A/HRC/63/10/Add. 1 could not be obtained through the UN's direct symbol API, the exact embedded link at docs.un.org, the register search or the country catalogue. The API returned an error page, not a PDF; the outer docs.un.org display documents only a link template. The country catalogue still showed 2021/2016/2011 files. This is a specific outstanding access item, not an assumption that the response annex does not exist. 174/91 must not be converted into individual matches or completed reparation. An annex with 2025 in its filename about earlier 60 numbers is not an answer to the 2026 set of 125 numbers.

Legal significance and concrete requirements

The final national report opens with Denmark's own acknowledgement of a responsibility to protect the population. This is a documented State statement requiring the analysis to ask about action, effect and reparation. The wording does not in itself prove that R2P's four international-crime categories are met. The specific tracks concern first the rights to family, liberty, integrity, legal access and relevant disability protection under the identified conventions. [UPR26-NAT,§1;the report's legal chapter]

The strongest documented criticism is the difference between assurances of compliance and known oversight findings. The State's section 96 declares that the Children's Act secures respect for the Convention; national original studies simultaneously document continuing errors in fact-finding, consent and timely intervention. The State's section 34 declares sector responsibility for accessibility; CRPD findings and the 2026 recommendations specifically identify legal access, complaint processing time, coercion and assistance. A statute's name, a budget, a plan or an accepted recommendation does not document cessation of an individual's loss.

The demand is a numbered compliance account: original recommendation and finding→responsible ministry/authority→knowledge received→necessary action and deadline→actual measures→affected person's intervention and loss period→dated redress→examination of organisational and individual responsibility. For children, it must follow both the child and the relevant caregivers. For disability, procedural support and accessibility must be examined before the authority treats non-participation as the citizen's own failure. Irreversible interventions require independent investigation and relevant compensation because a later legislative initiative does not restore bodily integrity.

The four fully read 2026 originals close the known reading hole in this UPRs base. They shall not create the unpublished individual files, an accessible written response document or a national register of actual repairs. These specific document requirements are separate, so that the completed original work is not confused with a loose personal account.

17. Copenhagen children's cases: errors and consequences

What the cases of the 77 children actually document

The study of 24. May 2017 shows deficiencies in all 77 children's cases examined. It also gives specific examples of interference with family life, pressure in obtaining consent, overstepping authority and long waiting time. Merely describing its result as a general error rate is therefore insufficient. Individual acts and effects require separate examination. [KK17,pp.6-8,66-69]

The population comprised 78 children’s cases from 2013-2016, with one court-ordered placement excluded. Three of six local units were included: Bispebjerg, Valby-Vesterbro-Kgs.Enghave and City-Østerbro. The starting point was the latest 10 cases in each of four categories per unit; overlap and the number of available cases reduced the sample. The cases were distributed approximately equally between units and between placements with/without consent. With few exceptions, the children were under 12 years. This is the specifically described selection. The report’s later assessment of representativeness cannot replace a documented national random sample. [KK17,pp.8,12-14]

The method consisted, on the one hand, of the administration's own screening and, on the other, of the citizen's control of relevant acts in 62 cases with unclear registrations. Records were amended, inter alia, when an investigation was actually completed after the placement, or a placement registered as a voluntary lack of consent. The main consideration was whether a case-by-case approach existed and, normally, whether its content was sufficient. Therefore, a recorded implemented step is not proof that the entire step was legal or professional enough. [KK17, p.13-14]

This delimits the statement of the check in two ways: the absence of written evidence cannot be explained merely by the lack of a note on an oral act; at the same time, the lack of quality in existing documents may be outside the control. The 77 / 77 report is the union of at least one investigated deficiency per child case, not the sum of all series of errors and not an individual decision on 77 materially illegal locations.

Relationship: an actual restriction can be hidden by the designation

Nine of the 23 children's cases with established facts or concrete signs concerned relations determined without the necessary competence. For six children, a scheme was designated as supported interaction effectively supervised interaction. The management had assessed ten other schemes which were properly supported. The relevant statement is therefore 6 / 16 = 37,5%; the original reproduces 37%. It is a subpopulation of 77 and 23 and should not be added to any of them. The original mention of 60 irrelevant cases and one further exclusion is not sufficiently explained to construct a new overall denominator. [KK17, p.66]

One of the specific cases shows that the administration wrongly believed that children and the youth committee could not decide on monitoring during a voluntary placement. It carried out the surveillance and called it supported interaction. The consequence was a real restriction of parent and child contact without the competent decision and associated review. It is the actual system, its intervention force and the rules of jurisdiction of the time that govern legality; the title of the case cannot provide a legal basis. [KK17, p.68, example 16]

The legal criticism must address both the excess of competence and the lost safeguards. The demand is production of the contact decision, contact actually carried out, surveillance instruction, reasons and subsequent correction. Until these dates exist, there is no documentation of the total days or hours the family experienced the scheme without legal authority. The missing measurement does not make the identified lack of competence less serious.

Six concrete types of trajectory and their human impact

The 16 numbered examples of p.66-68 are 16 relationships, not 16 different children or families. Several describe the same siblings or the same child. Nor should they be attributed to the main population, as they illustrate cases within it.

Progress in the original;	Specific regulatory action; or non-compliance;	Documented sequence / time	Legal deviation and necessary requirements
Three sisters, example 1-4	The mother is pressed for holiday / living; the municipality, on behalf of the father, seeks temporary full custody and advises him to detain the girls	Three children and their relationship with the mother are affected; later, municipal arrangements of access, even if the children are not placed	Examine impartiality, actual involvement and competence; obtain the municipal application, parental-responsibility decision and dates

Progress in the original;	Specific regulatory action; or non-compliance;	Documented sequence / time	Legal deviation and necessary requirements
	in respect of the mother, while she is still a member of custody and the right of residence;		for detention / presence
One son, example 5-6	The requirement to deposit passport without an identified legal basis; reference to placement changes the mother's refusal to accept; parents repeatedly ask for more contact.	A formal access decision is only seen over a year later.	Clear travel / family life, freedom of consent, non-decision and access to complaint; aim first request → decision → actual change of contact
Two non-related children, example 7	Decisions appear to have been taken immediately before birth.	Indication of two courses, unverified birth / decision dates in the text of the report	Check the original dates and the day-count right. The child's law later special rule about an unborn child cannot be used backwards on 2013-2016
Twin boys, just over a month, example 8-10	The municipality notifies its decision to the mother of the hospital prior to documented consent; changes the four months of the form to one for signature; accepts signature without documented verification of voluntary / informed consent	Two babies; the mother wants support at home and describes the signature as the pressure. Four / one month are planned periods, not verified actual separation	Try consent and competence, current decision and whether compulsory guarantees were circumvented; require the hospital's simultaneous file, both form versions and physical removal date
A boy with a former foster family, example 12-14	The municipality organises pick-up, pays board / lodging and driving, but designates the course as a private contract; records vary between private arrangement and placement	The father with custody is not contacted until three or four months after the apparent decision on voluntary placement.	Lack of necessary consent and changing legal basis; require the first decision, the consent of both parents, the basis of payment and the timeline for each basis
A son, example 15	The consent of the mother shall be withdrawn three days after receipt of the decision; the municipality shall decide on the period of return of one month and subsequently refer the matter to the Committee;	Withdrawal and planned repatriation period is described; actual return is not disclosed	Check the return-home decision, any new compulsory decision and actual cessation. A one-month decision is not evidence of return home after one month

The separate example 11 describes a family faced with family or forced housing, apparently motivated by previous opposition to cooperation. The number of children is not specified. It must therefore be described as one illustrated family course without an invented figure. The resistance to cooperation cannot in itself replace the material conditions for intervention. [KK17, p.67]

Parental authority and complicity in detention

The strongest point of criticism in the course of the three sisters is that the authority responsible for informing and managing the children's case was itself assisting one parent against the other and recommending detention. The citizen's adviser describes the mother's then custody and right of residence, and later the decision on the municipality's application. It is a concrete breaking track of impartiality and possible involvement; it cannot be reduced to an unfortunate tone. [KK17, p.66-69]

A comparison with child abduction by private individuals must therefore examine the actually recommended and carried-out removal from the entitled person, the timing of changes in parental responsibility and the actor’s knowledge. The report excerpt does not on its own document every element of Criminal Code§215 or§23 on complicity. The demand is to investigate these elements against original material while fully maintaining the already documented excess of authority.

Pressed consent and an amended form

The twins' case documents that a signature cannot simply be treated as self-explanatory evidence of a free decision. An already communicated placement decision, missing explanation of the compulsory process and rights, and a change of duration to obtain the mother's signature must enter substantive scrutiny of consent. A case label of voluntary does not exempt the authority from proving that necessary consents were valid. [KK17,p.67]

If the necessary consent was not valid and there was no other legal decision by the appropriate body, the removal shall be tested as an intervention without valid basis. It is the strong and concrete legal chain: action → lack of consent / competence → lack of action → separation → demands for termination, review and repair. At the same time, the final personal guilt requires proof of the action and guilt of the individual employee; it does not automatically follow from the fact that the report reproduces the course.

A year without a probable decision

Parents' repeated requests for access and a formal decision only more than a year later are an independent matter of time. During this period, the family lacked a formal decision which could be tested by the usual means of redress. The average time taken by the Board of Appeal does not capture this time before the complaint. It should therefore be kept in the time accounts as a delayed decision / access to review. [KK17, p.67, example 6]

The report shall not indicate the calendar dates or all visits actually made. Therefore, no precise number of separation days can be calculated or concluded that there was no interaction throughout the year. The verified consequence is the long-standing lack of formal consultation despite requests. Specific requirements: fix all requests and answers in time; measure the volume of visits; try whether the actual scheme was legal and whether the slowness violated the right to effective testing and family life.

A lack of protection also needs to be criticised.

The original describes the reports of violence against siblings, which were not more closely uncovered, and the cases of two brothers, where the authority was awaiting a suspended police investigation. It also describes one case of information about the mother's violence against a small sister, while the municipality continued its planned repatriation with a security plan. This documents the information received and a description of the omission; it is not in itself independent evidence of each reported act of violence. [KK17, p.68-69]

The legal criticism concerns lack of independent investigation of the facts and timely protection assessment. The municipality’s duty to investigate the child’s circumstances does not disappear because police are investigating a criminal case. Denmark’s positive protection obligations require examination of who knew what, which realistic protective steps were available, and why they were omitted. This criticism can coexist with demands to stop separations without legal authority; each child is entitled to a lawful, individual assessment of protection and family life.

Previous knowledge, repetition and undocumented closure

Annex 2 of the report describes previous oversight. In 2011-2012, the administration examined 203 registrations; the later joint review by Internal Audit and the Citizens’ Adviser found that the investigation did not provide a sufficient basis for the administration’s conclusion about the nature of the incorrect registrations and the measures selected. The reported approximate 11% and 13% must not be converted into exact error counts without the original account, and 203 are registrations, not necessarily 203 different children. [KK17,pp.74-75]

A separate investigation of 30 foster children's cases for 2011-2012 found a lack of evidence of the minimum requirements for supervision laid down in the Act in at least 22 cases; the result was completed in 2015. It is a former control find, not a sub-category of the 77 cases, and must be able to be summed up only into a single children's union after the person-coupling. The image is a verified later source; the original 30 case report is to be used for a full number and selection check. [KK17, p.75]

The repetition argument is therefore concrete: before 2017 management had received criticism about supervision, guidance and registration, and the 2017 study again found extensive failures in guarantees and registrations. It can be used to demand responsibility for the choice, implementation and control of the previous actions. It does not prove without further documents that all the mistakes were made by the same employees.

At p. 69, the conclusion of several competence and home issues is based on information on a plan of action and an assumption that errors were or would be corrected. The councilman asked the council to confirm the assumption. Such an assumption and a planned course do not in itself demonstrate that the intervention of each family ceased, that contact was restored or that the citizen was compensated. The chain of responsibility of the report must therefore not end when a plan of action is adopted. [KK17, p.69]

The requirement is an account of each of the 77 cases: actual errors, date of recognition by the authority, decision addressed, actual change in the child's life, loss / indemnity and, where appropriate, the outcome of the duties or criminal proceedings. This chain is necessary in order to compare long intervention time with actual lack of personal sanction. The existing study provides serious and useful evidence; it does not publish this overall closure account.

Verification of certificates and priority requirements

Documented report find: 77 / 77 with at least one deficiencies examined; the specified denominators in Chapter 9; 6 / 16 effectively supervised schemes designated as supported; specific actions described and over one year waiting time for a visit decision. In particular 23 / 77 is a mixed category of findings and concrete signs. The source itself states that much is based on the municipality's own identification and not a full independent study of all these matters. [KK17, p.13-14,66]

Further evidentiary requirements:original signatures and form versions; clinical/hospital records in the twin course; actual birth dates in the two pre-birth examples; parental-responsibility decisions and municipal correspondence in the sister cases; the dated contact requests; contact hours and move dates; the specific closing response to the Citizens’ Adviser and corrections per child. These documents differ from the 2017 report’s summaries.

The strongest arguments are, in order:1) lack of necessary consent and proper decision-making competence at the intervention itself;2) actual surveillance without a decision by a competent body;3) the authority’s assistance to one party and pressure against the other parent;4) absence of a decision and prolonged blocking of review;5) repetition after earlier documented management knowledge;6) lack of documentation of actual cessation and individual reparation. Each point must be linked to the precise person, period and original document when advanced as an individual claim.

18. Time of intervention, repatriation and temporary residence of children protection;

A registered win must be followed to the actual situation of the family

Conclusion: Remittal or annulment is not in itself an account of when a child returned home or how long the family lost contact. The public scrutiny system must show both the decision's legal consequence and the intervention's actual cessation. Appeal processing time alone can hide further months following a favourable decision. Conversely, a child may have returned home before the appeal decision later recorded as remittal. The two timelines must therefore be linked through original documents and event dates. [HG01-HG03; R07-R10]

The commissioner's two meanings of "sending home" are treated separately: **remittal for fresh consideration by the authority** and **return home with actual return**. Contact, geographical distance, support and later reunification are also recorded. Annulment of a contact decision may be an important legal consequence even while the child remains in placement. Remittal of an assistance decision may involve restoration of an earlier benefit; it does not prove that a child returned home.

Registration	Unit and necessary originals	What can it prove?
Remittal for reconsideration	Appeals, grounds of error, repeal and any provisional provisions	New processing is required; the specific legal order must be read
New Decision	Date, decision-making power, legal basis, justification and documented legal conditions	Whether the intervention was given a new independent basis; no retrospective repair of past losses
Actual return	Date of removal, end of placement, receiving homes and, where appropriate, support courses	When physical separation ceased
Consultation and contact	Decisions and actual visits, telephone contacts, cancellations and transport	Whether the family actually had contact and how the relationship was affected
Suspension effect	Request and decision of each body	Whether implementation was temporarily stopped; not automatically the outcome in the main proceedings
Repair	Restoration, compensation, assistance, liability assessment and effective implementation	Whether an established error was followed by effective redress

A commune declaration such as "returned" must be checked against actual cessation and the child's stay. A statement of continued need shall be checked against the simultaneous evidence, including documented help, the child's statement and relevant counter-evidence. None of the information will be sufficient simply by repeating several decisions.

Højesteret 3 November 2025: a rule was wrongly made an absolute ban

Documented error of law: The Eastern High Court precluded an individual assessment of suspensive effect in a case concerning a Faroese child's placement in Denmark. The Supreme Court quashed the order and remitted the question to the High Court for reconsideration. This specifically demonstrates that a review body may itself limit interim protection through an incorrect interpretation of law. [HG01,particularly pp.9-10]

The original order, BS-28216/2025-HJR, describes one child, B, born in 2009,and the two parents F1 and F2. This is **one case with three named procedural roles**,not three independent courses involving errors. The placement decision was made by Føroya Kærustovnur on 3. September 2024. On 25. September 2024,the Court of the Faroe Islands granted the proceedings suspensive effect. The High Court revoked this decision on 18. March 2025. The Supreme Court remitted the matter for reconsideration on 3. November 2025. [HG01,pp.1-2 and8-10]

Step	Documented date	Legal meaning
Administrative placement decision	3.9.2024	Decision on institutional placement in Denmark

Step	Documented date	Legal meaning
The Court of First Instance of the Faroe Islands	25.9.2024	Temporary suspension after a specific assessment
Østre Landsret	18.3.2025	The suspension was lifted on the basis of an assumed absolute prohibition;
Højesteret	3.11.2025	High Court order annulled; issue remitted for specific assessment

There were **426 calendar days** from the administrative decision to Højesteret's order and **230 calendar days** from the high court's order to Højesteret's correction. From first-instance interim protection to Højesteret there were **404 days**. The calculation is the difference between dates without including both endpoints. It shows review time; the order does not document that the child was physically separated from the parents on all those days. Højesteret's remittal is also not evidence of later return home or a final decision granting suspensive effect. The subsequent high-court order and actual residence dates are necessary to count this individual case as a quantified loss through separation.

The evidence chain and the specific deviation

The child's statement, reproduced in the original case, includes six relocations, of which four in the last two years, and a wish to remain in the improved current situation. The information is counted as: **the child's rerepresented statement;**. It is not an independent document-controlled relocation package in this national review. The original order also reproduces school information on improved development and the first court's assessment that an acute relocation was not necessary. The risk of a Danish institution included the fact that the child did not speak Danish. Arguments on psychiatric risk are included in the manufacture of the parties; they are not to be converted into independent medical findings from: Højesteret. [HG01, p.2-7]

The national court's specific legal statement was that Article 64 of the Faroese Barnavodar Act cut the suspensive effect. Højesteret The Court held that that provision did not exclude the right of the court under the Code of Procedure of the Faroe Islands, Section 517 (3), to grant suspensive effect exceptionally. That is why the national court had to make the specific assessment. The case concerns Faroese social legislation and Danish law in the Faroe Islands; it may not be used as an interpretation of all provisions of the child's law for municipalities in Denmark. The established legal principle in this context is that the relevant access to temporary protection should not be excluded by the categorical interpretation of the national law. [HG01, p.9-10]

Significance for outcomes: The specific assessment of risk, the child’s current situation and the consequences of intervention was delayed by the incorrect legal exclusion. **Responsibility and demands:** The Supreme Court order documents the legal error and the necessary fresh consideration. It does not establish personal disciplinary culpability, criminal punishment or a specific compensation amount. The strongest documented demand is a prompt, genuine, reasoned decision on interim protection, together with production of the subsequent decision and actual event dates if loss is to be calculated. The substantive placement decision still requires independent review.

Procesbevillingsnævnet's public account states leave granted on 8. May 2025 and publication the following day. The registration supports the review chain, but is not an additional remittal or a new child. [HG02]

C-5-99:remittal for reconsideration may occur after return home

The Board of Appeal's decision of principle C-5-99 concerns a historical course outside the twenty-year period of the report. It is used here as **legal and conceptual explanations;**, not as a case in the count 2006-2025. Legal information shall indicate the decision as applicable at the time of the verification 7 October 2026. The then paragraph numbers must not be referred to as current provisions of the child's law. [HG03]

The original two-page decision describes a boy placed in care from 1995. The Children and Young People Committee decided on continued placement on 19. August 1998. The municipality moved him from an institution to a foster family without his mother’s consent. When Ankestyrelsen considered the case, the boy had already been home for approximately three weeks with municipal assistance. Ankestyrelsen annulled the continued-placement decision and remitted the question of relevant assistance and support for a new decision. There was to be, among other things, a relevant offer of psychotherapeutic treatment. [HG03,s. 1-2]

This case includes both an **annulment** and a **remittal**, but the remittal concerned future support after the child had actually returned home. A statistical registration as remittal therefore cannot, on its own, determine whether physical separation continued. The necessary rights-oriented account also includes missing support after

The return. The original does not provide the exact dates necessary for a day-by-day calculation of the entire period of placement; no such duration shall be constructed.

The time rules shall be tested against each day of continued action;

The controlled provisions of the child's law allow for a period of return of up to six months and a period of seven days for the decision on the request for termination of a voluntary placement. The two rules are different. Six months is not an automatic minimum period and the seven-day period is not always a guarantee of physical return on the seventh day. The decision, period and concrete basis must be presented. Complaints against children and decisions of the Youth Committee do not, as a matter of principle, have suspensory effect, but there is an exemption and subsequent judicial review. [R08, § 100,102,146-148]

The legal departure must be located: If a voluntary placement continues without valid consent, without a lawful return-home decision or without another valid decision, the basis for continuation must be examined for the specific period. If the decision has only a documented procedural error, its validity, the error's significance and any independent violation of procedural rights must be examined. If the basis ceases through being set aside, actual continuation must be investigated anew. A later decision does not change past events or remove losses already suffered.

Absence of automatic suspensive effect must not be described as **criminal immunity**. It allows a decision to be implemented while under review and may thereby create a period in which the citizen bears the actual consequences before the error is clarified. Precisely for this reason, the responsibility inquiry must examine knowledge of the missing basis, breached safeguards, management instructions, failure to respond to complaints and omissions after documented error. The Liability for Damages Act's limitation of personal employee liability is a separate form of financial protection. It must not be rewritten as legality of the intervention or extinction of the State's responsibility. [R05; R11]

What the family can actually lose in the waiting period

Physical distance, reduced hours of visiting, cancelled visits, transport, loss of daily care, school and language environments, as well as stress on repeated relocations are concrete consequences. They must be registered next to the processing time. A figure of waiting time cannot in itself prove each of these losses, but the absence of national interconnection must not be used to prove that the losses do not exist.

The ECtHR's Grand Chamber in *Strand Lobben* links Article 8 to active efforts towards reunification as soon as practically possible and an obligation that increases over time. Authorities' own restrictions of contact or slow processing must not become an unchecked link in reasoning that family ties are now weakened. For every such argument, the origin of the alleged weakening must be investigated: Which contact decisions were made, who implemented them, which opportunities were refused, and when? [R09, §§205 and208]

Specific requirements for the national statement of time

The municipalities, Ankestyrelsen and Danmarks Statistik must be able to delimit annual cohorts with original decision ID, complaint ID and pseudonymised person coupling. The time fields shall include at least the initial decision, actual move, appeal, reassessment, external decision, new municipal decision, actual cessation and actual return. Changes in circumstances and the reasons for continued intervention must be attributable to the same periods. Existing registrations and a documented explanation are requested if the fields do not exist. The report does not claim that all this information is already in a common national register.

Statement	Required denominator	Counter and Outcome
Time for remittal for reconsideration	All relevant reality decisions in a clearly defined annual cohort	Remitted cases with actual dates; amended and affirmed cases separately
Time after remittal for reconsideration	All remitted cases in the same cohort, including those not yet concluded	New decision, continued intervention, termination, new complaint and lack of follow-up
Actual separation	Children with documented movement and start / end date	Days, relationships, reunification; progress separately
Time without valid basis	Individual procedures with established legal consequences	The documented illegal period; not automatically the entire placement

Statement	Required denominator	Counter and Outcome
Parents' touch	Documented parents and actual rights / care relationship	No automatic multiplication of the child count by two

The central criticism concerns both the documented legal exclusion in the specific Supreme Court case and the review system's insufficient basis for calculating total intervention time in national statistics. The national figure must not be invented. The demand to produce the linkage, make corrections effective and secure rapid redress can be stated precisely without it.

Children's contact, freedom and actual repatriation: three documented progress of the authority;

BK01. Illegal control of a boy's communications

Conclusion: The residential facility and municipality contributed to interference with a boy in care's privacy and contact without the necessary decision from the Children and Young People Committee. The boy thereby lost both confidentiality and special opportunities to obtain review. This is a specific deficiency in competence and legal authority for communication monitoring. It must be recorded independently even if the placement decision otherwise remains in force. [BK-K01, pp.1-15]

What the original document chain shows

FOB 2018-26 of 4 July 2018 concerns a boy who was 14-15 years of age in 2015-2016. The residence B was private; the responsibility of the municipality is reflected in its own notes and orders. A private supplier does not make the act of the municipality a purely private relationship.

Documented impact	Initial document referred to in the opinion	Meaning of proof
7 June 2015; received by the Municipality of 8 June	diary note with details from the boy's Skype communication	The municipality's knowledge can be traced back beyond its later explanation
9 September 2015	The municipality's telephone note about the location's access to the boy's phone without his knowledge	Direct evidence of municipal knowledge of hidden access
11 and 16 September 2015	The municipality's request for the content of the communication and the delivery of the contact printouts by the place of stay	The municipality was active recipient and ordering
21 September 2015	New detailed note on Skype contact with the former foster mother	A further documented reduction in controls
6 January 2016	The case handler's desire for proof of contact; subsequent screenshots	The active participation of the municipality continued
16 February 2016	Place of residence information to the boy about limited control	The information did not cover the hidden copying and transmission; it does not document informed consent
29. May 2016	Latest documented material from the check	End point of the rebates shown; exact date of harvest has not been proven

The Ombudsman also reviews information about checking letters and about the boy's anger about getting messages read. The opinion is based on simultaneous documents reproduced in the file. The report has checked the entire 15 pages of the opinion, but has not received the complete original file systems of the municipality and the place of residence.

The Authority's statement tested against its own documents

In fact, the municipality's first statement of 21 December 2017 rejected the fact that the material provided the basis for its involvement. In its opinion of 16 February 2018, the Municipality recognised, inter alia, involvement in Skype and e-mail control, but sought to delimit its role at images and time. The Ombudsman's verification shows that the simultaneous notes were of greater value than the later narrow description. The first initiator of all control actions has not been identified; it does not change the documented municipal orders and arrivals. [BK-K01, p.8-15]

Rule, deviation and actual follow-up

Paragraph 123 (2) of the service law at the time laid down the special competence of children and the youth committee. The place of stay and the municipality could not replace the required decision with their own discretion or the consent of the child or parents. The Ombudsman's opinion describes that the unlawful approach also removed guarantees, such as legal assistance, access to documents, access to the hearing, necessity and delimitation of the period and judicial review. [BK-K01, p.11- 14]

The concrete consequence was that the child's private contact was read, documented and surrendered without the legal decision-making process. There is no need for a subsequent psychiatric diagnosis to document this private life loss. Furthermore, whether the illegally collected communication has an impact on contact or other decisions requires comparison with subsequent original decisions.

From 7 June 2015 to 29 May 2016, there are 357 calendar days between the discounts shown. From the direct telephone note 9 September 2015 to 29 May 2016, there are 263 days. The figures are own date calculations; they are **not** evidence of daily uninterrupted checks throughout the period. From the first showed discounts to the opinion 4. July 2018 went 1.123 days. The time of the course of control and the time of the course of supervision are different.

Responsibility and comparison with private individuals

The sustainable track of responsibility is the municipality's own actions, the execution of the place of residence and the identifiable duties and management stages. The Ombudsman informed, inter alia, the Parliamentary Committee on Legal Affairs, the Ministry, the Municipal Council and the Social Security Authority of the South. Information on changed workflows is reaction information; they do not document compensation for the boy or punishment for a particular employee.

A private individual's unauthorised access to another person's communications may fall under section 263 of the Criminal Code where the relevant elements of the offence are met. In the 2014 statutory text checked, subsection 1 provided a fine or imprisonment for up to 6 months, unauthorised access to information systems under subsection 2 up to 1 year and 6 months, and particularly aggravating circumstances under subsection 3 up to 6 years. These are different forms of offence, not one standard sentence for reading a child's message. The specific act, statutory version and culpability must be examined. Public employees are not generally exempt from this criminal provision. The material checked documents no criminal conviction concerning these particular acts. [BK-K04,§263]

Specific demand: Disclose the full communication, commissioning and access chain, identify its use in later decisions, examine rectification and erasure under the appropriate rule, and make a separate decision on individual redress and responsibility. The unlawful surveillance must not be hidden within overall placement statistics.

BK02. Egely: incarceration and a presumption of authority without proof

Conclusion: Two examined interior locks in young people's rooms did not have the required legal basis. At the same time, the region's acceptance was based on a crucial factual condition which the reports did not substantiate. It is both an intervention problem and a problem in the proof test of the control. [BK-K02, printed p.35-40; physical p. 36-41]

The Ombudsman's follow-up of 12. April 2011 followed the inspection on 12. December 2007 and main report of 14. April 2010. Two use-of-force reports stated respectively 5 and 15 minutes for the complete interventions. The times include taking the person to the room and, in the second case, restraint and locking in. They are not precise separate measurements of how long the door was locked.

The Region of Southern Denmark accepted door locking as an emergency guard provided that an employee was with the young person. In its letter of 23 January 2008, the region acknowledged that this was not apparent from the notification. The Ombudsman criticised the fact that the region had taken a decision without examining this crucial fact. The subsequent reference by the institution to the opinion of the region did not provide any new independent evidence. This is a concrete example of how

the institution's and the supervisory authority's references to each other shall not be read as two independent endorsements. [BK-K02, printed p.36-37]

The Ministry of Social Affairs' opinion of 26. October 2010 clarified that there was no legal authority to lock children and young people in their rooms in secure units outside the special night-time arrangement. The special rules on isolation rooms could not provide legal authority for the room confinement in question. The Ministry considered both instances unlawful use of force. Placement in a secure institution therefore does not remove the right to separate review of the lawfulness of further confinement. [BK-K02, printed pp.38-39]

The displayed source documents **two instances of intervention**. It does not identify whether two different young people were involved. Egely's 129 placement sequences in 2008 and 117 in 2009 are the institution's other activity data, not the number of unlawful interventions. The corresponding 8.237 and 7.984 days of stay and averages of 64 and 68 days describe the entire activity series and cannot be added to the two uses of force. [BK-K02, section on length of stay]

It took 1.217 days from the inspection to the follow-up report. It is supervisory time; the examined interior locks did not last for 1.217 days. The source does not document an individual penalty or compensation paid for the two cases.

Responsibilities and requirements: The action of the executing institution, the decision of the region on an unpaid basis and the subsequent follow-up shall be recorded separately. Retrieve both original alerts, the duration of the door locking and subsequent liability decisions. Comparison with a private person's deprivation of liberty requires the actual stages of action and guilt in Section 261; there is no basis for transforming the finding of the supervisory authority into a claim for a specific automatic prison sentence.

BK03. Randers: return without the statutory guarantees

Conclusion: All four controlled repatriation cases had shortcomings in both the previous action plan and the child interview. The three children over 12 years of age were not given the decision in due time in the manner required, according to the documentation examined. Two decisions for parents were insufficiently justified. The documented return error must be included alongside removal and continued placement errors. [BK-K03, p.1-36]

The entire sample and the correct denominator

Randers reported 12 return-home decisions from 1. January to 1. June 2017:6 from an institution,4 from kinship/network foster care and 2 from a foster family. The Ombudsman selected four cases, A-D. A and B had been placed without consent; C and D with consent. The investigation covers the four selected cases, not a legality review of all 12. Both cases without consent were included in the sample. The sample's composition must be preserved when communicating the results. [BK-K03, pp.3-5 and annex]

Controlled deficiency	Number	Actual population	Cosmetic count
Action plan not revised in due time with focus on repatriation	4	A-D	Same four kids as next row.
No sufficiently documented child interview about imminent return	4	A-D	Do not add as four new children
Decision not correctly notified to the child before return	3	A, B, D; all over 12 years	Subset of the four
Insufficient justification for parents	2	A and D	Subset, not new cases
Lack of information for children and the Youth Committee	1	A; the sample included 2 children in compulsory placements	B's committee was informed

The above outcomes include four investigated cases with overlapping errors. There are not 14 different children who have failed by adding 4 + 4 + 3 + 2 + 1. The decision on D also included her sister. The material thus refers to at least five children concerned, but the sister's own case was not examined as a fifth sample case. The precise unique number of parents has not been published; four children's cases are not automatically converted into eight parents.

Actual return and subsequent dates of proceedings

Child	Actual return to: it controlled docutato n	Other crucial dates	Documented meaning of time
A	10 January 2017	Written decision 26 January; plan revised 28 February but not forwarded; plan received 27 May	16 days from actual return to the written decision; the plan reference in the decision did not give sufficient reasons;
B	23 January 2017	The first survey by the municipality indicated 1 March; the plan was subsequently recognized 1 March; Ankestyrelsen 30 October 2017 immediately imposed aid	37 days difference between first review date and corrected actual date; this difference shall not be used to prolong the separation;
C	1 June 2017	Application by the mother 21 February; decision 22 February; interview 14 June; revised plan 26 June	100 days from application to return; interview 13 past days and schedule 25 days after return
D	31 January 2017	Decision 12 January; earlier Decision 14 December 2016 sought to indicate period 25 May to 31 October 2016 retroactively	19 days from the date of the new decision until the date of return; the retroactive decision was not effective and does not document a return in May;

The Ombudsman's text calls the interview 14 June 14 days after 1 June. The 13 days of the report are common date subtraction without including counting. The difference is indicated rather than hiding it. The 100 days in C's course are not automatically 100 illegal separation days; the legality of the period of return itself is a separate test point. [BK-K03, p.6-12 and 26-35]

There are also different original dates for placing in B's material: the inventory refers to 13 February 2015, while the later case description indicates a first placing in January 2014. This information may relate to different stages during a longer period. Therefore, the report does not calculate an overall uninterrupted separation from February 2015 alone.

Actual aid following the Office's request to act immediately

Ankestyrelsen the decision of 30 October 2017 to immediately launch psychological examination / assistance, permanent contact person and family-led support during B's course. The municipality's subsequent response gives mentors and family-oriented action launched 20 November and psychological assistance 24 November. It is 21 and 25 calendar days after the order, respectively. From the actual return, there were 301 and 305 days for these operations. The final figures are not proof that any other aid was lacking for the whole period; they measure the time of the specifically declared bets. [BK-K03, p.28-29 and 33]

The municipality states that the mentor and family-focused intervention ended on 23. February 2018 and that its purpose was not achieved. It explains this by a lack of cooperation from B and her mother. That is the municipality’s explanation, not an independently verified finding of their fault. For a causal assessment, it must be compared with the information given to B about the support, its late initiation, the intervention’s content and the family as actual participants. The opinion does not document that the original case-handling deficiencies were thereby immaterial.

The record as proof, not automatic fact

A meeting in B's case is in the journal dated 1 January 2017, but the note was created on 1 March. The municipality itself declared uncertainty about the date of the meeting and assumed that it took place around the clearing of 10 January. The date of 1 January cannot therefore be used as a secure simultaneous proof of timely involvement. [BK-K03, p.32]

According to the municipality's own post-control, D's allegedly updated plan of 14 December 2016 had the same content as the September 2015 plan; only the consultant's signature had changed. A new date of the document was thus not a documented new material assessment. [BK-K03, p.30]

The municipality's statement that the decisions were sufficiently informed at a general level does not replace the specific statutory guarantees. The Ombudsman maintained his serious criticism, although the municipality announced changed working practices. His decision not to carry out any more is an end to the investigation; it is not an acquittal of the errors found or proof of individual repair. [BK-K03, p.21-24]

Rules, responsibilities and specific requirements

Clauses 46,48 and 68 of the Services Act at the time required involvement, relevant conversations and legal decision on return and period; Clause 140 (7) required a plan of action on repatriation. The relevant rules on notification and complaint, as well as Sections 22- 25 of the Administrative Act, ensured the possibility of understanding and testing the decision. The point of criticism must be taken from the particular lack of action to the particular loss of the guarantee. It must not be converted into a finding that all four children should have been placed longer or not have been placed at all.

Demand: Publish an anonymised date/implementation account for the 12 decisions; produce missing original plans and corrections in the case record; examine support and reparation in the specific cases affected by errors; identify management responsibility for ensuring that new dates, standard references and declared changes were not confused with actually fulfilled safeguards. Individual criminal responsibility requires further investigation of specific duty and culpability. This opinion documents no criminal decision.

19. The case of instruction: separation, time and jurisdiction

An unlawful decision may take effect long after the instruction is amended;

The Court of Impeachment's judgment of 13. December 2021 makes it possible to link an established unlawful public scheme with specific families, separation dates and subsequent handling. The original instruction was changed on 18. March 2016. Separations already carried out continued without renewed assessment, and cases were only reopened on 28. April 2016 for consultation with the parties. Thus,**41 calendar days elapsed from the change to reopening**. A corrected instruction was not in itself redress for the people already separated. [IF01, p.142]

The court's majority found violations of ECHR Article 8 and general administrative-law principles in decisions separating **18 couples** during 10. February-18. March 2016. This included missing individual assessment and insufficient fact-finding. For **at least three couples, nos.6,12 and 15**, the majority also found a substantive violation: on the available material, these couples could not lawfully have been separated even if procedural rules had been followed. These are independently documented violations, not dependent on a calculated error percentage. [IF01, pp.138-141]

Three populations should be distinguished: **24 pairs in the overall table of the judgment; 18 pairs in the majority assessment of decisions under the initial instruction; at least three pairs with the material expressly established; infringement;**. The three groups must not be merged. A previous mention of 32 pairs is also not a substitute for the judgment's limited table of actually separate pairs.

All 24 courses in the judgment schedule

The daily figures below represent the judgment's own duration column. The nature of the end point is crucial: the transition to integration and departure is not necessarily evidence of actual reunification. A dash in the original is retained as unknown duration; it is not zero days. The table provides evidence of the progress made, not an individual judgment that the entire period was unlawful. [IF01, p.112-116]

Number of pairs	Actual separated	Registered end point	Days in the judgment; table	Children / Pregnancy in the table;	What the end point documents
1	18.02.2016	03.10.2016	228	None specified	Transition to integration; continued separation decided in July
2	16.02.2016	30.06.2016	135	None specified	Transition to integration
3	18.02.2016	25.05.2016	97	None specified	Together accommodated after changed age setting
4	17.02.2016	27.04.2016	70	None specified	Together accommodated after changed age setting
5	18.02.2016	Request for continued separation in July	Unknown	None specified	Later wish; no precise duration in the original
6	16.02.2016	30.07.2016	165	Pregnancy, probably from March	Women's transition to integration; men's about one month earlier
7	16.02.2016	19.05.2016	93	None specified	Together accommodated after 18th birthday
8	31.01.2016	Request for continued separation in June	Unknown	None specified	Separation before instruction; continued after 15th birthday
9	16.02.2016	01.05.2016	75	Pregnant	Transition to integration

Number of pairs	Actual separated	Registered end point	Days in the judgment; table	Children / Pregnancy in the table;	What the end point documents
10	19.02.2016	10.05.2016	81	None specified	Together accommodated after 18th birthday
11	04.03.2016	23.05.2016	80	One child, born 2015	Together accommodated after 18th birthday
12	04.03.2016	07.07.2016	125	One child, born 2015; pregnant	Transition to integration
13	02.03.2016	13.10.2016	225	One child, born 2015	Together after further consultation; continued separation decided in July
14	02.03.2016	14.07.2016	134	Pregnant	Together accommodation after consultation
15	17.03.2016	11.07.2016	116	One child, born 2014	Together accommodation after consultation
16	11.03.2016	12.07.2016	123	Pregnant	Together accommodation after consultation
17	07.03.2016	11.07.2016	126	Pregnant	Together accommodation after consultation
18	01.04.2016	23.08.2016	144	None specified	Exit; continued separation decided in July
19	17.11.2015	01.05.2016	Unknown	Pregnant	Transition to integration; later cohabitation explicitly unknown
20	13.05.2016	03.11.2016	174	None specified	Together after further consultation; continued separation decided in July
21	29.06.2016	02.11.2016	126	None specified	Together after further consultation; continued separation decided in July
22	20.07.2016	16.08.2016	27	None specified	Together accommodated after 18th birthday
23	15.08.2016	22.08.2016	7	Pregnant	Together accommodation after consultation
24	19.04.2016	11.11.2016	206	One child, born 2016	Together according to the wishes of the woman; original request in anticipation of compulsory separation

The 21 given durations have a span of **7-228 days**. The three undisclosed durations may not be completed by guessing an end date. The five registered common children are found in pairs 11,12,13,15 and 24. Eight pairs have indicated pregnancy: 6,9,12,14,16,17,19 and 23. Par 12 belongs to both categories. There is therefore a need for **12 pairs with child and / or pregnancy;**Not 13. The 24 pairs include 48 partners; the five already born children provide at least 53 people described in the family population of the form. These are not 53 court-determined offenses. Later births are not counted without birth and time information.

Age and consent must be checked in each course. Pairs 3 and 4 changed the age of the woman to 18 and 19, respectively. There are also other changes in age levels. A later desire for continued separation does not prove that the original separation was desired. Par 24 specifically shows the problem: the desire to learn to fend for themselves was explained in the expectation that the authorities would nevertheless separate the couple. It requires an independent review of whether consent or wish was free and informed. [IF01, p.113- 116]

Three materially illegal interventions with concrete time and impact chain

Progress	Documented knowledge before / during the intervention;	Later treatment	Consistency and precise evidence status
Par 6	Complaint 15 February with announced hunger strike, school absenteeism and possible self-harm; separation 16 February, approximately 60 km between centres	22 March men were told of fear of health and depression; 26 May women were considered to be accompanied by men; various dates of integration 27 June / 30 July	165 days in the form; information on serious burdens consists of documented statements in the judgment's account of the facts, not an independently verified diagnosis
Par 12	Child born 2015 and pregnancy; Operator's Schedule 22 February described the risk of crisis action, falling well-being and retaumatisation; complaint 26 February described ongoing psychological treatment and support needs	The father moved 4 March, about 8 km; consultation 20 June; accompanying assessment 21 June; integration 7 July	125 days in the schedule. The child lost daily life with the father. The paragraph of the judgment on material infringement has been verified; the risk indication is not proof that any damage was caused
Par 15	Local Social Coordinator on 1 March described joint childcare, lack of support networks and risk of traumatisation; the couple did not want separation	Father moved 17 March, approx. 37 km; first stated renewed hearing 17 June; decision on common accommodation 6 July; physically together 11 July	116 days of registered separation; 5 days from the reunification decision to actual common accommodation. The woman was still under 18 at the reunion

Source chain: simultaneous forms, complaints, interviews and decisions reproduced in the original case-law p.116-118 → Independent controlled material grounds p.139 → This report's time and impact assessment. The underlying original forms and clinical files are not identical to the reproduction of the judgment. Therefore, the report does not use the reproduction as an automatic proof of all the psychological damage referred to. On the other hand, it documents that such information was provided and that the court found the separation itself to be materially contrary to the Convention.

For couple 15, there were **92 days from physical separation to the stated hearing on 17. June**, then 19 days to the decision on 6. July and another 5 days until actual shared accommodation. For couple 12, there were 108 days from 4. March to the hearing on 20. June. For couple 6, there were 65 days from the accompanying-person assessment on 26. May to the woman's integration date on 30. July; this calculation must not be called 65 days from a return-home decision to reunification, since the two events are not documented as such. All calculations are calendar differences excluding the starting day.

Responsibilities cannot be read out of the administrative end date

The conclusion is that there is a specific public example of **intentional unlawful administration of separation**, and that changing the general instruction did not immediately remove its effect on the separated families. The evidence is the original judgment's 18 decisions, at least three substantive violations and the documented waiting time. The relevant rule is ECHR Article 8 and § 5, subsection1 of the Ministerial Responsibility Act. The act was an instruction allowing no exceptions; the omission was the lack of individual examination at the intervention. The departure consisted in the established unlawful administration. The consequence was separation and loss of daily family life. The Court of Impeachment established personal ministerial responsibility and 60 days' immediate imprisonment. Citizens' claims for redress and any reparation must still be assessed separately; the Minister's punishment must not be counted as compensation to the families. [IF01, pp.138-149]

The period of personal culpability established by the Court of Impeachment ended on 18. March 2016. That date is **not a determination that all subsequent days of separation were lawful**. Page142 of the judgment specifically describes continued separation without a new assessment. Personal ministerial responsibility, the agency's duty to act and State responsibility are different examinations. The report must therefore preserve the later actual intervention periods even where the particular Minister has not been convicted in respect of them.

Combining with private abduction cases

The sentencing practice concerning private persons in chapter 9 includes 20 days' suspended imprisonment for withholding two children for approximately1½hours,40 days' suspended imprisonment with community service for 33 days and 6 months, of which 3 suspended, for almost 10 months. Compared with the Court of Impeachment's 60 days' immediate imprisonment, the material shows that both private and public interventions may lead to personal criminal liability. The private cases mentioned are summarised in the Director of Public Prosecutions' practice overview, while the Court of Impeachment's judgment has been read in the original. [R06; IF01]

A penalty per day of separation cannot be legally calculated by this row. The content of the offence, the guilt, the duration, the situation of the children, the injury, the relationship, other offences and the length of the criminal proceedings are not the same. The concrete

comparison shall instead check: who removed or detained the child / family member; what right was missing; when the person knew or should know; how long the intervention continued; what circumstances were investigated; and what decision was taken by the competent forum.

The strong accountability demand is **consistent investigation of documented acts and duties**, including where the perpetrator acts through a public body. Protection against personal recourse claims, absence of suspensive effect and a supervisory recommendation do not provide legal authority for continuing intervention. If a public intervention continues after knowledge that its basis is missing, the new omission must be examined separately. A low or absent personal sanction does not, on its own, determine whether the citizen suffered a violation.

Mink: actual ex post liability assessment shall include:

The subsequent chain of responsibility changes what can be counted as a final personal sanction. The Head of Department of the Ministry of State received a disciplinary warning on 24 August 2022. The original decision of 23 March 2023 revokes the warning after a re-evaluation, which takes into account the report of the interrogator on the Chief of Police. It cannot therefore appear in a register as a continuing warning. [IF02, p.1-4]

The inquiry leadership's published part 8 of 10. February 2023 found no basis for disciplinary punishment of the National Commissioner of Police. Among other things, the report proceeded on the basis that the press-conference statements were not a legal instruction to the police and assessed his specific duties to act. This is a later disciplinary assessment in a delimited individual case; it is not a judgment that every culling, every actioncard or all authorities' communications were lawful. [IF03, sections8.1-8.3]

The Ministry of Justice’s original withdrawal decision concerning the Permanent Secretary likewise describes why the reprimand is not maintained. The Ministry’s statement of 24. March 2023 also reports withdrawal concerning a Head of Division. The account must preserve the original grounds for criticism, the initial response and the later outcome in three separate fields. [IF04; IF05]

The Danish Parliament’s report of 8. July 2022 is the subsequent parliamentary consideration and contains different majority and minority assessments. It must be read as such. It does not determine officials’ disciplinary cases, and political criticism must not be counted as a criminal conviction. [IF06, pp.1-2,21-27]

20. Tibet: rights, proof and responsibility

The result and the different responsibilities

The Tibet movement demonstrates that public servants used police force to prevent peaceful political expression without the necessary legal basis. Tibetan Commission I denotes concrete orders and actions in 2012 and 2013 as clearly illegal and identifies incorrect or misleading information to the Danish Parliament. The Tibetan Commission II alters the assessment of the role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and of PET in particular because it receives material that the first Commission had not received. The final sentence of 2025 concerns the false explanations of two police officers in court in 2013. It is not an overall criminal sentence against all interventions, employees or ministers. [TB01, TB02, TB04]

For citizens, the violations consist of removed flags, relocation, screening and obstruction of visible demonstration at the relevant time. A demonstration possible only after the foreign delegation's departure does not restore the lost opportunity for expression. Subsequent commission criticism and a suspended sentence therefore document different responses; they do not in themselves prove full redress for each affected citizen.

What original evidence changed the case?

Search the chain	Original documentation and locator	Documented meaning
General order in 2012	Tibet I, Volume 2, printed pp. 352-353: Operation Command, Tactical Command and Briefing, compared with the actual interventions	Visibility of the Chinese delegation was targeted without any concrete hazard assessment; the Commission considers that there is no legal basis and a breach of freedom of expression and assembly.
Specific interventions in 2013	See also, p. 353 and 371-372, for Avedøreværket, Rigsdagsgården and Amalienborg.	Absence of a general written order for the entire visit does not make the specific foreclosure orders legal
Information to the Danish Parliament	See also, p. 354-355: identified questions and presentations in 2012-2015	Some answers repeat previous misinformation. The number of repetitions is not the number of independent proofs
Role of the Minister for Foreign Affairs	Tibet II, Volume 2, p. 1110-1118, including mails from 2009 and Claus Grubes mail of 12 June 2012	Commission II rejects the previously limited description of the role of the Ministry. In its view, trade and diplomatic considerations were overruled by the Constitution and the Treaty on European Union. EMRK
Role of PET	The same, p. 1118 - 1121, including the minutes of Tuesday meetings and briefings	Material missing by the first Commission supports the dissemination of wishes to avoid demonstrations and loss of reputation; PET recommendations were perceived in police work as orders
Kim Lykke Østergaard's knowledge	1125- 1128, read in conjunction with Tibet I, p. 365- 366	The assessment of the first Commission is amended with the later material, including a relationship from 2004 and an email dated 24 May 2013. This is a different assessment of evidence, not a new criminal conviction.
False explanation	Østre Landsret 29 October 2025, p. 18-21, S-3118- 23	The court compares witness statements with surgical material and audio / video; two defendants are sentenced for certain statements, while other parts are dismissed.

The underlying emails, plans and recordings are discussed here through the commissions' and judgment's documentation. The report does not claim independently to have verified all raw recordings or every annex. On these points, independent verification consists of reading the original reports' responsibility assessments and the full original High Court judgment, and checking whether the result, scope and later changes are reproduced correctly.

The chain of incorrect information of the first investigation

Tibet I identifies on pages 354- 355 parts of answers to questions 865, 875- 880 and BL-BN from August 2012, question 1119 from October 2012, ministerial statement of 26 June 2013, questions 650, AC, 864- 865 and 868 from April 2014, questions 866 and 914-916 from December 2014, and the briefing of 18 September 2015 as incorrect, misleading or incomplete. The 2013visit highlights questions 895 and 956 as well as BI-BL. These are concrete references to documents, not an allegation that all the information contained in each reply was false.

The Commission's examination of the case on p. 362 also shows delayed investigation of already available material: Central audio files were only examined in the summer of 2015 following the national court's opinion of 29 April 2015. Material on golf vehicles was not included in the briefing to the Ministry of Justice and, following a request in February 2014, only two of three relevant persons from the King's Garden were identified in February 2015. These are concrete omissions in the information of the case, which extend the gap between intervention and responsibility.

On the other hand, p. 358 and 360 contain the first Commission's premise that the Ministry of Justice and the State Police could, as a starting point, rely on police contributions. This paragraph is reproduced as the Commission's assessment; it is not used as an independent presumption of truth in this report. When information runs from the executing police force through the State Police and the Ministry of Justice to the Folketing, the source remains the same. More official reproductions of information do not create more independent evidence.

Study number two: documents were not necessarily gone simply because they were not delivered

The final control by the Commission II describes the following on printed pages 99 to 102 of Volume 1:

- The State Department's recovery database contained additional relevant employees' mailboxes, which were subsequently provided.
- A relevant mailbox from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was overlooked due to a spelling error in the name; the extradition was corrected.
- The National Police had indicated that 87 former employees' accounts were not available in an external mail system. The checks showed that the search required the email addresses of the persons concerned. When Johan Reimann's address was delivered, correspondence could be found. A typo error had also hidden Kim Lykke Østergaard's correspondence.
- A further 54 of the 87 employees were obtained and 15 of them had mail accounts which were provided. The Commission did not find any evidence of interest in these later correspondence. This does not alter the documented error in the previous search.

Figures 87, 54 and 15 are staff / search units with overlapping, not citizens with established rights breaches. They must also not be added to 156 missing mailboxes. Thus, a statement of missing material must be tested against the search method and the systems actually available before it is treated as a documented deletion.

Volume 2, pp. 1137-1138, separately emphasises that central documents, especially Grube's email and Tuesday minutes, were unavailable to the first commission. Commission II finds retention rules insufficient to secure all relevant investigation material. This is documented criticism of evidence preservation. It does not, on its own, establish a proved allegation of intentional destruction by a named employee.

Personal liability and the specific limitations

Person or group	Tibet I / Tibet II	Actual documented reaction or delimitation
Claus Hjelm Olsen	I, p. 364- 365: liability assessment for clearly unlawful orders and knowingly incorrect information	The Commission I finds the basis for disciplinary responsibility; this is not a disciplinary decision itself.
Andrew Jerome Henrik Oryé	I, p. 369-370: clearly unlawful orders and incorrect contributions to reply	The same distinction between Commission assessment and actual response
Mogens Norup Lauridsen	I, p. 363-364; II, p. 1124- 1125	Criticism of strategic management and lack of correction; the Commission's graduated assessment of responsibilities must not be transformed into a judgment
Martin Bille Hermann	II, p. 1117 - 1118	New critique. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs decides on 1 April 2022 not to open a staff case; the source is the Ministry's own communication [TB06]
PET employee KF0796	II, p. 1120 - 1121	New basis for criticism. The originals in question do not in themselves document a subsequent disciplinary decision.
Kim Lykke Østergaard	II, p. 1125- 1128	Modified basis for criticism against I; separate final staff reaction must be documented before counting
Disciplinary officials	II, Volume 1, p. 39-40; Volume 2, p. 1137-1138	The Commission limits its individual judicial review. Lack of assessment is not material acquittal
Two indicted police officers	Final judgment of the Landgericht of 29 October 2025 [TB04]	Each 30 days of conditional prison for false testimony; some statements are dismissed

The Communication of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of 1 April 2022 states that Hermann was the only one of the collective referred to, who was still employed by the State. The Ministry decided, on its overall assessment, to waive a staff case and to continue to declare his trust in him. It documents an actual decision on no staff case. The confidence of the Ministry is not a new original proof that repeals the criticism of the Commission.

Commission II does not exclude the institutional responsibility of the State or the illegality of the specific measures by restricting the assessment of persons. It states that a possible criminal liability for the historical circumstances must be regarded as obsolete and that the course of time will have a disciplinary effect. There is no general statutory five-year period for all disciplinary responsibilities. The practice of age and resignation must therefore be described precisely, rather than as a general rule of immunity. [TB02 Volume 1, pp. 35-40]

The two types of criminal matter must be kept separate: the Commission's discussion of the limitation period relates to the acts and breaches of its obligations which it has a mandate to assess. The subsequent sentence concerns a false explanation in court on 13 August 2013 under Section 158 of the Criminal Code. The fact that a commission renounces an earlier assessment of liability does not prove that any subsequent conditions of indictment for another crime have lapsed.

The final sentence and the importance of the 12 years

The original judgment of 21 pages has been published in the judgment database as final. The court considers that the guard at Højbro Plads should be carried out even if no demonstrators ran towards the Palace Square. By explaining the decisive condition differently, the defendants gave false explanations. For one of the contested statements, the number of votes was 4-2; this was the proof of that particular statement. It is not transformed into uncertainty about all other documented conditions. [TB04, pp. 18-20]

The court rejects exemption from punishment under section 159, subsection 1, in the specific circumstances. This is particularly relevant to immunity: the judgment shows actual criminal review of public employees despite the very lengthy process. The court upholds 30 days' suspended imprisonment for each and states that the lengthy period before the district-court decision was already reflected in sentencing. The Treasury was ordered to pay district-court costs; the defendants must pay their own defence costs before the High Court. The judgment does not document service of an immediate prison sentence. [TB04, pp. 20-21]

Start and finish	Calculated calendar days	Unit and meaning
Actions June 15, 2012 → Tibet In December 18, 2017	2.012	Time for the first Commission report, not the duration of detention
Intervention 15. June 2012 → police compensation notice 18. April 2018	2.133	Time for the documented offer of reimbursement
Tibet In 18 December 2017 → publication of Tibet II 28 March 2022	1.561	Additional study time after first result
Action 15 June 2012 → public surrender of Tibet II 28 March 2022	3.573	Almost ten years for the extended documented assessment
Tibet II 28 March 2022 → Parliamentary report 17 May 2023	415	Time for the political treatment of missing material, among others
False explanation August 13, 2013 → Final national court judgment October 29, 2025	4.460	More than twelve years for the documented final sentence
Urban judgment 1 November 2023 → National Court judgment 29 October 2025	728	Calendar length of the proceedings

The date of 28 March 2022 shall be used here for the publication: the original notification by the Ministry of Justice indicates that the report is made on that day and the annexes to the Folketing have the same document date. On the other hand, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs's subsequent communication refers to a report of 25 March. This dating difference does not change months to years of delay, but the start / end definition is explicitly maintained. The figures are own date calculations with end date minus start date.

The Independent Police Complaints Authority’s investigation and the indictment are separate temporal links. Commission II, volume 1, pp. 46-47, describes cooperation and postponement of the criminal case after the commission’s work resumed. The prosecution service’s announcement of 28. April 2022 maintains the charges against two managers after the second report. The two announcements and the judgment are different procedural stages of the same sequence and must not be counted as three new criminal cases or six new perpetrators. [TB08]

Compensation: claim, offer and payment are three different numbers

The original message of the Copenhagen Police of 18 April 2018 states that eight people had made demands and that 20.000 DKK would be offered to each. For three, the Financial Committee was asked to waive the limitation period. The documented offer is calculated to be DKK 160.000 for eight people. The notification does not in itself demonstrate that all offers were accepted or the amounts paid. [TB07]

The reported number of eight is not a count of all demonstrators whose rights were violated. The commissions’ count of more than 200 official visits is likewise an investigation universe, not 200 documented unlawful interventions and not 200 compensation recipients. The second commission’s specific assessments of unlawfulness also include visits in 2002 and 2004, before this report’s twenty-year period. They are used as documented background to the culture and authorities’ knowledge but must not be counted as new interventions in 2006-2025. [TB02, pp. 1121-1124]

Commission II informs 108 interrogated or re-interrogated persons over 39 days of questioning. Protocol numbers with repeated interrogations are not a higher number of unique witnesses. On the basis of its own statement, the Commission did not call witnesses outside the authorities; a few citizens' inquiries were made in writing. It limits what direct citizen explanation this particular study contains. On the other hand, the later sentence also contains a demonstration's testimony. The boundaries of Commission II may not be transferred to the trial. [TB02, Volume 1, pp. 45-47; TB04, pp. 15-16]

Commission II’s recorded expenditure up to and including 31. December 2021 was 57.554.015 kr.: operations 33.750.428 kr., IT 14.141.329 kr. and assisting counsel 9.662.258 kr. The sum reconciles. It is not the commission’s final total cost in March 2022, does not automatically cover all authorities’ internal work and is not compensation to citizens. The institution’s investigation expenditure and victims’ redress must appear in separate accounts. [TB02, volume 1, pp. 103-104]

Treatment of the Folketing: a opt-out of further investigation

Report No 1 of 17 May 2023 demonstrates that the majority S, V and M did not wish to further examine why the first Commission lacked material. The majority referred, inter alia, to new procedures and to Commission II's discussion of the framework for personal responsibility. The minority wanted a further study, including of responsibility for missing material. [TB05]

It is a political decision on the continuation of the investigation. It is neither an individual acquittal nor an original reconstruction of who failed to deliver. The Commission's representation on pages 1132- 1137 of the reforms described by the ministries and the police document the authorities' own information on measures; it is not a fully independent measure of whether the recurrence risk has actually been eliminated.

Legal argument and concrete legal order

Conclusion: Unlawful screening from view and misleading information to oversight bodies require separate redress and scrutiny of responsibility; time taken may weaken both the citizen's remedy and subsequent personal accountability.

Consignment and original proof: The Commission's statements on legal security considerations and the absence of knowledge must be tested against operating commands, simultaneous mails and recordings. The documents identified changed the assessment of Commission II and the original judgment uses recordings and explanations for judgment.

Discrepancy: Keeping political messages out of delegation escorts' field of vision is not the specific risk assessment required by the legal powers of intervention. Repeating incorrect information through several authorities does not make it correct.

Rule: Sections 77 and 79 of the Constitution, ECHR Articles 10 and 11 and sections 7-8 of the Police Act protect the expression and assemblies concerned. Conditions for personal criminal responsibility and duties of office are examined separately. The State's duty of effective response and protection does not cease when an employee leaves.

Action and deviation: The police gave and performed clearly illegal orders. Deceptive contributions were subsequently made and relevant evidence was only obtained through a new investigation. Some aspects of personal responsibility were then limited by time and resignation; others actually led to punishment.

Consequence: Citizens lost their opportunity at the crucial time, while questions of investigation and responsibility spread over many years. The precise financial and health damage to each individual requires individual documentation; no national injury figures shall be recorded.

Responsibility and demands: Authorities should document all identified interventions, all amounts actually offered and paid, the reasons for each personnel response, expired opportunities for accountability, and independent verification of the preservation and handover of evidence. On a documented basis, the citizen’s specific claims may include acknowledgment of the violation, compensation/damages, access to information, correction of authority information and effective safeguards against recurrence. These claims are analytical legal consequences, not an assertion that everyone affected has already been awarded them.

21. Stateless: breach of the Convention and 14 years civil review;

The state-aid case demonstrates that a correction of a government practice may occur several years after the intervention and that a subsequent judgment may reject compensation on the grounds of limitation without thereby legalising the original breach of the Convention. The Commission's annexes to the case, its assessment of responsibilities, the Ministry's staff releases and the judgments must therefore be read as different levels of evidence. The case covers both children and young adults; the figures below are not an overall measure for all stateless persons who the State has failed.

Control of action accounts

Annex 18 to Statsløsekommissionen's report, volume 9, printed pp. 2993-2997, has been reviewed row by row. Several rows concern multiple children, while the same case number may have several refusals. The report's account therefore uses both individual decisions and distinct case numbers. The machine-readable annex statsloese-indgrebsregnskab.json contains year, case numbers, Convention category, later citizenship year and source reference; annual figures have not been converted into invented dates. [SL01]

Population and time	Number	What the number counts
Applications received 1992-25 January 2011	758	719 in the child column and 39 in the 1961st Convention column; applications, non-observed violations;
of which received 2006-25 January 2011	710	672 in the child column and 38 in the 1961Convention column
Rejection 1995-2010 in Annex 18	50	Personal decisions after multi-person series have been folded out
Different case numbers behind the 50 refusals	44	The same person's repeated refusal is counted once here
Refusal within 2006-2025	40	6 in 2007, 9 in 2008, 24 in 2009 and 1 in 2010; defined by year of refusal
Different case numbers behind the 40 refusal period	35	12 in the Convention on the Rights of the Child category and 23 in the 1961 Convention category
Personal decisions in the Convention classes of the period	12 + 28	Refusals under the Convention on the Rights of the Child + refusals under the 1961 Convention; not 40 different people
Delay without refusal received from 2006	5	Case numbers 52, 62, 65, 66 and 696; separate from the 35 refusal numbers
Union of the refusal and delay numbers of the period	40	35 + 5 without overlap in this Annex; not a National Offer Statement

The category of the Annex is not a full age distribution for each intervention. Some applications were submitted while the applicant was a child and the birth right was only granted after the age of 18. Colonial headlines and the Commission's text do not always use identical age designations. The two categories of Convention are therefore maintained as the categories of the source. Case 80 contains a separate security issue; the position in the non-contractual statement of refusal contained in the Annex is not in itself proof that the refusal was also clearly unlawful under national law. [SL01, SL02]

The five expressly quantified delays without refusal are respectively 18, 12, 3, 6 and 6 months: a total of **45 person-months**. This sums five people’s delays,rather than 45 months of one shared calendar timeline. Case 65 concerns a younger child whose processing was tied to the sister’s documentation issues;the sister is not invented as another separate victim in this accounting. The appendix also includes case 35 with six months’ delay in 2003-2004. It is retained in the historical appendix,but not in the 2006-2025 total. For the refusal group,the commission’s findings describe delays of six months to six years and an average of approximately 22 months. That average concerns the broader historical group and must not simply be applied to the 35 distinct refusal case numbers within the report period. [SL01, SL02, SL07, p. 8]

Resumption is not the same as actual birth right

The Commission's examination shows that the Authority's initial information on the clean-up did not cover the whole of the found sample. Of 44 previous refusals / counselling cases, 13 had already been resumed or completed with the right of birth before the clean-up in 2010. Of the remaining 31, 27 were resumed in 2010; 23 were actually introduced in December 2010, while four were only admitted later. A further four people were not contacted directly until 2011. **31 potential retake, 27 retake and 23 actual retake in December are three different stages.** [SL01, printed pp. 2736-2747]

In 2010, a total of 194 stateless persons were included in naturalisation bills:152 in the child group and 42 in the adult group. Of the 42, 26 had applied as minors. The 194 are not 194 documented compensation or reparation cases; the group also includes applications without earlier refusal. Likewise, the 35 persons in the separate naturalisation Act of December 2010 form a legislative group that cannot be added to the 194 or the 44 without person linkage. [SL01, printed pp. 2736-2747]

Case 696 shows that the clean-up did not immediately stop all the consequences. The Commission notes six months of further delay in 2010-2011. Old standard letters and documentation requirements continued to be used even after the practice had been corrected. Therefore, the requirement for declarations etc. cannot be described as a purely linguistic error when the proven result was later citizenship. [SL01, Annex 18 and printed pp. 2736-2747; SL06]

SL- K01: The ministerial decision continued the antiConvention practice

Conclusion → concrete statement → proof → deficiency. The Commission considered that it was decided to continue the treatment according to general naturalisation requirements, while a Nordic comparison was examined. Its reported notes and progress show that questions concerning the special rights of the stateless had been submitted to the Minister in 2008-2009. The wording of the warnings was changed during the internal presentation. The Commission considered that it was not certain that the Minister actually understood practice as a breach of the Convention at the relevant times. The local uncertainty about her knowledge does not rule out the Commission's finding that the practice was contrary to international law or that the decision contributed to its continuation. [SL01, printed pp. 2785-2796 and 2809-2813]

Rule → action → departure → consequence. Article 7 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the 1961 Convention's special rules for stateless people born in the territory limit the conditions the State may impose. The Ministry's continued application of ordinary requirements produced new refusals and delayed citizenship. Delayed entitlement to citizenship matters for identity, belonging, travel documents and full civic status. Loss of voting rights requires that the individual met the other electoral conditions during the relevant period; it is not automatically attributed to every child.

Responsibilities → requirements. The Commission's mandate did not include a legal assessment of ministers' responsibilities. The Folketing's report of 4 March 2016 subsequently contains serious political criticism from a majority, including of poor information to the Folketing and the cleanup. Political criticism is not a punishment. The long-term requirement is the full separation of the State's contractual liability, the conditions of the Minister's liability and the individual claims for compensation; the absence of a ministerial judgment cannot be used as evidence of legal interference by citizens. [SL06]

SL-K02: Warnings were weakened and employee responsibilities were delimited differently

Conclusion → statement → original proof. The Commission considered that Claes Nilas and Kim Lunding had demonstrated facts on the basis of which disciplinary responsibilities were assessed. The criticism of Nilas includes that he should have warned the Minister clearly and ensured evidence of the advice. The criticism of Lunding includes continued refusal after knowledge of the problem, suspension and inadequate follow-up, advice on continued general requirements and inadequate public guidance. The Commission links the management process with additional waiting time. [SL01, printed pp. 2809-2813 and 2822-2828]

In 2008, the Commission found nine refusals, five of them in the adult and four in the children's group, as negligent misconduct, but not serious enough for disciplinary proceedings. For 22 cases dealt with under the Ministerial Decision of 23 February 2009, individual service offences were not established on the basis assessed. The Commission's reasoning specifically related to the clarity of national law, the understanding of employees and the basis of the order. It is not a general rule of immunity and it does not annul the very practice of international law. [SL01, printed pp. 2787-2796]

Omission → meaning of the evidence. Several dismissed officials were not subject to individual liability assessment. According to the report, Dorit Hørlyck wanted to be assessed, but was nevertheless excluded from this track of responsibility following the Commission's delimitation. Absence of assessment shall be in the absence of assessment. It is neither an acquittal nor evidence of a sanction. Described acts can still be tested on the document basis without the report inventing a subsequent disciplinary outcome. [SL01, printed pp. 2787-2796]

Response → specific status. On 21. December 2015, the ministry announced it would take no further action against Nilas on the available basis; he took up an advisory post in SIRI on 1. January 2016. On 11. January 2016, the ministry announced corresponding closure for Lunding, who became an adviser in Udlændingestyrelsen. These are two verified decisions not to proceed, made by the employing authority. The public announcements do not document an independent disciplinary judgment or a punishment subsequently substituted for the commission's criticism. [SL03, SL04]

Time accounts: citizens' rights and the end of the track

Start and finish	Calendar days	What Time documents
4 August 2008 → 27 January 2010	541	Between the central stages of the decision and orientation process; not the same delay for each applicant
Proceedings 10 July 2012 → national court judgment 28 May 2025	4.705	Time for the first full judgment of the 33 applicants
Proceedings 10 July 2012 → Supreme Court judgment 21 August 2026	5.155	Time for the last appeal decision for the 22 who appealed
Report 17 August 2015 → Ministry of Finance for Nilas	126	Documented time for public staff closure
Report 17 August 2015 → Ministry of Finance for Lunding	147	Same for the other leader

The days are the report's own calendar calculations from dated sources. The 5.155 days are not 5.155 days without citizenship for every claimant. Several had received citizenship before proceedings began, but still awaited review of the compensation claim. The comparison shows that the two managers' public personnel tracks were closed within months of the commission report, while citizens' civil review reached its latest appeal decision only more than 14 years after proceedings began. [SL01, SL03, SL04, SL07, SL08]

The Commission pointed to the statute of limitations on the actions under investigation and discussed the importance of the past for disciplinary proceedings. It is a concrete time barrier, not a general criminal immunity for civil servants. The limitation period must be linked to the possible criminal offence and to the legal proceedings before it; the reference to the report of two years is not uncritically transferred to any present-day criminal offence. [SL01, printed pp. 2787-2796]

SL-K03: Civil judgments only remedy part of the documented course

The Eastern High Court judgment of 28. May 2025, BS-4484/2012-OLR, covers **33 claimants**. They are not 33 new Convention violations on top of the commission's cases. Another judgment mentioned in this judgment and the Supreme Court's 2018 annual report involved 17 other claimants: ten without an award on the delay ground, six awarded 10.000 kr. each and one whose claim was time-barred. The two litigation groups therefore comprise 50 distinct claimants according to the judgment's account of separate groups; links to the commission's 44 case numbers have not been published as a complete person key. [SL05; SL07, pp. 4, 124-129]

In 2025 claimants 3, 20 and 23 were each awarded 10.000 kr. with litigation interest from 23. November 2012. For nos. 3 and 23 the Ministry had offered the same principal sum on 6. December 2019. For no. 20 the high court established a delay based on application on 14. November 2008 and citizenship on 28. December 2010. Three awards amount to **30.000 kr. in principal**, not an account of all consequences. No party was ordered to pay another's costs in the high court. [SL07, pp. 126-129]

The court had mainly negotiated the case in 2021-2022, but it had to go back with new judges on the grounds of inequity. The court awarded its own affairs and the Ministry awarded DKK 50.000 from the Treasury in accordance with Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The applicants were not granted the same concession because the court referred to their legal process and to a lack of own costs at the time of the procedure. **Free process does not eliminate the extra years of waiting.** The 50.000 DKK is a legal cost response to the Ministry, not compensation for the people concerned. [SL07, p. 129]

The judgment of the Supreme Court of 21 August 2026, B-36329 / 2025 -HJR, comprises 22 applicants. It shall maintain the suspension of their further claims. The groups of the judgment shall be counted precisely:

Group in the appeal of the Supreme Court	Number	Facts of the judgment
Nos 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 21, 22 and 24	9	The Court of First Instance did not find any delay in relation to other applicants
Points 1, 2, 8 and 25	4	The Ministry had recognised that prior right of entry was possible; the requirements were rejected as obsolete
Nos 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19	9	Any claims were already out of date; not a positive finding of actual delay for all nine
Grants to the 22 of this appeal	0	No further compensation following the judgment of the Supreme Court

The Ministry's payment to the three successful claimants appears in Højesteret's reproduction of information supplied by the Ministry. This is a different level of documentation from independent payment records. Højesteret did not find the additional alleged violations of ECHR Articles 3, 8 and 14 and did not grant the claims concerning personal data or the application fee. The court ordered the Treasury to pay 100.000 kr. in appeal costs to the Ministry under legal aid; this is not recorded as a private debt of 100.000 kr. for each claimant. [SL08, pp. 1-7]

Review of the premises. The High Court assumed an ordinary processing time of 16 months to two years from the actual application, referring to earlier practice. The distinction between ordinary applicants and people with special Convention rights thereby became central. The High Court states that the ministry did not comply with the claimants' request of 5. November 2021 for comparative information, but found that this did not alter the outcome. Missing production is a specific evidential deficiency in the comparison basis. The report identifies it without rewriting the rejected discrimination claim as a judgment won. [SL07, pp. 124-128]

Consequence → responsibility → demand. Rejection of an acknowledged delay claim as time-barred cannot be presented as exoneration in respect of the original act. The judgments show a difference between breach of Convention law and access to individual compensation. The strongest sustainable demand is an account linking the specific Convention right, the refusal, the actual citizenship date, the documented additional waiting time and the remedy; comparative material and possibilities of reparation must be examined separately when the authority's own guidance contributed to the citizen's lack of knowledge of the right.

Documented errors, open evidence questions and claims

The proven errors are the non-contractual practices in the Commission's delimitation, the registered refusal and delays, the management and advisory errors, inadequate guidance and grubbing-up, and the documented conduct of the trial due to inequity. They must not be extended to the fact that any application from the 758 had been unlawfully processed.

Continued unresolved is a full public link between the numbers of the Commission Annex and the two legal groups, individual financial and health losses for all concerned and evidence of actual payment in addition to the reported information of the judgment. These deficiencies are concrete absences in the published material. They are not open tasks, which can be solved by counting the same people again.

The arguments are prioritised as follows: 1) the special rules provided legal protection that ordinary naturalisation requirements could not replace; 2) the actual date of correction must be documented for each person; 3) management's weakening of warnings and delayed remedial work must be attributed to specific acts; 4) criminal, disciplinary and civil limitation must be kept separate; 5) the courts' refusal of further compensation must not erase the original Convention violation from statistics or historical responsibility.

22. Mink: legal, management and staff actions

The citizen's intervention must be tested independently

The strongest proven criticism is that the authorities' knowledge of the lack of legal basis did not stop communication that healthy crews outside the safety zones should be killed. The report of the Mink Commission links the government's decision to the letter of the Food Authority and the police's phone calls. Subsequent decisions on employee responsibility relate to defined duties of action. They are not an overall decision that each citizen's intervention was lawful. [MK01, kap.8; IF03-IF05]

In the report's accounts, this is counted as one coherent process, with more actions, more authorities and more liability studies. Ten positive assessments of civil liability are neither ten citizens' victims nor ten convictions. The Commission shall not give a judgment on penalties or compensation.

Legal timing of the advance

Time	Information or assessment of the original source	Importance to the citizen and the testing of responsibility
3 November 2020	The coordinating committee of the government decides on the killing of all mink, including breeding animals	The Decision covers more than the previous zone regulation; its legal basis must be examined separately;
4 November	National press meetings and subsequent reports	The Commission assesses the statements as objectively grossly misleading and as an unlawful instruction; the subsequent hearing assesses the nature of the press meeting differently;
5 November	NOST meeting: lack of legal basis outside the zones	The Commission places specific knowledge on the part of key police officers; citizens do not receive similar clarification at the same time.
6 November	Letter from the Food Safety Agency and the police's original action card	The mandatory nature of the letter and the pressure of the telephone manuscript must be assessed as actual acts of authority.
7 November	New press conference maintains the effort	Continued communication must be assessed on the basis of the knowledge that the individual now had
8 November	Home shortage becomes public; urgent legislation is being prepared	Publicity is not in itself individual rectification of all growers already contacted
10 November	New message and revised action card	The Commission states that the new action card did not come into use; follow-up contact was limited to some of the contacted growers.

The timeline is based on the Commission's assessments and reproduced simultaneous documents. The original mails, letters and telephone notes are not all individually verified outside the report. This does not alter the fact that the pages of the report itself and subsequent original decisions can be compared directly. [MK01, p.632-650,708-712,727-740]

Mandatory, economic pressure and unused corrected telephone script

The Food Safety Agency's letter of 6 November also dealt with herds outside the safety zones as part of the killing. The Commission attaches importance to the wording of the letter rather than to the subsequent explanation of an invitation. It set the deadline of 16 November and an economic bonus scheme. An authority's subsequent description of its intention does not alter what was actually communicated to the citizen. [MK01, p.642-644]

The police action card concerned contact about counting. The commission’s criticism concerns a refusal being linked to loss of a bonus and the prospect that the authorities would empty the herd anyway. A formally voluntary response obtained under this pressure cannot automatically be registered as free and informed consent to the substantive operation. The legal scrutiny must therefore concern legal authority, truthful information and the effect of the specific authority communication. [MK01, pp.646-647]

According to the Commission, a revised action card of 10 November was never used. The plan to contact all first contacted growers was again restricted to those who had answered no. The Commission did not criticise the revised action card separately in the circumstances described. This limited assessment does not demonstrate that all citizens were granted individual rectification or that the germinal products were already killed. Actual

culling dates, herd information and contact notes are necessary for an account of harm by citizen. [MK01, p.648]

Criticism chain: Authority communications with the character of orders after knowledge of missing legal authority are documented → letter and actioncard identified → later labels such as encouragement or voluntariness must be compared with the content communicated → the principle of legality and duty of truthfulness require lawful, correct communication → authorities continued or failed to make adequate corrections → the citizen's decision basis and freedom of action were affected → a specific loss must be connected to the contact and actual culling → State responsibility and any individual responsibility are examined separately → demand for documented cessation, correct information and specific redress.

Ten official reviews: what can actually be documented about the follow-up

Commission Chapter 8.8 contains positive assessments of responsibility for the following ten named persons. It's a count of ratings, not a percentage of guilt. Several other officials were examined without a similar positive assessment; for example, Commissioner Lykke Sørensen was not placed in this group. She must also not be confused with the individual role of Lykke Sørensen in the instruction process. [MK01, pp.8.8.1-8.8.6]

Person	The Commission's limited criticism	Further follow-up and documentation status
Henrik Studsgaard	Press conference, continued misconduct, letter and press statement	The Ministry of the Environment published duty exemption and service study 24.8.2022. New municipal employment can be documented. The exact closing decision must be presented separately [MK04- MK05]
Tejs Binderup	Press conference, maintenance, letter and press opinion	The specific decision on employment law and any subsequent amendment have not been substantiated by the published original decision here
Paolo Drostby	Press conference and subsequent maintenance	FOB2024-5 documents that the Ministry of Food had disclosed a revocation decision with the employee’s consent, but does not identify the person. The named original decision is necessary [MK03, p.5]
Hanne Larsen	Fødevarestyrelsen’s letter of 6.11.2020	The specific decision on employment law and any subsequent amendment shall be documented by the original decision;
Barbara Bertelsen	Press conference and subsequent maintenance	Warning of 24.8.2022 revoked 23.3.2023. The original decision is published [IF02]
Johan Legarth	Press conference and maintenance; not the creation of the action card	Reprimand of 24.8.2022 revoked 23.3.2023. The original decision has been published [IF04]
Anne-Mette Lyhne Jensen	Press conference and maintenance; not the creation of the action card	Warning of 22.9.2022 revoked 23.3.2023. The original decision has been published [MK06]
Thorkild Fogde	Reaction after knowledge of homelessness and continued misconduct	On 10.2.2023, the disciplinary inquiry found no disciplinary offence within the four matters examined; service resumed [IF03, del8]
Uffe Stormly	Participation in the police's use of the actioncard of 6.11.2020	Warning 20.9.2022 revoked 2.6.2023. The National Police published the result; detailed reasons were denied [MK02-MK03]
Birgitte Buch	Involvement in police use of the same action card	Same dated outages as Stormly, separate person [MK02-MK03]

There is thus direct public original documentation of **five revoked sanctions** concerning Bertelsen, Legarth, Lyhne Jensen, Stormly and Buch, and Fogde’s separate disciplinary-inquiry outcome. This is a documented subset. It must not be presented as all later responses, all revocations or an exhaustive national account. The three food officials’ named original decisions and Studsgaard’s closing decision must be added when available; non-publication is not a zero result.

Why Fogde's results do not determine the legality of the action board

Part 8 of the interview management has been checked in its entirety. It describes four specific issues, in particular press conferences and the duties of the Head of State. It expressly notes that the action card of the National Police is not part of the facts that have been raised against him. This is a crucial delineation. [IF03, part 8, physical p.13 / printed p.124]

The disciplinary inquiry leadership classifies the press-conference announcement as a political decision to be followed by lawful authority actions, and does not find that Fogde breached the service duties examined. The commission, by contrast, had assessed the announcement as an instruction. The discrepancy is legal and specific. The report does not automatically give either assessment truth value solely because of the institution's name. Instead, it specifies the actions examined, the decision's scope and the intervention affecting citizens that still requires review. [MK01, pp.709-712; IF03, part 8]

The disciplinary inquiry's own principles include the legality requirement applying to actual administrative activity too, and a manager having to respond where there is specific reason rather than simply assuming subordinates acted lawfully. It emphasises the duty to reject a clearly unlawful instruction and seek to stop it. These principles must therefore be applied to the specific letter, telephone contact and knowledge at the time of the act. Fogde's lack of knowledge of the action card before 10. November does not determine what its authors or approvers knew on 6. November. [IF03, del8, physical pp.5-8; MK01, pp.714-717]

Ministerial responsibility: positive findings without a judgment of the Court of Justice in the mink case

The Commission considered that the statements made by the Prime Minister on 4 November were objectively grossly misleading. At the same time, it assumed that she did not know the lack of home space and expressly stated that it did not consider gross negligence. A reproduction of the report as a complete acquittal of any ministerial responsibility therefore goes beyond its investigation. Nor does it document a criminal offence. [MK01, p.738-739]

The commission's own evidential chain concerning Mogens Jensen is more specific: in its assessment, his text message of 9. November and contemporaneous emails supported knowledge already on 5. November. Wording about the briefing date was subsequently changed in drafts and replies. The commission assessed the information at the parliamentary consultation on 11. November as incorrect. The Minister's own original statements and identified emails must be kept separate from later accounts. [MK01, pp.728-732]

For the Minister for Health, the Commission defines the opinions for risk assessment and health actions; for the Minister of Finance, uncertainty about the financial basis of the bonus scheme is identified without an assessment of gross negligence. Therefore, the liability accounts must not assign identical actions or identical knowledge to all ministers. The material shortage of land in relation to the growers is a separate point of investigation. [MK01, p.742-748]

The evidence of the limitation of access

FOB 2024-5 accepted that Clause 21 of the Public Law did not give the right to neither the revoked police warnings nor the revocation decisions. Earlier extradition did not preserve the general right of access. The Ombudsman also accepted the balancing of the authorities against more publicity. The opinion also documents different public practices between the police, the Prime Minister, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Food. [MK03, p.5-14]

This is a **documented limit on public scrutiny**, not documentation of concealed criminal culpability. The legal decision must be reproduced precisely. The democratic consequence can be criticised independently: the public can see the commission's specific criticism and a later brief outcome, but does not necessarily have access to the reasoning connecting them. FOB 2024-6 similarly concerns the underlying material for the Prime Minister's Office's revocation, even though the revocation decision itself was published. [MK07]

The specific requirement is the publication of an anonymous inventory of actions and reasons: what actions were tested, what actual grounds were changed, what rule applied and what citizens' consequences were investigated? The report does not create fictitious outcomes for the documents that are not available.

Control status and necessary originals

• **Documented:** lack of home; letter and action card with the described content; Commission's ten positive liability assessments; five identified recalls; Fogdes limited interrogation result; actual refusal of access to police reasons.

• **Not established:** individual criminal culpability in the mink case; the number of breeders who culled outside the zones solely because of the unlawful communication; all ten persons' final responsibility; whether each individual citizen received effective rectification and full redress.

• **Necessary investigative steps:** the four missing named closure/response decisions; contact and culling dates for each herd; legal authority on each date; compensation decisions and actual payments; documentation of individual correction. These demands derive from the present verification against originals.

23. Defence and intelligence: Green Desert and Samsam

The Danish acquittal did not lift the court's finding of abuse

Højesteret On 31 May 2022, the Ministry of Defence dismissed the appeal but maintained that: **18 of the 23 Iraqi parties had been subjected to inhumane treatment;** the transfer to and detention in Al Jameat, as determined by the National Court. The evidence included torture with falanga and electric shock. For the other five, the court did not find the offences described proven. The 18 and the five are subsets of 23, not extra persons. [GD01, p.26-28]

This is a court-established evidentiary finding. The individual original medical reports, interviews and detention registers have not all been independently verified here. The documented conclusion is that the published Danish acquittal **does not mean the court found that no one was ill-treated**. Its reasoning concerns Danish attribution, knowledge, control and jurisdiction.

Before the Supreme Court, the Ministry of Defence argued that none of the Iraqi parties could be regarded as having suffered inhuman treatment and that their accounts lacked credibility. The Supreme Court reproduces that position on p.26, but upholds on p.27 the High Court's affirmative findings concerning 18. The authority's general denial is therefore not the judgment's overall evidential finding. [GD01, pp.26-27]

Chain of criticism: The acquittal cannot document absence of ill-treatment → the Ministry's denial is identified → the judgment upholds 18 affirmative findings of abuse → the statement and evidentiary finding differ → the State's duty to investigate and provide redress must be delimited under the relevant basis of responsibility → a public account must not replace that examination with a general acquittal label → such an account may conceal citizens' documented suffering → scrutiny of responsibility requires evidence of injury, acts and knowledge → a specific demand for an account, broken down by person and citing sources, of abuse, Danish involvement and actual redress.

Population and timing

The operation took place on 25 November 2004. It is before the 2006-2025 event period of the report, while the investigations and the public court investigation are inside. The judgment of the EMD in 2025 concerns 21 complainants from the same course of action. They must not be added to the 23 Danish parties as 44 separate people. The judgment indicates all 21 as Iraqi nationals; Danish residence is not Danish citizenship. [GD02, Introduction / § 1-3]

Search	Original information	Precise meaning
Operation 25.11.2004	Danish and British forces assist the Iraqi operation	Initial point of occurrence and subsequent investigation, not a 2006 event
Danish studies 2 010-2011,2012-2014,201 5-2016	Three audit studies	Three studies of the course, not three groups of victims [GD01, p.33]
First civil cases 2011- 2012	Five actions; later merged and rejected 2013, confirmed 2014	Refusal to proceed, not a substantive decision on the infringements [GD02, § 21- 24]
New lawsuit 24.10.2014	New civil proceedings	Independent process start point [GD02, § 25]
High Court 15.6.2018	18 obtain a partially favourable finding; five do not	DKK 30.000 for each of the 18 in the national court; later abolished Danish payment obligation [GD01-GD02]
Højesteret 31.5.2022	No compensation from the Ministry of Defence; the assault finding for 18 is maintained.	2.776 calendar days after the new action; 1.446 days after the judgment in the main proceedings;
EMD21.10.2025	Differential Appeals Outcome	1.239 calendar days after the judgment of the Supreme Court;
EMD judgment final 21.1.2026	Final maturity after 92 calendar days	Additional 2026 status; judgment year remains 2025

The daily figures are own calendar calculations on the dates of the sources. They shall indicate the duration of judicial review, not the duration of detention or a determined number of illegal days. From the operation to the Supreme Court judgment went 17 years, 6

months and 6 days. From the operation to the EMD judgment went 20 years, 10 months and 26 days. The total personal load shall be documented by the detention, health and life cycle; it cannot be calculated solely by the date of the judgment.

What? Højesteret actually decided on Danish responsibility

The court proceeded on the basis that Danish forces had not detained the parties, held them in custody, transferred them or commanded the Iraqi forces. It therefore found no Danish jurisdiction over the specific parties under ECHR Article 1. This is a specific finding about control, not a rule that Denmark has no human rights duties outside the country. [GD01, pp.25-26,31-32]

The Court also examined Danish liability law independently of EMRK. It stated that the absence of Danish detention or direct transfer does not relieve Danish authorities of any liability. Assistance may be unlawful in the event of sufficiently specific and current knowledge or suspicion of abuse. In the present case, the court did not find the necessary knowledge. The documented control point is therefore the simultaneous knowledge and the actual functioning of the operation, including by indirect assistance. [GD01, p.30-31]

The Defence Command Directive 1.9.2004 is described in the judgment with two different situations: own detainees had to go to British rather than Iraqi forces; Iraqi own arrests under cooperation were considered to be Iraqi. The Directive also included attention, reporting and, where appropriate, action in the event of illegality. The term Iraqi arrest must therefore be checked against actual checks; it cannot only determine who contributed to what. [GD01, p.30]

The Supreme Court did **not decide the limitation issue**, because it found no Danish basis for compensation. The judgment must therefore not be described as dismissal of liability solely because of limitation. It found the investigations conducted sufficient and rejected a new investigation and remittal. [GD01, pp.32-34]

EMD 2025: Inadmissibility and admissibility must be kept separate

Point of complaint	The exact outcome of EMD	What it doesn't document
Substantive Article 3	Rejected for lack of Danish jurisdiction, § 108- 109	No overall finding that the abuses described did not take place
Duty to investigate under Article 3	Rejected; even if a jurisdictional link existed, the court found no deficient investigation, sections 118,131-132	No Danish criminal record of the alleged perpetrators
Duration of proceedings Article 6	Rejected for failure to discharge the national legal instrument, § 143	No decision of substance that the whole course of time was reasonable
Access to a court and a fair trial Article 6	Reality test: no infringement § 165- 166	No decision on all other points of international law
Article 13	§ 169- 171 Rejected	No redress awarded for the Iraqi ill-treatment itself

Source: original judgment *Abdulaal Naser and Others v. Denmark*,46571 / 22. [GD02] The grounds for rejection must be retained in the statistics. A single label that no break cannot replace the different outcomes of the table.

Costs are not compensation for the victims

Højesteret the total costs to the Ministry of Defence of: **DKK 9.010.796,85**, distributed as follows: [GD01, p.34-35]

Obligation to pay following the judgment	Amount	Unit and delimitation
Anti-Torture Support Fund for A and U	562.500,00 kr.	One mandate payment, not two identical payments
21 other parties, including the heirs of E	984.375,00 DKK	21 × 46.875 DKK; heirs are not an additional live person

Obligation to pay following the judgment	Amount	Unit and delimitation
The Treasury	7.463.921,85 DKK	State financing of the remaining part
Total	DKK 9.010.796,85	Sum of the three items above

The sums imposed do not constitute evidence of actual payment and do not constitute compensation to the applicants. Freedom of procedure, the removal of the term of office and limited claims are described separately in the judgment. A national cost analysis must therefore preserve the payer, the recipient, the amount allocated and the actual payment as different fields.

Remaining review and specific requirements

Later judgments can be analysed, but cannot replace independent verification of all original operational orders, command arrangements, detention lists, transport/transfer registers and knowledge of Al Jameat. Each decisive claim requires a source chain from the contemporaneous original to the high court's and Højesteret's reasoning. The two domestic instances' reproduction of the same original information is one evidential link, not two independent pieces of evidence.

The United Nations Torture Committee's 2023 observations on a close focus on individual criminal liability specifically concern the police and the DUP, with reference to: *E-Asmar*. They may not be reproduced as a separate committee decision on Green Desert. Their fundamental relevance to the methodology of the report is the distinction between the existence of the incident, the State's protection / investigation responsibility and identified individual criminal liability. [GD03, § 40-41,48-49]

The strongest sustainable investigation demand is specific verification against originals of the factual links on which accountability decisions rest. If new primary material changes a decisive link, the legal consequence must be assessed for the specific person and basis of responsibility. Suspicion of concealment or incorrect oversight classification must be identified separately until the material documents it. The report does not establish Danish responsibility for torture contrary to the available outcomes without this further basis.

Samsam: authority information, evidential chain and late review

The documented main conclusion

Højesteret found 02.09.2025 that Ahmed Samsam had demonstrated cooperation with PET and FE during the travel in 2013- 2014 and receipt of fees and other services for information about Danish Syrian fighters. The original judgment, BS-58021 / 2023-HJR, has been read with separate verification of the parties' claims, explanations, grounds and findings. It's a recognition judgment. It does not even lift the Spanish sentence and does not provide for Danish compensation for detention. [SA01, p.16-21]

The crucial point of criticism is a **evidence of inconsistency in information that became relevant for a the assessment of evidence by foreign courts;**. Højesteret p. 19 describes that the Spanish højesteret Denmark's registration in the Schengen Information System and the information provided by the Spanish police on the denial of cooperation by the Danish police were important to its conclusion that Samsam was not among the people who actually cooperated with the Danish authorities against terrorism. The later Danish judgment states precisely this kind of cooperation in connection with travel. The original SIS registration, the specific Danish reply and the Spanish original case are different proofs which have not all been replaced by the Danish judgment's reproduction. [SA01, p.18-21]

The concrete source and evidence chain

Search	Original source; or document status;	What the proof carries	What needs to be tested separately
Danish SIS-registration	Referred to in the judgment of the Supreme Court under review p.19	The registration was part of the reasoning of the Spanish court	Original content of the registration, date, purpose, sender, knowledge basis and subsequent corrections
Spanish police information about Danish denial	Reported in paragraph 19 of the Danish judgment	Spain højesteret built on an information about Danish denial	Who in Denmark replied, precise wording and recipient; the Danish original correspondence
Spanish Penalty and Appeals	Dates and extracts of the judgment in the original Danish judgment	Convicted 28.06.2018 to 8 years; appeals 23.11.2018 and 17.05.2019	All original Spanish evidence and the importance of proper cooperation information
Cooperation	Explanation, sound file, payment information and other material in the Danish case	Overall basis for the establishment of cooperation and benefits by the Supreme Court	The author and authenticity of each certificate; not all individual statements submitted have been established independently;
New translation	Judgment p.2-3	An expression in a previous Spanish extract was changed from a translation of precise cooperation to occasional cooperation	The Spanish original and certified translation; language changes must not be concealed
Final Danish recognition	Judgment p.21; Joint opinion of PET / FE on the same day	The services shall recognise and recognise the cooperation;	Actual assistance for resumption, subsequent Spanish decision and possible repair

It is not sufficient to point out that the Spanish judgment was final and thus treat the Danish information behind the judgment as correct. The paragraph of the Supreme Court shows a specific point where such an argument would repeat an information created by the authority without testing its actual basis. On the other hand, the Danish judgment does not determine by its very existence what the result of a completely new Spanish test will be. The necessary review is the local cause chain: Danish information → foreign ending → importance for sentence and continued detention → possibility of resumption. [SA01, p.18-21]

Timetable and actual consistency

Date / period	Documented event	Meaning for the citizen
2013-2014	The subsequent judicial cooperation	The relationship of cooperation is an essential factual proof of the journeys which were later made in the criminal proceedings.
28.06.2018	Spanish sentence of 8 years in prison	serious deprivation of liberty and legal status as a criminal offence; the length of the sentence is not automatically the same as the time actually served;
23.11.2018 and 17.05.2019	Spanish appeals	The authority information formed part of a situation in which ordinary review ended without change
24.06.2020-07.09.2021	The lawyer's explanation of 13 meetings with the management layers of the intelligence services	Documentary explanation of attempts to settle; meetings are not proof of a settlement reached or recognised liability
20.11.2020	The court in Glostrup converted the execution into 6 years imprisonment in Denmark	Amendment of the execution framework; not cancellation of the result of the debt
December 2020	Transfer to continued service in Denmark; lawyer indicates 10.12.2020	Physical return home was continued service of the sentence, not release or full redress
08.11.2023	Østre Landsret's decision in the recognition case	At this stage, the case did not lead to the subsequent recognition
02.09.2025	Judgment of the Supreme Court and public recognition of services	A central relationship of cooperation was legally established more than 7 years after the Spanish judgment.

Sources: SA01 p.1 -3,9 -14,16-21; SA02. From 28.06.2018 to 02.09.2025 it took 7 years, 2 months and 5 days. From the judgment of the National Court on 08.11.2023 to the judgment of the Supreme Court, 664 calendar days were allowed. These periods are calculated procedural and evidence periods. They are **not an inventory of 664 illegal prison days or a court-determined 7; year-illegal detention;**. Such an inventory actually requires the history of atonement and the legal review of each period.

The lawyer's explanation describes a claim for compensation, including detention entries, actual losses / expenses and tort, as well as changing discussions on amounts. None of the amounts of the negotiations referred to may be recorded as compensation paid. DKK 500.000 to be paid jointly and severally by PET and FE **to the Treasury as legal costs;**, not for Samsam as compensation. [SA01, p.12-14,21]

Examination of the opinion of the Authority and of the judgment

Conclusion → The specific official information denying cooperation was incompatible with cooperation later proved in the Danish case. Authority statement → The Spanish evidential chain included information about a denial by Danish police. Original evidence → Supreme Court judgment pp.19-21 documents the chain and the later finding of cooperation. Deficiency → Original Danish correspondence and the complete Spanish legal assessment must be obtained to establish sender,culpability and causal contribution. Rule → Truthfulness,proper fact-finding and access to effective review must be assessed alongside the particular services' duties and relevant Convention provisions. Conduct/omission → Recording,responses and failure to produce or correct information must be dated. Departure → Incorrect or inadequate official information must not become self-confirming evidence against the citizen. Consequence → Central information about his activities was legally established only after many years of criminal and declaratory proceedings. Responsibility → State responsibility and each individual's responsibility require separate review. Demands → Preservation of original correspondence and recording histories,specific assistance with reopening,assessment of documented loss and a decision on actual redress.

The Supreme Court established a highly restrictive starting point for proceedings concerning intelligence services' sources, but accepted the specific exception. The report's criticism therefore also concerns the effect of a barrier to review in a case with serious consequences for a citizen:the information-related legal position must be reviewable in time to matter in practice. The citizen's eventual acknowledgment does not on its own answer the question of preceding assistance, information and elapsed time. [SA01,pp.17-19]

Documented findings: cooperation and services established by Højesteret; the described significance of Danish information for the Spanish inference; the lengthy trajectory until Danish acknowledgement; the recipient of the costs amount. **Further evidential requirements:** original Danish-Spanish communication, complete SIS history, source agreement and payment trail, actual history of serving the sentence, later reopening decision and final compensation decision. A deliberate lie by a particular Danish person, criminal complicity and a particular total period of harm are not established by the declaratory judgment alone.

24. Greenland: self-determination, family ties and repair

The inquiries into contraception and the 22 Greenlandic children show specific losses of self-determination, family ties and cultural belonging. The historical interventions occurred before 2006 and therefore are not included as new interventions in the report's 20-year total. Investigation, apology and reparation in 2006-2026 are included as present-day State acts. Both timelines must be retained: a citizen may still bear the consequences of an old intervention even if the State investigates only much later.

The independent investigation 2025: countable events and people

The investigation into contraceptive practices in Kalaallit Nunaat 1960-1991 was delivered on 9. September 2025 after starting on 1. June 2023. Ilisimatusarfik and the University of Southern Denmark anchored the work; the Danish ministry funded it. The study uses voluntary accounts and archival material. It is not a random national sample or a judgment on every individual healthcare intervention. Abortion and sterilisation received only limited examination; the main priorities were intrauterine devices and Depo-Provera. [GL01, printed pp. 6-10]

Population of the survey	Number and sub-groups	Unit and delimitation
Women with reports	354	Various women; 137 by telephone, 125 by the National Doctor, 72 personal interviews and 20 by Sullissivik
Double story from the same woman	17	Oral + written; oral use only. They are not added to 354
Other women's enquiries	70	Outside topic / period or guidance needs; omitted from analysis
Specialist, etc., interview	11	Nine inquiries + one former official + one former minister; two other inquiries omitted
Beret events	488	410 spiral, 43 Depo-Provera and 35 other events; more events per woman
Place of occurrence	422 Greenland, 22 Denmark, 44 not available	All 488 events; not 488 different people
Residence in the report	244 Greenland, 66 Denmark, 44 not available	Women, not places of incident
Number of events per woman	264 with one, 62 with two, 20 with three, 8 with more than three	354 women; the last eight have 40 events in total
Women with Spiral Report	335	410 events; average 16,7 years at first spiral
First spiral, age	94 not more than 14 years old, 120 at 15-17, 75 at least 18, 46 not available	335 women; **214 with known inferiority** at first spiral
Depo-Provera, age	6 up to 14 years, 11 at 15-17, 16 at least 18, 10 not available	43 women / events; mean age 17,4. Overlap with spiral group not published as person key
Births before first spiral	176 without birth, 31 with one, 21 with more, 107 not available	335 women
Spiral events of known age and place	316	297 Greenland and 19 Denmark; 94 of the 410 omitted from this particular analysis
Minors in Greenland's sub-analysis	185 girls, 204 incidents	The 204 are contained in the 297, not new cases

The last subanalysis distributes the 204 events: birth 11, own / parents' wish 11, sent by school 24, provoked abortion 28, second consultation 30, sent from college etc. 26, unpublished 32 and summoned from health care 42. The 24 and 26 provide 50 events with the school / institution path as indicated category; it is not 50 identified

employees or, necessarily, 50 different girls. The material also describes girls without sexual debut and girls whose parents according to the reports had not been informed. [GL01, printed pages 8-10 and 177-182]

Consent, information and consequences have different denominators

Measurement	Counter / denominator and remainder	Meaning
Consent to Spiral or Depo-Provera	55 yes, 330 no / not clear, 68 not available / 453	Events. The 35 other events are outside this measurement
Spiral alone	47 yes, 300 no / not clear, 63 not available / 410	Same events in a subgroup
Depo-Provera alone	8 yes, 30 no / not clear, 5 not available / 43	55=47+8; 330=300+30; 68=63+5
Information by spiral	98 sufficient, 58 insufficient, 170 none, 84 not available / 410	228 / 410 with negative information; 228 / 326 = 69,94% among the informed
Information at Depo-Provera	22 sufficient, 15 insufficient / none, 6 not available / 43	15 is the total negative category; the two types cannot be separated accurately;
Experienced consequences of spiral	349 yes, 14 no, 47 not available / 410	Preferred consequences; not 349 medically diagnosed injuries
Experienced consequences of Depo-Provera	42 yes, 1 not available / 43	No separate "no 'category declared
Both forms, consequences	391/453	349 + 42, with 14 no and 48 not available; not new events
Sexual education	44 yes, 150 no, 160 not available / 354	Women; a large undisclosed group must be preserved
Women without children	63/354	The source does not determine how many were involuntarily childless, or individual cause for all 63

330 / 453 is 72,85% of the reported spiral / depot events; among the 385 with information on consent, the proportion is 85,71%. Both fractions are right for each denominator. None of them is a national percentage for all Greenlandic women. The consent, information and impact categories of the events overlap; 330 + 228 + 391 may not be used as a number of assaults or victims. [GL01, printed pp. 203-211 and 224- 230]

GL-K01: The interventions had concrete bodily and family consequences

Conclusion → statement → evidence. The women's accounts describe interventions without their knowledge or clear consent, severe pain and bleeding, hospital admissions, lack of subsequent help and experiences of lost self-determination. The investigation identifies women through anonymised codes and compares their accounts with historical material, but has not made an individual medical causation determination for each consequence. It thus documents that the consequences were reported; where contemporaneous records or medical assessments are missing, this must be stated locally. [GL01, printed pp. 203-211, 224-230]

Action → deviation → result. In report 10B96, a 12-year-old girl was sent from the school home without explanation of the purpose. 10B30 describes the collection of a 13-year-old with an ambulance without prior knowledge of spiral and later scar tissue as well as unwanted infertility. The 5B63 describes repeated unsuccessful requests to have the spiral removed. For these reports, criticism must not be reduced to inadequate record keeping: the procedure described and the continuing lack of help relate to the body itself, the possibility of choosing from and the possibility of having children later. The cause assessment for long-term health requires the specific records; the uncertainty does not change the documented report's description of lack of information and experienced coercion. [GL01, printed pp. 180-181, 226-229]

Rule → responsibility → demand. The rules then applicable to minors' and parents' consent changed several times. Access to counselling without parental consent is not equivalent to permission to perform any physical intervention without the girl's own involvement. The investigation's legal analysis describes parental consent requirements until 30. September 1973 and subsequent differing periods and age thresholds. Present-day ECHR analyses must also examine Article 8, Article 3 where the necessary severity is reached, and Article 14 where discrimination is documented, particularly where authorities controlled children in institutions. The specific demand is person-by-person clarification of consent, actors, age, timing, case-record basis and aftercare, with relevant reparation. [GL01, printed pp. 161-166, 242-254]

GL-K02: Central knowledge and supervision must be independently tested

Conclusion → authority statement → original chain. Official descriptions of contraception as voluntary cannot, on their own, prove voluntariness. The inquiry reproduces specific warnings about inadequate information and excessively active intervention that officials and politicians learned of. A municipal council meeting in Scoresbysund in 1972 included participation from Grønlandsministeriet and criticism of inadequate information and girls' perception that the intrauterine device could not be removed. The inquiry did not find that this led to the closer investigation the allegation might have prompted. The national report bases this link on the inquiry's references to historical originals; those archival records have not themselves been published and independently reread here. [GL01, printed pp. 165-166]

Deficiency → rule → legal significance. The State managed and financed Greenland's healthcare system until responsibility was transferred at the turn of 1991/1992. The inquiry's responsibility analysis describes the Ministry, Health Authority, chief medical officer and district doctors. Operational and supervisory roles within the same official function, together with failures in registration and follow-up, therefore cannot conceal who had the opportunity and duty to respond. Reasonably substantiated allegations of treatment contrary to Article 3 trigger requirements of investigation and protection under the relevant conditions. The report distinguishes documented receipt of specific warnings from an as-yet undocumented claim that every manager knew every individual incident. [GL01, printed pp. 131-136, 161-166 and 258-263]

Responsibility → demand. The apology and a general compensation scheme do not in themselves conclude scrutiny of supervision, individual losses or personal responsibility. The strongest sustainable demands are a coherent evidential chain for the known warnings, investigation of the specific omission and accessible means of reparation. Assessment of historical ECHR protection must respect the law at the time; the inquiry itself describes assessment of the temporal legal position as difficult. This is not a general defence of the interventions, but a precise delimitation of the legal conclusion.

Historical registrations: scope is not the same as a recorded breach of consent

The historical series are used as material on scope and knowledge, not as a 2006-2025 error total. Table 3. a of the investigation gives women with an IUD:684 as at 1. January 1968, 1.820 as at 1. January 1969, 2.854 as at 1. January 1970, 4.070 as at 31. December 1970, 4.890 as at 1. January 1972 and 5.737 as at 31. December 1972. Printed p. 170 also gives 3.821 women at the end of 1970. **3.821 and 4.070 must not be conflated:** the text describes a registration deducting removed/lost IUDs, whereas the table and conclusion discuss the number who had received an IUD. The original does not provide full person reconciliation that makes all these measurement points unique historical recipients. They must not be added across years. [GL01,printed pp. 170-176 and 262]

In ten of 17 districts, 606 spirals were newly set up in 1973 and 791 in 1974; relocations and relocations make national de-industrialisation uncertain. Three protocols contain: **2.206 pledges**: Sisimiut 1973-1977: 445; Ilulissat 1967-1983: 1.261; Nuuk 1973-1979: 500. The Ilulissat Protocol identifies 807 different girls / women. The 807 must not be added to the 1.261 or 2.206. Across the protocols, the age groups are below 15: 50; 15-19: 598; 20-24: 539; 25-29: 415; 30-34: 305; 35-39: 162; at least 40: 54; not applicable: 86. **These summers to 2.209, while The sum of the minutes is 2.206: an internal difference of three, which is retained.** The mixed 15-19 group cannot be converted into an exact number of children. [GL01, printed pp. 172-175]

Depo-Provera is reported as having 480 users in 1981 and 290, 340, 260 and 240 in 1985-1988. The Chief Medical Officer’s 1988 count covers approximately 4.000 women, of whom 50 % used an IUD, 45 % contraceptive pills/mini-pills and 5 % Depo-Provera; 27 % of women aged 15-49 within that delimitation used the three methods. Import-based estimates of coverage below 40 % in the first half of the 1980s also include condoms and measure something different from these records. None of the series identifies nationally who consented. [GL01, printed pp. 175-176]

GL-K03: Compensation 2026 and a concrete exception to the fine

Act no. 722 of 1. September 2026 has been read in its complete original text. It grants 300.000 kr. to an eligible woman following application, a solemn declaration and making it probable that a contraceptive event without consent occurred in 1960-1991. The residence requirement may be waived. The application deadline is 1. September 2028 with a limited exemption possibility. Heirs succeed to the claim if the woman dies after applying; the Act does not give every descendant of a woman who died before applying an independent claim. [GL02, sections 1-3, 8]

Conclusion → statutory text → difference. Section 4 requires necessary information to be supplied to Patienterstatningen within 30 days, with a possible additional 30 days. Section 16,subsection 2,expressly exempts public authorities and their employees from the fine for failing to fulfil that information duty. An intentionally false declaration on one's honour under section 16,subsection 1,can meanwhile be punished by a fine or imprisonment for up to two years. This is a **specific statutory difference in the criminal-law avenue** between private information-providers and public actors. The maximum sentence for a false declaration is not a sentence imposed on the women, and the exemption is not general immunity for historical abuses or other official-duty offences. [GL02, sections 4, 15-16]

Consistency → responsibility → requirements. The derogation will be significant if the non-extradition of a public actor delays the repair of a woman. For this reason, the obligation to provide information to the administration does not lapse. A specific control account should show the date of the requirement, any extension of time, extradition, date of decision and response to a break in time. Paragraph 5 of the Act provides for the possibility of the legal costs of necessary assistance, which give rise to a new and amended decision when the initial lack of information was not due to the applicant; this may be a concrete consequence of the error of the Authority. [GL02]

The Act applies the Public Administration Act but exempts Patienterstatningen's activity under the scheme from the Access to Public Administration Files Act. This does not remove individual parties' rights under the Public Administration Act. The scheme provides for appeal to Ankenævnet for Patienterstatningen and interest on payment later than five weeks after the award, subject to the statutory exception for impediments caused by the recipient. The amount is protected in specified benefit and set-off contexts. Earlier settlements/compensation must not be counted as new payments through the scheme. Section 19 contains a separate territorial provision; Greenland's assumption of responsibility and the geographical application of Danish law must be distinguished from Denmark's human-rights responsibility as a State. [GL02, sections 3, 5-14, 19]

The public status of the patient compensation, entered on 7 October 2026 and on the Danish part dated 30 September 2026, shows: **627 cases: 138 applications received, 4 applications dismissed and 485 applications dismissed**. The four refusals are due to previous settlements with the State. The Greenlandic part shows the same number, but another update date. DKK 138 × DKK 300.000 is DKK 41,4 million in calculated compensation; **award is not independent proof of actual payment;**. An estimated potential target group is not counted as recognised victims. [GL03]

GL-K04: Return to Greenland was not reunion with the family

The historical investigation from 2020 covers 22 children sent to Denmark in 1951. Six were adopted in Denmark; the 16 who returned grew up in a children's home in Godthåb. These geographical returns were therefore not 16 returns to parents. The investigation's chapter on broken family ties describes the difficulties both adopted children and children in the home faced in finding their families again, lost Greenlandic language and sparse contact. Even children whose mothers and siblings lived in the town experienced restricted visits. [GL04, printed pp. 54-66, 73-78]

Conclusion → statement → evidence → deficiency. It is documented that the project's planned return did not restore the children's previous family life. The investigation draws on contemporary archival records and later recollections and explains the distinction between them. The lifelong feeling of estrangement or loss is described as the participants' experience; an overall psychiatric diagnosis or an exact family-contact duration for all 22 cannot be inferred. The specific consequence is separation, a language barrier and loss of the close relationship, including after return.

Time → repair. The State's written apology came in December 2020. Six living persons brought an action in December 2021. The Ministry of Social Affairs's announcement of 25 February 2022 documents a settlement of DKK 250.000 for each, a total of DKK 1,5 million. The six are a surviving subset of the 22, not six new victims. The settlement is not a judgment on the legal position of all 22 children. [GL05]

Rule → responsibility → demand. The example is central to the report's current analysis of return home: reunification must be documented as actual restoration of relationship and contact, not merely transport back to a country or closure of a case. Current Article 8 obligations and the Convention on the Rights of the Child's protection of family, identity and language are the legal measure for acts in the reporting period; they are not uncritically backdated as ratified rules in 1951.

Folkeret and R2P: the exact meaning

The material’s connection between population policy, ethnicity, reproductive control and children in public care requires serious scrutiny under international law. The Genocide Convention’s provision on measures intended to prevent births within a protected group, and the provision on forcible transfer of children, may be relevant lines of investigation. A completed genocide conclusion requires proof of the specific intent to destroy the group in whole or in part; regulating birth numbers or the documented incident counts does not on its own prove that intent. Crimes against humanity likewise require the relevant examination of attack, scale, policy and knowledge. [The legal basis is examined in the report’s international-law analysis.]

R2P encompasses four specific forms of mass atrocity and does not automatically become applicable because an authority has disregarded consent or family reunification. The immediately strong rights-based and responsibility claims here are protection of bodily integrity, effective investigation of substantiated allegations of abuse, access to individual review and reparation. The international-law investigation track must be pursued as far as specific archival records concerning purpose, orders, knowledge and implementation support; absence of a judgment is not evidence that these questions are irrelevant.

Documentation checks and necessary evidentiary links

Documented findings comprise the delimited event and person series, accounts of missing consent, specific descriptions of bodily and family consequences, historical State organisation and current statutory text and compensation status. Hypotheses requiring further proof are the individual medical cause of each lasting injury, personal criminal liability of specific historical actors and a specific intent to destroy a group. These questions must not be conflated with already documented deficiencies in information and contact.

For each critical requirement, the chain shall be: reporting code → time / age group → simultaneous records / archives, where available → actual action and consent → relevant day-to-day law → later consistency → state / individual liability condition → specific investigation or repair requirements. The present system includes decision-making and payment documents and time-limit data. The report's total statistics cannot replace these individual evidence.

25. Commission, audit, liability time limits and preservation of evidence;

What a Commission study can document

Denmark has acquired extensive publicly accessible knowledge of unlawful administration, misleading information and failing management through commission investigations. However, a commission report is not a criminal judgment, a compensation decision or documentation that the intervention described has ceased. The report's responsibility chain therefore has four distinct links: an established circumstance; assessment of possible personal responsibility; the competent authority's subsequent decision; actual redress for the citizen. A missing link must not be replaced by the preceding one.

For the older investigations, the original comparative source is the official report 1571 from 2018. It reviews terms of reference, investigation courses, conclusions and subsequent parliamentary consideration. It is a documented source for that subsequent consideration, but its summary is not an independent re-examination of all original annexes in every commission. Where the report uses the original commission report, this is stated separately. Publication date, date of the acts investigated and duration of the investigation are preserved as different quantities. [KO01, chapter3, particularly pp.90-118]

Eight studies ending or closing in 2006-2015

Investigation	Reduction → report / closure	Period or topic examined	Documentary knowledge and delimitation of responsibilities
PET Commission	17.08.1999 → 24.06.2009; approximately 9 years 10 months	PET company 1945- 1989	The report dealt, inter alia, with the violation or circumvention of the 1968 Government Declaration. There was no mandate to assess individual legal liability. The after-treatment of the Folketing 19.12.2011 emphasised the long past. Older actions are not new mistakes in 2009.
Farum Commission	06.08.2003 → 12.04.2012; approximately 8 years 8 months	Farum Kommune 1990-2003	Comprehensive study of municipal administration and economy; not mandate to individual responsibility. Parallel criminal proceedings had their own course of action, including national court judgment 06.10.2009. The Commission's mandate therefore does not limit what the criminal courts could deal with.
Dan Lynge-Kommission	15.09.2003 → 19.09.2006; approximately 3 years old	Police, PET and cooperation with an informant	Criticism of, inter alia, the handling of information on a homicide, drug information, confidential information and management failure. The report refers to three cases of excessive disclosure of confidential information. The post-examination 23.05.2007 had different political assessments; these are not three convictions.
Tax credit commission	19.03.2004 → 16.06.2006; ca.2 years 3 months	Tax administration and information on tax relief problems 2000-2003	Critics of three employees were not attributed to them as service offences in the Commission's assessment. The failure to respond to information must be preserved as an independent administrative finding. Parliamentary finishing 28.02.2007.
Blekingegade Commission	15.09.2010 → 26.05.2014; approximately 3 years 8 months	Whether central authorities had obstructed investigation 1980-1990	The Commission did not find any evidence of the main obstacle to which the mandate was addressed. This is a limited evidence conclusion, not a general approval of any police or PET action. No mandate for individual responsibility. Finishing 10.03.2015.
Statelessness Commission	23.08.2011 → 17.08.2015; approximately 4 years old	Treatment of the birth right of stateless persons 1991-2010	Non-contractual practices and grounds for seeking disciplinary action by two senior officials. A duty waiver 17.08.2015 is an interim response, not in itself the final sanction. Finishing 16.03.2016.
Tax matters	12.03.2012 → 03.11.2014; ca.2 years 8 months	A concrete tax case and interference by the department	Criticism of interference in a specific decision-making process and handling confidential information. Valuations of gravity, resignation and later advice did not automatically lead to disciplinary punishment. Finishing 10.03.2015.
Iraq and Afghan Central Commission	07.11.2012 → 02.07.2015; closed after c.2 years 8 months	Basis of war, detention exercises, transfers and knowledge of abuse risk	Closed without report. Absence of a report is a lack of a finding and cannot be counted as zero illegality or as an acquittal.

Source and verification position: KO01, PET pp.90-92; Farum pp.95-97; Dan Lynge pp.98-101; tax deductions pp.102-105; Blekingegade pp.106-107; stateless persons pp.108-111; tax case pp.114-118; Iraq/Afghanistan pp.128-132. Durations are rounded calendar periods between the stated dates, not measures of how long a particular citizen was subjected to an unlawful intervention.

The investigations are very large, but page counts are not counts of proved errors. The report gives, among other things, 88 witnesses and 146 hearing days in the PET investigation, 222 witnesses and 93 hearing days in Farum, 44 witnesses and 29 hearing days in Dan Lynge, 64 witnesses and 30 hearing days concerning tax deductions, 69 witnesses and 28 hearing days in Blekingegade, 44 witnesses and 27 hearing days concerning stateless persons, and 45 witnesses and 45 hearing days in the tax case. These counts describe investigative work. They must not be added to the report's case or person counts. PET's 13.414 cases examined are likewise not 13.414 established breaches of law. [KO01,the specified sections]

Accounts of investigation expenditure incurred must not be called compensation either. For example, the report states 77.514.141 kr. for the PET Commission,61.985.285 kr. for Farum,11.269.082 kr. for Dan Lynge,19.988.794 kr. for Blekingegade,42.241.877 kr. for stateless persons,28.475.942 kr. for the tax case and 18.576.933 kr. for the closed Iraq/Afghanistan Commission. The expenditure accounts each have their own coverage of commission, secretariat and assisting counsel. They are therefore retained as source-specific amounts without a common 20-year total or conversion to citizens' losses. [KO01, same section]

Convention-barred birth case-law and political closure of investigation

The state-run case shows that Denmark may have a binding international obligation while at the same time managing contrary to it for a long period of time. The relevant deviation was the examination of applications without the protection provided by the 1961Convention on the Limitation of Statelessness and the Child Convention. In the chain of responsibility, refusal, lack of guidance, subsequent resumption and actual granting of citizenship must be assessed separately. The Commission's assessment of two officials does not prove that all the applicants concerned were subsequently given their legal status or that any refusal during the period under review was contrary to the Convention. [KO01, p.108- 111]

The specific checks should identify the original application, the birth and the stateless person, the day-to-day convention rule, the grounds for refusal, the authority's documented knowledge, the time of resumption and the actual outcome. The consequence is the time period during which a person lacked the nationality or access to the award to which he or she was entitled. Persons, families, refusals and resignations are different counting units. The national inventory can only be deduced when these events are linked at case or person level.

For the Iraq/Afghanistan Commission, the documented failure in the report's material is that politically decided closure prevented the commissioned overall public investigation. Its mandate covered circumstances central to examining the State's duty to investigate possible torture and ill-treatment. Closure does not itself establish that a particular person committed torture. The demand is investigation of unresolved acts, knowledge of risk, transfers and accountability chains in a forum capable of obtaining original material. Later Green Desert judgments have their own parties and limits and cannot simply replace the entire closed mandate. [KO01, pp.128-132; see the report's separate Green Desert analysis]

Instruction Commission: limitation of the right to review of criminal liability

The lengthy delay had a documented legal consequence: the commission refrained from assessing possible criminal responsibility for 2016-2017 because the relevant matters were time-barred. This appears in the original final report of April 2021,volume 6 pp. 3578-3579. The precise conclusion is therefore not that the officials were criminally acquitted for 2016-2017. It is that culpability was not examined for these acts. [KO02]

The report examines Criminal Code sections 156-157 as applicable at the time, the limitation period and when neglect of duty ceased. The then ordinary maximum sentence of 4 months' imprisonment generally entailed a 2-year limitation period. A subsequent increase for certain managers could not simply be applied retrospectively to earlier acts. Circumstances from 2019 were assessed separately. A present-day maximum sentence or statutory text must not be inserted as the applicable rule for all 20 years. [KO02, pp.3577-3579]

The Commission's individual assessments concerned, inter alia, the following five persons, but **At different points of responsibility**:

Person in the report	The criticism that led to a positive assessment of possible disciplinary liability	Original position
Line Shooter Mørk Hansen	Active involvement in the instruction and its maintenance; assessed as intentional and gross	Volume 6 p.3499-3500
Happiness Sørensen	Actions / omissions in the administration and duty of truth in the subsequent course	S.3500- 3504
Jesper Gori	Confidentiality in the subsequent course; the separate assessment of the 2016 administration did not have the same positive gravity conclusion	S.3501-3504
Lene Linnea Vejrum	Involvement in the administration, failure to resume immediately after 18.03.2016, and information to the Danish Parliament / Ombudsman	S.3506-3509
Ditte Kruse Dankert	Involvement in the administration, failure to re-establish the law and the obligation to be truthful in the future	S.3506-3509

This table summarises the Commission's assessments of responsibilities. It is not five convictions, five similar administrative offences or proof of five final penalties. Those who had left state employment were not considered disciplinary within the scope of the mandate; it is not an acquittal of fact. The final employer's reaction must be documented by a separate decision. [KO02, p.3492- 3509,3568-3569]

There is no corresponding fixed general disciplinary limitation period. The report nevertheless describes how a long delay may justify a milder response or no response, and how special grounds are required after approximately 5 years. This is a time factor in the assessment of responsibility, not an unconditional statutory 5-year limit. Disciplinary responses under Civil Servants Act § 24 include warning, reprimand, fine, transfer, demotion and dismissal. Disciplinary and criminal assessments of responsibility are not mutually exclusive. [KO02,pp.3570-3572,3580]

The importance of the evidence is that, several years after the intervention, the end of a public inquiry may be too late for a trial, while the family has already borne the consequences. The action / omission to be tested is both the original unlawful instruction and the subsequent failure to stop or resume. The liability is a dated record of the authorities' knowledge, continued actions and any interruption of limitation. The specific requirement of the system is that investigation into possible criminal liability and the safeguarding of evidence should not be postponed solely to await a multiannual Commission report.

Liability does not confer the right to continue clearly unlawful action;

The original version of the report clarifies a significant difference: in the case of a clearly unlawful order of service, the official must state his resignation; in the case of a highly probable illegality, there may be a right to reject, even if the higher threshold for an unconditional obligation to reject has not been reached. The obligation of warning and the obligation to seek an unlawful condition which has already been implemented must be examined separately. This must not be reduced to a general claim that a staff member should simply obey. [KO02, corrigendum and p.3526-3528]

The later disciplinary inquiry in the mink case also describes the duty to establish the facts as applicable both to decisions and operational administrative activity. Acts without a formal decision therefore do not become free of legal responsibility. A supervisory rule normally permitting a superior to rely on subordinates has a specific exception where there is particular reason to investigate unlawfulness. The report therefore does not apply a presumption of lawful administration without first checking what the superior actually knew and when. [IF03, physical pp.5-8/printed pp.116-119]

Subsequent studies and current open mandates

Investigation	Knowledge / status before the report cut-off date	How to count the result
Tibet Commission and Tibet Commission II	Public reports 2017 and 2022 on police interventions and the conduct of the authorities	Specific circumstances, persons and subsequent decisions must be deduced between the first and the second investigation. A repeated finding is not a new violation.
Instruction Commission	Sub-report 2020 and Final Report April 2021; subsequent Court of Justice 2021	The commission’s assessments of individuals and the Court of Impeachment’s judgment concerning a Minister are different determinations. The same family cases must not be counted twice.
Mink missile n	Report 30.06.2022; Parliamentary and disciplinary finishing 2022-2023	First criticism, first reaction and subsequent recall must be separate. Revocated warnings are not sanctions in force.
Survey on SKAT	Established 03.07.2017; continued work	An open investigation mandate does not provide a final error rate or a completed account of personal responsibility.
THE FEE COMMISSION	Declared 21.12.2020; Report 13.12.2021 classified	The full report is not public. Public access to a summary does not allow for retesting of all underlying issues.
THE COMMUNITY COMMISSION	Decreased 01.10.2023; amendment 2024 extended to the Findsen/ Hjort cases. Letter 25.06.2026: expected report by 30.06.2028	The investigation has not yet been completed. The original target date 01.04.2026 and later the end of 2026 are higher expectations, not closing dates.
Samsam Commission of Inquiry	The proposal B27 was rejected 18.12.2025	A rejected proposal may not be registered as an actual commission or an investigation carried out. The Supreme Court judgment of 02.09.2025 is an independent basis of evidence.

Sources: KO03-KO06 and the separate original reports in the literature and source register. For FEII, current expectations are checked on the Commission's own website, which explicitly refers to the letter 25.06.2026. The Ministry of Justice communication 09.07.2026 describes the transmission; a brief search for the "possibility" of ending 2026 cannot be used as proof that 2026 was still the schedule. [KO04- KO05]

FEII's mandate covers both the suspensions from duty in August 2020 and, following its extension, the organisation of investigation and prosecution of Lars Johan Findsen and Claus Hjort Frederiksen. The commission must investigate improper considerations and express its opinion on possible responsibility. § 22 of the Act envisages a public report with necessary protections and the possibility of a further non-public report. Confidentiality limits public scrutiny; it does not remove the mandate's duty to investigate. [KO04]

A proposed longer ministerial deadline was not applicable

Bill L118, introduced 25.02.2026, proposed, among other things, to change the ordinary limitation period for ministerial responsibility and provide a subsequent period in connection with commission investigations. Folketinget's official case status is **lapsed**. The proposal must therefore not be used as the applicable rule in the report's comparison of public and private responsibility. A document display labelled "In force" on Retsinformation does not in itself turn a bill into an enacted law. [KO07]

This source control is of direct importance: the report can demonstrate a political attempt to remedy the problem of time, but cannot on that basis claim that the problem is generally resolved. Special rules in the legislation on a particular commission must be assessed within their own scope of application and cannot be extended to all municipal case handlers or ministers.

Documented errors, hypotheses and necessary evidence

Documented in the stated original sources: unlawful separation administration and substantive ECHR violations in the Court of Impeachment's judgment; the commission's positive assessments of possible disciplinary responsibility on the separately identified points above; absence of criminal review of 2016-2017 because of limitation; withdrawal of several mink-related disciplinary responses; closure of the Iraq/Afghanistan Commission without a report; lack of public access to FEI's complete report; postponement of FEII's expected report to 2028. These findings must not be added as numbers of victims or criminal convictions.

Hypotheses requiring further evidence: that the timing in a specific case was deliberately arranged to avoid responsibility; that a particular manager had specific knowledge not apparent from the checked records; that a later revocation disregarded necessary contemporaneous evidence; or that every citizen in the commission's subject population suffered the same legal harm. None of these hypotheses is used as established fact.

Documents necessary to complete an individual accountability account: original report/list of allegations, documented knowledge, actual cessation date, investigative steps relevant to limitation, final employer decision and actual redress for the citizen. Their absence from public records does not prove that no response occurred. Every decisive factual claim above can be traced to a specific report, decision or official case status; where the source is only an official later review, this is stated.

Cassation of social complaints: documented loss of evidence

Original-controlled course [ARK-FOB08]

The Ombudsman's case 2006-3096-009 / FOB 2008.399 describes erroneous rules of cassation: an annual deadline was calculated from creation rather than closure. PDF-s.8-14:

Central government	Documented regional progress
Capital	Cases created up to 2004 and many from 2005 were discarded; direct citizens' mail was not generally passed on to the municipality.
South Denmark	Cases set up before 2005 discarded; direct incoming mail not generally forwarded.
Central Jutland	Cases brought up to and including 2004 dismissed; last completed on 25 November 2005.

Central government	Documented regional progress
North Jutland	Nordjylland's old social cases have been preserved since 1992; Viborg's cases up to and including 2004 have been discarded, including original municipal acts. Electronic self-produced material preserved.

The Ministry had not carried out a systematic survey of the archives of the municipalities; the sample included 4-5 municipalities per region. The Ombudsman maintained criticism of premature cassation and considered that one year of storage was usually inadequate in relation to obsolete requirements. The archives could not simply be moved to the municipality. Later, own and received acts were retained longer; Zealand stopped returning. No total number of cases destroyed or citizens concerned shall be published. Locator: PDF-s.8-14 and 32-35; printed pages are one lower.

Consistency, responsibility and necessary investigation

The documented interference with the citizens' evidence is concrete: material which had been delivered directly to the Board of Appeal could have been destroyed without being returned to the municipality. The archives of the municipality cannot therefore be used without control as proof that the entire appeal has been preserved. For Viborg, the loss described also includes original municipal acts. The cases concerned must be examined through the files of both the Board of Appeal and the municipality, electronic documents, copies of the citizen and any files supplied.

The strongest documented criticism is the premature discarding and the inadequately investigated basis for the conservation policy. The specific consequence may be to prevent the resumption of proceedings, more difficult proof of errors and losses, and a weakened review of the decision of an authority. Whether this resulted in a particular loss or breach of a convention in an individual case requires the evidence and timeline of the case in question; the national investigation does not establish this automatically for all cases.

The necessary register query to the Appeals Board, National Archives and those responsible for the relevant former State Administrations' archives is: destruction protocols and legal authority; specific case numbers and creation/closure dates; which originals, copies and digital documents were covered; return registers; any reconstruction; remaining archive location. Municipal responses must be reconciled against the same case numbers. Numbers of cases and persons can be counted only afterwards.

This is not evidence that a particular public statistical year has disappeared or that published anchor tables are incorrect. Such an end requires separate proof. Nor is it a justification for omitting still available primary tables from the report.

Documented errors and open evidence points

• Documented: incorrect start date of the cassation deadline; concrete cassation in the specified areas; not fully investigated municipal storage; criticism of the short storage.

• To be examined: number of cases / persons destroyed, actual lack of material in each case, financial and family consequences, employee and management responsibilities, and actual reconstruction and restoration.

• The evidence chain: regional response in the Ombudsman's original decision → control and criticism of the document → case cashier / return records and retained originals. Regional responses are the information provided by the authorities; individual reconstruction is not yet checked here.

Annual review 2006-2023 - historical original figures

Substantively checked 2006-2023: main conclusions/denominators, reported columns in ministerial tables and annual reports' follow-up distributions. From 2018 both annual originals' complete follow-up annexes and financial section tables are checked;the 2021-23 theme matrix is complete. Specific citizen/time findings and other tables in criticism sections are separately delimited in the coverage matrix below; no overall unique victim population has been inferred. 2024-2025 is addressed in the other audit module.

Total number of checks

Year	Evaluated audits;	Appropriations trolled main accounts;	Positive bedø %	Essential b Evil Bem Prunes	Original / locator
2006	504	1331	89	4	Report, PDF 9
2007	470	1437	89	10	Report, PDF 8

2006: 18 follow-up cases from 2005; 11 are dealt with in the year's report and 7 in separate notes (PDF 6, § 17). This is a location of follow-up, not a figure for closed cases.

Ministerial areas: all published evaluation totals

Colony break: The 2006 product column also includes unrated grant control. The 2007 total is audited. Main accounts are a separate unit. No column counts unique institutions, employees or citizens.

2006

Council of Ministers	Products including non-b old	Very Rare dsstilling,	Satisfaction end	Not quite open the nesting stille, de	Not satisfied still	Appropriations label; no	PDF / Table
in the territory of the Ministry of State;	10	0	7	0	0	0	11/t 2
in the territory of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;	10	0	7	1	0	1	14/t 4
in the territory of the Ministry of Finance;	28	8	11	3	2	0	20/t 6
in the territory of the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Industry;	48	1	36	1	0	0	28/t 8
on the territory of the Ministry of Taxation;	13	0	9	1	0	1	31/t 10
in the territory of the Ministry of Justice;	27	1	19	0	0	0	35/t 12
in the territory of the Ministry of Defence;	27	0	12	5	0	0	38/t 14
in the territory of the Ministry of Social Affairs;	31	1	20	1	0	0	45/t 16
in the territory of the Ministry of the Interior and Health;	43	2	27	1	0	0	49/t 18
within the Ministry of Employment's remit	35	0	24	5	0	0	53/t 20
within the Ministry of Integration’s portfolio	16	1	12	0	0	0	58/t 22
within the Ministry of Science’s remit	87	0	69	6	0	0	61/t 24
within the Ministry of Education's remit	39	0	25	3	1	1	71/t 26
in the territory of the Ministry of Culture;	133	2	80	8	1	1	77/t 28
on the territory of the Ministry of Church;	4	0	3	0	0	0	83/t 30
in the territory of the Ministry of the Environment;	30	0	18	3	0	0	86/t 32
in the territory of the Ministry of Food;	19	0	12	1	0	0	91/t 34
within the Ministry of Family and Consumer Affairs’ portfolio	24	0	12	6	0	0	93/t 36
in the territory of the Ministry of Transport and Energy;	55	1	29	5	1	0	98/t 38

Council of Ministers	Products including non-b old	Very Rare dsstilling,	Satisfaction end	Not quite open the nesting stille, de	Not satisfied still	Appropriations label; no	PDF / Table
Own sum	679	17	432	50	5	4	19 ministerial areas

Source: Original 2006.

2007

Council of Ministers	Evaluated audits;	Very common setting	Satisfactory nde	Not quite available Editing	Not satisfied add	PDF / Table
in the territory of the Ministry of State;	7	1	6	0	0	11/t 3
in the territory of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;	9	0	6	3	0	14/t 6
in the territory of the Ministry of Finance;	25	10	12	3	0	24/t 9
in the territory of the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Industry;	40	0	37	3	0	31/t 12
on the territory of the Ministry of Taxation;	11	1	9	1	0	35/t 15
in the territory of the Ministry of Justice;	22	0	20	2	0	42/t 19
in the territory of the Ministry of Defence;	22	0	20	2	0	49/t 22
in the territory of the Ministry of Social Affairs;	23	0	17	6	0	58/t 26
in the territory of the Ministry of the Interior and Health;	25	0	23	2	0	64/t 29
within the Ministry of Employment's remit	34	0	26	7	1	70/t 32
within the Ministry of Integration's portfolio	10	0	9	1	0	76/t 35
within the Ministry of Science's remit	61	0	59	2	0	79/t 38
within the Ministry of Education's remit	26	0	19	5	2	88/t 41
in the territory of the Ministry of Culture;	78	3	70	5	0	99/t 44
on the territory of the Ministry of Church;	3	0	3	0	0	105/t 47
in the territory of the Ministry of the Environment;	19	0	18	1	0	108/t 50
in the territory of the Ministry of Food;	11	1	9	1	0	112/t 53
within the Ministry of Family and Consumer Affairs' portfolio	14	0	13	1	0	116/t 56
in the territory of the Ministry of Transport and Energy;	30	1	23	5	1	119/t 59
Own sum	470	17	399	50	4	19 ministerial areas

Source: Original 2007.

Importance and local boundaries observed

The 2006 scale allows improvement needs in a positive assessment. "Satisfactory" means that the main standards are met, not that every action was flawless (PDF 149- 150, § 619- 621). Thus, the positive assessment of the State Ministry is followed by specific shortcomings in the documentation and approval of reposts (PDF 11, § 36-37). Therefore, a positive audit conclusion cannot be used as evidence that the rights of all citizens concerned were fulfilled.

Residues

The main/ministerial/follow-up series 2006-2023 and the 17 separately specified 2018-2021 annual tables have subsequently been checked in the following sections and supplementary module. Current gaps concern individual criticism/methodology figures, other special reports and person/loss/redress linkage. Ministerial portfolios and review units change; aggregation requires compatible units and populations.

2007- 2017: declarations, control populations and follow-up

Year	Measure	Number	Unit / denominator	Limitation / Locator
2007	2006 follow-up	13	cases	9 referred to in the year's report; 4 continued note; original, PDF 179
2007	follow-up referred to in the report;	9	cases	; original, PDF 179
2007	follow-up separately note	4	cases	Own 13 − 9; original, PDF 179
2007	enterprises in the state accounts;	175	enterprises;	; original, PDF 179
2007	own funds institutions audited;	311	institutions	; original, PDF 179
2007	declaration pilot;	15	enterprises;	New product; overlapping with rating ratings; original, PDF 180
2008	ministerial areas;	19	areas	; original, PDF 170
2008	accounting reservations undertakings;	5	enterprises;	; original, PDF 9
2008	reservations concerning administration	1	cases	Can overlap with companies with accounting reservations; original, PDF 9
2008	the main remarks of the appropriation;	7	comments;	; original, PDF 9
2008	main accounts with authorisation control;	1470	main accounts;	; original, PDF 9
2008	companies with a declaration;	72	enterprises;	2008 methodology break; risk / materiality selection; original, PDF 5
2008	enterprises without a declaration;	127	enterprises;	Only final audit / authorisation control; not examined target / results / management; original, PDF 5
2008	companies disclosed in background	168	enterprises;	Position other than 72 + 127; denominators not harmonised; original, PDF 170
2008	own funds institutions audited;	289	institutions	; original, PDF 170
2008	2007 follow-up	26	cases	; original, PDF 170
2008	follow-up referred to in the report;	6	cases	; original, PDF 170
2008	follow-up separately note	20	cases	Own 26 − 6; not finished; original, PDF 170
2009	companies with a declaration;	88	enterprise accounts;	; original, PDF 8
2009	accounting reservations undertakings;	2	enterprises;	; original, PDF 8
2009	additional information;	14	information;	Number of data; not number of enterprises; original, PDF 8
2009	set-up auditor reservations	1	reservations;	TAX management; separate actor / area; original, PDF 8
2009	follow-up from 2008	22	cases	; original, PDF 131

Year	Measure	Number	Unit / denominator	Limitation / Locator
2009	follow-up referred to in the report;	12	cases	; original, PDF 131
2009	follow-up moved second report	1	Case	Regions' financial reporting, government transfers 2009; original, PDF 131
2009	follow-up separately note	9	cases	Own 22 − 12 − 1; original, PDF 131
2010	Reservation of undertakings in the State accounts	3	enterprises;	; original, PDF 7
2010	additional information in the state accounts;	6	information;	; original, PDF 7
2010	set-up auditor additional information	1	information;	; original, PDF 7
2010	DSB reservations without state accounts	2	reservations;	One enterprise; not 2 persons / enterprises; original, PDF 9
2010	2009 follow-up	22	cases	The financial management of the police is followed in the police reform report; original, PDF 119
2010	additional 2009 solved	10	conditions;	14 years before: 10 loose + 3 maintained + 1 referred to EU report; original, PDF 9
2010	Additional 2009 maintained	3	information;	; original, PDF 9
2010	additional 2009 moved	1	information;	; original, PDF 9
2011	accounting reservations undertakings;	3	enterprises;	; original, PDF 5
2011	additional information in the state accounts;	16	information;	; original, PDF 5
2011	follow-up from 2010	29	cases	; original, PDF 153
2011	follow-up proposed completed	11	cases	; original, PDF 153
2011	follow-up continued in the report	11	cases	; original, PDF 153
2011	follow-up of future report	7	cases	; original, PDF 153
2012	companies with a declaration;	53	enterprise accounts;	; original, PDF 7
2012	companies endorsed without the state accounts;	54	enterprises;	; original, PDF 8
2012	accounting reservations undertakings;	2	enterprises;	; original, PDF 5
2012	additional information in the state accounts;	10	information;	Distributed to 8 enterprises; original, PDF 5

Year	Measure	Number	Unit / denominator	Limitation / Locator
2012	undertakings providing additional information;	8	enterprises;	; original, PDF 5
2012	follow-up before year	49	cases	; original, PDF 17
2012	follow-up proposed completed	22	cases	; original, PDF 17
2012	continued follow-up;	27	cases	; original, PDF 17
2013	ministerial declarations;	20	ministerial areas;	Level moved from enterprises to ministerial areas; original, PDF 8
2013	Reservation on ministerial declarations	3	reservations;	Concerns the lawfulness of administration/dispositions in 2 enterprises; original, PDF 6
2013	Additional information Ministerial Declarations	3	information;	2 ministerial areas; original, PDF 6
2014	Reservation on ministerial declarations	5	reservations;	All SKAT; not 5 ministries / persons; original, PDF 7
2014	Additional information Ministerial Declarations	2	information;	Defence and EU funds; original, PDF 10
2015	ministerial declarations;	20	Ministries	; original, PDF 14
2015	Reservation on ministerial declarations	2	reservations;	Tax and former City / Housing / Rural; total accounts without reservation; original, PDF 4
2015	Opinions TAX	2	opinions;	; original, PDF 15
2016	ministerial statements including section 38;	19	declarations;	; original, PDF 10
2016	Highlights Ministerial Declarations	3	Ministries	New name for supplementary information; ISSAI200; original, PDF 10
2016	critical opinions;	1	Opinion	SKAT recovery; other local errors below materiality; original, PDF 11
2017	Reservation § 38 and consolidated accounts	1	reservations;	The same tax reservations are made in two declarations; not two independent cases; original, PDF 8
2017	critical opinions;	2	opinions;	Tax interest on and recovery; original, PDF 10
2014	follow-up annex total	58	Cases / 58	Total source; original, PDF 157-163
2014	follow-up proposed completed	21	Cases / 58	Own enumeration of all status rows; proposal ≠ documented closing date; original, PDF 157-163
2014	follow-up awaits publicity	27	Cases / 58	Own count; original, PDF 157-163
2014	follow-up will continue to follow	7	Cases / 58	Own count; original, PDF 157-163
2014	follow-up to the second report;	3	Cases / 58	Own count; not ending the problem; original, PDF 157-163
2015	follow-up annex total	62	Cases / 62	Total source; original, PDF 141-149
2015	follow-up proposed completed	23	Cases / 62	Own enumeration of all status rows; proposal ≠ documented closing date; original, PDF 141-149

Year	Measure	Number	Unit / denominator	Limitation / Locator
2015	follow-up awaits publicity	26	Cases / 62	Own count; original, PDF 141-149
2015	follow-up will continue to follow	11	Cases / 62	Own count; original, PDF 141-149
2015	follow-up to the second report;	2	Cases / 62	Own count; not ending the problem; original, PDF 141-149
2016	follow-up annex total	48	Cases / 48	Total source; original, PDF 143-150
2016	follow-up proposed completed	14	Cases / 48	Own enumeration of all status rows; proposal ≠ documented closing date; original, PDF 143-150
2016	follow-up awaits publicity	24	Cases / 48	Own count; original, PDF 143-150
2016	follow-up will continue to follow	9	Cases / 48	Own count; original, PDF 143-150
2016	follow-up to the second report;	1	Cases / 48	Own count; not ending the problem; original, PDF 143-150
2017	follow-up annex total	55	Case / 55	Total source; original, PDF 130-136
2017	follow-up proposed completed	15	Case / 55	Own enumeration of all status rows; proposal ≠ documented closing date; original, PDF 130-136
2017	follow-up awaits publicity	32	Case / 55	Own count; original, PDF 130-136
2017	follow-up will continue to follow	6	Case / 55	Own count; original, PDF 130-136
2017	follow-up to the second report;	2	Case / 55	Own count; not ending the problem; original, PDF 130-136

Documented definition breaches

•2008: A four-grade scale is replaced by risk-selected entity statements; final audit without a statement remains.

• 2013: Core conclusions are specified in ministerial territory; enterprises / reservations / areas are different entities.

• 2016: Highlighting replaces additional information after ISSAI200.

• 2018: Financial audit of state accounts and legal-critical / administrative audit are published in separate reports.

2008 announces the introduction 72 with / 127 without a statement, while the background section informs 168 companies and 289 independent institutions. The figures are kept according to their own textual boundaries. A false uniform population has not been formed.

The follow-up tables 2014-2017 have been counted in full: closure proposal + pending + continuing follow-up + another report = respectively 58,62,48,55. »Can be closed« is Rigsrevisionen's assessment, not documentation of specific redress for citizens or a closure date. Transfers are counted separately.

Additional verified figures

Year	Measure	Number	Unit / denominator	Meaning and original
2006	enterprises in the state accounts;	175	enterprises;	; original, PDF 148
2006	own funds institutions audited;	72	institutions	; original, PDF 148
2015	additional ministerial information;	3	Ministries	Defence, City / Housing / Rural and Transport / Building; original, PDF 15
2012	follow-up actual supporting documents;	50	rows	49 pre-case plus 1 additional cultural case from 2013; original, PDF 170- 175
2012	follow-up documents closure	22	rows	intro example omitted from the count; original, PDF 170- 175
2012	follow-up documents continued	23	rows	; original, PDF 170- 175
2012	follow-up documents transferred;	5	rows	; original, PDF 170- 175
2013	follow-up main text total	56	cases	; original, PDF 13
2013	follow-up main text closure	16	cases	; original, PDF 13
2013	follow-up key text continued	40	cases	; original, PDF 13
2013	follow-up documentsintotal	56	cases	; original, PDF 157
2013	follow-up supporting documents	17	cases	; original, PDF 157
2013	follow-up supporting belief continued	33	cases	; original, PDF 157
2013	follow-up supporting documents; second report;	6	cases	; original, PDF 157
2013	own fully completed or proposal;	17	rows / marks;	16 complete proposal + 1 already completed; original, PDF 158-163
2013	own continued incl mixed	34	rows / marks;	14 awaiting + 20 continued; 2 mixed; original, PDF 158-163
2013	own other transferred	5	rows / marks;	6 transfer marks minus 1 already completed; original, PDF 158-163
2013	own mixed follow-up outcome;	2	rows / marks;	PDF158 rows 1 and PDF162 rows 6; original, PDF 158-163
2013	own closing stamps;	18	rows / marks;	16 full + 2 partial; not 18 fully completed cases; original, PDF 158-163
2013	the audit trail has already been completed;	1	rows / marks;	Notice 10.4.2014 on the Financial Management of the Defence Service; original, PDF 158-163
2021	theme vision	54	themes / revisions;	2021: source alternates between topics and cases; original, PDF 9
2021	positive thematic conclusions;	51	themes / revisions / 54	2021: source alternates between topics and cases; original, PDF 9

Year	Measure	Number	Unit / denominator	Meaning and original
2021	critical thematic conclusions;	3	themes / revisions / 54	2021: source alternates between topics and cases; original, PDF 9
2022	theme vision	35	themes / revisions;	; original, PDF 9
2022	positive thematic conclusions;	30	themes / revisions / 35	; original, PDF 9
2022	critical thematic conclusions;	5	themes / revisions / 35	; original, PDF 9
2022	Legal critical audits	17	themes / revisions;	; original, PDF 9
2022	positive legal-critical	16	themes / revisions;	; original, PDF 9
2022	Performance audits	18	themes / revisions;	; original, PDF 9
2022	positive management audits	14	themes / revisions;	; original, PDF 9
2023	theme vision	39	themes / revisions;	; original, PDF 10
2023	positive thematic conclusions;	39	themes / revisions / 39	; original, PDF 10
2023	critical thematic conclusions;	0	themes / revisions / 39	; original, PDF 10
2023	Legal critical audits	23	themes / revisions;	; original, PDF 10
2023	positive legal-critical	23	themes / revisions;	; original, PDF 10
2023	Performance audits	16	themes / revisions;	; original, PDF 10
2023	positive management audits	16	themes / revisions;	; original, PDF 10
2018	critical opinions;	3	cases / opinions	Critical Skat cases in ministry audits; other population delimitations separately; original, PDF 12
2019	critical opinions;	5	cases / opinions	Critical tax cases in the ministerial audit; other population delimitations separately; original, PDF 15
2020	critical opinions;	4	cases / opinions	Critical tax cases in the ministerial audit; other population scopes separately; original, PDF14
2021	financial provisions;	24	Declarations / 24	; original, PDF 11
2021	positive financial rules;	21	Declarations / 24	; original, PDF 11
2021	financial provisions subject to reservations;	3	Declarations / 24	; original, PDF 11
2021	Rejection of financial conclusions	0	Declarations / 24	; original, PDF 11

Year	Measure	Number	Unit / denominator	Meaning and original
2021	lack of financial conclusions;	0	Declarations / 24	; original, PDF 11
2021	financial audit cases in report	7	cases	5 contributes to overall reservations; 2 without; original, PDF 14
2021	Financial matters subject to reservations	5	cases	3 also clause reservation + 2 only aggregate; overlap; original, PDF 14
2022	financial reservations;	1	Rule of Procedure	Occupation; overall positive; original, PDF 10
2022	financial highlights;	2	conditions;	Articles 9 and 38; original, PDF 10
2022	financial management weaknesses	4	Ministries	; original, PDF 10
2023	financial reservations;	3	ministerial areas;	Occupation, Justice, Social / Housing / Older; Overall Positive; original, PDF 10
2023	financial highlights;	2	ministerial areas;	Tax and Food; original, PDF 17
2023	other accounting errors / weaknesses;	4	cases	; original, PDF 10
2023	user rights;	14	Ministries	Overlap possible; original, PDF 10
2023	IT safety missing r	4	Ministries	Overlap possible; original, PDF 10

The 2012 annex has 50 actual status rows:49 from the annual-audit stream plus 1 Culture case from 2013.2013's annex has 56 rows;2 rows contain both proposed closure and continued follow-up, and 1 transferred row was already closed in another stream on 10. April 2014. Our disjoint classification:17 closed/full proposals,34 continued including mixed cases,5 other transferred. The original's 16/40(main text) and 17/33/6(annex introduction) are retained. None of these figures counts citizens who obtained redress.

All product ranges 2006-2007

The Vector shows products, very satisfactory, satisfactory, not entirely satisfactory, not satisfactory; 2006 also has comments on appropriations. The source's hyphen is maintained as "-"; empty number cells are reproduced as 0. All 273 product rows are aligned to 38 ministerial totals.

Year	Ministerial Table	Product	All columns	PDF
2006	2	authorisation checks;	3 / - / - / - / - / 0	11
2006	2	closing	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0 / -	11
2006	2	Current	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	11
2006	2	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	11
2006	2	annual report;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	11
2006	4	authorisation checks;	2 / - / - / - / - / 1	14
2006	4	closing	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	14
2006	4	Current	2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0 / -	14
2006	4	pay;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	14

Year	Ministerial Table	Product	All columns	PDF
2006	4	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	14
2006	4	IT	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	14
2006	4	annual report;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	14
2006	6	authorisation checks;	4 / - / - / - / - / 0	20
2006	6	closing	8 / 4 / 3 / 0 / 1 / -	20
2006	6	Current	2 / 0 / 0 / 2 / 0 / -	20
2006	6	pay;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	20
2006	6	other	2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0 / -	20
2006	6	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	20
2006	6	annual report;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	20
2006	6	internal audit;	8 / 4 / 3 / 0 / 1 / -	20
2006	8	authorisation checks;	10 / - / - / - / - / 0	28
2006	8	closing	12 / 1 / 11 / 0 / 0 / -	28
2006	8	Current	4 / 0 / 3 / 1 / 0 / -	28
2006	8	pay;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	28
2006	8	grants;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	28
2006	8	IT	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0 / -	28
2006	8	annual report;	4 / 0 / 4 / 0 / 0 / -	28
2006	8	internal audit;	11 / 0 / 11 / 0 / 0 / -	28
2006	10	authorisation checks;	3 / - / - / - / - / 1	31
2006	10	closing	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0 / -	31
2006	10	Current	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	31
2006	10	pay;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	31
2006	10	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	31
2006	10	IT	1 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 0 / -	31
2006	10	annual report;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	31
2006	10	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	31
2006	12	authorisation checks;	7 / - / - / - / - / 0	35
2006	12	closing	7 / 0 / 7 / 0 / 0 / -	35
2006	12	Current	4 / 0 / 4 / 0 / 0 / -	35
2006	12	pay;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	35
2006	12	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	35
2006	12	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	35
2006	12	IT	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	35

Year	Ministerial Table	Product	All columns	PDF
2006	12	annual report;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	35
2006	12	other	1 / 1 / 0 / 0 / 0 / -	35
2006	12	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	35
2006	12	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	35
2006	14	authorisation checks;	10 / - / - / - / - / 0	38
2006	14	closing	7 / 0 / 7 / 0 / 0 / -	38
2006	14	Current	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0 / -	38
2006	14	pay;	2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0 / -	38
2006	14	annual report;	2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0 / -	38
2006	14	internal audit;	3 / 0 / 0 / 3 / 0 / -	38
2006	16	authorisation checks;	9 / - / - / - / - / 0	45
2006	16	closing	8 / 0 / 8 / 0 / 0 / -	45
2006	16	Current	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	45
2006	16	pay;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	45
2006	16	grants;	1 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 0 / -	45
2006	16	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	45
2006	16	annual report;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	45
2006	16	other	1 / 1 / 0 / 0 / 0 / -	45
2006	16	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	45
2006	16	other	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	45
2006	16	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	45
2006	18	authorisation checks;	13 / - / - / - / - / 0	49
2006	18	closing	13 / 0 / 13 / 0 / 0 / -	49
2006	18	Current	5 / 0 / 5 / 0 / 0 / -	49
2006	18	pay;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	49
2006	18	grants;	3 / 1 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	49
2006	18	IT	3 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 0 / -	49
2006	18	annual report;	4 / 0 / 4 / 0 / 0 / -	49
2006	20	authorisation checks;	6 / - / - / - / - / 0	53
2006	20	closing	17 / 0 / 13 / 4 / 0 / -	53
2006	20	Current	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	53
2006	20	pay;	1 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 0 / -	53
2006	20	grants;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	53
2006	20	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	53

Year	Ministerial Table	Product	All columns	PDF
2006	20	annual report;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	53
2006	20	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	53
2006	20	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	53
2006	20	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	53
2006	22	authorisation checks;	3 / - / - / - / - / 0	58
2006	22	closing	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0 / -	58
2006	22	Current	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	58
2006	22	pay;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	58
2006	22	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	58
2006	22	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	58
2006	22	annual report;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	58
2006	22	other	1 / 1 / 0 / 0 / 0 / -	58
2006	22	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	58
2006	24	authorisation checks;	12 / - / - / - / - / 0	61
2006	24	closing	24 / 0 / 21 / 3 / 0 / -	61
2006	24	Current	17 / 0 / 15 / 2 / 0 / -	61
2006	24	pay;	3 / 0 / 2 / 1 / 0 / -	61
2006	24	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	61
2006	24	annual report;	16 / 0 / 16 / 0 / 0 / -	61
2006	24	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	61
2006	24	internal audit;	12 / 0 / 12 / 0 / 0 / -	61
2006	26	authorisation checks;	10 / - / - / - / - / 1	71
2006	26	closing	13 / 0 / 10 / 2 / 1 / -	71
2006	26	Current	6 / 0 / 5 / 1 / 0 / -	71
2006	26	pay;	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0 / -	71
2006	26	grants;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	71
2006	26	IT	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	71
2006	26	annual report;	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0 / -	71
2006	26	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	71
2006	28	authorisation checks;	42 / - / - / - / - / 1	77
2006	28	closing	42 / 1 / 38 / 3 / 0 / -	77
2006	28	Current	14 / 0 / 14 / 0 / 0 / -	77
2006	28	pay;	11 / 0 / 8 / 2 / 1 / -	77
2006	28	grants;	7 / 0 / 6 / 1 / 0 / -	77

Year	Ministerial Table	Product	All columns	PDF
2006	28	IT	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0 / -	77
2006	28	annual report;	13 / 1 / 10 / 2 / 0 / -	77
2006	28	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	77
2006	30	authorisation checks;	1 / - / - / - / - / 0	83
2006	30	closing	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	83
2006	30	Current	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	83
2006	30	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	83
2006	32	authorisation checks;	9 / - / - / - / - / 0	86
2006	32	closing	9 / 0 / 8 / 1 / 0 / -	86
2006	32	Current	6 / 0 / 5 / 1 / 0 / -	86
2006	32	pay;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	86
2006	32	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	86
2006	32	IT	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	86
2006	32	annual report;	3 / 0 / 2 / 1 / 0 / -	86
2006	34	authorisation checks;	6 / - / - / - / - / 0	91
2006	34	closing	4 / 0 / 3 / 1 / 0 / -	91
2006	34	Current	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	91
2006	34	pay;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	91
2006	34	grants;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	91
2006	34	annual report;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	91
2006	34	internal audit;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	91
2006	36	authorisation checks;	6 / - / - / - / - / 0	93
2006	36	closing	6 / 0 / 4 / 2 / 0 / -	93
2006	36	Current	3 / 0 / 2 / 1 / 0 / -	93
2006	36	pay;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	93
2006	36	grants;	1 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 0 / -	93
2006	36	IT	2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0 / -	93
2006	36	annual report;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	93
2006	36	other	1 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 0 / -	93
2006	36	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	93
2006	38	authorisation checks;	19 / - / - / - / - / 0	98
2006	38	closing	19 / 0 / 16 / 2 / 1 / -	98
2006	38	Current	6 / 1 / 3 / 2 / 0 / -	98
2006	38	pay;	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0 / -	98

Year	Ministerial Table	Product	All columns	PDF
2006	38	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	98
2006	38	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	98
2006	38	annual report;	2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0 / -	98
2006	38	other	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0 / -	98
2006	38	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0 / -	98
2007	3	closing	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0	11
2007	3	Current	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	11
2007	3	pay;	1 / 1 / 0 / 0 / 0	11
2007	3	annual report;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	11
2007	6	closing	2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0	14
2007	6	Current	2 / 0 / 0 / 2 / 0	14
2007	6	pay;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	14
2007	6	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	14
2007	6	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	14
2007	6	annual report;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	14
2007	9	closing	9 / 5 / 3 / 1 / 0	24
2007	9	Current	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	24
2007	9	pay;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	24
2007	9	other	1 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 0	24
2007	9	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	24
2007	9	internal audit;	9 / 5 / 3 / 1 / 0	24
2007	12	closing	14 / 0 / 13 / 1 / 0	31
2007	12	Current	5 / 0 / 5 / 0 / 0	31
2007	12	pay;	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0	31
2007	12	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	31
2007	12	IT	3 / 0 / 2 / 1 / 0	31
2007	12	annual report;	4 / 0 / 3 / 1 / 0	31
2007	12	internal audit;	10 / 0 / 10 / 0 / 0	31
2007	15	closing	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0	35
2007	15	Current	2 / 1 / 1 / 0 / 0	35
2007	15	pay;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	35
2007	15	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	35
2007	15	IT	1 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 0	35
2007	15	annual report;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	35

Year	Ministerial Table	Product	All columns	PDF
2007	15	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	35
2007	19	closing	7 / 0 / 5 / 2 / 0	42
2007	19	Current	5 / 0 / 5 / 0 / 0	42
2007	19	pay;	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0	42
2007	19	grants;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	42
2007	19	IT	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	42
2007	19	annual report;	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0	42
2007	19	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	42
2007	22	closing	5 / 0 / 5 / 0 / 0	49
2007	22	Current	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0	49
2007	22	pay;	4 / 0 / 3 / 1 / 0	49
2007	22	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	49
2007	22	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	49
2007	22	annual report;	4 / 0 / 4 / 0 / 0	49
2007	22	internal audit;	3 / 0 / 2 / 1 / 0	49
2007	26	closing	8 / 0 / 8 / 0 / 0	58
2007	26	Current	3 / 0 / 2 / 1 / 0	58
2007	26	pay;	4 / 0 / 3 / 1 / 0	58
2007	26	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	58
2007	26	IT	2 / 0 / 0 / 2 / 0	58
2007	26	annual report;	2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0	58
2007	26	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	58
2007	26	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	58
2007	26	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 0	58
2007	29	closing	13 / 0 / 11 / 2 / 0	64
2007	29	Current	6 / 0 / 6 / 0 / 0	64
2007	29	grants;	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0	64
2007	29	IT	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	64
2007	29	annual report;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	64
2007	32	closing	21 / 0 / 13 / 7 / 1	70
2007	32	Current	5 / 0 / 5 / 0 / 0	70
2007	32	pay;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	70
2007	32	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	70
2007	32	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	70

Year	Ministerial Table	Product	All columns	PDF
2007	32	annual report;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	70
2007	32	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	70
2007	32	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	70
2007	35	closing	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0	76
2007	35	Current	2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0	76
2007	35	pay;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	76
2007	35	IT	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	76
2007	35	annual report;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	76
2007	35	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	76
2007	35	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	76
2007	38	closing	18 / 0 / 18 / 0 / 0	79
2007	38	Current	19 / 0 / 17 / 2 / 0	79
2007	38	pay;	5 / 0 / 5 / 0 / 0	79
2007	38	IT	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	79
2007	38	annual report;	10 / 0 / 10 / 0 / 0	79
2007	38	internal audit;	8 / 0 / 8 / 0 / 0	79
2007	41	closing	13 / 0 / 9 / 2 / 2	88
2007	41	Current	4 / 0 / 2 / 2 / 0	88
2007	41	pay;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	88
2007	41	grants;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	88
2007	41	IT	2 / 0 / 1 / 1 / 0	88
2007	41	annual report;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	88
2007	41	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	88
2007	44	closing	42 / 3 / 36 / 3 / 0	99
2007	44	Current	11 / 0 / 11 / 0 / 0	99
2007	44	pay;	4 / 0 / 4 / 0 / 0	99
2007	44	grants;	4 / 0 / 4 / 0 / 0	99
2007	44	IT	4 / 0 / 2 / 2 / 0	99
2007	44	annual report;	12 / 0 / 12 / 0 / 0	99
2007	44	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	99
2007	47	closing	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	105
2007	47	Current	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	105
2007	47	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	105
2007	50	closing	9 / 0 / 8 / 1 / 0	108

Year	Ministerial Table	Product	All columns	PDF
2007	50	Current	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0	108
2007	50	pay;	3 / 0 / 3 / 0 / 0	108
2007	50	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	108
2007	50	IT	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	108
2007	50	annual report;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	108
2007	53	closing	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	112
2007	53	Current	2 / 1 / 1 / 0 / 0	112
2007	53	pay;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	112
2007	53	grants;	1 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 0	112
2007	53	IT	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	112
2007	53	internal audit;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	112
2007	56	closing	5 / 0 / 5 / 0 / 0	116
2007	56	Current	4 / 0 / 4 / 0 / 0	116
2007	56	pay;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	116
2007	56	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	116
2007	56	IT	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	116
2007	56	annual report;	1 / 0 / 0 / 1 / 0	116
2007	56	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	116
2007	59	closing	18 / 0 / 13 / 4 / 1	119
2007	59	Current	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	119
2007	59	pay;	2 / 0 / 2 / 0 / 0	119
2007	59	grants;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	119
2007	59	IT	2 / 1 / 1 / 0 / 0	119
2007	59	annual report;	3 / 0 / 2 / 1 / 0	119
2007	59	other	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	119
2007	59	internal audit;	1 / 0 / 1 / 0 / 0	119

Full theme matrix 2022-2023

P = positive, K = critical. Absence of control fields does not mean a positive audit. Minorities follow the organisation of the year.

2022

Theme columns: 1=fee, 2=procurement, 3=pay/employment, 4=sales, 5=grants, 6=transfer of rights, 7=tax/duty, 8=debt collection, 9=debt-collection management, 10=project budget, 11=activity/resources, 12=target/result, 13=procurement management, 14=grant management, 15=tax-collection management, 16=sanctions. Original, table 1, PDF10.

Actor	Selected themes / outcomes	Number
Besk	5P, 14P	2

Actor	Selected themes / outcomes	Number
Children	12P	1
Erh.	1P	1
Fine.	4P, 12P	2
Fors	12P	1
Input	3P	1
Just	3P, 12P	2
Kirk	6P	1
Climate	5P, 14P	2
Cult	4P, 10P	2
Environment	1P, 12P	2
Food	1P, 12P	2
Honey.	7P, 9K, 10K, 16P	4
Social	1P, 12P	2
State	12P	1
Healthy	1K, 3P, 11K, 12K	4
Transport	3P	1
udd	5P, 14P	2
UM	4P	1
EXP	14P	1
Own sum		**35**

2023

Theme columns: 1 = purchase, 2 = salary / employment, 3 = sale, 4 = fee, 5 = grant, 6 = right transfer, 7 = debt recovery, 8 = tax / charge, 9 = activity / resource, 10 = target / result, 11 = purchase management, 12 = project budget, 13 = grant management, 14 = tax collection management, 15 = recovery management, 16 = system update. OriginalTable 1, PDF11.

Actor	Selected themes / outcomes	Number
State	No control fields	0
UM	4P	1
Fine.	9P	1
Erh.	9P	1
Honey.	2P, 7P, 8P, 9P, 14P, 16P	6
Eko	No control fields	0
Just	2P, 4P, 6P, 9P	4
Fors	2P, 3P, 9P	3

Actor	Selected themes / outcomes	Number
EXP	2P, 10P	2
Social	No control fields	0
Insund	2P, 5P, 6P, 13P	4
Besk	6P	1
udd	10P	1
Children	5P, 13P	2
Cult	5P, 13P	2
Kirk	2P, 10P	2
Environment	5P, 13P	2
Food	2P, 12P	2
Digital	1P, 11P	2
Transport	2P	1
Climate	6P	1
Regions	2P	1
Own sum		**39**

2022: 17 legal-critical and 18 management audits; 16 / 17 and 14 / 18 positive. 2023: 23 legal-critical and 16 management audits, all positive. This does not alter the actual breaches of the rules in the same report. The conclusions apply materiality and do not replace individual review of legality.

Concrete residues at the part-delivery

- 2006-2023 specific citizens / time consequences

Full Declaration Annex 2008-2010 by ministerial area

All 613 published annexes are checked by graphical column location. With / without is declaration columns; positive is an express pure declaration marker (2008 uses "revision" also in this column). Reservations and additional information may be in the same row; they are not combined as unique cases. A published series can bring together several institutions.

2008

Original, PDF174- 179.

Minister	Rows	With declaration	Without declaration	Positive cursor	Container cursor	Additional end Marker	Attachment cursor	No revision Black Marker
5	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
6	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
7	9	4	5	4	0	0	0	0
8	12	4	8	3	0	1	0	1
9	3	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
11	8	3	5	2	1	0	0	0
12	10	5	5	3	1	1	0	0

Minister	Rows	With declaration	Without declaration	Positive cursor	Container cursor	Additional end Marker	Attachment cursor	No revision Black Marker
15	11	4	7	4	0	0	0	0
16	11	4	7	4	0	0	0	0
17	21	3	18	2	1	0	0	0
18	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0
19	18	11	7	9	0	2	0	0
20	13	2	11	2	0	0	0	0
21	39	11	28	11	0	0	0	0
22	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
23	10	3	7	3	0	0	0	0
24	5	5	0	4	0	1	0	0
28	13	4	9	1	2	2	0	0
29	7	1	6	1	0	0	0	0
Sum	200	72	128	60	6	8	0	1

2009

Original, PDF132-138.

Minister	Rows	With declaration	Without declaration	Positive cursor	Container cursor	Additional end Marker	Attachment cursor	No revision Black Marker
5	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
6	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
7	5	5	0	3	0	2	0	0
8	12	3	9	3	0	0	0	0
9	3	3	0	2	1	1	0	0
11	11	6	5	4	1	1	0	0
12	9	4	5	2	0	2	0	0
15	11	5	6	5	0	0	0	0
16	11	3	8	3	0	0	0	0
17	12	3	9	2	1	0	0	0
18	4	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
19	20	11	9	10	0	1	0	0
20	13	2	11	0	0	2	0	0
21	40	11	29	11	0	0	0	0
22	5	2	3	2	0	0	0	0
23	8	5	3	4	0	1	0	0
24	5	5	0	4	0	1	0	0

Minister	Rows	With declaration	Without declaration	Positive cursor	Container cursor	Additional end Marker	Attachment cursor	No revision Black Marker
28	17	8	9	6	0	2	0	0
29	9	3	6	3	0	0	0	0
Sum	200	83	117	68	3	13	0	0

2010

Original, PDF120-126.

Minister	Rows	With declaration	Without declaration	Positive cursor	Container cursor	Additional end Marker	Attachment cursor	No revision Black Marker
5	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0
6	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
7	9	5	4	5	0	0	0	0
8	23	13	10	2	0	0	11	0
9	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
11	11	6	5	3	0	0	3	0
12	9	3	6	1	2	0	0	0
15	8	4	4	3	0	0	1	0
16	14	3	11	3	0	0	0	0
17	11	3	8	3	0	0	0	0
18	4	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
19	20	12	8	12	0	0	0	0
20	11	3	8	3	0	0	0	0
21	44	12	32	11	1	0	0	0
22	5	2	3	2	0	0	0	0
23	8	5	3	4	0	0	1	0
24	5	4	1	2	0	2	0	0
28	16	7	9	3	1	2	1	0
29	8	4	4	1	0	1	2	0
Sum	213	93	120	64	4	6	19	0

2008:60 purely positive-opinion rows and 12 rows with reservations/supplementary information;2 rows bear both markers. The 127 audits without an opinion and 1 dash are distinct. 2009:68 positive-opinion rows and 15 rows with modification,including 1 bearing both markers.83 rows in the with-opinion column include SKAT's substitute-Auditor-General row and 1 group of 7 TV2 regions:83−1+6=88 accounts with Auditor General opinions (own reconciliation against original PDF8/133/136).13 supplementary-information rows are not the source's 14 individual supplementary matters. 2010:93 rows in the with-opinion column include endorsements for undertakings outside the State accounts. DSB has 1 row marked with reservations, but the source's 2 reservations; not 2 undertakings.

Explicit institutional groups in the Annexes

Year	PDF / row marker	Group number	Column	Outcome
2008	174/26	10	without an accounting statement of assurance;	audit;
2008	177/31	266	without an accounting statement of assurance;	audit;
2009	132/22	10	without an accounting statement of assurance;	audit;
2009	134/23	11	without an accounting statement of assurance;	audit;
2009	135/33	266	without an accounting statement of assurance;	audit;
2009	136/40	7	with an accounting statement	positive statement of accounts;
2009	137/3	10	without an accounting statement of assurance;	audit;
2010	120/26	9	without an accounting statement of assurance;	audit;
2010	122/33	11	without an accounting statement of assurance;	audit;
2010	123/31	261	without an accounting statement of assurance;	audit;
2010	125/3	10	without an accounting statement of assurance;	audit;

Group numbers shall not be multiplied by a different annual drop-out rate. Revision of a group is not evidence of errors on the part of all members.

Ministerial tables 2011, including continuation pages

Original. Yes / No applies to significant accounting errors; no is no collective review of legality or civil rights. The type / error columns are checked on the first and subsequent table pages.

Minister	PDF pages	Rows	Declaration	Review	Signature	Yeah.	No.	Binders g / blank	Outside st Rain rain ab
5	55	3	2	1	0	0	3	0	0
6	58	12	1	5	6	2	10	0	10
7	63	6	5	1	0	0	6	0	0
8	71	22	3	10	9	0	22	0	12
9	75	4	3	0	1	1	3	0	1
11	81	11	3	5	3	0	11	0	3
12	86	8	4	3	1	0	8	0	1
15	91	10	4	5	1	0	10	0	1
16	95	16	3	10	3	0	16	0	3
17	101	8	3	5	0	0	8	0	1
18	104	4	1	3	0	0	4	0	1
19	106	12	6	6	0	1	11	0	3
20	112	12	3	9	0	3	9	0	4
21	118,119	45	5	32	8	0	45	0	8
22	122	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	1
23	125	11	2	7	2	2	9	0	5

Minister	PDF pages	Rows	Declaration	Review	Signature	Yeah.	No.	Binders g / blank	Outside st Rain rain ab
24	129	7	4	2	1	1	6	0	2
28	134	15	3	8	4	0	15	0	4
29	140	8	1	5	2	0	8	0	2
Sum		216	58	117	41	10	206	0	62

The amounts below are financial materiality in millions. DKK, not damage / compensation. E / R / P = declaration / audit / endorsement marker; I / U = inside / outside the state accounts. Actor name is a short identifier from the basic line of the row; broken names are not fully reproduced.

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
55/1	5	Department	E / I	No	111	
55/2	5	National Ombudsman in Greenland	R / I	No	13	
55/3	5	National Ombudsman in the Faroe Islands	E / I	No	11	
58/1	6	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	E / I	Yes	15.254	
58/2	6	Dansk Center for International	R / I	Yes	375	
58/3	6	Institute for Multi-Party Cooperation	P / U	No	12	
58/4	6	Danmarkshuset in Paris 4)	R / U	No	22	
58/5	6	Nordic Council of Ministers	P / U	No	1.879	
58/6	6	Nordic Council	P / U	No	67	
58/7	6	Nordic Cultural Foundation	P / U	No	69	
58/8	6	Nordens Welfare Center - Education	P / U	No	14	
58/9	6	Industrialisation Fund for devel-	R / U	No	265	
58/10	6	Investment Fund for the countries of Eastern Europe4	R / U	No	50	
58/11	6	The Arab Investment Fund (4) (5)	R / U	No	0	
58/12	6	Danske-Norsk Co-operation Fund	P / U	No	80	
63/1	7	Department	E / I	No	10.116	
63/2	7	The Danish Economic and Social Committee	E / I	No	811	
63/3	7	State Administration 3)	E / I	No	6.457	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
63/4	7	Personnel Board	E / I	No	305	
63/5	7	Palace and Property Board	R / I	No	2.737	
63/6	7	Statens It 3)	E / I	No	427	
71/1	8	Department	E / I	No	18.161	
71/2	8	Economic Council	R / I	No	25	
71/3	8	Competition and consumers	R / I	No	306	
71/4	8	The Danish Business and Companies Agency	R / I	No	522	
71/5	8	Patent and Commodity Board	E / I	No	302	
71/6	8	The National Security Agency	R / I	No	179	
71/7	8	Financial supervision	R / I	No	467	
71/8	8	Business and Construction Agency	R / I	No	2.966	
71/9	8	Statistics in Denmark	E / I	No	494	
71/10	8	Maritime Authority	R / I	No	503	
71/11	8	Nordic Patent Institute	P / U	No	34	
71/12	8	Export Credit Fund 4)	P / U	No	610	
71/13	8	Danmarks Erhvervsfond 4	P / U	No	11	
71/14	8	Export loan scheme 4)	P / U	No	948	
71/15	8	Vækstfonden 4)	P / U	No	473	
71/16	8	The Danish Accreditation and	P / U	No	58	
71/17	8	The travel guarantee fund	P / U	No	27	
71/18	8	Guarantee Fund for Depositors and	P / U	No	501	
71/19	8	The guarantee fund for non-life insurance	P / U	No	43	
71/20	8	Investment Fund for growth and employment	R / U	No	2	
71/21	8	Trade Fleet Welfare Council	R / U	No	11	
71/22	8	Seafarers' holidays	R / U	No	1	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
75/1	9	Ministry of Taxation (§ 9) 4)	E / I	No	8.369	
75/2	9	National tax law 4	E / I	No	75	
75/3	9	Ministry of Taxation (§ 38) 4)	E / I	Yes	626.120	
75/4	9	Nordic Tax Sciences	P / U	No	2	
81/1	11	Department	E / I	No	228	
81/2	11	Civil Service Agency	R / I	No	46	
81/3	11	Family Agency	R / I	No	41	
81/4	11	Council of Prosecutors	R / I	No	12	
81/5	11	Data Protection Agency	R / I	No	22	
81/6	11	The police and the prosecution authority4	E / I	No	13.541	
81/7	11	Police Department.	E / I	No	3.184	
81/8	11	Court of Justice	R / I	No	3.163	
81/9	11	Crime Prevention Council	P / U	No	18	
81/10	11	Council on Safe Traffic	P / U	No	160	
81/11	11	Danish Dog Register	P / U	No	14	
86/1	12	Department	E / I	No	162	
86/2	12	Internal Audit of the Ministry of Defence	R / I	No	11	
86/3	12	Defence Command (4), (5)	E / I	No	22.028	
86/4	12	National Guard 4), 5)	E / I	No	Blank; common accounts	
86/5	12	Defence Intelligence Service	R / I	No	547	
86/6	12	The marine environment 4	E / I	No	979	
86/7	12	Emergency Board n	R / I	No	719	
86/8	12	Emergency services	P / U	No	30	
91/1	15	Department	E / I	No	2.862	
91/2	15	Ministry of Social Affairs Support Office	R / I	No	32	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
91/3	15	Ankestyrelsen	E / I	No	349	
91/4	15	Children's Council	R / I	No	9	
91/5	15	Central Council for Disabled People	R / I	No	6	
91/6	15	Social Services	R / I	No	556	
91/7	15	SFI - National Research	E / I	No	256	
91/8	15	Council	R / I	No	7	
91/9	15	Kofoeds School 4)	E / I	No	74	
91/10	15	Helsingfonden	P / U	No	23	
95/1	16	Department	E / I	No	207.190	
95/2	16	CPR administration a	R / I	No	160	
95/3	16	Health Service	R / I	No	640	
95/4	16	Local and regional authorities	R / I	No	18	
95/5	16	National Health-it	R / I	No	326	
95/6	16	Pharmaceutical Board n	E / I	No	857	
95/7	16	Patient Ombudg	R / I	No	524	
95/8	16	Ethics Council	R / I	No	8	
95/9	16	Central Science	R / I	No	3	
95/10	16	Regional central government	R / I	No	587	
95/11	16	Science and research centre for	R / I	No	5	
95/12	16	Kennedy Centre	R / I	No	128	
95/13	16	Statens Serum Institut	E / I	No	2.702	
95/14	16	MedCoM4)	P / U	No	105	
95/15	16	Health portal 4)	P / U	No	121	
95/16	16	Institute for Quality and Accreditation	P / U	No	81	
101/1	17	Department	E / I	No	163	
101/2	17	Labour inspectorate	R / I	No	1.617	
101/3	17	National Research Centre	R / I	No	224	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
101/4	17	Health and safety at work	E / I	No	993	
101/5	17	The Labour Market Authority	E / I	No	73.347	
101/6	17	Cross-border IT support i	R / I	No	119	
101/7	17	Pension Board	R / I	No	182.150	
101/8	17	11 Industry Working Environment Council	R / U	No	141	11
104/1	18	Department	R / I	No	2.023	
104/2	18	Foreign Service	R / I	No	1.351	
104/3	18	The Refugee Board	R / I	No	34	
104/4	18	The Danish Red Cross' Asylum Department (4)	E / U	No	1.117	
106/1	19	Department	E / I	No	524	
106/2	19	Research and Innovation Board	E / I	No	5.735	
106/3	19	IT and Telecommunications	R / I	No	639	
106/4	19	University and Building Administration	E / I	No	19.349	
106/5	19	International Education Agency	E / I	Yes	88	
106/6	19	Student advisory services	R / I	No	25	
106/7	19	Accreditation institution	R / I	No	26	
106/8	19	Danish Decommissioning	R / I	No	88	
106/9	19	Administrative Library	R / I	No	15	
106/10	19	High Technology Fund	R / U	No	24	
106/11	19	Board of Technology	E / U	No	10	
106/12	19	Danmarks Grundforskningsfond	E / U	No	586	
112/1	20	Department	E / I	Yes	1.829	
112/2	20	Education and training	E / I	Yes	31.163	
112/3	20	Quality and Supervisory Board	R / I	Yes	42.430	
112/4	20	Sorø Akademis Skole	R / I	No	85	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
112/5	20	The Danish Evaluation Institute	E / I	No	80	
112/6	20	UNI • C	R / I	No	636	
112/7	20	The South Indies Committee	R / I	No	1	
112/8	20	Danish Centre for Education	R / I	No	8	
112/9	20	240 State self-governing institutions 4)	R / U	No	29.231	240
112/10	20	Page youth board one	R / U	No	2	
112/11	20	The name of the Promotion of Debate and	R / U	No	43	
112/12	20	University of the People's Republic	R / U	No	98	
118/1	21	Department	E / I	No	117	
118/2	21	Centre of the Ministry of Culture	R / I	No	16	
118/3	21	The Royal Academy of the	R / I	No	3	
118/4	21	Charlottenborg Exhibition building	R / I	No	14	
118/5	21	Statens Workshops for Art	R / I	No	8	
118/6	21	The Arts Board	E / I	No	1.918	
118/7	21	English Crafts	R / I	No	10	
118/8	21	The Royal Theatre and Chapel	E / I	No	1.119	
118/9	21	The Danish Film Institute	E / I	No	591	
118/10	21	Library and Media Administration	E / I	No	1.389	
118/11	21	The Royal Library	R / I	No	476	
118/12	21	The State Library and the State Journal.	R / I	No	210	
118/13	21	Nota (Denmark's Blind Library)	R / I	No	51	
118/14	21	Denmark's Art Library	R / I	No	14	
118/15	21	State Archives	R / I	No	301	
118/16	21	Danish Language Board	R / I	No	22	
118/17	21	The Cultural Heritage Agency	R / I	No	667	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
118/18	21	National Museum	R / I	No	405	
118/19	21	National Defence Historical Museum	R / I	No	51	
118/20	21	Danish Agricultural Museum	R / I	No	26	
118/21	21	Danish Museum of Hunting and Forestry	R / I	No	13	
118/22	21	National Museum of Art	R / I	No	168	
118/23	21	The Hirschsprung Collection	R / I	No	21	
118/24	21	Ordrupgaard	R / I	No	31	
118/25	21	Architectural School Aarhus	R / I	No	135	
118/26	21	School of Architecture of the Academy of Fine Arts	R / I	No	243	
118/27	21	The Art Academy's Art Schools	R / I	No	48	
118/28	21	School of conservator of the Academy of Art	R / I	No	30	
119/1	21	Danmarks Design School	R / I	No	134	
119/2	21	That was a joke. Danske Musikonservatorium	R / I	No	110	
119/3	21	Rytmic Musickons ervatorium	R / I	No	38	
119/4	21	The Jyske Musikkon servatorium	R / I	No	90	
119/5	21	South Danish Musikkon servatorium	R / I	No	58	
119/6	21	Statens Teaterskole	R / I	No	53	
119/7	21	The Danish Film School	R / I	No	62	
119/8	21	Information society	R / I	No	95	
119/9	21	Design School Kolding	R / I	No	78	
119/10	21	(Danish Radio 4)	P / U	No	8.136	
119/11	21	TV 2 / North	P / U	No	123	
119/12	21	TV 2 / Lorry	P / U	No	132	
119/13	21	TV 2 / Bornholm	P / U	No	114	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
119/14	21	TV 2 / East Jutland	P / U	No	138	
119/15	21	TV 2 / East	P / U	No	120	
119/16	21	TV 2 / Funen	P / U	No	117	
119/17	21	TV 2 / Middle-West	P / U	No	115	
122/1	22	Department	E / I	No	598	
122/2	22	Joint Fund of the National Church of Denmark	E / U	No	2.300	
125/1	23	Department	E / I	No	248	
125/2	23	The Natural and Environmental Complaints Board	R / I	Yes	89	
125/3	23	Environmental Protection Agency	R / I	No	1.195	
125/4	23	The Danish Natural Resources Agency	E / I	Yes	3.402	
125/5	23	Kort and Matrikelstyrelsen	R / I	No	452	
125/6	23	Denmark's Environmental Portal	R / I	No	53	
125/7	23	Danish Producer Response System (4)	P / U	No	11	
125/8	23	Technological development of the water sector	P / U	No	43	
125/9	23	National Park Thy	R / U	No	11	
125/10	23	National Park Mols Mountains	R / U	No	3	
125/11	23	National Park Wadden Sea	R / U	No	1	
129/1	24	Department	E / I	No	311	
129/2	24	Food industry	E / I	Yes	18.158	
129/3	24	Plant Directorate	R / I	No	440	
129/4	24	The Danish Food Authority	E / I	No	1.750	
129/5	24	Directorate for Fisheries	E / I	No	227	
129/6	24	Food culture	P / U	No	20	
129/7	24	Foulum Researcher Park	R / U	No	7	
134/1	28	Department	E / I	No	4.990	
134/2	28	Accident Commissioner n for Civil Air	R / I	No	16	
134/3	28	Danmarks Vej- og Bromuseum	R / I	No	7	
134/4	28	Commission of the State of Ekspro-	R / I	No	6	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
134/5	28	Commission of the State of Ekspro-	R / I	No	5	
134/6	28	Auditor of the Ministry of Transport	R / I	No	2	
134/7	28	Road Directorate	E / I	No	5.915	
134/8	28	State Aviation	R / I	No	964	
134/9	28	Coastal Directorate	R / I	No	513	
134/10	28	Traffic Authority	R / I	No	2.555	
134/11	28	Banedanmark 4)	E / I	No	8.630	
134/12	28	DSB4)	P / U	No	24.864	
134/13	28	Development Company City & Port	P / U	No	3.861	
134/14	28	Metro company I / S4)	P / U	No	10.797	
134/15	28	Naviair (4)	P / U	No	1.935	
140/1	29	Department	E / I	No	137	
140/2	29	Danish Energy Agency	R / I	No	12.221	
140/3	29	Energy Complaints Board	R / I	No	6	
140/4	29	Unit for the administration of the Fund	R / I	No	14	
140/5	29	Danmarks Meteorological Institute	R / I	No	590	
140/6	29	National Geological Sub-	R / I	No	525	
140/7	29	Energinet.dk 4)	P / U	No	16.394	
140/8	29	North Sea Fund (4)	P / U	No	31	

Own delimitation: A marker is not automatically one independent account or one citizen. No group is multiplied by a wrong part.

Concrete source deviations: PDF86 footnote 5 includes the result of the Home Guard in the Joint Accounts of the Defence Command, despite separate marker. PDF129 Table 19 denotes Researcher Park Foulum as Revision; bread text refers to endorsement. The continuation of the cultural table PDF119 adds 17 rows (9 revisions / 8 endorsements). Former countdown 199 has been replaced by 216.

Ministerial tables 2012, including continuation pages

Original. Yes / No applies to significant accounting errors; no is no collective review of legality or civil rights. The type / error columns are checked on the first and subsequent table pages.

Minister	PDF pages	Rows	Declaration	Review	Signature	Yeah.	No.	Binders g / blank	Outside st Rain rain ab
5	56	3	1	2	0	0	3	0	0
6	58	11	1	5	5	1	10	0	9
7	63	5	5	0	0	0	5	0	0
8	73	17	2	6	9	0	17	0	10
9	78	4	3	0	1	0	4	0	1
10	85	6	1	5	0	0	6	0	0
11	89	14	5	8	1	0	14	0	3
12	95	6	3	2	1	0	6	0	1
14	101	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
15	103	11	4	6	1	0	11	0	1
16	109	13	2	8	3	0	13	0	3
17	115	8	2	6	0	0	8	0	1
19	119	16	4	12	0	0	16	0	4
20	125	8	3	5	0	0	8	0	2
21	130,131	42	5	26	11	2	40	0	14
22	136	3	2	1	0	0	2	1	2
23	140	8	2	4	2	2	6	0	2
24	144	6	3	2	1	0	6	0	3
28	150	15	4	6	5	0	15	0	5
29	156	10	3	5	2	0	10	0	2
Sum		207	56	109	42	5	201	1	63

The amounts below are financial materiality in millions. DKK, not damage / compensation. E / R / P = declaration / audit / endorsement marker; I / U = inside / outside the state accounts. Actor name is a short identifier from the basic line of the row; broken names are not fully reproduced.

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
56/1	5	Department	E / I	No	123	
56/2	5	National Ombudsman in Greenland	R / I	No	15	
56/3	5	National Ombudsman in the Faroe Islands	R / I	No	13	
58/1	6	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	E / I	No	16.239	
58/2	6	Dansk Center for International	R / I	Yes	387	
58/3	6	Institute for Multi-Party Cooperation	P / U	No	33	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
58/4	6	Danmarkshuset in Paris 4)	R / U	No	25	
58/5	6	Nordic Council of Ministers	P / U	No	1.925	
58/6	6	Nordic Council	P / U	No	74	
58/7	6	Nordic Cultural Foundation	P / U	No	66	
58/8	6	Investment Fund for development	R / U	No	210	
58/9	6	Investment Fund for Eastern Europe	R / U	No	72	
58/10	6	The Arab Investment Fund 4	R / U	No	6	
58/11	6	Danske-Norsk Co-operation Fund	P / U	No	80	
63/1	7	Department 3)	E / I	No	9.706	
63/2	7	Digitaliseringsstyrelsen 4)	E / I	No	622	
63/3	7	State Administration 4)	E / I	No	6.325	
63/4	7	Agency for Modernisation 4)	E / I	No	991	
63/5	7	Statens It 4)	E / I	No	497	
73/1	8	Department	E / I	No	2.788	
73/2	8	Competition and Consumer Protection	E / I	No	244	
73/3	8	The Danish Business Authority	R / I	No	3.216	
73/4	8	Patent and Commodity Board	R / I	No	315	
73/5	8	The National Security Agency	R / I	No	182	
73/6	8	Financial supervision	R / I	No	501	
73/7	8	Maritime Authority	R / I	No	410	
73/8	8	Guarantee Fund for Depositors and	P / U	No	1.582	
73/9	8	Export Credit Fund 4)	P / U	No	598	
73/10	8	Export loan scheme 4)	P / U	No	459	
73/11	8	Danmarks Erhvervsfond 4	P / U	No	24	
73/12	8	State Loads	R / U	No	695	
73/13	8	Vækstfonden 4)	P / U	No	151	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
73/14	8	The Danish Accreditation and	P / U	No	58	
73/15	8	Nordic Patent Institute	P / U	No	41	
73/16	8	The travel guarantee fund	P / U	No	27	
73/17	8	Guarantee fund for non-life insurance	P / U	No	20	
78/1	9	Ministry of Taxation (§ 9) 4)	E / I	No	8.153	
78/2	9	National tax law 4	E / I	No	74	
78/3	9	Ministry of Taxation (§ 38) 4)	E / I	No	658.752	
78/4	9	Nordic Tax Sciences	P / U	No	2	
85/1	10	Department	E / I	No	207.078	
85/2	10	Regional central government	R / I	No	557	
85/3	10	Statistics in Denmark	R / I	No	526	
85/4	10	CPR administration a	R / I	No	171	
85/5	10	National Institute of Local Authorities	R / I	No	110	
85/6	10	Economic Council	R / I	No	26	
89/1	11	Department	E / I	No	292	
89/2	11	Civil Service Agency	R / I	No	104	
89/3	11	Council of Prosecutors	R / I	No	12	
89/4	11	The political authorities	R / I	No	17	
89/5	11	The Refugee Board	R / I	No	39	
89/6	11	Data Protection Agency	R / I	No	22	
89/7	11	The police and the prosecution authority4	E / I	No	14.549	
89/8	11	Police Department.	R / I	No	3.307	
89/9	11	Court of Justice	E / I	No	3.077	
89/10	11	Immigration Board n	R / I	No	1.351	
89/11	11	Digitalisation initiatives	R / I	No	79	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
89/12	11	Crime Prevention Council	E / U	No	52	
89/13	11	Council on Safe Traffic	P / U	No	138	
89/14	11	The Danish Red Cross' Asylum Department (4)	E / U	No	1.115	
95/1	12	Department	E / I	No	173	
95/2	12	Defence Command one incl.	E / I	No	23.418	
95/3	12	Defence Intelligence Service	R / I	No	707	
95/4	12	Internal Audit of the Ministry of Defence	R / I	No	11	
95/5	12	Emergency Board n	E / I	No	677	
95/6	12	Emergency services	P / U	No	29	
101/1	14	Department	E / I	No	1.609	
103/1	15	Department	E / I	No	158.784	
103/2	15	Ankestyrelsen	R / I	No	363	
103/3	15	Children's Council	R / I	No	10	
103/4	15	Central Council for Disabled People	R / I	No	5	
103/5	15	Pension Board	E / I	No	2.388	
103/6	15	Social Services	E / I	No	585	
103/7	15	Family Agency	R / I	No	48	
103/8	15	SFI - National Research	R / I	No	241	
103/9	15	Council	R / I	No	6	
103/10	15	Koffoot School (4)	E / I	No	71	
103/11	15	Helsingfonden	P / U	No	24	
109/1	16	Department	E / I	No	5.272	
109/2	16	Health Service	R / I	No	609	
109/3	16	National Health-it	R / I	No	155	
109/4	16	Pharmaceutical Board n	R / I	No	847	
109/5	16	Patient Ombudg	R / I	No	747	
109/6	16	Ethics Council	R / I	No	8	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
109/7	16	National Science Ethics	R / I	No	3	
109/8	16	Science and Research Centre	R / I	No	3	
109/9	16	Kennedy Centre	R / I	No	69	
109/10	16	Statens Serum Institut	E / I	No	2.767	
109/11	16	MedCoM4)	P / U	No	92	
109/12	16	Health portal 4)	P / U	No	120	
109/13	16	Institute for Quality and Accreditation	P / U	No	78	
115/1	17	Department	E / I	No	207	
115/2	17	Labour inspectorate	R / I	No	715	
115/3	17	National Research Centre	E / I	No	223	
115/4	17	Health and safety at work	R / I	No	1.059	
115/5	17	The Labour Market Authority	R / I	No	107.147	
115/6	17	The Agency for the Maintenance and	R / I	No	30.309	
115/7	17	Cross-border IT support	R / I	No	158	
115/8	17	11 Industry Working Environment Council	R / U	No	116	11
119/1	19	Department	E / I	No	115	
119/2	19	Research and Innovation Board	R / I	No	5.647	
119/3	19	The Board of Universities and	R / I	No	15.551	
119/4	19	Higher Education Board	E / I	No	37.332	
119/5	19	Student advisory services	R / I	No	25	
119/6	19	Accreditation institution	E / I	No	28	
119/7	19	Danish Decommissioning	R / I	No	80	
119/8	19	Administrative Library	R / I	No	15	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
119/9	19	Architectural School Aarhus	R / I	No	128	
119/10	19	Information society	R / I	No	96	
119/11	19	The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts	R / I	No	352	
119/12	19	Ministry of Education	R / I	No	59	
119/13	19	37 short-term and medium-term	R / U	No	14.297	37
119/14	19	Design school Kolding (4)	R / U	No	128	
119/15	19	High Technology Fund	R / U	No	25	
119/16	19	Danmarks Grundforskningsfond	E / U	No	801	
125/1	20	Department	E / I	No	41.529	
125/2	20	Quality and Supervisory Board	E / I	No	160	
125/3	20	Sorø Akademis Skole	E / I	No	93	
125/4	20	The Danish Evaluation Institute	R / I	No	83	
125/5	20	UNI • C	R / I	No	647	
125/6	20	Danish Centre for the Educational Environment	R / I	No	9	
125/7	20	240 State-financed self-financing	R / U	No	22.742	240
125/8	20	The South Indies Committee	R / U	No	473	
130/1	21	Department	E / I	Yes	675	
130/2	21	The Danish Cultural Office	E / I	No	4.192	
130/3	21	The Royal Academy of Beauty	R / I	No	2	
130/4	21	Statens Workshops for Art	R / I	No	7	
130/5	21	English Crafts	R / I	No	9	
130/6	21	The Royal Theatre and Chapel	E / I	No	1.023	
130/7	21	The Danish Film Institute	R / I	No	554	
130/8	21	The Royal Library	E / I	No	432	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
130/9	21	The State Library and the newspaper of the State	R / I	No	212	
130/10	21	Nota	R / I	No	50	
130/11	21	Denmark's Art Library	R / I	No	15	
130/12	21	State Archives	R / I	No	278	
130/13	21	Danish Language Board	R / I	No	20	
130/14	21	National Museum	E / I	No	406	
130/15	21	National Defence Historical Museum	R / I	No	54	
130/16	21	Danish Agricultural Museum	R / I	No	24	
130/17	21	Danish Museum of Hunting and Forestry	R / I	No	12	
130/18	21	National Museum of Art	R / I	No	201	
130/19	21	The Hirschsprung Collection	R / I	No	23	
130/20	21	Ordrupgaard	R / I	No	34	
130/21	21	The Art Academy's Image Schools	R / I	No	62	
130/22	21	That was a joke. Danske Musikonservatorium	R / I	No	115	
130/23	21	Rytmic Musickons ervatorium	R / I	No	38	
130/24	21	The Jyske Musikkon servatorium	R / I	No	92	
130/25	21	South Danish Musikkon servatorium	R / I	No	61	
130/26	21	Statens Teaterskole	R / I	No	54	
130/27	21	The Danish Film School	R / I	No	66	
130/28	21	The Board of Castles and Culturej-	R / I	No	519	
131/1	21	DR4)	P / U	Yes	8.366	
131/2	21	Northern Vision Fund	P / U	No	80	
131/3	21	Northern vision fund R&U	P / U	No	4	
131/4	21	Giro 413	P / U	No	1	413
131/5	21	TV 2 / North	P / U	No	133	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
131/6	21	Lorry.	P / U	No	139	
131/7	21	TV 2 / East Jutland	P / U	No	140	
131/8	21	TV / Middle-West	P / U	No	132	
131/9	21	TV 2 / Funen	P / U	No	131	
131/10	21	TV 2 / East	P / U	No	136	
131/11	21	TV 2 / Bornholm	P / U	No	125	
131/12	21	Page youth board one	R / U	No	1	
131/13	21	University of the People's Republic	R / U	No	104	
131/14	21	The name of the Promotion of Debate and	R / U	No	45	
136/1	22	Department	E / I	No	659	
136/2	22	Joint Fund of the National Church of Denmark	E / U	No	2.323	
136/3	22	10 spring rain jaws	R / U	-/ blank	389	10
140/1	23	Department	E / I	No	237	
140/2	23	The Natural and Environmental Complaints Board	R / I	No	86	
140/3	23	Environmental Protection Agency	R / I	No	1.199	
140/4	23	The Danish Natural Resources Agency	E / I	Yes	3.229	
140/5	23	Kort and Matrikelstyrelsen	R / I	Yes	462	
140/6	23	Denmark's Environmental Portal	R / I	No	67	
140/7	23	Danish Producer Response System (4)	P / U	No	10	
140/8	23	Technical development of the water sector	P / U	No	42	
144/1	24	Department	E / I	No	175	
144/2	24	(4)	E / I	No	20.036	
144/3	24	The Danish Food Authority	E / I	No	1.876	
144/4	24	Food culture	P / U	No	53	
144/5	24	Danish Dog Register	R / U	No	14	
144/6	24	Foulum Researcher Park	R / U	No	8	
150/1	28	Department	E / I	No	4.530	
150/2	28	Banedanmark 4)	E / I	No	10.712	

PDF / row	Minister	Actor identifier	Type / Scope	Accounting error	Mio. DKK	Explicit Group number
150/3	28	Road Directorate	E / I	No	7.308	
150/4	28	Traffic Authority	E / I	No	3.240	
150/5	28	Coastal Directorate	R / I	No	476	
150/6	28	Accident Commissioner n for Civil Air	R / I	No	15	
150/7	28	Danmarks Vej- og Bromuseum	R / I	No	13	
150/8	28	Commission of the State of Ekspro-	R / I	No	8	
150/9	28	Commission of the State of Ekspro-	R / I	No	4	
150/10	28	The Auditor of the Transport Minis-	R / I	No	2	
150/11	28	DSB4)	P / U	No	24.082	
150/12	28	Metro company I / S4)	P / U	No	5.375	
150/13	28	Development Company City & Port	P / U	No	2.597	
150/14	28	Naviair (4)	P / U	No	2.238	
150/15	28	Aarhus Letbane I / S4)	P / U	No	6	
156/1	29	Department	E / I	No	105	
156/2	29	Danish Energy Agency	E / I	No	6.855	
156/3	29	The Energy Supervisory Authority	R / I	No	83	
156/4	29	Energy Complaints Board	R / I	No	6	
156/5	29	North Sea Unit	R / I	No	5.570	
156/6	29	Danmarks Meteorological Institute	R / I	No	587	
156/7	29	National Geological Sub-	R / I	No	569	
156/8	29	Building Authority	E / I	No	7.146	
156/9	29	Energinet.dk 4)	P / U	No	18.023	
156/10	29	North Sea Fund (4)	P / U	No	8.365	

Own delimitation: A marker is not automatically one independent account or one citizen. No group is multiplied by a wrong part.

The Culture continuation on PDF131 adds 14 rows (3 audits/11 endorsements), including DR with Yes. The earlier count of 193 is replaced by 207. PDF136:10 diocesan-fund accounts have a dash in the error column, not No. The source's 53 accounts with statements/54 endorsed accounts are different units from table markers 56/42; the remaining account linkage has not been assumed.

Pension 2011: full sample table and actual consequences

Original, PDF29 Table 1; method PDF28 § 61 -65; consequence PDF31 § 76.

Group	Population	Sample	Error	% of report	Sample gross error 2011, DKK	Extrapolated gross, kr.
New pay	1115	64	17	27	54402	947782
Old salary	5033	18	2	11	22567	6310099
Senior scheme	22	11	5	45	29610	59220
Annual target	24	19	8	42	216505	273479
Yield	164	19	1	5	14417	124440
§ 55 addendum	40	6	2	33	97034	646893
Total	6398	137	35	14	434535	8361913

11 undertakings were selected on a risk basis. Groups may overlap in people; actual pension payments were not examined. The percentage 14 is population-weighted. The sample fraction calculated here, 35/137, is 25,55%. Gross figures include overpayments/underpayments.8.361.913 kr. is an extrapolation, rather than documented total harm or compensation. All 8 errors in 19 fixed-term-appointment cases concerned pension contributions on allowances without legal authority; one error extended 8 years back, approximately 300.000 kr. That case is already included in 8; the amount covers several years. This documents both unlawful payment and prolonged duration, but not that all 6.398 records represent unique people with errors.

Financial lines 2013- 2017, full ministerial overviews

From 2013, the company's Yes / No and Declaration columns will be replaced by the Ministerial Declaration and the business line's comments. These years must not be harmonised with 2008- 12 markers. A remark can be an improvement, follow-up, uncertainty or criticism; the column is no binary illegality counter.

Year	Controlled financial rows	Of which outside the state accounts	Rows with note
2013	206	65	57
2014	198	67	52
2015	198	69	48
2016	195	68	43
2017	197	73	26

Own enumeration of published financial table rows. A number can bring together several institutions. Financial materiality is DKK million, not damage / compensation. No merger with critical conclusions or citizens' numbers.

2013

Original. I / U = inside / outside the state accounts. Referral candidates are identifiers for source sections, never extra cases.

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
50/1	5	Department	I	112	No	
50/2	5	The Ombudsman of the Republic of Greenland	I	12	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
50/3	5	National Ombudsman in the Faroe Islands	I	11	No	
52/1	6	Foreign Affairs	I	16.948	Yes	83,84,85
52/2	6	Department of Menn Escort	I	263	Yes	
52/3	6	Danish Institute of International Studies	I	148	Yes	
52/4	6	Institute for Multilingual Cooperation	U	31	No	
52/5	6	Danmarkshuset in Paris 2)	U	27	No	
52/6	6	Nordic Council of Ministers	U	1.982	No	
52/7	6	Nordic Council	U	66	No	
52/8	6	Nordic Cultural Foundation	U	74	No	
52/9	6	Investment Fund for developing countries (IFU) 2	U	191	No	
52/10	6	Investeringsfonden for Østlandene (IØ)2)	U	86	No	
52/11	6	Arab Investment Fund (2)	U	18	No	
52/12	6	Climate Investment Fund 2)	U	7	No	
52/13	6	Danske-Norsk Co-operation Fund	U	85	No	
56/1	7	Department 2)	I	31.107	Yes	
56/2	7	State Administration 3)	I	6.249	Yes	92,93
56/3	7	Modernisation (3)	I	836	Yes	92
56/4	7	Statens It 3)	I	768	Yes	92
56/5	7	Digitisation system 3)	I	475	Yes	92
56/6	7	(3)	I	89	No	
63/1	8	North Sea Unit	I	3.323	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
63/2	8	Department	I	2.792	Yes	101,102,103
63/3	8	Business Administration n	I	2.320	No	
63/4	8	Financial supervision	I	527	No	
63/5	8	Maritime Authority	I	446	No	
63/6	8	Patent and Product Brand Board	I	299	No	
63/7	8	Competition and Consumer Protection	I	257	No	
63/8	8	Security	I	183	Yes	104
63/9	8	North Sea Fund (2)	U	16.754	No	
63/10	8	Guarantee Fund for Depositors and Investors 2	U	1.812	No	
63/11	8	Vækstfonden 2)	U	917	No	
63/12	8	DanPilot 3)	U	717	Yes	105
63/13	8	Export loan scheme 2)	U	704	No	
63/14	8	Export Credit Fund 2)	U	595	No	
63/15	8	Travel guarantee fund	U	69	No	
63/16	8	The Danish Accreditation and Metrology	U	60	No	
63/17	8	Nordic Patent Institute	U	35	No	
63/18	8	The Danish Business Foundation (2)	U	18	No	
63/19	8	Guarantee Fund for non-life insurance undertakings2	U	9	No	
68/1	9	Article 38. Taxes 2) 679.358	I	679.358	Yes	108,114,117,118
68/2	9	SKAT2)	I	7.502	Yes	9,119,120,121,1 22
68/3	9	Department	I	145	Yes	121
68/4	9	Game authority (2)	I	116	No	
68/5	9	National tax law n 2)	I	76	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
68/6	9	Nordic Tax Scientific Research Council	U	2	No	
78/1	10	Department of 197.200	I	197.200	Yes	126,2012
78/2	10	Regional central government	I	541	No	
78/3	10	Statistics in Denmark	I	524	No	
78/4	10	The CPR administrator	I	164	No	
78/5	10	National Institute of Communes and	I	137	Yes	130,131
78/6	10	Economic Council	I	28	No	
82/1	11	The police and the appeal authority 2	I	14.334	Yes	134,135,136,137
82/2	11	Criminal services n	I	3.343	No	
82/3	11	Court of Justice	I	2.998	Yes	137
82/4	11	Alien rule of law	I	1.501	Yes	138
82/5	11	Department	I	298	No	
82/6	11	Civil Service Agency	I	174	No	
82/7	11	Digitalisation initiatives	I	107	No	
82/8	11	Data Protection Agency	I	23	No	
82/9	11	Policy Layer Disorder	I	18	No	
82/10	11	Council of Prosecutors	I	13	No	
82/11	11	Danish Red Cross' Asylum Department (2)	U	1.056	No	
82/12	11	Council on Safe Traffic	U	134	No	
82/13	11	The Criminally Ventive Council	U	50	Yes	2013,139
88/1	12	Defence comma ndo including. Home Guard 2) 3)	I	21.843	Yes	141,142,143,144 ,145
88/2	12	Detention service of the defence	I	619	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
88/3	12	Emergency management	I	611	No	
88/4	12	Department	I	174	No	
88/5	12	Minister for Defence Internal Audit of the Republic	I	9	No	
88/6	12	Emergency aid	U	29	Yes	146
91/1	14	Department	I	4.194	Yes	149,150,151
93/1	15	Department of 160.253	I	160.253	Yes	155,156,157
93/2	15	Pension Board n	I	1.087	Yes	2013
93/3	15	Social Services	I	504	Yes	155
93/4	15	Ankestyrelsen	I	466	Yes	155
93/5	15	SFI - National Research Centre	I	249	No	
93/6	15	Koffoot School (2)	I	69	No	
93/7	15	Children's Council	I	11	No	
93/8	15	Council	I	10	No	
93/9	15	Social Council	I	7	No	
93/10	15	Central Council for Disabled People	I	6	No	
93/11	15	Helsingfonden	U	15.238	No	
97/1	16	Department	I	4.973	Yes	161
97/2	16	Statens Serum Institut	I	2.927	Yes	162,163,164
97/3	16	Health	I	1.240	Yes	165,166
97/4	16	Patient Ombudg	I	611	No	
97/5	16	Joint Secretary of the Ethics Council and	I	10	No	
97/6	16	Health (2)	U	150	No	
97/7	16	MedCom 2)	U	104	No	
97/8	16	Institute for Quality and Accreditation in Sund-	U	72	No	
102/1	17	Labour Market Authority	I	74.429	Yes	169,170

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
102/2	17	Maintenance and Recruitment Board	I	30.630	No	
102/3	17	Employment damage	I	1.000	No	
102/4	17	Labour inspectorate	I	805	No	
102/5	17	National Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions	I	220	Yes	
102/6	17	Department	I	209	Yes	173
102/7	17	Cross-border IT support in employment	I	151	No	
102/8	17	11 Industry Council	U	100	No	
107/1	19	Higher Education Board	I	39.602	Yes	181
107/2	19	The Board of Universities and International	I	15.916	No	
107/3	19	Research and Innovation Board	I	4.910	No	
107/4	19	The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts	I	384	Yes	180
107/5	19	Education Department's It	I	146	No	
107/6	19	Architectural School Aarhus	I	123	No	
107/7	19	Department	I	111	No	
107/8	19	Danish Decommisioning	I	78	No	
107/9	19	Danmarks Akkredit institutio n	I	29	No	
107/10	19	Student advice	I	25	No	
107/11	19	Administrative Library	I	17	No	
107/12	19	8 universities (2)	U	53.750	Yes	
107/13	19	9 professional high schools (2)	U	11.126	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
107/14	19	9 business academies 2)	U	3.374	No	
107/15	19	9 maritime education institutions 2)	U	751	No	
107/16	19	Danmarks Grun dforskningsfond (2)	U	657	No	
107/17	19	High technology fund	U	25	No	
107/18	19	Design School in Kolding	U	140	No	
114/1	20	Department	I	41.601	Yes	188,189
114/2	20	UNI • C	I	495	No	
114/3	20	Quality and Supervisory Board	I	141	No	
114/4	20	Sorø Akademis Skole	I	95	Yes	190
114/5	20	Denmark's Evalu ation Institute	I	86	No	
114/6	20	Denmark's Centre for the Educational Environment	I	8	No	
114/7	20	236 State-financed self-employed	U	24.567	Yes	
114/8	20	South Africa	U	456	Yes	193
114/9	20	National Centre for Natural Education,	U	21	No	
119/1	21	The Danish Cultural Office	I	4.265	No	
119/2	21	The Royal Theatre and Chapel	I	1.082	No	
119/3	21	Department	I	873	Yes	196,197
119/4	21	The Board of Castles and Culture Buildings	I	665	No	
119/5	21	The Danish Film Institute	I	614	No	
119/6	21	National Museum	I	463	Yes	198
119/7	21	The Royal Library	I	439	No	
119/8	21	State Archives	I	268	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
119/9	21	The State Library and the National Newspaper Collection in Aarhus	I	231	No	
119/10	21	National Museum of Art	I	186	No	
119/11	21	That was a joke. Danish Music Conservato rium	I	113	No	
119/12	21	The Jewish Music Conservatory	I	95	No	
119/13	21	Nota	I	71	No	
119/14	21	The Art Academy's Art Schools	I	66	No	
119/15	21	The Danish Film School	I	64	No	
119/16	21	South Danish Music conservatory and Sku-	I	56	No	
119/17	21	Statens Scenekunstskole	I	55	No	
119/18	21	Historical Museum of the National Defence	I	43	No	
119/19	21	Rytmisk Musikko nservatorium	I	41	No	
119/20	21	Ordrupgaard	I	37	No	
119/21	21	Danish Agriculture museum	I	25	No	
119/22	21	Danish Language Board	I	19	No	
119/23	21	The Hirschsprung Collection	I	15	No	
119/24	21	Denmark's Art Library	I	14	No	
119/25	21	Danish Hunting and Forestry Muse	I	11	No	
119/26	21	English Crafts	I	10	No	
119/27	21	Statens Workshops for Art	I	7	No	
119/28	21	The Royal Academy of Fine Arts	I	3	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
120/1	21	DR2)	U	8.963	Yes	199
120/2	21	TV2 / NORD	U	141	No	
120/3	21	TV2 / Lorry	U	157	Yes	200
120/4	21	TV MIDTVEST	U	150	No	
120/5	21	TV EAST	U	150	No	
120/6	21	TV 2	East Jutland	U	148	No
120/7	21	TV 2 / FYN	U	143	No	
120/8	21	TV 2 / Bornholm	U	135	No	
120/9	21	Board of Public Universities	U	98	No	
120/10	21	Name of the Promotion of Debate and Information	U	40	No	
120/11	21	Tipps Youth Neveret	U	1	No	
124/1	22	Department	I	620	No	
124/2	22	Joint Fund of the National Church of Denmark	U	2.380	Yes	203
124/3	22	10 building materials	U	437	Yes	204
127/1	23	The Danish Natural Resources Agency	I	3.682	Yes	2013,2011,2012, 207,208
127/2	23	Environmental Protection Agency	I	1.288	No	
127/3	23	Geodata Board n	I	475	No	
127/4	23	Department	I	224	Yes	209
127/5	23	Nature and Environmental Protection Agency	I	73	No	
127/6	23	Denmark's Environmental Portal	I	64	Yes	210
127/7	23	Danish Producen responsible system (2)	U	10	No	
127/8	23	Vandsektorens Te knologiudviklingsf ond 2)	U	39	No	
132/1	24	The natural economy 2)	I	20.780	Yes	216
132/2	24	Food Safety Authority	I	1.793	Yes	217,218
132/3	24	Department	I	141	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
132/4	24	Food culture	U	48	No	
132/5	24	Danish Dog Register	U	14	No	
132/6	24	Foulum Researcher Park	U	8	No	
136/1	28	Banedanmark 2)	I	10.671	Yes	221,222,223
136/2	28	Department	I	6.534	No	
136/3	28	Road Directorate	I	6.021	Yes	224
136/4	28	Traffic Authority	I	1.643	Yes	75,225,226
136/5	28	Coastal Directorate	I	281	No	
136/6	28	Commission for Civil Aviation and	I	15	No	
136/7	28	Commission of the State Expropriations	I	7	No	
136/8	28	Road Accident Commission	I	5	No	
136/9	28	Commission of the State Expropriations	I	5	No	
136/10	28	The Auditor of the Ministry of Transport	I	2	No	
136/11	28	DSB2)	U	24.095	No	
136/12	28	Naviair (2)	U	2.450	No	
136/13	28	Development company City & Port I / S2)	U	2.057	Yes	227
136/14	28	Metro company I / S2)	U	2.107	Yes	228
136/15	28	Aarhus Letbane I / S2)	U	10	No	
141/1	29	Building Board n	I	7.021	Yes	2,234,235
141/2	29	Danish Energy Agency	I	2.077	No	
141/3	29	Danmarks Meteorological Institute	I	533	No	
141/4	29	National Geological Studies	I	486	No	
141/5	29	Department	I	97	No	
141/6	29	The Energy Supervisory Authority	I	87	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
141/7	29	Energy complaint-ass network	I	6	No	
141/8	29	Energinet.dk 2)	U	19.487	No	

2014

Original. I/U = inside/outside the State accounts. Reference candidates identify source sections, never additional cases.

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
44/1	5	Department	I	92	No	
44/2	5	The Ombudsman of the Republic of Greenland	I	11	No	
44/3	5	National Ombudsman in the Faroe Islands	I	10	No	
46/1	6	Foreign Affairs	I	16.431	Yes	80,81
46/2	6	Department of Menn Escort	I	268	Yes	82
46/3	6	Danish Institute of International Studies	I	120	No	
46/4	6	Institute for Multilingual Cooperation	U	45	No	
46/5	6	Danmarkshuset in Paris 2)	U	26	No	
46/6	6	Nordic Council of Ministers	U	1.936	No	
46/7	6	Nordic Council	U	66	No	
46/8	6	Nordic Cultural Foundation	U	73	No	
46/9	6	Investment Fund for developing countries	U	260	No	
46/10	6	Investment Fund for Central and Eastern Europe (IØ)2)	U	9	No	
46/11	6	Arab Investment Fund (2)	U	22	No	
46/12	6	Climate Investment Fund 2)	U	7	No	
46/13	6	Danske-Norsk Co-operation Fund	U	88	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
50/1	7	Department 2)	I	28.648	Yes	86,87,88,6,231,6 ,235
50/2	7	State Administration 3)	I	6.065	Yes	86
50/3	7	Modernisation (3)	I	841	Yes	86,90,91
50/4	7	Statens It 3)	I	723	Yes	86
50/5	7	Digitisation system 3)	I	587	Yes	86
50/6	7	(3)	I	88	No	
57/1	8	Department	I	2.660	No	
57/2	8	Business Administration n	I	1.750	Yes	96
57/3	8	Financial supervision	I	574	No	
57/4	8	Maritime Authority	I	376	Yes	97
57/5	8	Patent and Product Brand Board	I	303	No	
57/6	8	Competition and Consumer Protection	I	263	No	
57/7	8	Security	I	174	No	
57/8	8	North Sea Fund (2)	U	15.462	Yes	98
57/9	8	Guarantee Fund for Depositors and Investors 2	U	2.440	No	
57/10	8	Export Credit Fund 2)	U	2.009	No	
57/11	8	Vækstfonden 2)	U	1.307	No	
57/12	8	Export loan scheme 2)	U	970	No	
57/13	8	DanPilot 2)	U	763	Yes	99
57/14	8	The Danish Business Foundation (2)	U	75	No	
57/15	8	The Danish Accreditation and Metrology	U	58	No	
57/16	8	North Sea Unit (2)	U	58	No	
57/17	8	Travel guarantee fund	U	51	No	
57/18	8	Nordic Patent Institute	U	35	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
57/19	8	Guarantee Fund for non-life insurance undertakings2	U	34	No	
62/1	9	SKAT2)	I	6.545	Yes	118
62/2	9	Department	I	310	No	
62/3	9	Tax Appeals Agency 2)	I	167	No	
62/4	9	Game authority (2)	I	126	Yes	106,107,109,116 ,117,6,232,6,233 ,6,234
62/5	9	Nordic Tax Scientific Research Council	U	2	No	
73/1	10	Department 2) 199.899	I	199.899	Yes	121
73/2	10	Statistics in Denmark	I	533	Yes	122
73/3	10	Central government n	I	453	No	
73/4	10	The CPR administrator	I	147	No	
73/5	10	National Institute of Communes and	I	129	Yes	123
73/6	10	Economic Council	I	27	No	
77/1	11	The police and the appeal authority 2	I	14.748	Yes	126,127
77/2	11	Criminal services n	I	3.437	No	
77/3	11	Court of Justice	I	2.860	Yes	
77/4	11	Alien rule of law	I	1.885	No	
77/5	11	Department	I	329	No	
77/6	11	Civil Service Agency	I	228	No	
77/7	11	Data Protection Agency	I	24	No	
77/8	11	Policy Layer Disorder	I	21	No	
77/9	11	Supervision of the Eft Management Services	I	6	No	
77/10	11	Danish Red Cross' Asylum Department (2)	U	1.171	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
77/11	11	Council on Safe Traffic	U	130	No	
77/12	11	The Criminally Ventive Council	U	43	No	
80/1	12	Defence comma ndo including. Home Guard 2) 3)	I	20.620	Yes	130,131,132,133 ,134,135
80/2	12	Rescue-ready (Breddska Bsstyrelsen)	I	688	No	
80/3	12	Detention service of the defence	I	644	No	
80/4	12	Department	I	205	Yes	136
80/5	12	Minister for Defence Internal Audit of the Republic	I	9	No	
80/6	12	Emergency aid	U	30	Yes	137
85/1	14	Department	I	1.470	Yes	140,141
87/1	15	Department of 172.134	I	172.134	Yes	144
87/2	15	Social Services	I	698	No	
87/3	15	Ankestyrelsen	I	593	No	
87/4	15	SFI - National Research Centre	I	254	No	
87/5	15	Kofoeds School (2)	I	81	No	
87/6	15	Children's Council	I	16	No	
87/7	15	Social Council	I	8	No	
87/8	15	Council	I	7	No	
87/9	15	Central Council for Disabled People	I	6	No	
87/10	15	Helsingfonden	U	50	No	
90/1	16	Department	I	4.172	No	
90/2	16	Statens Serum Institut	I	2.757	Yes	147,148,149
90/3	16	Health	I	1.376	No	
90/4	16	Patient Ombudg	I	718	No	
90/5	16	Joint Secretary of the Ethics Council and	I	9	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
90/6	16	Health (2)	U	119	No	
90/7	16	MedCom 2)	U	90	No	
90/8	16	Institute for Quality and Accreditation in Sund-	U	76	No	
94/1	17	Labour Market and Recruitment Agency 103.012	I	103.012	Yes	152
94/2	17	Employment damage	I	1.089	No	
94/3	17	Labour inspectorate	I	809	Yes	153,154
94/4	17	National Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions	I	228	Yes	155
94/5	17	Department	I	209	No	
94/6	17	Cross-border IT support in employment	I	162	No	
94/7	17	11 Industry Council	U	95	No	
99/1	19	Higher Education Board	I	59.238	Yes	158
99/2	19	Research and Innovation Board	I	5.376	No	
99/3	19	The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts	I	352	Yes	159,160
99/4	19	Education Department's It	I	148	No	
99/5	19	Architectural School Aarhus	I	123	No	
99/6	19	Department	I	105	No	
99/7	19	Danish Decommisioning	I	91	No	
99/8	19	Danmarks Akkredit institutio n	I	36	No	
99/9	19	Student advice	I	26	No	
99/10	19	Administrative Library	I	19	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
99/11	19	8 universities (2)	U	54.632	Yes	164
99/12	19	8 professional high schools 2)	U	11.635	Yes	165
99/13	19	9 business academies 2)	U	3.750	Yes	166
99/14	19	9 maritime education institutions 2)	U	795	No	
99/15	19	Danmarks Grun dforskningsfond (2)	U	789	No	
99/16	19	Innovation Fund	U	67	No	
99/17	19	Design School in Kolding	U	147	No	
104/1	20	Department	I	42.394	Yes	169
104/2	20	The Board of IT and Learning	I	475	No	
104/3	20	Quality and Supervisory Board	I	137	Yes	170
104/4	20	Sorø Akademis Skole	I	96	No	
104/5	20	Denmark's Evalu ation Institute	I	86	No	
104/6	20	Denmark's Centre for the Educational Environment	I	8	No	
104/7	20	233 State-financed self-employed	U	24.934	Yes	171
104/8	20	South Africa	U	458	No	
104/9	20	National Centre for Natural Education,	U	21	No	
108/1	21	The Danish Cultural Office	I	4.233	Yes	174
108/2	21	The Royal Theatre and Chapel	I	1.072	No	
108/3	21	Department	I	808	Yes	175,176
108/4	21	The Danish Film Institute	I	589	No	
108/5	21	The Board of Castles and Culture Buildings	I	568	No	
108/6	21	National Museum	I	516	Yes	177,178

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
108/7	21	The Royal Library of Denmark	I	456	No	
108/8	21	State Archives	I	268	No	
108/9	21	The State Library and the National Newspaper Collection	I	242	No	
108/10	21	National Museum of Art	I	191	No	
108/11	21	That was a joke. Danish Music Conservato rium	I	121	No	
108/12	21	The Jewish Music Conservatory	I	93	No	
108/13	21	Nota	I	81	No	
108/14	21	The Danish Film School	I	67	No	
108/15	21	The Art Academy's Art Schools	I	66	No	
108/16	21	Ordrupgaard	I	61	No	
108/17	21	South Danish Music conservatory & Show-	I	57	No	
108/18	21	Statens Scenekunstskole	I	54	No	
108/19	21	Rytmisk Musikko nservatorium	I	40	No	
108/20	21	Danish Agriculture museum	I	31	No	
108/21	21	The Hirschsprung Collection	I	16	No	
108/22	21	Danish Language Board	I	16	No	
108/23	21	Danmarks Kunstbibliotek, Den Kgl. Danish	I	15	No	
108/24	21	Danish Hunting and Forestry Muse	I	13	No	
108/25	21	Statens Workshops for Art	I	8	No	
108/26	21	The Royal Academy of the Beauty	I	4	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
109/1	21	DR2)	U	8.949	No	
109/2	21	TV2 / Nord	U	148	No	
109/3	21	TV 2	EASTERN JYLAND U	148	No	
109/4	21	TV2 / Lorry	U	148	No	
109/5	21	TV EAST	U	146	No	
109/6	21	TV MIDTVEST	U	145	No	
109/7	21	TV 2 / FYN	U	144	No	
109/8	21	TV 2 / Bornholm	U	140	No	
109/9	21	Board of Public Universities	U	103	No	
109/10	21	Name of the Promotion of Debate and Information	U	64	No	
109/11	21	Tipps Youth Neveret	U	1	No	
112/1	22	Department	U	563	Yes	2,181,182
112/2	22	Joint Fund of the National Church of Denmark	U	2.397	Yes	183
112/3	22	10 building materials	U	356	No	
116/1	23	The Danish Natural Resources Agency	I	3.446	Yes	186,187,188,189
116/2	23	Environmental Protection Agency	I	1.373	No	
116/3	23	Geodata Board n	I	472	Yes	190
116/4	23	Coastal Directorate	I	267	No	
116/5	23	Department	I	222	No	
116/6	23	Denmark's Environmental Portal	I	65	No	
116/7	23	Nature and Environmental Protection Agency	I	65	No	
116/8	23	Vandsektorens Te knologiudviklingsf ond 2)	U	19	Yes	191
116/9	23	Danish Producen responsible system (2)	U	12	No	
119/1	24	The natural economy 2)	I	19.101	Yes	6,228,6,229,6,23 0
119/2	24	Food Safety Authority	I	1.746	No	
119/3	24	Department	I	134	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
119/4	24	Food culture	U	63	No	
119/5	24	Danish Dog Register	U	13	No	
122/1	28	Banedanmark 2)	I	11.898	Yes	196,197
122/2	28	Department	I	8.251	Yes	198
122/3	28	Road Directorate	I	5.750	Yes	199
122/4	28	Traffic Authority	I	1.613	Yes	200
122/5	28	Commission for Civil Aviation and	I	13	No	
122/6	28	Commission of the State Expropriations	I	8	No	
122/7	28	Road Accident Commission	I	6	No	
122/8	28	Commission of the State Expropriations	I	5	No	
122/9	28	DSB2)	U	25.098	No	
122/10	28	Metro company I / S2)	U	9.313	No	
122/11	28	Development company City & Port I / S2)	U	4.096	Yes	201
122/12	28	Naviair (2)	U	2.456	No	
122/13	28	Call 3 Lightlane I / S2)	U	127	Yes	3,19,2014
122/14	28	Aarhus Letbane I / S2)	U	11	No	
127/1	29	Building Board n	I	6.113	Yes	2014,204,208
127/2	29	Danish Energy Agency	I	1.849	No	
127/3	29	Danmarks Meteorological Institute	I	512	Yes	209,210
127/4	29	National Geological Studies	I	456	No	
127/5	29	Department	I	92	No	
127/6	29	The Energy Supervisory Authority	I	90	No	
127/7	29	Energy complaint-ass network	I	6	No	
127/8	29	Energinet.dk 2)	U	22.671	No	

2015

Original. I / U = inside / outside the state accounts. Referral candidates are identifiers for source sections, never extra cases.

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
42/1	6	Department of Human Rights (3)	I	277	No	
42/2	6	Danish Institute of International Studies (3)	I	137	No	
42/3	6	Nordic Council of Ministers	U	1.883	No	
42/4	6	Investment Fund for Developing Countries 3	U	303	No	
42/5	6	Danske-Norsk Co-operation Fund	U	76	No	
42/6	6	Nordic Cultural Foundation	U	70	No	
42/7	6	Nordic Council	U	70	No	
42/8	6	Institute for Multilingual Cooperation	U	33	No	
42/9	6	Danmarkshuset in Paris 3)	U	28	No	
42/10	6	Investment Fund for the countries of Eastern Europe3	U	27	No	
42/11	6	Arab Investment Fund (3)	U	14	No	
42/12	6	Climate Investment Fund 3)	U	7	No	
46/1	7	Department	I	32.563	Yes	70,3,71
46/2	7	State Administration 2)	I	6.093	Yes	72,73
46/3	7	Modernisation (2)	I	755	No	
46/4	7	Statens It 2)	I	742	Yes	
46/5	7	Digitisation system 2	I	452	No	
46/6	7	Competencesecr etariat2	I	82	No	
51/1	8	Department	I	8.713	Yes	76,77
51/2	8	Business Administration n	I	2.488	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
51/3	8	Financial supervision	I	651	Yes	
51/4	8	Maritime Authority	I	434	No	
51/5	8	Patent and Product Brand Board	I	319	Yes	78
51/6	8	Competition and Consumer Protection	I	280	No	
51/7	8	Security	I	172	No	
51/8	8	North Sea Fund (2)	U	9.161	Yes	2015,80
51/9	8	Financial Stability 2)	U	4.813	No	
51/10	8	Vækstfonden 2)	U	1.878	No	
51/11	8	Export Credit Fund 2)	U	1.837	No	
51/12	8	DanPilot 2)	U	802	Yes	81
51/13	8	Export loan scheme 2)	U	150	No	
51/14	8	North Sea Unit (2)	U	63	No	
51/15	8	The Danish Accreditation and	U	61	No	
51/16	8	The Danish Business Foundation (2)	U	57	No	
51/17	8	Travel guarantee fund	U	44	No	
51/18	8	Nordic Patent Institute	U	34	No	
51/19	8	Denmark's Green Investment Fund 2)	U	11	No	
51/20	8	Guarantee Fund for nonlife insurance	U	2	No	
58/1	9	SKAT2)	I	6.887	Yes	9,98
58/2	9	Department	I	363	Yes	99,100
58/3	9	Tax Appeals Agency 2)	I	207	No	
58/4	9	Game authority (2)	I	133	Yes	38,93,97,101,10 2,105,5,197
58/5	9	Nordic Taxation	U	2	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
73/1	10	Department 199.612	I	199.612	No	
73/2	10	Statistics in Denmark	I	611	No	
73/3	10	Central government n	I	465	No	
73/4	10	National Institute of Communes and	I	149	No	
73/5	10	The CPR administrator	I	148	No	
73/6	10	Economic Council	I	27	No	
75/1	11	The police and the appeal authority 2	I	14.920	Yes	111
75/2	11	Criminal services n	I	3.528	Yes	112,113
75/3	11	Court of Justice	I	2.817	Yes	
75/4	11	Alien rule of law	I	2.599	Yes	114
75/5	11	Department	I	480	No	
75/6	11	Civil Service Agency	I	218	No	
75/7	11	Data Protection Agency	I	24	No	
75/8	11	Policy Layer Disorder	I	21	No	
75/9	11	Supervision of the Eft Management Services	I	6	No	
75/10	11	Danish Red Cross' Asylum Department (2)	U	1.225	No	
75/11	11	Council on Safe Traffic	U	136	No	
75/12	11	The Criminally Ventive Council	U	53	No	
80/1	12	Defence 2) 3)	I	20.285	Yes	117,118,119
80/2	12	Emergency management 2)	I	739	No	
80/3	12	Detention service of the defence	I	692	No	
80/4	12	Department	I	296	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
80/5	12	Minister for Defence Internal Audit of the Republic	I	10	No	
80/6	12	Emergency aid	U	28	No	
84/1	14	Department	I	9.984	Yes	125,126,127,128 ,129,130
89/1	15	Department of 174.369	I	174.369	Yes	
89/2	15	Social Services	I	3.056	No	
89/3	15	Ankestyrelsen	I	553	No	
89/4	15	SFI - National Research Centre	I	213	Yes	133,134
89/5	15	Kofoeds School (2)	I	84	No	
89/6	15	Children's Council	I	14	No	
89/7	15	Central Council for Disabled People	I	8	No	
89/8	15	Social Council	I	7	No	
89/9	15	Council	I	4	No	
89/10	15	Helsingfonden	U	44	No	
92/1	16	Department	I	3.857	Yes	137,138
92/2	16	Statens Serum Institut	I	2.878	Yes	139
92/3	16	Health	I	1.713	No	
92/4	16	Patient Ombudg	I	714	No	
92/5	16	Joint Secretary of the Ethics Council and	I	11	No	
92/6	16	Health (2)	U	133	Yes	140
92/7	16	MedCom 2)	U	91	Yes	141
92/8	16	Institute for Quality and Accreditation in	U	81	No	
96/1	17	Employment and social affairs	I	97.915	No	
96/2	17	Employment damage	I	1.366	Yes	144
96/3	17	Labour inspectorate	I	858	No	
96/4	17	Department	I	265	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
96/5	17	National Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions	I	219	No	
96/6	17	Cross-border IT support i	I	192	No	
96/7	17	12 Industry Council, including one	U	117	No	
99/1	19	Higher Education Board	I	60.303	No	
99/2	19	Research and Innovation Board	I	4.970	No	
99/3	19	The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts	I	328	Yes	147
99/4	19	Ministry of Education and Research	I	154	No	
99/5	19	Architectural School Aarhus	I	122	Yes	148
99/6	19	Department	I	119	No	
99/7	19	Danish Decommisioning	I	83	No	
99/8	19	Danmarks Akkredit institutio n	I	34	No	
99/9	19	Student advice	I	28	No	
99/10	19	Administrative Library	I	19	No	
99/11	19	8 universities (2)	U	55.477	Yes	
99/12	19	8 professional high schools 2)	U	11.428	No	
99/13	19	9 business academies 2)	U	3.900	No	
99/14	19	9 maritime education institutions 2)	U	726	No	
99/15	19	Danmarks Grun dforskningsfond (2)	U	484	No	
99/16	19	Innovation Fund	U	79	No	
99/17	19	Design School in Kolding	U	135	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
102/1	20	Department	I	42.553	Yes	151,152
102/2	20	The Board of IT and Learning	I	469	No	
102/3	20	The Quality and Supervisory Board	I	273	No	
102/4	20	Sorø Akademis Skole	I	94	Yes	153
102/5	20	Denmark's Evalu ation Institute	I	80	No	
102/6	20	Denmark's Centre for the Educational Environment	I	10	No	
102/7	20	232 private activities financed by the State;	U	24.818	No	
102/8	20	South Africa	U	457	Yes	154
102/9	20	National Centre for Natural Education,	U	21	No	
106/1	21	The Danish Cultural Office	I	4.260	Yes	157
106/2	21	The Royal Theatre and Chapel	I	1.110	No	
106/3	21	Department	I	851	No	
106/4	21	The Danish Film Institute	I	647	Yes	158
106/5	21	The Board of Castles and Culture Buildings	I	588	No	
106/6	21	National Museum	I	475	Yes	159
106/7	21	The Royal Library, Denmark	I	447	No	
106/8	21	State Archives	I	268	No	
106/9	21	The State Library and the National Newspaper Collection	I	257	No	
106/10	21	National Museum of Art	I	165	Yes	160
106/11	21	That was a joke. Danish Music Conservato rium	I	135	No	
106/12	21	The Danish School of Scene Art	I	115	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
106/13	21	The Art Academy's Art Schools	I	101	Yes	161
106/14	21	The Jewish Music Conservatory	I	97	No	
106/15	21	Nota	I	87	Yes	162
106/16	21	The Danish Film School	I	61	No	
106/17	21	Ordrupgaard	I	57	Yes	163
106/18	21	South Danish Music conservatory	I	48	No	
106/19	21	Rytmisk Musikko nservatorium	I	41	No	
106/20	21	Danish Agriculture museum	I	31	No	
106/21	21	Denmark's Art Library	I	17	No	
106/22	21	Danish Language Board	I	16	No	
106/23	21	The Hirschsprung Collection	I	14	No	
106/24	21	Danish Hunting and Forestry Muse	I	13	No	
106/25	21	Statens Workshops for Art	I	8	No	
106/26	21	The Royal Academy of the Beauty	I	3	No	
107/1	21	DR2)	U	8.074	No	
107/2	21	TV MIDTVEST	U	148	No	
107/3	21	TV 2	EASTERN JYLAND	U	140	No
107/4	21	TV2 / Nord	U	142	No	
107/5	21	TV2 / Lorry	U	137	No	
107/6	21	TV EAST	U	137	No	
107/7	21	TV 2 / Funen	U	135	No	
107/8	21	TV 2 / Bornholm	U	134	No	
107/9	21	Board of Public Universities	U	109	No	
107/10	21	The name of the Promotion of Debate and	U	70	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
107/11	21	Tipps Youth Neveret	U	1	No	
111/1	22	Department	I	546	Yes	166,167
111/2	22	Joint Fund of the National Church of Denmark	U	2.273	Yes	168
111/3	22	10 building materials	U	404	No	
111/4	22	10 accounts for binding flat-rate contributions	U	56	No	
114/1	23	The Danish Natural Resources Agency	I	3.374	Yes	171
114/2	23	Environmental Protection Agency	I	1.438	No	
114/3	23	Geodata Board n	I	490	No	
114/4	23	Department	I	367	No	
114/5	23	Coastal Directorate	I	309	No	
114/6	23	Board of Appeal	I	66	No	
114/7	23	Denmark's Environmental Portal	I	63	No	
114/8	23	Danish Producen responsible system (2)	U	223	No	
114/9	23	Vandsektorens Teknologiudviklingsfond 2)	U	23	No	
117/1	24	The natural economy 2)	I	19.963	Yes	174,175,5,195,5, 196
117/2	24	Food Safety Authority	I	1.706	Yes	176
117/3	24	Department	I	145	No	
117/4	24	Food culture	U	59	No	
117/5	24	Danish Dog Register	U	13	No	
121/1	28	Banedanmark 2)	I	12.672	Yes	179,180,181
121/2	28	Department	I	8.877	No	
121/3	28	Road Directorate	I	5.348	Yes	182,183,184
121/4	28	Traffic Authority	I	1.784	No	
121/5	28	Commission for Civil Aviation	I	13	No	
121/6	28	Commissarius of the State of Expropria-	I	10	No	

PDF / row a	§	Actor Identifier or	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral ndidates
121/7	28	Commission for Road Traffic Accidents	I	6	No	
121/8	28	Commission of the State Expropriation	I	5	No	
121/9	28	DSB2)	U	24.114	No	
121/10	28	Metro company I / S2)	U	7.041	No	
121/11	28	Naviair (2)	U	2.430	No	
121/12	28	Development company City & Port I / S2)	U	2.129	Yes	185
121/13	28	Call 3 Lightlane I / S2)	U	324	No	
121/14	28	Aarhus Letbane I / S2) 3)	U	20	No	
121/15	28	Fjordelen n Frederikssund 2) 4)	U	-	No	
126/1	29	Building Board n	I	6.042	Yes	188,189
126/2	29	Danish Energy Agency	I	2.519	Yes	190
126/3	29	Danmarks Meteorological Institute	I	531	No	
126/4	29	National Geological Studies	I	431	No	
126/5	29	Secretariat of the Energy Supervisory Authority	I	120	Yes	191,192
126/6	29	Department	I	91	No	
126/7	29	Climate Council	I	6	No	
126/8	29	Energy complaint-ass network	I	5	No	
126/9	29	Energinet.dk 2)	U	25.906	No	

2016

Original. I / U = inside / outside the state accounts. Referral candidates are identifiers for source sections, never extra cases.

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
26/1	6	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	I	12.780	Yes	23,24,25

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
26/2	6	Department of Human Rights (2)	I	272	No	
26/3	6	Danish Institute of International Studies (2)	I	128	No	
26/4	6	Nordic Council of Ministers	U	1.865	No	
26/5	6	Investment Fund for Developing Countries (2)	U	316	No	
26/6	6	Danske-Norsk Cooperation Fund	U	85	No	
26/7	6	Nordic Cultural Foundation	U	72	No	
26/8	6	Nordic Council	U	70	No	
26/9	6	Investment Fund for the countries of Eastern Europe 2	U	52	No	
26/10	6	Institute for Multi-Party Cooperation	U	35	No	
26/11	6	Danmarkshuset in Paris 2)	U	24	No	
26/12	6	Arab Investment Fund (2)	U	7	No	
26/13	6	Agricultural investment fund (2)	U	2	No	
26/14	6	Ukraine Investment Facility 2)	U	1	No	
26/15	6	Climate investment (2)	U	1	No	
30/1	7	Department	I	36.184	Yes	28
30/2	7	State Administration 2)	I	5.658	Yes	
30/3	7	Moderniseringsstyrelsen 2)	I	1.232	Yes	32,33
30/4	7	Statens It 2)	I	827	No	
30/5	7	Digitaliseringsstyrelsen 2)	I	444	No	
30/6	7	Kompetencesekretariatet 2)	I	64	No	
30/7	7	Economic Council	I	26	No	
35/1	8	Department	I	3.347	Yes	36
35/2	8	The Danish Business Authority	I	2.366	Yes	37
35/3	8	Financial supervision	I	666	No	

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
35/4	8	Maritime Authority	I	359	No	
35/5	8	Patent and Commodity Board	I	308	Yes	7
35/6	8	Competition and Consumer Protection	I	274	No	
35/7	8	The National Security Agency	I	183	Yes	38,7
35/8	8	North Sea Fund (2)	U	8.080	No	
35/9	8	Export Credit Fund 2)	U	4.949	No	
35/10	8	Financial Stability 2)	U	2.172	No	
35/11	8	Vækstfonden 2)	U	1.701	No	
35/12	8	DanPilot 2)	U	812	Yes	39
35/13	8	Guarantee fund for non-life insurance	U	135	No	
35/14	8	The Danish Business Foundation (2)	U	117	No	
35/15	8	The Danish Accreditation and	U	60	No	
35/16	8	North Sea Unit (2)	U	59	No	
35/17	8	The travel guarantee fund	U	51	No	
35/18	8	Nordic Patent Institute	U	34	No	
35/19	8	Denmark's Green Investment Fund 2)	U	18	No	
39/1	9	SKAT2)	I	6.418	Yes	9,42,38,38
39/2	9	Department	I	1.467	Yes	43
39/3	9	Tax Appeals Board 2)	I	232	No	
39/4	9	Game Authority 2)	I	139	No	
42/1	11	Police and prosecution 2	I	13.906	Yes	46,47
42/2	11	Police Department.	I	3.394	Yes	48
42/3	11	Court of Justice	I	2.825	No	
42/4	11	Department	I	244	Yes	
42/5	11	Civil Service Agency	I	232	No	
42/6	11	The political authorities	I	24	No	
42/7	11	Data Protection Agency	I	23	No	

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
42/8	11	Supervision of the information services	I	7	No	
42/9	11	Crime Prevention Council	U	43	No	
46/1	12	Defence 2) 3)	I	21.683	Yes	51,52,56,57
46/2	12	Emergency Management Board (n 3)	I	831	No	
46/3	12	Defence Intelligence Service	I	782	No	
46/4	12	Department	I	315	No	
46/5	12	Emergency services	U	29	No	
52/1	14	Department	I	7.440	No	
52/2	14	Immigration Board n	I	3.489	Yes	60
52/3	14	International Recruitment Board	I	429	No	
52/4	14	Danish Red Cross' Asylum Department (2)	U	1.487	No	
55/1	15	Department of 209.915	I	209.915	No	
55/2	15	Social Services	I	1.517	No	
55/3	15	Ankestyrelsen	I	558	No	
55/4	15	Statistics in Denmark	I	509	No	
55/5	15	State administration	I	361	No	
55/6	15	Social Research Institute	I	198	No	
55/7	15	Local and regional authorities	I	159	No	
55/8	15	CPR administration a	I	144	No	
55/9	15	Kofoeds School (2)	I	78	No	
55/10	15	Children's Council	I	17	No	
55/11	15	Social Council	I	7	No	
55/12	15	Central Council for Disabled People	I	6	No	
55/13	15	Council	I	5	No	
57/1	16	Department	I	5.646	Yes	65

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
57/2	16	Statens Serum Institut	I	2.616	Yes	66,67,68
57/3	16	Pharmaceutical Board n	I	1.239	No	
57/4	16	Patient Safety Agency	I	851	No	
57/5	16	Health Service	I	608	No	
57/6	16	Health Data Board	I	496	Yes	69,70
57/7	16	Joint Secretariat of the Ethics Council and	I	11	No	
57/8	16	Health (2)	U	134	No	
57/9	16	MedCom 2)	U	111	No	
57/10	16	Institute for Quality and Accreditation in	U	72	No	
62/1	17	Labour Market Agency and 266.725	I	266.725	Yes	73
62/2	17	Labour inspectorate	I	1.328	No	
62/3	17	Department	I	380	No	
62/4	17	Health and safety at work	I	346	Yes	
62/5	17	National Research Centre for	I	204	No	
62/6	17	Cross-border IT support i	I	179	No	
62/7	17	12 working environment councils, including a	U	95	No	
66/1	19	Higher Education Board	I	60.482	Yes	
66/2	19	Research and Innovation Board	I	4.321	No	
66/3	19	The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts	I	340	No	
66/4	19	Ministry of Education and Training	I	162	No	
66/5	19	Department	I	132	Yes	
66/6	19	Architectural School Aarhus	I	119	No	

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
66/7	19	Danish Decommissioning	I	84	No	
66/8	19	The Danish Accreditation Institution	I	36	No	
66/9	19	Student advisory services	I	32	No	
66/10	19	Administrative Library	I	19	No	
66/11	19	8 universities (2)	U	55.812	No	
66/12	19	8 university colleges 2)	U	11.462	Yes	2,85
66/13	19	9 business academies (2)	U	4.072	No	
66/14	19	Danmarks Grundforskningsfond 2)	U	811	No	
66/15	19	9 maritime educational institutions 2)	U	732	No	
66/16	19	Design School in Kolding	U	133	No	
66/17	19	Innovation Fund	U	89	No	
70/1	20	Department	I	42.564	Yes	
70/2	20	The Board of IT and Learning	I	478	No	
70/3	20	Education and Quality Agency	I	287	No	
70/4	20	Sorø Akademis Skole	I	98	No	
70/5	20	The Danish Evaluation Institute	I	95	No	
70/6	20	The Danish Centre for the Educational Environment	I	9	No	
70/7	20	230 public-funded self-financing activities	U	23.981	No	
70/8	20	The South Indies Committee	U	473	No	
70/9	20	National Centre for Education	U	20	No	
72/1	21	The Danish Cultural Office	I	4.248	Yes	7
72/2	21	The Royal Theatre and Chapel	I	1.080	Yes	90,91,92,93
72/3	21	Department	I	771	No	

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
72/4	21	The Danish Film Institute	I	642	Yes	94,95
72/5	21	National Museum	I	617	No	
72/6	21	The Royal Library, Denmark	I	434	No	
72/7	21	The National Archives	I	281	No	
72/8	21	National Museum of Art	I	249	Yes	96
72/9	21	The State Library and the National Newspaper Collection	I	221	No	
72/10	21	That was a joke. Danske Musikonservatorium	I	125	No	
72/11	21	The Jyske Musikkon servatorium	I	97	No	
72/12	21	The Danish School of Scene Art	I	93	No	
72/13	21	Nota	I	88	No	
72/14	21	The Art Academy's Art Schools	I	67	No	
72/15	21	Ordrupgaard	I	66	Yes	97
72/16	21	The Danish Film School	I	57	No	
72/17	21	South Danish Musikkon servatorium	I	47	No	
72/18	21	Rytmic Musickons ervatorium	I	40	No	
72/19	21	Danish Agricultural Museum	I	26	No	
72/20	21	Danish Language Board	I	16	No	
72/21	21	The Hirschsprung Collection	I	15	No	
72/22	21	Danish Museum of Hunting and Forestry	I	14	No	
72/23	21	Statens Workshops for Art	I	8	No	
72/24	21	The Royal Academy of the Beauty	I	3	No	
73/1	21	DR2)	U	8.611	Yes	776,98
73/2	21	TV MIDTVEST	U	148	No	
73/3	21	TV2 ØSTJYLLAND	U	141	No	
73/4	21	TV2 Nord	U	140	No	

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
73/5	21	TV2 Lorry	U	136	No	
73/6	21	TV EAST	U	135	No	
73/7	21	TV 2 / Funen	U	132	No	
73/8	21	TV 2 / Bornholm	U	132	No	
73/9	21	University of the People's Republic	U	112	No	
73/10	21	European Court of Justice	U	38	No	
73/11	21	Page youth board one	U	1	No	
78/1	22	Department	U	608	Yes	7
78/2	22	Joint Fund of the National Church of Denmark	U	2.225	Yes	8,36,101
78/3	22	10 spring rain jaws	U	300	No	
78/4	22	10 accounts for binding flat-rate contributions	U	51	No	
81/1	24	(2)	I	17.799	Yes	535,168,169,170,172,7
81/2	24	The Danish Natural Resources Agency	I	3.077	No	
81/3	24	The Danish Food Authority	I	1.739	Yes	105
81/4	24	Environmental Protection Agency	I	1.399	Yes	7
81/5	24	Department	I	478	Yes	171
81/6	24	Coastal Directorate	I	372	No	
81/7	24	Denmark's Environmental Portal	I	76	No	
81/8	24	Board of Appeal	I	67	No	
81/9	24	Energy Complaints Board	I	6	No	
81/10	24	Danish Producer Response System (2)	U	302	No	
81/11	24	Food culture	U	67	No	
81/12	24	Danish Dog Register	U	13	No	
84/1	28	Banedmark	I	10.570	No	
84/2	28	Department	I	6.935	No	
84/3	28	Building Authority	I	6.028	Yes	108
84/4	28	Road Directorate	I	4.065	No	
84/5	28	Traffic and Construction	I	1.800	Yes	2017,109

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
84/6	28	Accident Commissioner for Civil Aviation	I	13	No	
84/7	28	Commissarius of the State of Expropria-	I	10	No	
84/8	28	Road Traffic Accident Commission	I	6	No	
84/9	28	Commission of the State Expropriation	I	5	No	
84/10	28	DSB2)	U	27.204	No	
84/11	28	Naviair (2)	U	2.440	No	
84/12	28	Metro company I / S2)	U	2.329	Yes	110
84/13	28	Development Company City & Port I / S2)	U	1.338	Yes	111
84/14	28	The capital Letbane I / S2)	U	241	No	
84/15	28	Council on Safe Traffic	U	133	No	
84/16	28	Fjord link Frederikssund SOV2)	U	9	No	
88/1	29	Danish Energy Agency	I	3.645	Yes	118,119
88/2	29	Danmarks Meteorological Institute	I	507	No	
88/3	29	Geodata Agency	I	502	No	
88/4	29	National Geological Studies	I	407	Yes	7
88/5	29	Secretariat of the Energy Supervisory Authority	I	110	No	
88/6	29	Department	I	95	No	
88/7	29	Climate Council	I	8	No	
88/8	29	Energinet.dk 2)	U	25.055	No	
88/9	29	Technical development fund for the water sector 2	U	0,3	No	

2017

Original. I / U = inside / outside the state accounts. Referral candidates are identifiers for source sections, never extra cases.

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
27/1	6	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	I	15.630	Yes	24,25
27/2	6	Department of Human Rights (2)	I	274	No	
27/3	6	Danish Institute of International Studies (2)	I	132	No	
27/4	6	Nordic Council of Ministers	U	1.880	No	
27/5	6	Investment Fund for Developing Countries (2)	U	258	No	
27/6	6	Danske-Norsk Cooperation Fund	U	77	No	
27/7	6	Nordic Cultural Foundation	U	75	No	
27/8	6	Nordic Council	U	70	No	
27/9	6	Danmarkshuset in Paris 2)	U	27	No	
27/10	6	Investment Fund for the countries of Eastern Europe 2	U	26	No	
27/11	6	Arab Investment Fund (2)	U	9	No	
27/12	6	Climate investment (2)	U	5	No	
27/13	6	Agricultural investment fund (2)	U	2	No	
27/14	6	Ukraine Investment Facility 2)	U	1	No	
29/1	7	Department	I	29.508	No	
29/2	7	Modernisation	I	4.396	No	
29/3	7	State Administration	I	2.193	Yes	27
29/4	7	Statens It	I	949	No	
29/5	7	Agency for Digital Government	I	468	Yes	4
29/6	7	Competencekredit	I	110	No	
32/1	8	The Danish Business Authority	I	1.992	No	
32/2	8	Department	I	1.522	Yes	30
32/3	8	Financial supervision	I	721	No	
32/4	8	Maritime Authority	I	367	No	
32/5	8	Patent and Commodity Board	I	311	Yes	29

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
32/6	8	Competition and Consumer Protection	I	263	No	
32/7	8	The National Security Agency	I	181	No	
32/8	8	Board of Directors	I	174	No	
32/9	8	North Sea Fund (2)	U	7.746	No	
32/10	8	EKF - Denmark's Export Credit 2)	U	3.940	No	
32/11	8	Vækstfonden 2)	U	1.821	No	
32/12	8	Financial Stability 2)	U	1.425	No	
32/13	8	DanPilot 2)	U	803	No	
32/14	8	Guarantee fund for non-life insurance	U	122	No	
32/15	8	Design Society 2)	U	67	No	
32/16	8	The Danish Accreditation and	U	64	No	
32/17	8	North Sea Unit (2)	U	53	No	
32/18	8	The travel guarantee fund	U	51	No	
32/19	8	Denmark's Green Investment Fund 2)	U	42	No	
32/20	8	Nordic Patent Institute	U	36	No	
32/21	8	The Danish Business Foundation (2)	U	29	No	
36/1	9	SKAT	I	6.860	Yes	32,33,9,34,38,83,91,94,95,96,102
36/2	9	Department	I	1.826	Yes	116,4
36/3	9	Tax Appeals Board	I	278	No	
36/4	9	Gambling Authority	I	135	No	
39/1	10	Department 2) 208.240	I	208.240	No	
39/2	10	Statistics in Denmark	I	589	No	
39/3	10	Ankestyrelsen	I	520	No	
39/4	10	VIVE - National Research and Development	I	391	Yes	36
39/5	10	CPR administration a	I	138	No	
39/6	10	Economic Council	I	28	No	

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
41/1	11	Police and Prosecutors	I	13.588	Yes	38
41/2	11	Police Department.	I	3.523	Yes	39
41/3	11	Court of Justice	I	2.779	No	
41/4	11	Department	I	281	No	
41/5	11	Civil Service Agency	I	216	No	
41/6	11	Data Protection Agency	I	27	No	
41/7	11	The political authorities	I	24	No	
41/8	11	Supervision of the information services	I	7	No	
41/9	11	Crime Prevention Council	U	29	No	
44/1	12	Defence 2)	I	21.955	Yes	41,42,43,44,45,46
44/2	12	Defence Intelligence Service	I	846	No	
44/3	12	Emergency Board n	I	556	No	
44/4	12	Department	I	387	No	
44/5	12	Emergency services	U	26	No	
49/1	14	Department	I	4.038	No	
49/2	14	Immigration Board n	I	2.171	No	
49/3	14	International Recruitment Board	I	461	No	
49/4	14	Danish Red Cross' Asylum Department (2)	U	881	No	
50/1	15	Department	I	4.065	No	
50/2	15	Social Services	I	1.631	No	
50/3	15	State administration	I	333	No	
50/4	15	Kofoeds School (2)	I	68	No	
50/5	15	Children's Council	I	14	No	
50/6	15	Central Council for Disabled People	I	8	No	
50/7	15	Social Council	I	7	No	
50/8	15	Council	I	5	No	
52/1	16	Department	I	3.464	Yes	50,51

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
52/2	16	Statens Serum Institut	I	1.962	No	
52/3	16	Pharmaceutical Board n	I	1.285	No	
52/4	16	Patient Safety Agency	I	1.047	No	
52/5	16	Health Service	I	728	No	
52/6	16	Health data management	I	468	Yes	52,4
52/7	16	Joint Secretariat of the Ethics Council and	I	12	No	
52/8	16	Health (2)	U	135	No	
52/9	16	MedCom 2)	U	133	Yes	53
52/10	16	Institute for Quality and Accreditation in	U	69	No	
56/1	17	Labour Market and 272.089	I	272.089	Yes	55,2,56
56/2	17	Labour inspectorate	I	1.329	Yes	57
56/3	17	Department	I	257	No	
56/4	17	National Research Centre for	I	219	No	
56/5	17	Cross-border IT support i	I	166	No	
56/6	17	6 industry associations for health and safety,	U	87	No	
60/1	19	Administrative Board of the Institutions and Education	I	63.661	Yes	59
60/2	19	Research and Innovation Board	I	2.229	No	
60/3	19	The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts	I	325	No	
60/4	19	Administrative Board of the Institutions and Education	I	172	No	
60/5	19	Department	I	140	No	
60/6	19	Architectural School Aarhus	I	132	No	
60/7	19	Danish Decommissioning	I	90	No	

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
60/8	19	Student advisory services	I	38	No	
60/9	19	The Danish Accreditation Institution	I	38	No	
60/10	19	8 universities (2)	U	57.152	No	
60/11	19	8 university colleges 2)	U	11.385	No	
60/12	19	9 business academies (2)	U	4.191	No	
60/13	19	9 maritime educational institutions 2)	U	900	No	
60/14	19	Danmarks Grundforskningsfond 2)	U	822	No	
60/15	19	Design School in Kolding	U	141	No	
60/16	19	Innovation Fund	U	79	No	
62/1	20	Department	U	41.139	Yes	61
62/2	20	The Board of IT and Learning	U	487	No	
62/3	20	Education and Quality Agency	U	316	No	
62/4	20	The Danish Evaluation Institute	U	102	No	
62/5	20	Sorø Akademis Skole	U	69	No	
62/6	20	The Danish Centre for the Educational Environment	U	14	No	
62/7	20	226 self-financing	U	23.272	No	
62/8	20	Astra 2)	U	20	No	
65/1	21	Danish Agency for Culture and Palaces	I	5.579	No	
65/2	21	The Royal Theatre and Chapel	I	1.041	Yes	64,65
65/3	21	Department	I	734	No	
65/4	21	The Danish Film Institute	I	683	No	
65/5	21	The Royal Library, Denmark	I	644	No	
65/6	21	National Museum	I	634	No	

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
65/7	21	The National Archives	I	271	No	
65/8	21	National Museum of Art	I	200	No	
65/9	21	That was a joke. Danske Musikonservatorium	I	132	No	
65/10	21	Ordrupgaard	I	112	Yes	66
65/11	21	The Danish School of Scene Art	I	97	No	
65/12	21	The Jyske Musikkon servatorium	I	93	No	
65/13	21	Nota	I	87	No	
65/14	21	The Art Academy's Art Schools	I	72	No	
65/15	21	The Danish Film School	I	55	No	
65/16	21	South Danish Musikkon servatorium	I	52	No	
65/17	21	Rytmic Musickons ervatorium	I	39	No	
65/18	21	The Green Museum	I	36	No	
65/19	21	The Hirschsprung Collection	I	17	No	
65/20	21	Danish Language Board	I	16	No	
65/21	21	Statens Workshops for Art	I	9	No	
65/22	21	The Royal Academy of the Beauty	I	3	No	
66/1	21	DR2)	U	8.620	Yes	63
66/2	21	TV MIDTVEST	U	147	No	
66/3	21	TV2 ØSTJYLLAND	U	143	No	
66/4	21	TV2 Nord	U	144	No	
66/5	21	TV 2 Lorry	U	150	No	
66/6	21	TV EAST	U	138	No	
66/7	21	TV 2 / Funen	U	138	No	
66/8	21	TV 2 / Bornholm	U	135	No	
66/9	21	University of the People's Republic	U	130	No	
66/10	21	Page youth board one	U	1	No	

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
68/1	22	Department	U	583	No	
68/2	22	Joint Fund of the National Church of Denmark	U	2.237	No	
68/3	22	10 spring rain jaws	U	234	No	
68/4	22	10 accounts for binding flat-rate contributions	U	60	No	
70/1	24	The natural economy	I	17.698	Yes	69,113,114,115,117
70/2	24	Environmental Protection Agency	I	2.893	No	
70/3	24	The Danish Natural Resources Agency	I	1.767	No	
70/4	24	The Danish Food Authority	I	1.744	No	
70/5	24	Department	I	358	No	
70/6	24	Coastal Directorate	I	259	No	
70/7	24	Denmark's Environmental Portal	I	76	No	
70/8	24	Water and Nature Management Agency	I	25	No	
70/9	24	Danish Producer Response System (2)	U	506	No	
70/10	24	Food culture	U	53	No	
70/11	24	Danish Dog Register	U	13	No	
73/1	28	Banedmark	I	10.823	Yes	4
73/2	28	Department	I	6.984	No	
73/3	28	Building Authority	I	6.679	Yes	71,72,4
73/4	28	Traffic, Construction and Housing Agency	I	5.431	No	
73/5	28	Road Directorate	I	4.261	No	
73/6	28	Accident Commissioner for Civil Aviation	I	14	No	
73/7	28	Commissarius of the State of Expropria-	I	10	No	
73/8	28	Commissarius of the State of Expropria-	I	4	No	
73/9	28	Road Traffic Accident Commission	I	4	No	
73/10	28	DSB2)	U	24.033	No	
73/11	28	Metro company I / S2)	U	4.502	No	

PDF / row	§	Actor identifier	Scope	DKK million	Note in Table	Referral scandal date
73/12	28	Naviair (2)	U	2.458	No	
73/13	28	Development Company City & Port I / S2)	U	950	Yes	73
73/14	28	The capital Letbane I / S2)	U	259	No	
73/15	28	Council on Safe Traffic	U	132	No	
73/16	28	Your Public Transport I / S	U	105	No	
73/17	28	Fjord link Frederikssund (2)	U	16	No	
76/1	29	Danish Energy Agency	I	5.583	Yes	75
76/2	29	Danmarks Meteorological Institute	I	511	No	
76/3	29	National Geological Studies	I	402	No	
76/4	29	The Directorate for Data Supply and	I	379	No	
76/5	29	Geodata Agency	I	235	No	
76/6	29	Secretariat of the Energy Supervisory Authority	I	138	No	
76/7	29	Department	I	127	No	
76/8	29	Climate Council	I	8	No	
76/9	29	Energinet.dk 2)	U	10.190	No	
76/10	29	Technical development fund for the water sector 2	U	0,5	No	
78/1	35	General reserves	I	9.699	No	
78/2	35	Pension services	I	29.964	No	
78/3	35	Interest	I	56.193	No	
112/1	40	Reloans etc.	I	59.681	No	
112/2	40	Stock movements etc.	I	23.967	No	
112/3	40	Net public debt instalment 484.749	I	484.749	No	

Material status: The financial row / scope columns of all ministerial statements have been checked, including cultural continuations. The individual legal conclusions of the observations are classified only where they appear as concrete findings in the main table; the presence of the table text is not in itself a breach of law. Other citizen / person and time findings in the bread text shall be checked separately.

Financial paragraph tables 2018- 2023, fully controlled

§ 3The Folketing has been omitted from the audit even where the table shows an amount. 2021 Joint Paragraffes; 2022-23 Collect 35-37 / 40-42. Their number of rows is therefore not the same denominator. Amount is financial activity in mio.DKK. Absence of a reservation marker is not proof of the absence of a breach of law. The statement of the state account as a whole shall be counted separately.

Year	Table rows	Of which § 3 omitted	Reservation marked paragraphs	Explicit positive 2021-23	Highlighting 2022-23
2018	29	1	38	Not homogenised	Separate main table
2019	24	0	38	Not homogenised	Separate main table
2020	24	0	38	Not homogenised	Separate main table
2021	24	0	9,16,38	21	Separate main table
2022	23	0	8	22	9,38
2023	24	0	8,11,15	21	9,24

Year	PDF / Row rod	§	Financial act I neffectiveness, mio.DK K	Reservation	Highlights a	Original
2018	10/1	1	82	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/2	2	28	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/3	3	1.188	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/4	5	120	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/5	6	17.832	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/6	7	43.045	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/7	8	8.624	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/8	9	11.065	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/9	10	202.550	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/10	11	22.019	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/11	12	24.922	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/12	14	5.627	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/13	15	6.235	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	10/14	16	10.267	No	No / other year column	Original

Year	PDF / Row rod	§	Financial act I neffectiveness , mio.DK K	Reservation	Highlights a	Original
2018	11/1	17	286.220	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/2	19	70.332	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/3	20	43.155	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/4	21	10.728	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/5	22	601	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/6	24	25.009	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/7	28	35.553	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/8	29	20.855	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/9	35	10.412	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/10	36	24.935	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/11	37	25.399	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/12	38	743.379	Yes	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/13	40	48.532	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/14	41	57	No	No / other year column	Original
2018	11/15	42	7.189	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/1	1	84	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/2	2	28	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/3	5	117	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/4	6	18.279	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/5	7	43.096	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/6	8	6.866	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/7	9	12.036	No	No / other year column	Original

Year	PDF / Row rod	§	Financial act l neffectiveness , mio.DK K	Reservation	Highlights a	Original
2019	10/8	11	23.321	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/9	12	26.107	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/10	14	4.339	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/11	15	215.394	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	10/12	16	9.611	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/1	17	287.764	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/2	19	70.846	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/3	20	42.239	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/4	21	12.060	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/5	22	620	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/6	24	24.682	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/7	28	19.469	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/8	29	22.516	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/9	35	10.950	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/10	36	30.990	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/11	37	42.174	No	No / other year column	Original
2019	11/12	38	764.022	Yes	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/1	1	85,9	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/2	2	28,2	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/3	5	119,5	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/4	6	17.134,9	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/5	7	35.439,5	No	No / other year column	Original

Year	PDF / Row rod	§	Financial act I neffectiveness , mio.DK K	Reservation	Highlights a	Original
2020	12/6	8	54.288,1	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/7	9	11.602,9	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/8	11	27.345,5	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/9	12	25.225,0	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/10	14	3.252,4	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/11	15	231.451,9	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/12	16	6.423,3	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/13	17	232.021,0	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/14	19	52.725,0	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/15	20	31.004,4	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/16	21	10.956,5	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/17	22	607,4	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/18	24	8.171,3	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/19	28	17.962,6	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/20	29	13.905,3	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/21	35	11.709,2	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/22	36	25.976,9	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/23	37	10.084,5	No	No / other year column	Original
2020	12/24	38	826.598,6	Yes	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/1	1-2	114,3	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/2	5	135,0	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/3	6	16.706,5	No	No / other year column	Original

Year	PDF / Row rod	§	Financial act l neffectiveness , mio.DK K	Reservation	Highlights a	Original
2021	13/4	7	32.805,1	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/5	8	31.579,6	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/6	9	13.678,9	Yes	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/7	11	33.155,7	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/8	12	27.004,3	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/9	13	237.229,6	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/10	14	3.039,3	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/11	15	9.845,3	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/12	16	14.876,6	Yes	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/13	17	229.970,7	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/14	19	51.760,8	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/15	20	31.134,9	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/16	21	12.266,4	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/17	22	604,4	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/18	23	2.208,8	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/19	24	18.254,8	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/20	28	18.845,5	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	13/21	29	13.976,7	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	14/1	35-37	46.835,0	No	No / other year column	Original
2021	14/2	38	929.023,7	Yes	No / other year column	Original
2021	14/3	40-42	-	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/1	1-2	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original

Year	PDF / Row rod	§	Financial act I neffectiveness , mio.DK K	Reservation	Highlights a	Original
2022	11/2	5	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/3	6	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/4	7	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/5	8	No amount	Yes	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/6	9	No amount	No	Yes	Original
2022	11/7	11	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/8	12	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/9	13	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/10	14	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/11	15	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/12	16	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/13	17	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/14	19	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/15	20	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/16	21	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/17	22	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/18	23	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/19	24	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/20	28	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/21	29	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2022	11/22	38	No amount	No	Yes	Original
2022	11/23	35-37/40 -42	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original

Year	PDF / Row rod	§	Financial act I neffectiveness , mio.DK K	Reservation	Highlights a	Original
2023	12/1	1-2	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/2	5	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/3	6	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/4	7	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/5	8	No amount	Yes	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/6	9	No amount	No	Yes	Original
2023	12/7	10	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/8	11	No amount	Yes	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/9	12	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/10	14	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/11	15	No amount	Yes	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/12	16	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/13	17	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/14	19	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/15	20	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/16	21	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/17	22	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/18	23	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/19	24	No amount	No	Yes	Original
2023	12/20	25	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/21	28	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/22	29	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original

Year	PDF / Row rod	§	Financial act I neffectiveness , mio.DK K	Reservation	Highlights a	Original
2023	12/23	38	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original
2023	12/24	35-37/40 -42	No amount	No	No / other year column	Original

Complete 2021 theme matrix:32 legal-compliance and 22 management audits

Original, PDF32 tableB/PDF34 tableC; red-font coding checked directly. Legal columns:1 procurement,2 pay,3 sales,4 fees,5 grants,6 transfers of rights,7 taxes. Management columns:1 activity,2 targets,3 procurement management,4 project budget,5 grant management,6 tax collection,7 debt collection.

Type	Minister identifier	Column	Outcome
legal	Employment	2	No critical opinion
legal	Employment	6	No critical opinion
legal	Children / Education	2	No critical opinion
legal	Children / Education	6	No critical opinion
legal	Occupation	2	No critical opinion
legal	Finance	1	No critical opinion
legal	Finance	2	No critical opinion
legal	Defence	2	No critical opinion
legal	Domestic / Housing	2	No critical opinion
legal	Domestic / Housing	3	No critical opinion
legal	Justice	2	No critical opinion
legal	Justice	7	No critical opinion
legal	Climate / Energy	1	No critical opinion
legal	Climate / Energy	2	No critical opinion
legal	Climate / Energy	4	No critical opinion
legal	Culture	2	No critical opinion
legal	Foodstuffs	2	No critical opinion
legal	Foodstuffs	6	No critical opinion
legal	Honey.	2	No critical opinion
legal	Honey.	7	Critical
legal	Social / Elderly	2	No critical opinion
legal	Social / Elderly	5	No critical opinion
legal	State	2	No critical opinion
legal	Health	2	No critical opinion
legal	Health	3	No critical opinion

Type	Minister identifier	Column	Outcome
legal	Health	6	No critical opinion
legal	Transport	2	No critical opinion
legal	Transport	4	No critical opinion
legal	Education	2	No critical opinion
legal	Education	3	No critical opinion
legal	External	1	No critical opinion
legal	Aliens	2	No critical opinion
management;	Employment	1	No critical opinion
management;	Occupation	2	No critical opinion
management;	Finance	3	No critical opinion
management;	Finance	4	No critical opinion
management;	Defence	4	No critical opinion
management;	Justice	6	No critical opinion
management;	Church	1	No critical opinion
management;	Climate / Energy	3	No critical opinion
management;	Climate / Energy	4	No critical opinion
management;	Culture	1	No critical opinion
management;	Culture	2	No critical opinion
management;	Environment	1	No critical opinion
management;	Environment	5	No critical opinion
management;	Foodstuffs	1	No critical opinion
management;	Foodstuffs	3	No critical opinion
management;	Foodstuffs	5	No critical opinion
management;	Honey.	6	Critical
management;	Honey.	7	Critical
management;	Social / Elderly	5	No critical opinion
management;	External	1	No critical opinion
management;	External	3	No critical opinion
management;	Aliens	1	No critical opinion

32 legal-compliance audits=31 without a critical finding+1 critical;22 management audits=20 without a critical finding+2 critical. Red text in Skat 7/B and Skat 6/7/C has been checked. The count covers 54 thematic audits, not 54 people. Table C places the Banedanmark/Bygningsstyrelsen project field under the Climate row; that table placement is retained without our own correction of ministerial responsibility.

Full follow-up Annex 2018- 2023

All 344 table rows are materially counted. The source's case totals summing 343, because 2021 finance indicates 13 cases but contains 14 rows. Summers repeat cases over years; they are not a national unique error / victim count. Tags can overlap, e.g. continued case moved to another account. Blank status means blank field, not rectified conditions.

Year	Part	Sourc e total	Loss Shoul ders no	Done at... utnine gsfo R attles	Fort set	Not omta lt	Blan k	Move ed	Alles ed exit t a ndet place	Asv arso verb Raget	Sam. menl weight	Original / Start PDF
2018	State aid	11	11	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	Original,47
2018	administra tion	43	43	7	6	30	0	2	0	0	0	Original,62
2019	State aid	15	15	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	Original,54
2019	administra tion	45	45	5	7	33	0	4	0	0	0	Original,85
2020	State aid	14	14	2	5	7	0	2	0	0	0	Original,51
2020	administra tion	52	52	12	3	37	0	0	0	0	0	Original,70
2021	State aid	13	14	3	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	Original,40
2021	administra tion	48	48	8	2	0	38	2	0	0	0	Original,36
2022	State aid	12	12	2	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	Original,29
2022	administra tion	38	38	5	2	0	28	3	0	2	1	Original,27
2023	State aid	18	18	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	Original,51
2023	administra tion	34	34	2	30	0	0	7	1	1	0	Original,28

Specific reconciliations:2019 administration section 77/PDF79 states 5 closures, but chapter 4 has 4 case sections,sections 78-81,the appendix introduction/PDF85 states 4,and 45 table rows have 5 closure markers. The fifth/PDF90 row 4 is in the financial annual report and overlaps its closures. 2021 finance/PDF40 states 13 versus 14 separate rows; no documented deduplication explanation has been invented. 2021 administration has 8 closure rows, whereas the introduction says 7 cases: payroll administration in Social/Defence appears on 2 rows but is closed jointly in section 25/PDF29.2023 administration:2 new closure proposals; education-institution funding had already been closed in another line through the memorandum of 24.8.2022(PDF32 row 1). Transfer of responsibility or completion of a network transition is not counted as a closed audit case.

All row identifiers, status and references:

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2018 / State Accounts	47/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / State Accounts	47/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / State Accounts	47/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2018 / State Accounts	47/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / State Accounts	47/5	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2018 / State Accounts	48/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / State Accounts	48/2	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2018 / State Accounts	48/3	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2018 / State Accounts	48/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / State Accounts	48/5	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2018 / State Accounts	48/6	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2018 / management	62/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	62/2	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2018 / management	62/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	62/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	62/5	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2018 / management	62/6	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	63/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	63/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	63/3	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2018 / management	63/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	63/5	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	63/6	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up; moved to the second report		
2018 / management	63/7	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	63/8	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2018 / management	63/9	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	64/1	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up; moved to the second report		
2018 / management	64/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	64/3	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2018 / management	64/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	64/5	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	64/6	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2018 / management	64/7	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	64/8	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	64/9	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	65/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	65/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	65/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	65/4	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2018 / management	66/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	66/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	66/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	66/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	66/5	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	66/6	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2018 / management	66/7	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	66/8	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2018 / management	66/9	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	66/10	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2018 / management	67/1	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2018 / management	67/2	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2018 / management	67/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	67/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2018 / management	67/5	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2019 / State Accounts	54/1	§ 7	end proposed		
2019 / State Accounts	54/2	§ 7	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / State Accounts	54/3	§ 9	end proposed		
2019 / State Accounts	54/4	§ 11	end proposed		
2019 / State Accounts	55/1	§ 12	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / State Accounts	55/2	§ 12	end proposed		
2019 / State Accounts	55/3	§ 15	end proposed		
2019 / State Accounts	55/4	§ 17	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / State Accounts	55/5	§ 17	end proposed		
2019 / State Accounts	55/6	§ 17	end proposed		
2019 / State Accounts	55/7	§ 17	continued follow-up;		
2019 / State Accounts	56/1	§ 24	end proposed		
2019 / State Accounts	56/2	§ 38	continued follow-up;		
2019 / State Accounts	56/3	§ 38	end proposed		
2019 / State Accounts	56/4	§ 38	continued follow-up;		
2019 / management	85/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	85/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	85/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	85/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2019 / management	85/5	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	86/1	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2019 / management	86/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	86/3	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up; moved to the second report		
2019 / management	86/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	86/5	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	86/6	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	86/7	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	86/8	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	87/1	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up; moved to the second report		
2019 / management	87/2	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2019 / management	87/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	87/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	87/5	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	87/6	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	87/7	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	87/8	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	88/1	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2019 / management	88/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	88/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	88/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	88/5	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2019 / management	88/6	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	88/7	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	88/8	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	88/9	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2019 / management	89/1	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2019 / management	89/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	90/1	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2019 / management	90/2	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up; moved to the second report		
2019 / management	90/3	not specified in the extract	(i) the proposal to close; referred to in the main section of the year; moved to the second report;		
2019 / management	90/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	90/5	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2019 / management	90/6	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	90/7	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	90/8	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2019 / management	90/9	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	91/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	91/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	91/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2019 / management	91/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / State accounts	51/1	§ 7	end proposed		
2020 / State accounts	51/2	§ 11	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / State accounts	51/3	§ 11	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2020 / State accounts	51/4	§ 12	end proposed		
2020 / State accounts	51/5	§ 12	continued follow-up;		
2020 / State accounts	52/1	§ 17	continued follow-up; moved to second report; moved to second report		
2020 / State accounts	52/2	§ 17	continued follow-up;		
2020 / State accounts	52/3	§ 28	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / State accounts	52/4	§ 28	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / State accounts	52/5	§ 38	continued follow-up;		
2020 / State accounts	52/6	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / State accounts	52/7	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / State accounts	53/1	§ 38	continued follow-up;		
2020 / State accounts	53/2	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	70/1	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	70/2	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	70/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	70/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	71/1	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	71/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	71/3	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	71/4	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	71/5	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	71/6	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	72/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	72/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2020 / management	72/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	72/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	72/5	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	72/6	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	72/7	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	72/8	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	72/9	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	73/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	73/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	73/3	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	73/4	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	73/5	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	73/6	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	73/7	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	73/8	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	73/9	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	73/10	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	73/11	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2020 / management	74/1	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2020 / management	74/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	75/1	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	75/2	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2020 / management	75/3	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up;		
2020 / management	75/4	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	75/5	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	75/6	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	75/7	not specified in the extract	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	75/8	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	76/1	§ 38	continued follow-up;		
2020 / management	76/2	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	76/3	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	76/4	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	76/5	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	76/6	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	76/7	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	76/8	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	76/9	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	76/10	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	77/1	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2020 / management	77/2	§ 38	not mentioned in the main section of the year;		
2021 / State Accounts	40/1	§ 9	status field without selection		
2021 / State Accounts	40/2	§ 11	status field without selection		
2021 / State Accounts	40/3	§ 11	end proposed		
2021 / State Accounts	40/4	§ 11	status field without selection		
2021 / State Accounts	40/5	§ 12	status field without selection		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2021 / State Accounts	41/1	§ 17	status field without selection		
2021 / State Accounts	41/2	§ 17	end proposed		
2021 / State Accounts	41/3	§ 20	status field without selection		
2021 / State Accounts	41/4	§ 28	end proposed		
2021 / State Accounts	41/5	§ 28	status field without selection		
2021 / State Accounts	42/1	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / State Accounts	42/2	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / State Accounts	43/1	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / State Accounts	43/2	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	36/1	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2021 / management	36/2	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2021 / management	36/3	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	36/4	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	37/1	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	37/2	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	37/3	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	37/4	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2021 / management	37/5	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	37/6	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	37/7	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	37/8	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	37/9	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	38/1	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2021 / management	38/2	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	38/3	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2021 / management	38/4	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2021 / management	38/5	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	38/6	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2021 / management	38/7	not specified in the extract	end proposed		
2021 / management	38/8	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	38/9	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	38/10	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	39/1	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	40/1	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	40/2	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up; moved to the second report		
2021 / management	40/3	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	40/4	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	40/5	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	40/6	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	40/7	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	41/1	not specified in the extract	status field without selection		
2021 / management	41/2	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	41/3	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	41/4	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	41/5	§ 38	status field without selection		

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2021 / management	41/6	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	41/7	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	41/8	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	41/9	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	41/10	§ 38	continued follow-up; moved to the second report		
2021 / management	42/1	§ 38	end proposed		
2021 / management	42/2	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	42/3	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	42/4	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	42/5	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	42/6	§ 38	status field without selection		
2021 / management	42/7	§ 38	status field without selection		
2022 / State accounts	29/1	§ 9	status field without selection	19/2019,18/2020,20/ 2021	
2022 / State accounts	29/2	§ 11	status field without selection	19/2019	
2022 / State accounts	29/3	§ 11	end proposed	18/2020	
2022 / State accounts	29/4	§ 11	status field without selection	20/2021	
2022 / State accounts	29/5	§ 12	status field without selection	19/2019,18/2020,20/ 2021	
2022 / State accounts	29/6	§ 17	end proposed	20/2018,19/2019,18/ 2020	
2022 / State accounts	29/7	§ 20	status field without selection	18/2020	
2022 / State accounts	30/1	§ 28	status field without selection	19/2019	
2022 / State accounts	30/2	§ 38	status field without selection	20/2018,19/2019,18/ 2020,20/2021	
2022 / State accounts	30/3	§ 38	status field without selection	19/2019	

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2022 / State accounts	30/4	§ 38	status field without selection	28/2013,23/2014,25/ 2016,21/2016,20/201 7,20/2018,19/2019,1 8/2020,20/2021	
2022 / State accounts	30/5	§ 38	status field without selection	19/2019	
2022 / management	27/1	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	22/2011,28/2013	
2022 / management	27/2	not specified in the extract	liability transferred;	28/2013,21/2018	
2022 / management	27/3	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	20/2019	
2022 / management	27/4	not specified in the extract	liability transferred;	21/2016	
2022 / management	27/5	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	28/2013	
2022 / management	27/6	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	23/2014,21/2016,20/ 2017	
2022 / management	27/7	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	20/2017	
2022 / management	27/8	not specified in the extract	end proposed	21/2018	
2022 / management	28/1	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	28/2013,21/2018	
2022 / management	28/2	not specified in the extract	end proposed	21/2018	
2022 / management	28/3	not specified in the extract	end proposed	20/2019	
2022 / management	28/4	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	19/2020	
2022 / management	28/5	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	21/2016	
2022 / management	28/6	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	20/2019	
2022 / management	28/7	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	21/2016	
2022 / management	28/8	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	19/2020	
2022 / management	28/9	not specified in the extract	end proposed	20/2019	
2022 / management	29/1	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	19/2008,18/2009,16/ 2010,22/2011,18/201 2,28/2013,23/2014,2 5/2015,21/2016,20/2 017,21/2018,20/2019 ,19/2020,19/2021	

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2022 / management	29/2	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	25/2015	
2022 / management	29/3	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	20/2017	
2022 / management	29/4	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	20/2017,21/2018,20/ 2019,19/2020	
2022 / management	30/1	not specified in the extract	continued follow-up; moved to the second report	20/2017	
2022 / management	30/2	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	20/2017	
2022 / management	30/3	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	21/2018,20/2019,19/ 2021	
2022 / management	30/4	not specified in the extract	status field without selection	21/2018	
2022 / management	30/5	§ 38	continued follow-up; moved to second report; moved to second report	20/2019	
2022 / management	30/6	§ 38	status field without selection	20/2019,19/2020,19/ 2021	
2022 / management	30/7	§ 38	status field without selection	20/2019	
2022 / management	30/8	§ 38	together with the other case	20/2019	
2022 / management	30/9	§ 38	status field without selection	19/2020	
2022 / management	30/10	§ 38	end proposed	19/2020	
2022 / management	31/1	§ 38	status field without selection	20/2019	
2022 / management	31/2	§ 38	status field without selection	21/2018	
2022 / management	31/3	§ 38	status field without selection	21/2018	
2022 / management	31/4	§ 38	status field without selection	20/2019	
2022 / management	31/5	§ 38	status field without selection	20/2019	
2022 / management	31/6	§ 38	status field without selection	20/2019	
2022 / management	31/7	§ 38	status field without selection	20/2019	
2023 / State accounts	51/1	§ 7	continued follow-up;	22/2022	
2023 / State accounts	51/2	§ 9	continued follow-up;	19/2019,18/2020,20/ 2021,22/2022	
2023 / State accounts	51/3	§ 11	referred to in the main section of the year;	19/2019	

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2023 / State accounts	51/4	§ 11	continued follow-up;	19/2019	
2023 / State accounts	51/5	§ 11	continued follow-up;	20/2021	
2023 / State accounts	51/6	§ 12	referred to in the main section of the year;	19/2019,18/2020,20/ 2021,22/2022	
2023 / State accounts	52/1	§ 15	referred to in the main section of the year;	19/2019	
2023 / State accounts	52/2	§ 17	continued follow-up;	22/2022	
2023 / State accounts	52/3	§ 19	referred to in the main section of the year;	19/2019	
2023 / State accounts	52/4	§ 20	continued follow-up;	19/2019	
2023 / State accounts	52/5	§ 20	continued follow-up;	18/2020	
2023 / State accounts	52/6	§ 21	referred to in the main section of the year;	19/2019	
2023 / State accounts	52/7	§ 28	continued follow-up;	19/2019	
2023 / State accounts	52/8	§ 29	end proposed	19/2019	
2023 / State accounts	53/1	§ 38	continued follow-up;	28/2013,23/2014,25/ 2015,21/2016,20/201 7,20/2018,19/2019,1 8/2020,20/2021,22/2 022	
2023 / State accounts	53/2	§ 38	referred to in the main section of the year;	20/2018,19/2019,18/ 2020,20/2021,22/202 2	
2023 / State accounts	53/3	§ 38	referred to in the main section of the year;	19/2019,22/2022	
2023 / State accounts	53/4	§ 38	continued follow-up;	22/2022	
2023 / management	28/1	§ 6	continued follow-up;	20/2019	
2023 / management	28/2	§ 7	continued follow-up; responsibilities transferred	28/2013,21/2018	
2023 / management	28/3	§ 7	end proposed	20/2019	
2023 / management	28/4	§ 7	continued follow-up;	21/2016	
2023 / management	29/1	§ 9	referred to in the main section of the year;	19/2008,18/2009,16/ 2010,22/2011,18/201 2,28/2013,23/2014,2 5/2015,21/2016,20/2 017,21/2018,20/2019 ,19/2020,19/2021,21/ 2022	
2023 / management	29/2	§ 9	end proposed	25/2015	
2023 / management	29/3	§ 9	continued follow-up; moved to the second report	20/2017	
2023 / management	29/4	§ 9	continued follow-up;	20/2017,21/2018,20/ 2019,19/2020	
2023 / management	30/1	§ 9	continued follow-up;	20/2017,19/2019	

Year / part	PDF / row	Minister identifier	Status	Previous Reporting ID	Continuation pages
2023 / management	30/2	§ 9	continued follow-up;	21/2018,20/2019,19/ 2021	
2023 / management	30/3	§ 9	continued follow-up;	21/2018	
2023 / management	30/4	§ 9	continued follow-up;	20/2019,19/2020,19/ 2021	
2023 / management	30/5	§ 9	continued follow-up;	20/2019	
2023 / management	30/6	§ 9	continued follow-up;	19/2020,21/2022	
2023 / management	30/7	§ 11	continued follow-up; moved to second report; moved to second report	28/2013,21/2018	
2023 / management	30/8	§ 11	continued follow-up;	19/2020,21/2022	
2023 / management	31/1	§ 12	continued follow-up; moved to the second report	28/2013	
2023 / management	31/2	§ 12	continued follow-up;	23/2014,21/2016,20/ 2017	
2023 / management	31/3	§ 12	continued follow-up;	20/2017	
2023 / management	31/4	§ 16	continued follow-up;	20/2019	
2023 / management	31/5	§ 16	continued follow-up;	21/2022	
2023 / management	31/6	§ 16	continued follow-up;	21/2022	
2023 / management	31/7	§ 19	continued follow-up;	20/2019	
2023 / management	32/1	§ 20	completed in the second report;	22/2011,28/2013	
2023 / management	32/2	§ 21	continued follow-up;	21/2022	
2023 / management	32/3	§ 22	continued follow-up;	21/2016	
2023 / management	32/4	§ 22	continued follow-up;	20/2019	
2023 / management	32/5	§ 23	continued follow-up;	19/2020	
2023 / management	32/6	§ 23	continued follow-up;	21/2022	
2023 / management	32/7	§ 28	continued follow-up;	21/2018	
2023 / management	33/1	§ 29	continued follow-up;	21/2016	
2023 / management	33/2	§ 29	continued follow-up; moved to the second report	21/2018	
2023 / management	33/3	§ 29	continued follow-up; moved to the second report	20/2019	
2023 / management	33/4	§ 29	continued follow-up; moved to the second report	20/2019	

Separate critical 2020 endorsement outside the state accounts

Original, Table 1 / PDF13 and Section 43 / PDF60: 4 critical statements of the ministerial audit are Treasury cases. In addition, 1 critical endorsement on health education annual accounts 2020, carried out with private auditor, outside the state accounts. It concerns activity / resource management. It is a separate actual 2020 opinion, not SSI / 2019 repetition. No addition as 5 critical statements in the ministerial audit's own population.

Materiality and Consequence of Rights

Management 2023, PDF8-9: a legal breach is assessed as material above 100 million DKK or above 10% of revenue/expenditure on the audited theme; consequences for citizens/businesses may also be included. A positive conclusion may contain delimited breaches of rules. Management 2022, PDF26 also has a 937 million DKK threshold for section 38. Finance 2023, PDF49: overall accounts 1%=17,4 billion DKK;section 38 1%=9,2 billion; ministerial graph 2% with a maximum of 1 billion DKK. Thus »positive« is a materiality conclusion, not a declaration that all transactions had legal authority or citizens obtained full redress.

Material coverage matrix and concrete residues

Year	Main figures	Ministerial / Conclusion Tables	Follow-up	Person / time
2006	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All 38 ministerial-assessment totals combined; all 273 product rows across the 2 years	Original total and breakdown between annual report / memo; not all individual cases' later effective closure	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2007	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All 38 ministerial-assessment totals combined; all 273 product rows across the 2 years	Original total and breakdown between annual report / memo; not all individual cases' later effective closure	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2008	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All 613 declaration-annex rows combined for 2008-10, graphical columns/groups/overlap checked	Original total / location / transfer; non national power or person coupling	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2009	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All 613 declaration-annex rows combined for 2008-10, graphical columns/groups/overlap checked	Original total / location / transfer; non national power or person coupling	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2010	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All 613 declaration-annex rows combined for 2008-10, graphical columns/groups/overlap checked	Original total / location / transfer; non national power or person coupling	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2011	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All 216 table rows with Culture-continuation, Yes / No / type / amount; pension table full	29 cases total, 11 closing proposals / 11 continued / 7 second report; not separate register of all later closing dates	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2012	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All 207 series of tables with continuation of Culture; group 10 with dash retained	50 attachments counted; 49 previous cases + 1Culture 2013; 22 close / 23 continued / 5 move	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2013	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All financial summary rows; 20 ministerial declarations, new regime	All 56 rows/status overlaps; main text 16/40 and annex 17/33/6 reconciliation discrepancies retained	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2014	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All financial summary rows and main criticisms; 994 rows overall 2013- 17	Status count of the complete annexes,223 rows overall 2014-17; proposal≠effective redress	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2015	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All financial summary rows and main criticisms; 994 rows overall 2013- 17	Status count of the complete annexes,223 rows overall 2014-17; proposal≠effective redress	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2016	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All financial summary rows and main criticisms; 994 rows overall 2013- 17	Status count of the complete annexes,223 rows overall 2014-17; proposal≠effective redress	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2017	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	All financial summary rows and main criticisms; 994 rows overall 2013- 17	Status count of the complete annexes,223 rows overall 2014-17; proposal≠effective redress	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2018	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	The entire financial overview by statutory account section; the entire performance-audit overview and 2021-23 thematic matrix	All 2 annexes of the year materially row / status checked; 344 rows of 12 Annexes 2018- 23; repetitions / transfers retained	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling

Year	Main figures	Ministerial / Conclusion Tables	Follow-up	Person / time
2019	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	The entire financial overview by statutory account section; the entire performance-audit overview and 2021-23 thematic matrix	All 2 annexes of the year materially row / status checked; 344 rows of 12 Annexes 2018- 23; repetitions / transfers retained	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2020	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	The entire financial overview by statutory account section; the entire performance-audit overview and 2021-23 thematic matrix	All 2 annexes of the year materially row / status checked; 344 rows of 12 Annexes 2018- 23; repetitions / transfers retained	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2021	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	The entire financial overview by statutory account section; the entire performance-audit overview and 2021-23 thematic matrix	All 2 annexes of the year materially row / status checked; 344 rows of 12 Annexes 2018- 23; repetitions / transfers retained	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2022	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	The entire financial overview by statutory account section; the entire performance-audit overview and 2021-23 thematic matrix	All 2 annexes of the year materially row / status checked; 344 rows of 12 Annexes 2018- 23; repetitions / transfers retained	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling
2023	Materially controlled: main conclusions and reported main denominators	The entire financial overview by statutory account section; the entire performance-audit overview and 2021-23 thematic matrix	All 2 annexes of the year materially row / status checked; 344 rows of 12 Annexes 2018- 23; repetitions / transfers retained	Selected concrete findings; no full national personal / time coupling

Scope remains delimited: other numeric methodology/criticism-section tables and figures for 2006-23 are not all reproduced in this module,although the main,ministerial and follow-up series have been substantively completed. Additional substantive checking appears in the supplementary analysis of specific consequences and tables below: 2018 tables 7-9, 2019 tables 5-6 and 8, 2020 table 7 and all 12 interest errors,2021 table 3, 2022 table 3 and the entire 2023 financial user-control matrix. Remaining public-table checking in these newer criticism sections comprises 2018 tables 2-6 and 10, 2019 tables 2-4 and 7, 2020 tables 2-6 and 2021 tables 1-2; older specific criticism sections have not all been numerically extracted. Effective closure dates and back payments also require individual follow-up memoranda. Rigsrevisionen must separately explain the 2012 accounts/marker discrepancy and the 2013/2021 follow-up groupings. No authority inquiry has been sent.

National audit: concrete consequences and full control tables

Complementing the yearseries. Documented populations and effective actions are separated from potential amounts and from accounting / audit markers.

2018: Working time break, Table 7

OriginalPDF34.

Company	48 hours	Rest / free days
SKAT	Yes	Yes
Banedmark	Yes	Yes
Defence Command	Not studied	Yes
Emergency Board	Not studied	Yes
Region Zealand	Yes	Not studied
Criminal services	Yes	Not studied

4/4 examined in each column;2 unexamined per column.6 entities,5 ministerial portfolios; no employee denominator.

2018: Gymnasium samples, Table 8

OriginalPDF37.

Theme	Gymnasia
Flat-rate wages	30
Chief Addendum	30
Earnings contract	19
Performance target percentage	108
One-off remuneration	13

The population overlaps; not 200 unique colleges.

2018: Chief Salary Allowance without Authorisation, Table 9

OriginalPDF37.

High school	From	To	Overrun DKK
West Funen	2008-08	2018-06	1107000
Høj-Taastrup	2008-10	2019-03	413438
Esbjerg / HF	2013-08	2019-03	318815
Midtfyn	2007-12	2019-03	283876
Gefion	2011-12	2018-01	117035
Vordingborg / HF	2013-01	2019-03	98997
Frederikssund	2016-01	2019-03	98856
Viral	2013-01	2018-05	41534
Total			2479549

8 / 30 rectors. The report is about 25% rounded; own 8 / 30 = 26,67%. The amount is multiannual, not 2018 alone. Board of Directors of independent high schools; not number of misofferings. The own sum of eight amounts is DKK 2.479.551 against the original's printed sum DKK 2.479.549; the difference of DKK 2 is retained.

2019: Honorary check, Table 5

OriginalPDF55.

Body identifier	Members	Payments 2019DKK	Cranberries
Political warehouse council	5	172000	1
Free Research Fund	84	9485000	2
Accreditation Board	9	738000	1,3,4
School of Architecture Board	5	344000	1,2,4
Royal Theatre	8	730000	2,4
Arts fund	56	9811000	3
Radio / TV Board	8	595000	3,4
Committee of the Regions	4	186000	2

Cross 1=fee error/no legal authority;2=no assessment of time spent;3=no rate differentiation;4=maximum hourly rate. The entire payment is not an erroneous amount. Columns graphically checked at x 313/373/434/494; not independent errors/people.

2019: civil servant pension, Table 6

OriginalPDF58.

Minister identifier	Population	Test	Officials dbug	Report%	Error DKK
Honey.	1590	40	19	48	1852600
Defence	7488	17	7	41	217200
Climate	54	3	1	33	562700
Transport	578	4	1	25	4500
Church	1908	38	9	24	154300
Occupation	75	17	3	18	74800
Education	168	22	4	18	55300
Social	57	13	2	15	412200
Employment	96	14	2	14	336200
Children	97	19	2	11	23800
Environment / Food	260	29	3	10	98700
External	121	13	1	8	7200
Justice	13679	45	3	7	377200
Source's sum	18683	274	57	20	4176700
Own colony sum	26171	274	57	57/274=20,80%	4176700
Other 5 ministries	199	18	0	0	0

The entire table visually verified. Population 26.171 against source sum 18.683:discrepancy 7.488=Defence row.5 error-free areas omitted from the table; total sample 292,57/292=19,52%. The source's 20% is therefore retained without changing 274. Errors cover § 36 contributions and occupational pensions, not nationally unique victims of pension payouts. The simplification recommended in 2011 had still not been implemented in 2019.

2019: Security / additional work payment, Table 8

OriginalPDF61.

Department identifier	2018 mioDKK	2019 mioDKK
Reichshospital / Thorax	2.1	2.0
Odense / Anneesi	3.9	3.4
Small Belt / Stunning	2.0	0.6
Total	8.0	6.0

3 / 4 hospitals studied, 2 regions with systematic error of assessment. The amounts include both on-call and on-call work without any specific assessment; 14 million have not been proven illegal.

2020: All 12 home / interest rate errors § 18-20

Original, PDF36-40.

Error ID	Period / knowledge	Population	Amount DKK	Facts / status
Tax Account 1	2016/2013-08-2015-10	approx. 40.000 companies	Not quantified	Interest rate without legal basis; grubbing-up not resolved
Tax Account 2	2013-2017-07	about 274.000 companies	488 million too much; 63 million too little; up to 150 million	In fact, 42 million to about 137.000, excluding compensation.
Tax Account 3	2017-07-2018-12	Enter in 2	Enter in 2	Discovered 2019-01; no separate addition
Tax Account 4	2013-2020	Not quantified	31,8 million non-eligible; 1,2 million paid / off	Converted 2013 main requirement 10- 30 million is omitted
Tax Account 5	2008-2019	56 cases; 2 accounting errors	3,9 million; 543 million	Former 4,3 billion / 830 million; 405 million overpaid to 2 companies recovered
Tax Account 6	Objections 2017-19; closed 2021-06	69 cases	207,3 million; about 35 million compensation estimates	Relief in a tax complaint did not trigger the correct interest adjustment
Tax Account 7	Determined 2020	Not quantified	Not quantified	Wrong date of return; possible obsolescence
SAP1	2019 -04-2020-12; vi den 2013	Not quantified	approx. 14 million years	Manual solution 2018; obsolescence / loss
SAP2	Since 2013	Not quantified	Not quantified	Simple interest used without the law interest rate
SAP3	Since 2013	Not quantified	Not quantified	Pension claims due late
SAP4	Since 2012-06; new duty 2019-03	Not quantified	58 million 2019 / 131,8 million 2020	Exemption 2016-03-2019-02; start-up 2020 with data gaps
SAP5	Since 2013	Not quantified	1,2-1,6 miageld; 100-130 mioannually	8,05% 2020; interest older than 3 years old

503 million = newly estimeable 2020 error; 1.167,6 million = government accounting errors including years of old. Not additive. Companies / cases / errors overlap; in particular 2 / 3. Full unique organisational / personal union is missing.

2020: DMI potential, Table 7

Original, PDF35.

Population	Number	Debt securities DKK	Potential repayment DKK
Guilders with unused capacity	606798	58	4

Potential, not documented individual injury.4 billion=3,2 pay+0,8 agreements;underestimated by approximately 0,7 billion. Ability-to-pay/subsistence objections require individual assessment.

2021: DMI potential, Table 3

OriginalPDF22.

Population	Persons	Debt securities DKK	Potential investment DKK
Payment capacity without remuneration / agreement	529715	52.1	4.8

Includes locked / covered claims; PSRMafflutions.63% of DMIperson debtors, about 80% pay / 20% others. Recurrence of persons in 2020 / 22; no addition as new misofferings.

2022: DMI potential, Table 3

OriginalPDF16.

Population	Guilders	Debt securities DKK	Potential investment DKK
Payment capacity without remuneration / agreement	600659	44.3	4.0

The potential includes 0,9 million doubtful / temporarily exempted claims; debt with only 3 months recovery at the end is deducted. Not 4 mi- liable damage. 38% of DMIs are doubtful, 40,7 billion; enterprises 53,9 million debt, 18% of unsettled company debt.

Actual post-payment 2019 after sub-payment 2017

Original, PDF80 § 79: 6 months 2017 underpayment; right up to 85% of VE / PSO, budget 195 million 2016 / 285 million 2017. Review 2015- 19. About 8 mioDKK actually paid back 2019-12. Number of unique companies and each payment date not given; the period between underpayment and post payment is documented but not individual delay days.

Full user rights matrix 2023, Table A / PDF50

Original.26 system rows × 4 control areas = 104 cells: 44 missing, 10 met, 50 not revised 2023. The 54 currently tested cells are no 54 people; 14 ministerial areas overlap with the second annual report criticism. Repeat the same system name; do not deduplicate the original rows by name.

Row	Minister	Function separation	Right control	Extended users	Action Control
1	5	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	met	not _ revidere2023
2	6	not _ revidere2023	deficiencies	deficiencies	deficiencies
3	7	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023
4	8	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023
5	9	met	met	met	met
6	9	deficiencies	deficiencies	deficiencies	met
7	9	deficiencies	deficiencies	deficiencies	deficiencies
8	11	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023
9	11	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023
10	12	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023
11	12	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023
12	15	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	met	not _ revidere2023
13	17	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	met	not _ revidere2023
14	19	deficiencies	deficiencies	deficiencies	deficiencies
15	19	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023
16	19	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023
17	19	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023
18	19	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023
19	21	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	met	not _ revidere2023

Row	Minister	Function separation	Right control	Extended users	Action Control
20	21	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023
21	21	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023
22	21	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023
23	21	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023	not _ revidere2023
24	22	not _ revidere2023	met	deficiencies	deficiencies
25	24	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023
26	28	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023	deficiencies	not _ revidere2023

Rigsrevisionen: the 17 remaining annual tables 2018- 2021

All tables below are checked in the original by text reading and visual reading. This complements the historical annual and impact modules; the same original cells should not be counted again. The checks shall include the tables and the surrounding method, not a new certificate of all the formulations on all pages.

Original tables

2018 Table 2 - printed page 7, PDFpage 14

Unit: mia.kr.. 2018 arrears; without foreign requirements and manuelSAP38; approach includes interest. Not loss / persons.

Movement	Amount
Primo	108,6
Supply	25,4
Recovery	-7,2
Depreciated	-8,6
End	118,2

Source: RR2018F.

2018 Table 3 - printed page 9, PDFpage 16

Unit: mia.kr.. Cut of demands. Without foreign / manual / converted; not the same population as T2.

Krav status	Amount
DMI Closed	60,2
Coverage ready, non-PSRMclear	56,1
PSRMclyde	0,0

Source: RR2018F.

2018 Table 4 - printed page 11, PDFpage 18

Unit: yes / no. System status; requirement / attachment / settlement planned developed 2019. EFI tools for the end 2018; manual application is another device.

Tools	System supported
Wages and salaries including separately	No
Forced payment agreement	No
Requirements	No
Consignment / attachment	No
Housing	No
Set-off	Yes
Voluntary payment	Yes

Source: RR2018F.

2018 Table 5 - printed page 14, PDFpage 21

Unit: DKK million / employee / month. Profit productivity; not employee error.

Zone	Average
Capital companies	4,51
Foreign	0,46
Private entertainment	0,12

Source: RR2018F.

2018 Table 6 - printed page 15, PDFpage 22

Unit: mia.kr.. Price values are uncertain estimates, not recorded or final loss of citizens. UDK is also amended by transferred portfolio. SAP38 outside.

Claim holder	Nominal 2017	Nominal 2018	Course 2018
Honey.	72,3	78,9	15,9
UDK	11,9	21,2	7,9
State Police	9,2	10,4	1,8
Municipalities	4,2	3,9	1,5
DR	1,7	1,7	1,2
Statens Administration	6,3	0	0
Others	3	2,1	0,8
Total	108,6	118,2	29,1

Source: RR2018F.

2018 Table 10 - printed page 43, PDFpage 50

Unit: mio.kr.. Three defence projects; budget, not actual losses.

IT project	Budget
Time management	100
Emergency IT	3,5

IT project	Budget
Capacity maintenance	20,5

Source: RR2018F.

2019 Table 2 - printed page 29, PDFpage 38

Unit: DKK billion / pct. SAP38 outside. Printed total is 0,1 higher than the sum of rounded system cells; the rounding note of the original is retained.

System	Amount	Share
DMI	126,7	98,3
PSRM	2,1	1,7
Total	128,9	100

Source: RR2019F.

2019 Table 3 - printed page 30, PDFside 39

Unit: balance sheet / estimate. Three routes of connection, statements of the future are not actually implemented.

System	Initial status
Tax account	45,8 million DKK development written down; break 2019; early 2021 connection expected
KOBRA	Bskat 2019 controlled; restskatJun / Aug 2020 planned, unsafe
SAP38	No expected connection

Source: RR2019F.

2019 Table 4 - printed page 34, PDFpage 43

Unit: per cent. Country statements have different positions of set-off. The comparison is not harmonised.

Country	Assumed
Denmark	98,7
Sweden	99,6
Norway	98,9

Source: RR2019F.

2019 Table 7 - printed page 51, PDFpage 60

Unit: control scope. Two different control populations; not two persons or full country control.

Revision issue	Regions	Hospital snitch
Overtime	Capital; North Jutland	All hospitals in the two regions
Other work	Capital; South Denmark	Rigshospital; Herlev; OUH; Little Belt

Source: RR2019F.

2020 Table 2 - printed page 8, PDFpage 17

Unit: DKK million / control status. Five projects, 20 control cells. Color cells visually read; budget versions different. DAC6 is 9,6 million, not 69,6.

Project	Budget	Basis	Businesscase	Steering group	Eligible budget
DUPLA	25,8	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DAC6	9,6	Yes	No	No	No
Annual Report 2018	81,1	Partial	No	No	No
Annual log 2019	49,3	Partial	No	Partial	No
L4	1,0	No	No	No	No

Source: RR2020F.

2020 Table 3 - printed page 10, PDFpage 19

Unit: projects. Application models and undisclosed IT omitted. Classification is not a certificate of effective compliance.

Project class	Number
State model	17
Model non-business / risk	5
Operation	9
Borrowed	37
Total	68

Source: RR2020F.

2020 Table 4 - printed page 13, PDFpage 22

Unit: mio.kr.. Five versions of one annual declaration project 2018, not five projects.

Version	Estimated end	Eligible budget	Provisional consumption
Aug 2018	81,2	10,5	0,8
Jan 2019	70,6	10,5	28,6
Feb 2019	70,6	63,6	28,6
Nov 2019	67,7	63,6	64,7
May 2020	68,7	63,6	68,1

Source: RR2020F.

2020 Table 5 - printed page 14, PDFpage 23

Unit: mio.kr.. Six versions of one annual declaration project 2019. The Executive Board's budget is not approved by department. The final estimate is not actually final consumption.

Version	Estimated end	Non-approved budget	Provisional consumption
May 2019	10	0	0,5
Sep 2019	49,3	49,8	6,7
Mar 2020	54,5	49,8	41,4
May 2020	53,9	49,8	50,6
Aug 2020	53,9	49,8	58,7

Version	Estimated end	Non-approved budget	Provisional consumption
Sep 2020	65	49,8	59,9

Source: RR2020F.

2020 Table 6 - printed page 23, PDFpage 32

Unit: mia.kr.. Recovery proceeds, not losses. Positive 0,02 / 0,002 underlying figures and rounded totals are retained.

Tools	DMI	PSRM	Total
Set-off	2,6	0,4	3
Voluntary deposit	2,3	0,2	2,5
Wage maintenance	0	0,8	0,8
Separate wage and salary retention	0	0,2	0,2
Forced payment agreement	0	0,02	0
Voluntary payment agreement	0,3	0	0,3
Claim / bankruptcy	1,1	0,002	1,1
Other	0	0,3	0,3
Total	6,3	1,9	8,2

Source: RR2020F.

2021 Table 1 - printed page 10, PDFpage 17

Unit: DKK billion / pct. Tax contingencies after year of transmission, not annual total populations. Locked is not evidence of illegal debt. Rounding note explains possible differences.

Year of shipment	Total	Locked	Share
Before 2014	3,8	2,8	74
2014	1	0,3	25
2015	4,1	1,3	32
2016	3,8	1,6	41
2017	3,8	1,3	35
2018	3,9	1,3	33
2019	4,9	1,3	27
2020	4,5	1,3	29
2021	8,8	3	34
Total	38,7	14,2	37

Source: RR2021F.

2021 Table 2 - printed page 11, PDFpage 18

Unit: DKK billion / pct. Only six types over 1 billion DKK Same underlying requirements as T1, second breakdown; not to be added T1.

Type of claim	Total	Locked	Share
VAT	20,2	6	30
Askat	8,5	2,6	30
Interest	1,8	1,8	100
Company tax	1,8	1,1	61
AMcontributions	1,7	0,5	27
Post-declaration VAT	1,1	0,5	50

Source: RR2021F.

Voting and limitation

• 2018 T2 movement: 108,6 + 25,4 − 7,2 − 8,6 = 118,2 aligned.

• 2019 T2 system sum: 126,7 + 2,1 = 128,8 versus printed 128,9. 0,1 rounding difference; original note.

• 2020 T2 Control Cells: 5Yes + 3Partial + 12No = 20 Cells; 5 projects.Own Countdown; Not Person / Case Union.

• 2020 T6PSRM: visible subcells 1,922 against total 1,9. rounding levels maintained.

• 2021 T1 total: visible annual cells 38,6 against total 38,7 rounding note, no arbitrary correction.

• 2021 T2 selection: 35,1 total / 12,5 locked. Six types; not whole T1 population.

Additional method and impact checks

2018: Supply 25,4 includes 19,2 new claims and 6,2 interest; 8,6 depreciation includes 5,3 exceptional and 3,3 additional. SAP38 manual 1,4 billion has been omitted; 0,4 billion of the approach comes from conversion. Time management budget 38 → 100 million is not proof of 62 million losses.

2019: The original links hypothetical DKK 8,8 / 2,2 billion to Norway / Sweden. The percentage differences 0,2 / 0,9 points point in opposite order at common denominator. The allotment is maintained; the raw denominator / corrected original is required before the power amount can be used. Refers 2019 about 250.000 people / companies and 44 billion; by April 2020 cumulatively 565.000 debtors / 72,3 billion: overlap, unsummable years.

2020: the T2DAC6 budget of 9,6 million has been visually reread separately. T2 footnotes: DUPLA25,8 million budget in 2017, expanded in 2019 by 4,5 million; copies outside the project budget of 25 million for 2018 and 28 million for 2019. L4’s recorded 2,9 million includes other projects; it does not prove a 1,9 million overrun. L4 remained in operation 2 years after project completion; DUPLA reclassification occurred half a year after completion. The table measures financial governance, rather than employees/citizen numbers.

2021: SAP38 manual 1,7 billion is separate from the tax-account tables. The percentage lock is based on unrounded values;0,3/1,0 therefore cannot replace the printed 25%. T1/T2 gives neither a unique debtor union nor realised loss.

Own method analysis: An amount can demonstrate errors in registration, budget approval or recovery basis without being equal to a realised loss. The relevant further proof is the validity of the claim, the actual payment, actual damage and the date of correction. No person or liability numbers can be formed from these tables.

Sources and control tracks

• RR2018F, 70 originals; SHA256 6bc1fc95a6697e29a36d52d6c4382395090b1cddaa6b7d18c4e65c71df574525. The table is visually read; temporary control images are deleted.

• RR2019F, 93 originals; SHA256 cbff6e4e7262811676e72941ee44f14c0c1d0d906934f975623fb0dfb10901ea. The table is visually read; temporary control images are deleted.

• RR2020F, 79 originals; SHA256 b262e458304d4db7160d940edd061c9b61eddce2b66d1228718bd10csa18b25. The table is visually read; temporary control images are deleted.

• RR2021F, 44 originals; SHA256 52db66913cdaf5c2c84ff411c86eb3a6c88958e9937e388f6c64ee9a53e073f4. The table is visually read; temporary control images are deleted.

Annual review of the National Audit Office: separate populations and permanent breaks

2024: 56 audits =22 legal+14 management+20 other; 35 positive thematic conclusions/one critical. Risk-based selection, five-year rotation; a positive conclusion may contain delimited breaches of rules. Materiality:100 million kr./10%, tax sector 945 million kr.; consequences for citizens may be included.30 earlier follow-up cases. [RRAAR24, PDF8-13/49-50/53-58]

Controlled objectives	Number; own population	PDF
esas	≥ 88,7 million DKK / ≥ 44% increase; 39 m delay; 2 / 10 late references	15-17
VAT	597 associations; 35 / 35 bug applications; 562 uncontrolled; estimated DKK 21,3 million wrongly paid	22
Purchasing	124 Risk selected contracts / 11 agencies / 6 ministries; 5 / 11 management deficiencies; Health 5 / 30 breach + Geodata 1	23-29
It	13 ministries examined; 5 highlighted with shortcomings	30-35
Policy items	4 / 13 circuit; access 1 / 4; temporary overview 2 / 4; pre-recorded destruction 1 / 4; early destruction 1 / 4	38-39
Greenland	28 / 86 satellite images unread 2019-24; 6 studies; 0 control; specialist shortage 14 m / 24 m on ship	41-44
Interest	274.000 companies wrong rate of interest; 40.000 interest rates 2016. Later legislative changes and correction, follow-up case 2017- 24 will be completed	46

Debt / proceeds 2014- 24,2024 prices: 107,0 / 7,9; 122,3 / 8,1; 142,0 / 7,2; 148,6 / 9,1; 157,7 / 9,4; 167,2 / 11,1; 173,4 / 13,1; 168,2 / 13,2; 160,5 / 13,0; 181,0 / 14,8; 173,8 / 15,3 mia.kr 2024 suspended 23,1; new debt 17,7, of which 5,8 suspended → 2,8 clear + 1,9 settled + 1,2 still unclear (rounding 0,1). [RRAAR24, PDF18-21]

Patrol 2020-24, target / actual days: aircraft 220 / 221,294 / 275,365 / 171,365 / 272,365 / 311; ship-, 365 / 323,365 / 215,365 / 2 88,365 / 251; vessels-882 / 554,882 / 786,732 / 623,822 / 644.2020 ship data missing. [RRAAR24, Table 3 PDF43, visually aligned]

Own analysis: The economic materiality limit is an audit classification. It does not determine whether a particular citizen has been the subject of illegal interference. The number of audits, risk-selected contracts, authorities, companies and possibly affected users are different entities. They are measured separately. Positive conclusions should not be converted into the absence of errors when the same audit documents specific breaches of rules.

In fact follow-up November 2025

RN902 / 25: The report is closed, but other cases are moved to later annual reports. Two cases are closed in full / in part: esas because the project ended June 2024; Geodata is closed in new procurement / contract. Twelve ministerial areas are included. VAT initiative is expected early 2027; new debt 2026 / 27; police clarification first half 2026; marine environment specialists by 2026 end. Rigsrevisionen continues checking of actual implementation, also where the FDA announces all deficiencies handled. [RROP24, PDF2-10, point 7 / 11 / 13 / 17 / 29 / 31]

Own analysis: The end of the project is an explicit reason for closing the control case, although the improvement has already taken place. Therefore, closure and repair must not be treated equally. Moreover, the administrative document status continues to hide control when cases are moved to future reports; national time series must follow the critical point itself across these documents.

An institutional promise about changing practices is not actually repair either. The closure of a follow-up case must be examined for the transfer to another report, amended legislation, correction of historical transactions and actual recovery. The follow-up shall document the correction in all essential respects; it shall not provide a full person-based replacement or criminal case counter. A number of system users shall not be renamed to documented victims. The concrete evidence-keeping errors in the police forces require linkage with the criminal proceedings concerned, their outcome and responsible decisions.

The total catalogue work continues with other annual audits and special reports. Titles and document links are marked metadata until original targets, denominators and follow-up are checked. This 2024 check does not close all 20 years of content gaps.

Source

• [RRAAR24] Report 21 / 2024,18.8.2025, Review of the State Administration 2024,58PDFsider; SHA-256 1f6e0f26ff082c141d830a9c78428bs20d96dcb67a8318710d39ecc51339d49a. All material pages 8-58 read; Table 1 / 3 visually aligned. Official Report page with ministerial statements and follow-up 20.11.2025.

• [RROP24] RN902 / 25,20.11.2025,11PDFsider; SHA-256 d567c9db143f054f261d10a609fd3b1f34472f0cdfbfd5b0c818d7693e865445. All material pages 2-11 read. Cover dates the publication December 2025; the note itself dated 20.11.2025.

State administration 2025: control, continued errors and actual follow-up

Financial year 2025; published 17.8.2026. The entire original 61PDFs pages are reviewed; tables 2 / 3 are visually controlled. New seven-theme model and critical scale: 57 revisions, 41 not highlighted, 16 highlighted; 43 older follow-up cases, 11 mentioned, 4 closing proposals. Five-year risk-based tour; one table marker may cover several revisions. No annual comparison of error rates without population control. [RRAAR25, PDF4 / 11- 15 / 50- 61]

Population and objectives	Controlled figures	PDF
IT procurement	31 / 172 contracts; 13 ministries above 2024-25. Culture 8 / 21; Justice 13 / 41	17-20
Culture	21 contracts ≥ 171 million DKK; ≥ 30% of 2025-t purchase. Four direct contracts: 18,1 / 1,9 / unknown / 4,2 million DKK	18-19
Justice	41 contracts ≥ 1,5 billion DKK; ≥ 22% of 2025-t purchase. The 7 contracts of the police are included among the 16 well-known problem contracts in 2017 / 18; ≥ 840 million DKK 2018-25	20
Acquisition by court	Operating contract 2014: 11 years, expected 13 years in 2027; DKK 228,5 million, DKK 113 million above; foged DKK 20,5 million; Box DKK 5,1 million.	20
Defence purchases	37 purchases 2023-25/91,3 million kr.;19 reasons,10 need,27 market documentation with deficiencies. 2025 total direct purchases≈1,2 billion kr./2%;27.000 additional knives	21-22
Health fees	17 schemes / 620 million DKK; 15 investigated / 597 million DKK; 13 imbalances: 3 surpluses 119,8 million DKK + 10 deficits 126,4 million DKK All 15 balance 273 million DKK; + 109 million DKK since 2022	23-24
Prison staff	730/≈1.900 round-the-clock duties;avg.35/employee;41/59 prisons.28,5 million kr. compensation 2022+2025 for breaches of the 48-hour limit.7.7.2026 exemption at 19/41 locations	25-26
Oxygen security	14 ministries studied, 7 major problems highlighted. Court of Justice; 30 privileged users; Fish 102. SU- system 21 years; CESA3 previous deficiencies, 1 fixed	27-36
Court data	February 2025 deleted civil data:12 days until restoration,target 28 hours	31
Banedmark	Supplier control received 9.5.2025, reviewed 10.9.2025	36
Helicopters	14 EH101, objective 8 ready to operate, ngs.6.106 / 1.268 missions 2021-25 exceeded maximum; ≤ 2% allowed. Response times 13 / 25 min day / night; 5SARs criteria, 3 not met	37-39
Fisheries control	46 straight adjustments 2025; 5 risk selected: 4 inadequately controlled, of which 2 uncontrolled	40-42

Population and objectives	Controlled figures	PDF
Assessment Appeal Board	350 members; 119,8 mio.kr.1.7.2022-31.12.2025; 21 members>100 cases, 12<5,3 only 1.7 short-term members 0 cases / 23.300 -117.500 DKK. RR model saving 85,1 million DKK / 71%	43-44
Tax-it	8 projects examined, 2 problematic; EUTK11 / 19EU deadlines exceeded; 2021 release 120 error / 41 critical; Q4 202599% imports in old system. Parallel operation: DKK 50 million / DKK 1,3 million per month BF17 ≥ 9 md.delayed / 13% above budget;>40 million p.a. intermediate consumption	44-46

Debt / proceeds, billion DKK, 2025 prices:

Year	Debt	Profenu
2014	108,8	8,1
2015	124,5	8,3
2016	144,9	7,5
2017	151,5	9,4
2018	161,0	9,7
2019	170,8	11,5
2020	179,0	13,6
2021	174,7	13,7
2022	166,4	13,5
2023	188,0	15,3
2024	180,5	15,9
2025	177,1	15,1

2025: 20,1 billion DKK non-recoverable debt due to lack of information. [RRAAR25, PDF15-16]

Final proposal: Health Network 2013- 25, Environmental Fees 2022- 25, SABA 2023- 25 of the Nature Agency and the Hunting Portal 2020- 25. Environment: 3 / 4 previous problems without significant imbalance; removal of the hunting portal's old log problem because the system is no longer used. [RAAR25, PDF47-49]

Our methodology and consequences analysis: Statsrevisorerne's opening formulation about 41 satisfactory audits does not justify declaring all underlying transactions lawful. RR's own reporting rule excludes less material problems; selection is risk-based. Oversight markers, contracts, systems and employees cannot be added as harmed citizens. The 102 privileged users are neither 102 perpetrators nor 102 victims. Payment amounts and modelled savings are not a crime account either: the boards' fixed fee model is described as the applicable scheme, while RR criticises whether it is economical.

The twelve-day unavailability of civil data is a documented actual incident; the number of families and specific case delays require incident and case registers. The working-time compensation documents payment, but the published amount does not show the number of recipients or payment for all breaches of rest-time requirements. Exemptions in 2026 do not prove the legality of earlier shifts. Closure of follow-up and replacement of systems do not prove historical compensation, responsibility or full redress. The 43-case overview includes reused, multi-year cases and references to other reports; counting again for each reference would create duplicates. Named ministers' portfolio responsibility in annex 2 is not individual criminal culpability.

The 18-year debt-collection follow-up 2008-2026, working time 2020-2026 and CØSA 2020-2026 show correction still outstanding across multiple checks. Specifically necessary data: RR's audit register with stable audit/follow-up IDs, Danish Prisons' compensation recipients and duty-roster data, the Court Administration's incident log and affected case IDs. The purpose is to link documented oversight findings with periods, affected rights holders and actual reparation without double counting.

26. Legal basis and liability comparison

Position: the meaning of the defect must be followed up to the procedure

Removal or continued separation without any necessary legal basis shall be regarded as unlawful interference with family life. If consent, competence or substantive conditions are missing, this must be examined as a concrete defect in the legality of the action itself. A procedural error may be decisive for the validity and the process may independently infringe Article 8, even where there is a need for assistance. A need for assistance does not replace legal basis and legal procedure. [R01- R04]

The precise scope of the commission’s term “administrative abduction” is as follows:the term may describe documented removal or detention through public administration without a valid basis. It is not a separate Danish criminal provision. A missing date, incorrect appeal guidance or another procedural error does not on its own prove fulfilment of every element of the Criminal Code’s abduction or deprivation-of-liberty provisions. The law must be applied separately to the action, rights holder, absence of entitlement, intent or required negligence and the specific period. This delimitation removes no documented error or actual separation. [R04-R06]

Section 19 of the Administrative Procedure Act regulates hearing of the parties; sections 22-25 regulate reasons and appeal instructions. Hearing of the parties is a procedural safeguard whose breach may cause invalidity. Specific materiality, the decision's content and any lawful curing of the defect must be examined; the authority's own assurance that the outcome would have been the same is not evidence. [R01-R02]

For each removal, the test shall follow this chain:

1. Original decision, date and decision-making body; any prompt decision and approval.
2. Documented consent of the necessary rightholders; no conclusion of the municipality's label "voluntary" alone.
3. Actual data for each legal condition, simultaneous counter-evidence and possible absence of aid.
4. Consultation of parties, access to documents, lawyer, child participation, justification and complaint guidance.
5. Actual movement, interaction and later basis for continued separation.
6. Complaint, review, remittal for reconsideration / cancellation, new decision and actual reunification.
7. Losses in each period and liability for the act or omission that created or prolonged the loss.

This chain prevents subsequent summaries from becoming evidence of their own original claims. It also makes it possible to require the termination of a continued unlawful action, even if an administrative appeal procedure is marked as having been closed.

Copenhagen: a proven chain from the municipality to international criticism

Borgerrådgiveren's original report of 24. May 2017 concerns 2013-2016. 78 selected cases became 77 after exclusion of one placement ordered by judgment. Thematic denominators vary. [R03, pp.12-14]

Control Point	Error / Investigation
Investigation not timely, where required	22/27
Child welfare assessment entirely missing	14/77
Action plan not timely, where required	14/27
Action plan completely missing	9/77
Not both study and action plan	27/77
Absence of prior child interview	17/77
Relevant consultations of the parties appear to have failed	42/76
Lack of voluntary / coercive guidance	50/70

Control Point	Error / Investigation
Lack of complaint guidance	67/76
No position on the subject	25/76
No decision on location	68/76
Established facts / concrete signs: inter alia, jurisdiction, legal basis, misuse of powers	23/77
Lack of guidance for the child about the support person	Interval 48-70 / 77
The child did not guide about the network support person, then SEL § 68 b, paragraph 4	76 / 76; guideline 0 / 76
Parents did not guide the child's network support person	72 / 73; guidance 1 / 73
Parents did not guide about their own support person, then SEL § 54	49/75
No guidance on free lawyer in relevant forced labour proceedings	3/35
Absence of justification in the decisions taken	6/24
Absence of justification in the decision on location	4/8
At least one of the procedural deficiencies examined	77/77

Source: R03, p.6-8 and 21-24. Rows overlap; the sum is not children. The Union 77 / 77 follows the report's explicit statement that no case met all the requirements examined. 23 / 77 mix established facts and concrete signs and are not 23 proven homelessness. Records were verified and modified; screening and report should not be merged. Paragraph 26 (c) of the UN Children's Committee is a later source, not a new population. [R03; UN-CRC17]

The analysis concludes that the checks demonstrate serious shortcomings in citizens' access to understand, contradict and have the interventions tried. The case-file must be linked to continuous separation and subsequent decisions in order to determine periods without valid basis and individual losses. This is a concrete investigation requirement, not a presumption of legality.

Remittal for reconsideration, return home and the time the family loses

Remittal is a legal return for reconsideration. Return home is termination of placement and coming home. A family may win an appeal without being reunited the same day. It is precisely the gap between review and actual redress that must be measured.

Ankestyrelsen’s precedent decision 108-15 states that, when ongoing assistance is remitted, the original decision is annulled and the legal position is generally restored. This cannot mechanically be translated into the same legal consequence for every compulsory placement. The specific appeal decision, any other operative decisions and the basis for every subsequent day must be disclosed. A new decision does not erase loss already suffered. [R07]

Time	What is to be documented?	Consequences
T0 operations	Decision and actual implementation	Separation begins
T1 complaint	Reception and re-evaluation	Time before external review
T2 remittal for reconsideration / cancellation	Precise legal procedure and grounds for error	Initial period
T3 new decision	Self-employed and legal basis	Time for a new administrative position
T4 actual return	Actual date, contact and support	Length of the entire separation
T5 redress/responsibility	Help, compensation, investigation	Time for effective remedy

T2−T1 is appeal processing. T3−T2 is the time after remittal for reconsideration until a new decision. T4−T0 is actual separation. T4−T2 shows whether a favourable appeal decision is followed by prompt redress. None of these periods can be replaced with an average for the Appeals Board’s part of the course. Contact is recorded alongside: number of visits, hours, cancellations, supervision and distance. The table is a measurement model, not invented national statistics.

The child's law in the controlled version of the law provides for a period of repatriation of **up to six months**, not a general requirement for six months' additional separation. The deadline of **seven days** in the case of a request for termination of a voluntary placement, it concerns a return decision, not necessarily a physical return. Complaints about children and the decision of the Youth Committee do not have suspensory effect in principle; exceptionally, the Director of the Appeal Board may decide to do so. There is access to judicial review. [R08, § 100,102,146-148]

The legal conclusion of the report is that these schemes **rapid review and concrete assessment of the continued basis;** It is essential. Absence of suspensive effect is a rule of implementation; it does not grant immunity to the cashier and does not make an invalid decision legal. A period of repatriation cannot subsequently provide the legal basis for a previous unlawful act. Support and organisation must be assessed according to the specific child and family life, not used as an automatic additional waiting time.

The ECtHR's Grand Chamber holds in *Strand Lobben*, §§ 205 and 208, that reunification efforts must take place as soon as reasonably feasible, and that the obligation increases with time. Authority-created erosion of family ties must not become a justification for permanently severing them. This is a central argument against a chain in which restricted contact and slow case processing first create distance, and that distance is then used against the family. [R09]

Errors in homelessness cases are documented

FOB 2018-33 examined four randomly selected cases among 12 returns home in one municipality. All four lacked a revised action plan and prior child interview; three cases involving children over 12 lacked notification to the child; two statements of reasons to parents were insufficient. The error categories overlap. The investigation proves errors in the return-home process, not four earlier placements without legal authority. [R10]

Quality and time must therefore be measured in both directions: by removal and by reunification. The child's participation and specific support cannot be deleted from the analysis simply because the municipality describes a course as completed.

Responsibilities of civil servants and comparison with private individuals

There has been no evidence of general personal immunity for case handlers. The Criminal Code has provisions on public service, including sections 150,155- 157. According to Paragraph 81 (8), abuse of a public position may be an aggravating circumstance. Liability requires that the conditions and claims of the specific provision are fulfilled. Management responsibilities must be independently examined and must not end at the individual case manager. [R05]

Sections 19-20 and 23 of the Liability for Damages Act may limit the employee's personal liability in damages and the employer's recourse. This provides significant protection against personal financial consequences. It is not criminal immunity and does not extinguish the authority's or State's responsibility. [R11]

Tracks of responsibility	The decisive question	Specific requirements of the citizen
Validity of decision	Is there a legal and sufficient basis?	Setting aside, fresh review, cessation/redress
Compensation and compensation	What liability, loss, causal link and remuneration basis?	Specified requirements against proper accountability
Legal liability	Which duty was disregarded by the employee/manager?	Independent investigation and reasoned outcome
Personal criminal liability	Does action / omission and guilt each link?	Specific notification and investigation
International State responsibility	What contractual obligation did a sane body break?	Termination, effective remedy, repair

Penal framework of the law: only if the conditions of the offence were met

Destination	Action	Controlled criminal framework
§ 215, § 261	Child under 18 is excluded from proper authority / care; illegal immigration	Section 261: fine or imprisonment up to 4 years; qualifying conditions up to 12 years
§ 150	Abuse of a public position for illegal coercion	Prison up to 3 years
§ 155	Abuse of a public position for infringement of rights	Fine or up to 4 months; unwarranted benefit up to 2 years
§§ 156-157	Duty or gross / repeated negligence	Fine or up to 4 months; special managers up to 1 year in the 2025 version
Law of the child § 209	Helping to escape / hide the placed child	Prison up to 2 years

Sources: R05, R08. The punishment framework is not the actual punishment. The law and obsolescence of the year of action must be checked; the sharpening of managers in 2025 must not be applied without further ado to older actions. Paragraphs 156 to 157 provide for a special exception for public office to be chosen; this exception does not constitute a general exception to other criminal provisions.

The Director of Public Prosecutions' checked practice overview provides actual points of comparison. The source chain is **judgment discussed in the prosecution's overview → the overview's summary → the table**; full judgment documents have not been reviewed here. [R06,pp.12-14]

Court reference	Actual separation / action in summary	Punishment
TfK 2013.338V	Two children, approximately 1 ½ hour; parent without custody	20 days conditional; short duration and about 5 ½ years of proceedings were included
TfK 2014.801E	Child, almost 10 months	6 months, of which 3 conditional
TfK 2015.1182E	Child, 33 days	40 days conditional on community service
TfK 2017.684 / 2V	Played child taken to Ethiopia	4 months, 30 days to be served
TfK 2019.1332E	Child led to Syria	1 year and expulsion

The illegal separation of individuals may thus lead to imprisonment, even at short notice. The strongest sustainable issue in the comparison is: **Why has a documented public intervention been unjustly investigated? For the relevant personal responsibility, and who has secured an end in the meantime?** The answer requires the act of the case, not an assumption of public immunity.

There is no basis in the material for claiming that any municipal procedural error would give a private person the same penalty as § 215. A home-free removal and a short or long private detention must be compared with the actual act, duration, loss of access, awareness of the lack of justice and the claim for the debt. There may be specific public duties in addition to ordinary crimes. A low number of criminal proceedings may be evidence of inadequate investigation; this does not in itself prove that a particular employee is punishable or guilty.

An official police announcement on 28. March 2023 reports two years' imprisonment following nine years' withholding of three children in Lebanon. It documents the reported district-court decision, rather than finality after a possible appeal. [R12] A 2026 supplement is a prosecution announcement of 30. June 2026 about one child concealed from November 2024 to March 2026 and a sentence of 1 year 3 months. Reunification occurred in March 2026. This is one case, rather than a new full-year statistic. [R13]

Time can weaken responsibility without abrogating the infringement

In the introduction to Chapter 9, the Tibet Commission notes that possible criminal liability was outdated and that the liability of the service was made more difficult by time and resignation. This documents a mechanism in which late hedging can reduce the real possibility of personal responsibility. It is something other than statutory general immunity. [R14, p.987]

The report therefore demands simultaneous time measures: time to redress **and** time to assessment of responsibility. A supervisory case opened or closed only after several years must be examined to determine whether the authority in the meantime allowed interventions to continue, evidence to be

lost or liability parent. Individual limitation periods shall be calculated on a case-by-case basis after determination, timing and any interruption.

Ministers, officials, police and institutional knowledge

The Court of Impeachment's judgment of 13. December 2021 documents an intentional breach of ministerial duties through implementation and maintenance of an unlawful accommodation scheme for asylum-seeking couples. The period of culpability was 10. February-18. March 2016.25 of 26 judges found guilt; the sentence was 60 days' immediate imprisonment. The judgment must not be converted into a specific number of unlawfully separated families without checking each couple and the relevant period. [R15]

The Tibet Commission II documents a practice of illegal police orders in demonstrations and examines ministerial and managerial influences. The historical events 2002 / 2004 are used as prehistory; events 2012 / 2013 are in the reporting period. The Commission's 2022 conclusions are based on a broader source base than the 2017report. A previous summary of authority must therefore not be the last step in the evidence chain. [R14, § 9.7]

Minkkommissionen's 2022 report and Folketinget's subsequent consideration form a track concerning the 2020 decision, legal authority, communication and duties of office. The commission was not to determine ministers' criminal responsibility. The report refers to commission material and Folketinget's own documents; complete volume 2 could not be checked directly in this review and is therefore not used for an independent conclusion on each person's culpability. No count of »all mink« as culled without legal authority, or animals as numbers of harmed citizens, is presented. [R16-R17]

The Egely Inspectorate documented two incidents of locking young people without the necessary legal basis. The region's reference to a less intrusive solution could not create a legal basis. It is a concrete example of why good intentions or the practical needs of an institution do not replace a legal basis. [R18]

Across these tracks, the key question of knowledge is: **When did the body receive sufficient documents, what obligation triggered it and when did the practice actually stop?** An action plan or ministerial response documents a reaction, but not that the error ended. Ex post verification of decisions and concrete consequences must be required.

State responsibility, positive obligations and international law

ECHR Article 1 obliges the State to secure rights within its jurisdiction. Articles 2 and 3 may trigger protection and investigation duties; Article 8 covers family and private life; Article 13 requires an effective remedy for an arguable claim of a violation. The thresholds must be examined under the specific article. A public procedural error is not automatically torture; nor may a well-substantiated allegation of serious ill-treatment be reduced to an internal administrative error. [R04]

For interference, Article 8 requires legal authority, a legitimate aim and necessity/proportionality, together with a decision-making process protecting affected interests. Under relevant conditions, authorities also have positive duties to support family life and reunification. An intervention may be unlawful because of insufficient procedure even where the State invokes a protective purpose. Child and parents are separate rights holders; the number of parents cannot simply be assumed to be twice the number of children. [R04,R09]

The ILC's articles on State responsibility deal with state bodies, including local bodies, and public acts in addition to competence. Therefore, the State cannot reject international imputability solely by exceeding its authority by a municipality or employee. A breach of a binding obligation still needs to be identified. Termination, non-repetition and repair are key legal consequences. The articles are a codification work, not a ratification treaty as a whole; the normal legal status and application must be assessed for the relevant rule. [R19, Art. 2,4,7,30-37]

Critics from UN committees and the CPT document concrete control findings and state problem knowledge. It must not be interpreted as as being as many convictions. On the other hand, repeated warnings may have a decisive impact on evidence when investigating future omissions: the material can demonstrate that the risk was known before a new family or patient was hit. Each such argument must show the recipient, date, applicable practice and subsequent omission.

UN Disability Committee 2024 criticism of late or insufficient support for parents with disabilities makes it necessary to test the chain **lack of support → functional assessment → placement / adoption**. If public negligence has created the situation that has since been used against parents, the causal link must be presented. The criticism does not contain a number of illegally separated disabled families. [FN-CRPD24]

The UN Committee against Torture's 2023 criticism of an excessively narrow focus on individual criminal culpability supports three separate investigations: what happened; what State responsibility exists; who can personally be punished. Absence of a conviction does not, on its own, answer the first or second question. [FN-CAT23]

Responsibility to Protect and International Crimes

The R2P of the UN 2005 Final Document, § 138- 139, concerns protection against genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. The political framework is not a general system of complaints for management errors and does not provide an automatic basis for international intervention. The material of the report must be examined through the conditions of the specific crimes before R2P is invoked as other than a track of investigation. [R20]

Rome Statute article 6 on forcible transfer of children requires, among other things, a protected national, ethnic, racial or religious group and specific intent to destroy the group in whole or in part. Article 7 requires, among other things, a widespread **or** systematic attack directed against a civilian population and knowledge of it; the individual underlying act and other contextual requirements must be proved. War crimes require a relevant connection to armed conflict. A high administrative error rate does not on its own satisfy these elements. [R21]

Denmark introduced new provisions on international crimes through Act 1674 of 30. December 2024, entering into force on 1. January 2025. These include a separate criminalisation of torture. The law in the year of the act and the statute’s special retroactivity rule must be checked; the entire new chapter cannot simply be applied to acts from 2006. [R22]

The strongest documented conclusion of international law in this material is that tampering by local and central bodies can trigger **State responsibility and effective resolution requirements;**, regardless of whether a particular employee is convicted. There has been no evidence here of the further context and intent that would bear a global conclusion on genocide or crimes against humanity. It is a precise definition of these designations; other proven illegality stands.

Specific protection against sanctions in healthcare incident reporting: scope, time and the citizen's accountability track

There is express statutory protection against sanctions resulting from reporting adverse events. It must be included in the comparison of responsibility. The protection applies to a particular reporting basis and group of people; it provides no legal authority for harm, coercion, deprivation of liberty or separation. Nor may it be overlooked by stating only generally that public employees can be punished. [UTHP03; UTHP20; UTHP25]

Controlled rule versions and time

Version	Protected persons and sources	Documented rule change
2006	The reporting health professional; Patient Safety Act 429/2003,§ 6	The Act had entered into force on 1.1.2004. It protects against consequences of one’s own reporting; not every treatment or error.
2007-2008	Reporting Health Officer; Section 201 of the Health Act 2008 version	§ 277 indicates the transition 1.1.2007 and the repeal of the patient safety law. No new general impunity.
2011	Reporting person; Guidance 1 / 2011, Section 8, PDF6	The guidance explicitly distinguishes between reporting bases and sanctions on a different basis.
From 1.1.2021	Rapporteur **and healthcare professionals involved in: reporting;**; Act 1855 / 2020, § 1 nr. 4-5, § 5	Protection of identity and protection against sanctions are both expanded. This part enters into force on 1.1.2021, not 1.7.2021 as for the Act's special appeals-board part.
March 2025	The same extended population; Health Act 275 / 2025, § 200- 202, PDF43	The protection includes disciplinary investigation / measure, supervisory response and criminal penalties where the following is based on the reporting.
From 1.5.2025	Act 406 / 2025, § 1 and § 4, whole 2 pages	Administration and analysis are transferred to designated Regional Council; § 201 is not repealed. STPS shall continue to receive anonymised thematic, oversight and learning reports.

The source chain is the specific statutory versions and the amending Act's entry-into-force provision. A later consolidated Act is not a retrospective description of the entire 20-year period. The table documents the stated versions; it does not purport to review all amendments to the Health Act's other provisions. [UTHP03;UTHP08;UTHP11;UTHP20;UTHP25;UTHP25A]

Protection of the information base shall be separated from responsibility for the action;

Guide 2011 paragraph 8 states that the Patient Ombudsperson could not raise disciplinary proceedings or deal with a patient complaint on the basis of the statutory reports to the central database. The same paragraph states that other evidence may lead to penalties. It is a concrete barrier between the learning register and individual sanctions cases. [UTHP11, PDF6]

For the citizen, therefore, the chain of responsibility requires simultaneous records, medical and forced logs, own inquiries, testimonies, decisions and other independent evidence. An authority may not refer solely to the protection of the report in response to a documented other basis; it shall identify which material is protected and which other information is to be investigated. At the same time, an alert shall not be converted into a documented offence or criminal offence. The actual source of evidence and causality must be maintained for each action.

Public and private: the relevant comparison

Section 202, subsection 2, of the Health Act extends reporting rules to private hospitals. This protection is therefore not in itself a privilege available only to public employees against private practitioners. Comparison must concern the same rule and evidential basis. It is separate from liability limits in the Liability for Damages Act, special exceptions for elected offices and the specific fine exception in Greenland's 2026 Compensation Act. [UTHP25,PDF43;R05,R11;GL-K03]

Child abduction by a private individual must still be compared with public separations through the actual course of conduct, legal basis, culpability, duration and judgment outcome. The UTH rules give a municipal caseworker no general permission to separate children and parents without a valid basis. Whether a specific healthcare action within a sequence falls within reporting protection requires the specific action, actor and information source.

The citizen's time, information and repair

The 2011 guidance, section 7, states that the reporting scheme does not in itself require the patient to be informed of the reporting itself. Section 7.1 also describes healthcare professionals' separate duty to inform about injuries that may be assumed to confer entitlement to compensation and assist with notification. These two matters must be kept separate: no duty to disclose the database report does not remove the compensation information described. Actual compliance requires the patient's record and information given. [UTHP11,PDF6]

Reporting and analysis are not cessation, treatment or payment. The 2011 rules specify 7 days for staff reporting and 90 days for local onward reporting. These are reporting deadlines, not a promise of clinical or financial redress within 90 days. The same historical guidance excludes, among other things, incidents in the Prison and Probation Service from the reporting duty; national incident statistics therefore do not exhaust health-care errors in State institutions. The report's later 2025 ministerial documentation of non-retention in the Prison and Probation Service must be examined in its own responsibility track. [UTHP11,PDF3,5;KFUTH25]

Party-oriented liability requirements and evidence testing

Conclusion: The report's specific protection of penalties must be recorded together with an independent track of responsibility from the other original evidence. **Statement by the Authority:** Legal text and guidance protect against sanctions as a result of reporting. **Original proof:** They controlled § 201 versions, the Amendment Act 2020 and the precise limit of the guidance. **Deficiency to be investigated:** Whether a specific authority has made protection a general refusal to examine other evidence. The report does not claim that this has happened in each reported event. **Rule:** The specific health, criminal and liability rules as well as the relevant EMU obligation. **Action / omission:** Identify the treatment, the procedure, the knowledge and the actual subsequent examination. **Legal deviation:** Try each stage of duty and apply protection only within its documented scope. **Consequence:** Continue to record loss of liberty / integrity, loss of treatment and financial loss from actual dates. **Responsibility:** Institution, management and concrete employee according to their own rules. **Requirements:** [UTHP11; UTHP20; UTHP25; R04, R05, R11, R19]

Documented: existence, extension and precise scope of reporting protection. Hypothesis: specific misuse of the rule to avoid responsibility on another basis. Missing material: individual sanction/inadmissibility decisions, evidence actually used and implementation dates. The strongest argument is to demand individual assessment of responsibility from independent sources without awaiting or confusing closure of the learning register with the citizen’s reparation.

Rights, consequences and responsibilities

The report shall make documented criticism a verifiable chain: the Authority's concrete statement, the original proof, the legal discrepancy, the concrete citizen's consistency and the continuing failure to restore the situation. It must be seen where the state knew a problem and continued or failed to correct it. The end of a control institution, the remuneration paid and the actual restoration of a citizen are carried out as three different events.

Legality matrix for the legal final review

The table is a control structure. Each rule and its conditions must be summed up against the actual original material contained in the main report; the list does not constitute a finding that any error automatically infringes all the rules mentioned.

Documented action; or non-compliance;	Legal review fields	Original certificate required	Direct impact accounts;	Restoration to be undertaken checked
Child is removed, family separation continues, relationships are restricted	Home and validity; EMRK 8; CRC 3, 9, 12; CRPD 23 for disability	Decision and day-to-day rule, hearing of parties, justification, review, child's own involvement; documented location and schedule of visits	Number of children and parents, days separated, actual contact, lost family relations and injury	Remittal, new decision, actual return home/reunification and compensation, each with its own dates
Deprivation of liberty, restraint or inhuman conditions	EMRK 3 and 5; CAT; CRPD 14-17; day-to-day coercive measures	Journal, start / stop, justification, monitoring, alternatives, health follow-up and original recordings	People, episodes and hours separately; injuries, deaths and persistent consequences	Actual cessation, treatment, independent investigation, sanction and compensation
Prolongation and refusal of compensation	EMRK5, including paragraphs 3 to 5, subject to specific conditions; § 762,768 and 1018a of the Danish Code of Procedure	All orders and periods, actual release, prosecution/judgment outcomes; original compensation reasoning and causal assessment of the person's own fault	Days of deprivation of liberty, sequences and people separately; lost earnings, work and family contact	Repayment of damages, actual payment with interest and outstanding loss; judgment in damages is not automatically in breach of all orders
Absence of mandatory submission of long-term storage extension	Section 768 a of the Code of Procedure and the relevant order for reference, checked by time	LV19 pp. 3-4 records 16 missing submissions; check each request, time limit, order and the responsible person’s knowledge	Actual continuation and persons concerned are not quantified by the 16 registrations	Identification and verification of all processes involved; subsequent management initiative is not individual restoration;
Health errors and non-preservation of UTH information in prisons	Specific treatment / updating of evidence; EMRK2 / 3 and effective investigation after condition testing; the explicit exception of the UTH scheme is separate	Journal, medicine log, reporting, time of authority knowledge, processing and subsequent conservation; KFUTH25, p.2-3	Persons, events, damage and waiting period separately; West's 38 local events are not national total	Actual treatment and remedying, independent investigation, secured proof and concrete liability / compensation
Disciplinary cell, security cell/restraint, exclusion and their judicial review	Sentence-enforcement rules then applicable, legal basis/proportionality/procedure; ECHR3/5/8/13 according to the nature of the matter; §120 and transition under Act 661/2024	Action and cessation records, underlying decision, sample / chain dates, PBN application and actual implementation; KF24, p.39-43,54-56	Intervention, man and duration separately; 2024 departure 141 and status 148 shall be maintained without tacit uniformity;	Actual cessation or release, treatment, payment and liability; changed decision and effect are own events

Documented action; or non-compliance;	Legal review fields	Original certificate required	Direct impact accounts;	Restoration to be undertaken checked
Child with disabilities excluded from municipal services	Disability Discrimination Act sections 5,7,10 and 11 as applied in KEN9536/2021; relevant CRPD5,7 and 30 following specific examination	Access rule, support needs, municipality justification and actually investigated less intrusive means	The child's loss of participation; parents' documented follow-up separately	Actual access with necessary support, reimbursement and concrete follow-up
Police violence or inadequate investigation	EMRK 2 / 3 and their procedural duties; 13; CAT 12-14	Evidence of the event, independence, investigative steps, timeline and grounds for closure	Victims, injuries, lost evidence and loss of trial opportunity	Investigation reopened, proofs secured, liability processed, compensation
Social aid is refused or reduced on an inadequate basis	Daily social law; official principle, equal treatment, proportionality; concrete CRPD / CESCR right	Needs, relevant acts, decision, measurement and whether the actual needs were later met	People, support without delivery, self-payment, loss of function, health and participation	Remuneration, actual support, rehabilitation and compensation
Wrong record, unsubstantiated statements, lack of access to documents	Administrative law, disclosure, data protection; EMRK 6 / 8 / 13 by specific scope	First source, all subsequent reproductions, changes, omissions and simultaneous objections of the party	What decisions were based on the information, which people were affected and what damage was done?	Correction, deletion / rectification, defence, resumption of secondary decisions
Issue despite genuine risk or provisional measures	EMRK 3, 8 and 13; CAT 3 / 22; ICCPR 6 / 7; CRC by specific case	Risk information, receipt by the State of the provisional application, expulsion time and residence conditions	Actual expulsion, travel, family split, deprivation of liberty, concrete damage	Actual return, stay, security and compensation; resumption alone is insufficient as counts
Discriminatory law or practice	ECHR14 taken together with the relevant right; CERD/CEDAW/CRPD; equal-treatment rules	Criterion, basis for comparison, cause, effect and original complaint decision	Persons concerned and losses; an inspector may count cases without knowing all persons;	Practice / law amended, previous cases identified and specifically restored
Unreasonably long treatment or loss of redress	EMRK 6 / 13 where applicable; EMRK 8's positive duties in family matters	Complete timeline, authority periods without action and impact on result	Days / years for each event; permanent loss of family relations, support, evidence or claim	Rapid and effective new decision, effective effect and remuneration
The state fails to protect against private abuse	Specific EMRK 2 / 3 / 8-obligation; CRC / CEDAW / CRPD and day-to-day protection rule	Actual knowledge of the Authority, risk assessment, availability of effective steps and concrete omissions	Repeated assaults, damage and loss of protection	Actual safety, effective investigation, liability and compensation
Overseas military operations	Jurisdiction, relevant humanitarian law, State responsibility and specific elements of crimes; R2P's special thresholds	Original operating order, control of persons, surrender, knowledge of risk and simultaneous reports	Consequences of deprived, injured, dead and families, with actual identity / overlap	Investigation, remedy, liability and restoration; refusal of jurisdiction cannot be interpreted as proof that the act did not take place

Five accounts showing the real impact

The oversight account describes what was complained about and reviewed. **The error account** describes the specific departures established. **The person account** describes documented applicants and other directly affected people. **The consequence account** describes what actually happened to them. **The responsibility and redress account** describes who knew of the problem, who had to act and what was actually done. The five accounts must be linked through document and case identity; their totals must not be added together.

A series of 385 decisions examined can document many errors and several errors in the same decision. It is neither automatically 385 unique persons nor an estimate for all decisions in Denmark. The placement of one child may affect two parents and siblings. These people must be included in the impact accounts when they are documented; a mechanical factor three would conceal which family members are actually identified.

Word choice and local legal clarification

Write the documented action specifically: "The authorities refused the entire compensation for 240 days in addition to the penalty; DKK 408.000 was not confirmed until 673 calendar days after the release" shows both loss, incorrect outcome and trial time. The time in the replacement process must not be converted into continued detention. When an intervention specifically lacks the legal basis, it must be said unequivocally. At the same time, in the case of an application for placement, it must be specified whether the error found affects the place of placement itself, the compulsory procedure, the individual action or anything else. An established lack of legal basis for supervised contact is not evidence that all locations in the population studied lacked legal basis.

"Administrative abduction 'may be used as the descriptive designation of a specific unlawful action by the applicant if the report shows at the same time the actual separation and the relevant lack of home space. Where the name is presented as a criminal offence, each relevant criminal scene, including subjective conditions and the individual's liability, shall be tested separately. The criticism of the intervention itself must remain strong, even if a particular criminal link still requires further proof.

In comparison with private individuals, the comparison must keep action, consistency, home status and subjective conditions fixed and only change the role. "The same concrete detention without legal basis" is a useful comparison; two different courses of action are not the same simply because both include the removal of a child. State responsibility, employer responsibility, disciplinary responsibility, ministerial responsibility and criminal liability shall each have a documented rule and subtraction.

The PB01-PB03 shows this with a full original chain: two defendants, one child, the prosecutor's claim 2-3 months in prison and the acquittal of both in the District and the National Court. The description of the defendant, the penalty imposed by the authority, the evidence and the person actually determined shall have separate columns. This local correction does not negate any proven lack of home space by public intervention.

The PU22 has another proven outcome: 40 days of conditional prison and 60 hours of community service for a private evasive period of 37 days' time; the second defendant has been acquitted. All six original pages have been read. At the same time, the reproducible family law premium of the Criminal Court criticises the basis at the original time and allows later stay / time to be included in the maintenance. The two decision tracks shall be tested separately. An embedded reproduction of family law is not a full reading of its own documents; criticism and document requirements are in the 2022 judgment module.

Mandatory fields of the Time Account

For each documented person, it shall read: first intervention; first objection; first proven knowledge of the error; complaint; decision on amendment / termination / remittal for reconsideration; new decision; actual cessation of the intervention; actual reunification / return / aid; reimbursement; liability and actual follow-up. Calculate the intervals between the events. An empty date means a specific unannounced event and must not be set equal to the date of the appeal decision.

The following oversight tracks are already documented in the international modules: A.H. 2370/2014 has three different events, reopening, return and asylum. CRPD Domina/Bendtsen has reopening in 2018 and permanent residence in 2022; Mikkelsen has a concluded UN follow-up dialogue with a negative implementation assessment in 2025. ECtHR Aggerholm has compensation paid and execution supervision still open. These must be used as specific examples of why the accounts must be kept separate.

The national chains show the same distinction. ERVA01 documents an incorrect complete refusal and a later award of 408.000 kroner, but no actual payment date. ERVA02 documents early part-payment and the mother’s account of the children returning upon her release; a favourable High Court outcome 875 days later does not prove restoration of health or work. ERVA03 documents notification delayed by 273 days, but also a maintained refusal of compensation. KEN9536/2021 documents unlawful discrimination and 5.000 kroner awarded after 961 days, while payment and access are unknown. The favourable result must not conceal the independently documented errors, consequences and open implementation links.

Historical deprivation of liberty must be read with both time and annual version. The 2011-12 QlikView transition, 2017 recalculation and 2021 transition to actual release change populations and endpoints. Earlier deadline tables had a documented incorrect endpoint. Authorities' known registration problems and follow-up must be examined as a separate accountability track while each citizen's orders and actual interventions are examined specifically.

Isolation courses have their own unit: 2019 s 15 periods relate to documented 13 people; the 19 historical records of children cannot be deduced by public tables alone. Compliance with an absolute maximum time limit alone does not demonstrate necessity, the child's special conditions, proportionality or the correct grounds for order.

Ankestyrelsen’s scrutiny targets require the same distinction: 13 weeks was replaced by 30, and around 35 weeks in 2025 also exceeded the new target. Closing scrutiny under the new benchmark does not document actual redress. The original remitted sanctions case has 97 calendar days from appeal to remittal, 44 until municipal forwarding and 53 afterwards; the printed week figures cannot replace these events. Distinguish administrative targets, specific statutory deadlines and applicable Convention duties. [AT02, physical PDF33-34; AT07, pp. 3-4; AT13, pp. 8-11]

Source and verification

The matrix’s actual examples must refer to the report’s original source cards in fn-individuelle-klagesager.md, emd-fuldbyrdelse-regnskab.md, hudoc-doms-og-personregnskab.md and the specific national case chapters, including varetaegt-primaere-erstatningsforloeb-og-genoprettelse.md and handicap-barn-musikalsk-legestue-tid-og-ansvar.md. Legal rules are documented with original text and the precise provision in the main report’s legal analysis. The matrix connects right, original evidence, consequence and demand; the specific legal assessment is in the documentation chapters mentioned and chapter 28.

Additional original controls: long-range -product range -2011-2023-original controls -md / .json and isolation-originals -boern- time-and-versioner.md; original URL and locators are available in the final source lists of these modules.

Prison and private-responsibility chains: kriminalforsorg-indgreb-proevelse-og-sundhedsblindhed.md, kriminalforsorg-originale-tabeller.md and privat-boernebortfoerelse-originaldom-og-anklage.md. The prison module’s review scope is 45 tables/598 data rows from selected chapters in three publication versions, not full reading of all annual originals.

Time control: ankestyrelsen-time-control measurement and effective protection; md; and ankestyrelsen-original time and time tables. Md; control targets, original dates, weighting and case closures follow their own populations.

Private child abduction: original judgment, criminal claim and legal basis

A concrete criminal case must be divided into indictment, claim and actual outcome

Copenhagen District Court, 16. January 2017,SS1-23445/2016,and Eastern High Court, 7. June 2017,S-218-17,provide a complete checked source chain for a mother and her mother who were charged under Criminal Code § 215,subsection2. All 3 pages of the District Court judgment, 6 pages of the supplementary court record and 5 pages of the High Court judgment were read directly in the published originals. The three documents concern the same case, two defendants and one child; they are not three abductions.

Search	Original information	Legal / census significance
Period of the concession	23-26 February 2016, exit from Spain without father's prior consent; child born 2013	Title of indictment, non-independent evidence of criminal activity
Punishment	Prosecution sought 2-3 months’ immediate imprisonment; district-court judgment 1	Alleged penalty, not sentenced and not a general penalty rate
Administrative basis	Temporary residence decision 22 February 2016; it was not known whether the decision had been notified to the mother; urban judgment 2	A decision, its notification and the addressee's knowledge are separate evidence
Legal delimitation	Both parents had joint custody; the pending case concerned residence; the 2-3 judgment of the City Court and the 5	Pupils and custody should not be assimilated to criminal submission

Search	Original information	Legal / census significance
Actual Outcome	Both defendants were dismissed in the local and national courts; the national courts applied the wording and the principle of criminal legality.	In fact sentenced penalty 0 in this particular course of proceedings; no further conviction is inferred from the defendant's allegation
Actual consequence produced by the mother	Legal Book 2: Accelerated return journey after information on possible Interpol search and first contact 21 April 2016; national court judgment 3: at that time 19 days without having seen the child	Documented explanations in the original courtbook; residence / visits and decisions are necessary before independent determination of the entire period and responsibility of the authority

The Landgericht held that the mention of residence by the processor could not extend the criminal territory against the wording and the terms of Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code. It is not a decision on the legality of any subsequent decision to stay / stay or the accelerated return journey. These matters must be examined on their own original decisions and rules.

The originals also show differences in the source chain: the mother disputed the police report's account of when she learned of the residence decision; the grandmother disputed its account of whether the host in Spain knew of the journey. The father's testimony concerning the municipality's recommendation to report the matter and apply for temporary sole parental responsibility is on court-record p. 5. These are disputed accounts and witness testimony respectively. None becomes an independent fact through repetition in an authority's case. Original messages, tickets, decision notifications and the police's contemporaneous audio/statement material are the relevant verification sources.

The importance of the comparison between private and public separation

The report’s notices of judgments concerning private individuals and its case-law overview show that documented criminal child abduction can lead to imprisonment. This original chain also shows why a requested sentence must be distinguished from an imposed sentence, and why the specific missing legal element must be identified. Comparison with public interventions must use the same relevant elements of the act, rights, culpability and period. It must not assign every procedural error the 2-3-month sentence requested here, or present the acquittal as legal authority for another public intervention.

Conclusion→authority’s statement: prosecution and a demand for immediate imprisonment. Original evidence: district-court judgment pp.1-3 and High Court judgment pp.3-5. Deficiency in legal characterisation: disagreement about residence did not satisfy the wording’s disagreement about parental responsibility. Rule:section 215,subsection2,the then Parental Responsibility Act section 3,subsection2,and Criminal Code section 1. Conduct: departure with the child as described in the indictment. Departure/outcome: the basis for criminal liability could not sustain conviction; both acquitted. Consequence: prosecution and the described family/contact consequences require separate investigation. Responsibility: no criminal culpability is attributed to those acquitted; possible responsibility for other official acts requires the specific chain of legal authority/knowledge/loss. Demands: complete contemporaneous documentation and independent review of return home, later changes in parental responsibility, contact and possible compensation.

Private evasion 2022: actual punishment, time and the Authority's created situation

Conclusion: 37 days evasive gave 40 days conditional prison

The original overall judgment from the Public Knowledge Base of the Public Prosecutor's Office contains the Court of First Instance in Aarhus judgment of 31 March 2022 and Vestre Landsret judgment of 16 June 2022, S-0833-22. All six PDFs pages have been read. The mother T1 was sentenced to keep the child X1 hidden from March 30 to May 6, 2020: 37 calendar days of date. The sentence was 40 days in prison, conditional on 60 hours of community service, a longer period of nine months and a trial period of one year. The court confirmed. The defendant T2 was dismissed on the ground that the alleged financial contribution had not been proven. [PU22, physical PDF1-6]

It is one family and one evasive period, not two new children in two agencies. The judgment is a concrete example of a criminal offence within the period of the report. It provides a documented comparison point for the user's question of public and private accountability. It does not automatically document the punishment a particular public servant would receive: action, lack of right, intention, involvement and the relevant crime description must continue to be proved. The penalty of 40 days shall be conditional and shall not be produced as 40 served days.

Time chain and legal events

Event	Date	What the original documents
Temporary parental responsibility transferred to the risk F	27 March 2020	The decision of the family court; the court shall address the incorrect declaration of authority of the accusation;
The mother informed and the beginning of the period of the offence	30 March 2020	The court bases her knowledge and subsequently concealment on her.
The child delivered to the father	6. May 2020	Termination of the stay on the grounds of the criminal court
Family law shall review the provisional decision.	10 July 2020	Reported grounds say that there were no grounds initially; the decision is nevertheless confirmed on the basis of the later situation
Final decision on custody	8 September 2020	The criminal court states that: Højesteret the father granted custody only to him;
Statement of claim received	12 November 2020	Start-up information in the criminal proceedings of the City Court
Penalty in the city	31 March 2022	40 days conditional / 60 hours community service; T2 acquitted
Penal convictions in national law	16 June 2022	T1's judgment upheld

From the administrative decision to the reproduction of family law went 105 days. From the delivery of the child on 6 May to this trial, 65 days passed. From delivery to the city court's sentence, 694 days went to 771. These are calculated date distances without double counting of endpoints. 65 days is the time for the test described, not a documented period without the mother. 694 / 771 is the time of the criminal proceedings after the cessation of the escape, not continued abduction. [PU22]

The lengthy criminal proceedings, which were not attributable to T1, formed part of the District Court's reasons for suspending the sentence, together with her personal circumstances and the circumstances of the case. This is a specific documented effect of time on the private person's sentence. It is not general impunity because of processing time. The High Court upheld the same sentence after assessing nature, length and personal circumstances. [PU22, physical PDF4 and6]

The crucial regulatory framework: the time after a critical intervention

The Court of Justice reproduces the Decision of the Court of Justice of the European Communities of 10 July 2020. According to this reproduction, the mother was the primary caretaker of the child, and the father had had sparse contact. Family law considered that 27 March 2020 did not provide grounds for granting temporary parental responsibility. Nevertheless, the court maintained the decision because it considered it best for the child in the present situation to remain with the danger. The Court of First Instance expressly referred to the time since delivery on 6 May and to subsequent information from kindergarten and municipality. [PU22, physical PDF2]

Original evidence and evidence chain: The primary sentence contains a reproduction of the grounds of family law. The criminal court is the prime source of punishment and its own reasons; it is an embedded reproduction of the second decision. The full original family law act, underlying simultaneous evidence and the administrative case act are not read as an independent source chain in this module. Therefore, the assessment is precisely referred to as the reproducible premise. One cannot simply repeat its reference to carers, relationships or the situation of the child as a self-controlled fact.

Importance of the incompatibility: There is a concrete contradiction between the assessment of the basis of 27 March and the decision to maintain the later result. Here, the situation created by implementation and time will have an impact on the subsequent review. The report treats this as a documented track of time and justification. It is necessary to examine whether the original decision was fully informed and legally justified, what information was missing and whether subsequent considerations actually meant that an initial error had a lasting effect. The contested criticism does not in itself establish that the decision was formally annulled or declared void.

Action and legal deviation in private criminal proceedings: The courts found that at the time of the offence there was a decision on parental responsibility to be observed. The mother knew the decision and kept the child hidden from the danger. The Landgericht took the view that the subsequent comment by the family court on the original basis did not alter this. The legal qualification was Section 215 (1) of the Criminal Code, cf. Section 261 (1). The controlled judgment thus shows an actual punishment, even

whether the initial basis of the administrative decision had subsequently been criticised in the reproducedfamily court premium. [PU22, physical PDF3-4 and 6]

Comparison with public intervention and continued omission

Tracks of responsibility	The concrete evidence point of comparison,	Proof to be added by public intervention
Private intentional evasion	37 days of hiding after known decision; 40 days conditional plus 60 hours of community service	Identified rightholder, lack of right, concrete action, knowledge and intent
Private participation	T2 dismissed: alleged financial assistance not proven	Each person's contribution, period of time and calculation; the same probationary requirements for management / staff liability
Administrative action	Reported criticism of the initial basis and later maintenance over time as regards	Original decision, competence, legal conditions, factual basis and validity for each period
Continuation after error or cancellation	This sentence does not establish the guilt of an official.	Knowledge of errors / lapses, duty of action, actual ability to stop and documented omission
Compensation and loss of child	Reservations were made for claims for compensation on behalf of the child	Own loss, causation, claim, decision and payment of the child and parents

Strongest sustainable criticism: Where a private individual is actually judged not to comply with a decision, the action and omission of the Authority itself shall be independently examined against legal basis, proper information, timelimit and liability. The private judgment is not proof of the legality of all the steps taken by the authorities. The repeated criticism of the original basis gives a concrete reason to demand the originals and to examine the administrative decision-making chain. A later assessment of the child's situation shall not be used to remove the documentation of past errors or to make an responsibility chain invisible.

A public employee’s power to make or implement a lawful decision depends on the relevant legal authority and its requirements. It is not general criminal immunity. If a child is actually removed or withheld without a valid basis, the act must be described with a precise date, rights-holder and deficiency in legal authority. Possible criminal characterisation under section 215/section 261 or official-duty provisions must rest on each element, including intent or the culpability required by the provision. For a continuing intervention, knowledge of an established error and failure to remedy it constitute a separate issue of investigation. The report’s legal framework identifies the checked statutory versions and avenues of accountability.

Documented conditions: One private conviction, one member's acquittal, the same child and period, 40 days of conditional sentence, 60 hours of community service and the reproduced family court premium on the original basis / time. The indictment of the General Court in Aarhus as the decisive authority was incorrect; the national court corrects it to Familieretshuset. The correction shows why the identity of the authority may not be automatically taken over from the charge.

Suspects and hypotheses with specific evidence requirements: Whether the provisional decision was based on unsubstantiated or repeated information; whether the Authority's implementation created the later reasoned stay; whether contact was interrupted and, if so, how long; whether the administrative error led to liability or loss. The mother's information in the national court about 24 notifications, changed CPR address and load response is reproduced explanations, non-independently controlled files, dates or medical causality findings. Therefore, neither 24 additional errors nor a documented diagnosis are counted into national totals. [PU22, physical PDF5-6]

Specific requirements: Collect the original 27 March decision, all simultaneous evidence and party consultations, full 10 July decision, the 8th September decision of the Supreme Court, contact / delivery log and evidence of subsequent liability assessment. Warn the legal position and loss of the child and each parent for the specific periods. A possible requirement for repair must include actual relationship and support, not just a later change of status. The reservation for the child's compensation in the criminal proceedings does not demonstrate that the compensation was awarded or paid.

27. Judicial, detention and restoration;

Review of a judgment and responsibility for a judge's conduct concern different populations. Reopening permits fresh review; it is not in itself acquittal, actual release, compensation or personal punishment of a judge. Nor does a rejected conduct complaint document substantive examination of the original judgment's evidential basis. This distinction is necessary for the citizen's right to both a correct decision and effective redress.

The Special Complaint Court: Original Outcome 2020- 2025

The official table is updated on June 19, 2026. The entity is settled cases; it is not a register of unique citizens or all errors in the courts. "Other" is closure without judgment or judgment, such as revocation or closure. [DSK01]

Year	Readmission proceedings	Allowed	Rejected	Other
2020	57	7	45	5
2021	38	3	30	5
2022	27	2	22	3
2023	41	5	36	0
2024	18	7	11	0
2025	41	2	39	0
Sum	**222**	**26**	**183**	**13**

Year	Legal appointment honorable objectives;	Raised / Refused	Stated	Modified
2020	13	4	8	1
2021	9	2	7	0
2022	11	1	7	3
2023	7	2	3	2
2024	6	0	6	0
2025	5	2	3	0
Sum	**51**	**11**	**34**	**6**

Year	Appeals concerning default cases	Raised / Refused	Stated	Modified
2020	12	3	8	1
2021	9	3	5	1
2022	7	0	7	0
2023	21	3	16	2
2024	18	2	15	1
2025	23	6	14	3
Sum	**90**	**17**	**65**	**8**

Year	Appeals against judges etc.	Rejected	Disapproval; or suspension	Other
2020	90	82	3	5
2021	64	62	1	1
2022	30	29	1	0
2023	73	73	0	0
2024	33	32	1	0
2025	74	73	0	1
Sum	**364**	**351**	**6**	**7**

All the sums are the own addition of the original cells. Disapproval and suspension are not fragmented in the source. Therefore, the six outcomes cannot be classified as six fines, redundancies or various responsible judges. The table does not have person ID or connection to change of judgment and subsequent repair. The four types of case are not summed to a unique citizen population. [DSK01]

Historical figures in legal research literature

Gorm Toftegaard Nielsen reproduces the complaint's then network statistics. He was himself a member 2006-2016. The article is checked in the original, but its figures are a representation of a historical register of authorities; the original web version has not been found here. [DSK02, p.552, footnote 16-19]

Year	Applications in the article	Allowed	Rejected	Other
2013	48	3	42	3
2014	62	13	46	3
2015	71	5	62	4
2016	47	9	34	4
2017	37	0	35	2
2018	46	1	39	6
2019	63	7	49	7
2020	57	7	45	5

2020 overlaps with DSK01 and is not counted again. 2014's higher number of permits is explained in the article by several cases following an understated speed sign and several cases of ship owners' notification after grounding. The authorisation is thus no one counts for final acquitments. 2006- 2012 and other types of historical case require the original register. [DSK02]

Legal significance and concrete requirements

Conclusion: An account of reopenings must be followed through to a new decision and actual consequences. **Authority's statement:** Official statistics state decisions on reopening, interlocutory appeals and conduct. **Original evidence:** DSK01's four tables; DSK02 is a separate historical account. **Deficiency:** They do not record the complete citizen journey from original error to cessation or reparation. **Relevant rule:** ECHR Article 6 and, for deprivation of liberty, Article 5; reopening and complaint rules have their own conditions. **Act or omission:** A case is closed or opened for fresh review while substantive consequences for the citizen may continue. **Legal departure:** The specific decision's evidential basis and duty of effective reparation must be examined independently. **Significance for the outcome:** Errors concerning guilt, impartiality, adversarial procedure or service of process may result in punishment, intervention or lost access to review. **Responsibility:** The correct judicial/authority chain and, on separate evidence, the responsible person. **Demand:** The original judgment, order for fresh review, new judgment, actual end of deprivation of liberty and compensation are linked through shared case identification.

Paragraph 49 (6) to (8) of the Code of Procedure provides for the possibility of disapproval, fine and for the stated serious or repeated conditions of detention. The independence of the judge is therefore not a general exemption from liability. However, a decision on conduct should not be used as proof that all the facts of the judgment in question have been properly examined. Accident and evidence criticism requires comparison with the original material, including several bodies repeating the same case. [DSK03]

Necessary register information: For 2006-2025, Klageretten/the Danish Court Administration must disclose de-identified annual rows with case type, outcome, complaint/judgment ID, original decision date, new review and any new judgment. Reopening in favour of and to the detriment of a defendant, reopening after default and conduct complaints must remain separate. For interventions affecting liberty, dates of actual cessation and compensation outcomes are required from the prosecution service and courts. An incomplete public register provides no documented national error rate; nor does it bar claims in individually proved sequences.

Storage: actual time of liberty, acquittal, isolation and data limits

Preservation must be included as actual deprivation of liberty before final criminal clarification. Statistics on custody are not, in itself, statistics on unlawful custody, and an acquittal does not automatically determine whether the original action was without legal basis. The duration and outcome of the proceedings, on the other hand, must be followed by the citizen through the examination of necessity, proportionality, propulsion and compensation. The sources show long-term freedom interventions, the process of acquittal and concrete shortcomings in the central data which a pure enumeration of convictions does not illuminate.

Latest original annual statistics: 2024, published March 2026

The county attorney's 2024 statistics were prepared in March 2026; Polsa extracts 3 February 2026. "Long-term" means over 3 months. The device is completed, not unique people. Progress started earlier with end 2024 is included; ongoing progress without end 2024 is omitted. Time for transition to service can be included by judgment. An interrupted course is now counted as two; in published 2020 and earlier versions, it was counted as one, and time ended at first instance / indictment waiver / notice. The later historical series are thus audit versions, not new persons. [VA01, p.7]

Year	All DK / NSK	Long-term	Share%	Long-term meeting
2020	4039	1749	43,3	7,8
2021	3648	1851	50,7	8,1
2022	3668	1805	49,2	8,6
2023	3363	1881	55,9	8,8
2024	2941	1690	57,5	9,6

Year	Less than 18, all	Less than 18 long-term	Share%	Long-term meeting
2020	173	68	39,3	6,4
2021	166	89	53,6	6,1
2022	128	60	46,9	7,7
2023	129	69	53,5	6,6
2024	104	54	51,9	8,1

There is a specific internal discrepancy: the summary p.1 states 127 minor case trajectories in 2023, but table B states 129. Both versions are retained; their difference is not two new children. The 2024 total of 54 long-term child cases is a subset of 104 and of 1.690, and must therefore not be added to national figures. An average of 8,1 months does not state each child's precise time separated from the parents. [VA01,pp.1,3-4]

All 2024 circle cells

Circles	All	Long-term	Rounded%	Long-term meeting
North Jutland	216	142	66	7,5
East Jutland	220	155	71	9,0
Middle and West Jutland	247	183	74	8,7
South-East Jutland	121	77	64	7,6
South and South Jutland	160	93	58	10,2
Funen	160	84	53	8,5
South Zealand / Lolland-Falster	230	166	72	7,7
Middle and West Zealand	120	65	54	13,9
Northern Zealand	148	62	42	8,9
The West Region of Copenhagen	180	104	58	10,5
Copenhagen	968	424	44	10,3
Bornholm	21	2	10	4,5
NSK	150	133	89	13,3
Total	2941	1690	58	9,6

The total 58% of Table C is rounded; the 57,5% of Table A is the same ratio to one decimal place. 2024 changes the NSK division from archive location to responsible authority at the end of the run. Former NSK cases could be registered under Copenhagen because NSK is located there in POLSAS. It is an organisational change of registration, not evidence of a similar new increase in people subject to intervention. SEV was situated before 2022 under Østjylland, while SEØ / Frontier Centre Øresund was located below Copenhagen. [VA01, p.3-4]

Faeroe Islands and Greenland: all age cells

Faroe Islands, Table D / E, p.9

Year	All	Long-term	Share%	Mdr.
2021	27	10	37,0	11,0
2022	27	7	25,9	8,9
2023	29	8	27,6	8,9
2024	34	15	44	7,4

Year	Less than 18, all	Long-term	Share%	Mdr.
2021	1	0	0	0
2022	1	0	0	0
2023	0	0	0	0
2024	0	0	0	0% in the monthly field

Greenland, Table F / G, p.12

Year	All	Long-term	Share%	Mdr.
2022	81	42	51,8	8,9
2023	97	59	60,8	8,0
2024	123	51	41,5	8,8

Year	Less than 18, all	Long-term	Share%	Mdr.
2022	0	0	0	0
2023	4	4	100	6,7
2024	0	0	0	0

The Faroe Islands are coming from 2021 and Greenland from 2022. According to the original, NIFLHEIMR and Avannarleq cannot deliver the relevant automatic extracts; the figures are manually reported. Greenland 2023's four long-term children's courses and 6,7 months are not four extra people in addition to the year's total. A 0 in the mean field at no course is the source's table convention, not a measured average duration for an actual citizen. The 2024 cell of the Faroe Islands also has "0%" in the monthly field, which is retained as a typographic unit deviation. [VA01, p.8-13]

Conviction figures with a different denominator: Denmark 2024 approximately 92% conviction and 84% immediate imprisonment/preventive detention concern decided cases involving prolonged remand detention; the exact denominator is not stated. The Faroe Islands describe all such decided cases as convictions/immediate sentences. Greenland reports 96% conviction and 94% institutional placement/preventive detention/other liberty-depriving measures;86% of the 2024 detentions concern offences against the person. Rounded percentages without an exact decision denominator are not converted into numbers acquitted or unlawful interventions. [VA01,pp.2,8,10]

The State Advocate's 2025-analysis: all 22 statistical tables

The analysis has two different populations: completed courses 2018- 2023 and 2.950 valid courses, which were pending during the period 1 January-24 August 2024. The latter may be both completed and still open; they are not the total stock of the year or the 2.941 completed in the later 2024-year statistics. The polsa extracts are from October-November 2024; Table 11 uses the Crime Registry October 2024. The judgments of the Court shall be omitted. The start of the service is taken into account in the analysis from the court's decision; in fact, prior arrest must be added to by a single civil order. [VA03, p.4-5,32]

Scope of acquittal: Only processes with acquittal on the charge under which pre-trial detention was registered are included. The individual may simultaneously have been convicted of other charges in the same case complex. The 2018-2023 figures 303/228/261/248/249/217 are therefore neither a union of people nor a register of unlawful imprisonment. Their averages of 3,9/5,1/4,8/4,7/6,5/6,8 months show the actual time burden in the specified group. [VA03,s. 5,22-23]

Verification of the conclusions:

• Table 9's 2020-total 4.038 differs from Table 1's 4.039; 2022 is 3.667 against 3.666, and 2023 is 3.360 against 3.361. Tables 4 and 10 also have different rounded ranges. The deviant original cells are preserved, not normalised to an apparently identical series of years.

• Table 21's explanatory text p.42 says 100 presumptions correspond to 31% of 575; 100 / 575 is 17,4%, while 100 / 319 in the killing / fire group is 31,3%. The precise denominator is therefore crucial.

• The text on pp.43-45 and 53 compares pre-scheduled cases' 8,4 months with 5,9 months, described as »without« pre-scheduling. But table 19's 1.938 includes all the stated first-instance cases, including the 449 pre-scheduled cases. It is therefore not an independently selected control average for cases without pre-scheduling. The text's reference to table 17 as a timing basis is also incorrect; table 17 concerns changes in legal basis. The group cannot serve as a clean effect measure without its own comparison data.

• Table 17 records 208 changes from collusion risk alone among 1.047 original sequences of that kind.173 of 208 end with the law-enforcement basis§762, subsection 2. The source cannot date the change; its assumption that it occurred when

the initial risk ceased is not a verified measure of timely termination. Later shifts do not demonstrate the necessity on every previous day.

• Prior investigation and the prosecution's indictment cannot be broken down reliably; their time is measured together. The longer course of the analysis with the mental statement does not prove who caused the waiting time. Defender changes, defences, reconditioning and decay are not part of the data model of the conclusion.

The 22 tables are reproduced below with all extracted statistical cells. Months are averages, not summable case or person numbers; percentages are the rounded figures of the source. Empty supporting cells shall be kept as "- '. The same courses appear in many tables and are not counted again as a new population. Table 8's shorter name "Other Penal Code" includes the source's use theft group. Table 16's combinations are reciprocal registration rows; their large matrix is reproduced in two readable parts. [VA03]

VA03, Table 1: Completed course and start after urban judgment

Physical PDF page 23; printed page number is one lower.

Year	Progress	Start by city judgment
2018	4.604	75
2019	4.387	76
2020	4.039	101
2021	3.648	63
2022	3.666	87
2023	3.361	73

VA03, Table 2: Relief from registration

Physical PDF page 23; printed page number is one lower.

Year	Duration of the suspension	Share%
2018	303	6,58
2019	228	5,20
2020	261	6,46
2021	248	6,80
2022	249	6,79
2023	217	6,46

VA03, Table 3: Duration of all completed courses

Physical PDF page 23; printed page number is one lower.

Year	Average months
2018	3,3
2019	3,9
2020	4,2
2021	4,9
2022	5,0

Year	Average months
2023	5,6

VA03, Table 4: Rounded interval distribution, all

Physical PDF page 24; printed page number is one lower.

Year	0-3 %	3-6 %	6-12 %	12-24 %	24+ %
2018	66	18	12	4	0
2019	62	19	13	6	1
2020	57	22	14	6	1
2021	49	25	17	7	2
2022	51	23	16	8	2
2023	44	26	19	8	3

VA03, Table 5: Duration of discharge

Physical PDF page 24; printed page number is one lower.

Year	Period of suspension, average months
2018	3,9
2019	5,1
2020	4,8
2021	4,7
2022	6,5
2023	6,8

VA03, Table 6: Progress with mentals by interval

Physical PDF page 25; printed page number is one lower.

Year	0-3	3-6	6-12	12-24	24+	Total
2018	78	64	52	21	2	217
2019	68	89	118	36	3	314
2020	60	76	123	59	5	323
2021	56	85	131	58	16	346
2022	50	76	90	64	14	294
2023	33	48	99	65	21	266

VA03, Table 7: Rounded interval distribution, mental statement

Physical PDF page 25; printed page number is one lower.

Year	0-3 %	3-6 %	6-12 %	12-24 %	24+ %
2018	36	29	24	10	1
2019	22	28	38	11	1
2020	19	24	38	18	2
2021	16	25	38	17	5
2022	17	26	31	22	5
2023	12	18	37	24	8

VA03, Table 8: All areas of responsibility and duration ranges

Physical PDF page 26,27; printed page number is one lower.

Area / range	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Homicide, fire, etc. / 0-3 months	83	49	53	73	58	51
Homicide, fire, etc. / 3-6 months	61	55	43	49	44	45
Homicide, fire, etc. / 6-12 months	92	78	61	68	53	53
Homicide, fire, etc. / 12-24 months	60	79	51	51	53	66
Murder, fire, etc. / 24 months +	8	3	17	29	25	34
Homicide, fire etc. / Total	304	264	225	270	233	249
Violence / 0-3 months	532	453	403	339	357	245
Violence / 3-6 months	120	138	174	182	192	167
Violence / 6-12 months	83	93	68	94	89	88
Violence / 12-24 months	13	26	17	18	26	26
Violence / 24 months +	1	0	6	1	1	3
Violence / Total	749	710	668	634	665	529
Composition / 0-3 months	110	75	60	77	83	63
Default / 3-6 months	37	37	40	54	41	30
Composition / 6-12 months	62	53	61	54	51	59
Serial / 12-24 months	21	16	27	26	26	29
Rated / 24 months +	2	1	0	6	4	8
Composition / Total	232	182	188	217	205	189
Robbery / 0-3 months	177	113	133	121	112	78
Robbery / 3-6 months	128	87	115	102	118	88
Robbery / 6-12 months	53	54	64	70	56	74

Area / range	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Robbery / 12-24 months	14	21	20	34	17	11
Robbery / 24 months +	4	0	5	1	5	1
Robbery / Total	376	275	337	328	308	252
Breaking and entering / 0-3 months	350	254	197	151	124	111
Breaking and entering / 3-6 months	95	104	84	61	56	62
Breaking and entering / 6-12 months	39	42	36	29	43	41
Breaking and entering / 12-24 months	7	6	6	9	6	4
Breaking and entering / Total	491	406	323	250	229	218
Theft / 0-3 months	480	423	271	143	229	174
Theft / 3-6 months	74	46	58	60	70	63
Theft / 6-12 months	33	30	18	37	21	33
Theft / 12-24 months	5	0	4	4	5	1
Theft / 24 months +	0	0	0	0	1	0
Theft / Total	592	499	351	244	326	271
Financial crime / 0-3 months	211	215	205	162	155	132
Financial crime / 3-6 months	43	36	36	48	31	50
Financial crime / 6-12 months	16	20	19	38	30	39
Economic crime / 12-24 months	1	13	6	6	11	14
Financial crime / 24 months +	0	5	2	1	0	4
Economic crime / Total	271	289	268	255	227	239
Drugs and smuggling / 0-3 months	602	652	603	459	438	411
Drugs and smuggling / 3-6 months	149	197	213	246	188	230
Drugs and smuggling / 6-12 months	87	118	156	149	143	167
Drugs and smuggling / 12-24 months	24	61	57	93	105	85
Drugs and smuggling / 24 months +	3	27	8	12	29	39
Drugs and smuggling / Total	865	1055	1037	959	903	932
Other Penal Code / 0-3 months	196	150	133	123	131	91

Area / range	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Other Penal Code / 3-6 months	115	86	95	84	82	77
Other Penal Code / 6-12 months	87	63	79	66	66	62
Other Penal Code / 12-24 months	23	32	34	22	37	30
Other Penal Code / 24 months +	0	1	1	8	11	10
Other Penal Code / Total	421	332	342	303	327	270
Other special law / 0-3 months	262	312	218	127	140	104
Other special law / 3-6 months	17	36	41	18	38	45
Other special law / 6-12 months	3	6	15	6	25	26
Other special law / 12-24 months	0	0	0	0	3	0
Other special law / Total	282	354	274	151	206	175
Road traffic law / 0-3 months	16	17	15	22	34	22
Road traffic law / 3-6 months	4	3	8	9	1	6
Road traffic law / 6-12 months	1	1	2	6	2	5
Road traffic law / 12-24 months	0	0	0	0	0	3
Road traffic law / 24 months +	0	0	0	0	0	1
Road Transport Act / Total	21	21	25	37	37	37
Other areas / 12-24 months	0	0	1	0	0	0
Other areas / Total	0	0	1	0	0	0

VA03, Table 9: Attribution groups and exact interval cells

Physical PDF page 58,59; printed page number is one lower.

Year / group	0-3	3-6	6-12	12-24	24+	Total
2018 / 1 indicted	1829	501	266	100	10	2706
2018 / 2 defendant	460	161	95	30	-	746
2018 / 3 + defendant	336	175	195	38	8	752
2018 / No indictment	369	19	12	-	-	400
2018 / Total	2994	856	568	168	18	4604
2019 / 1 indicted	1745	506	306	96	3	2656
2019 / 2 accused	413	156	99	36	-	704
2019 / 3 + defendant	256	148	152	122	34	712

Year / group	0-3	3-6	6-12	12-24	24+	Total
2019 / No indictment	285	22	8	-	-	315
2019 / Total	2699	832	565	254	37	4387
2020 / 1 charged	1346	553	326	104	11	2340
2020 / 2 accused	353	186	120	55	3	717
2020 / 3 + defendant	273	162	134	64	24	657
2020 / No defendant	302	16	5	-	1	324
2020 / Total	2274	917	585	223	39	4038
2021 / 1 indicted	1113	587	348	123	15	2186
2021 / 2 defendant	243	166	94	42	10	555
2021 / 3 + defendant	191	152	166	97	32	638
2021 / No defendant	236	19	12	1	1	269
2021 / Total	1783	924	620	263	58	3648
2022 / 1 charged	1233	568	338	131	15	2285
2022 / 2 defendant	244	171	113	51	12	591
2022 / 3 + defendant	142	106	124	107	48	527
2022 / No defendant	233	21	9	-	1	264
2022 / Total	1852	866	584	289	76	3667
2023 / 1 indicted	941	548	392	157	21	2059
2023 / 2 defendant	198	148	116	41	15	518
2023 / 3 + defendant	144	143	144	70	64	565
2023 / No defendant	190	25	2	1	-	218
2023 / Total	1473	864	654	269	100	3360

VA03, Table 10: Attribution groups and rounded percentages

Physical PDF page 60,61; printed page number is one lower.

Year / group	0-3 %	3-6 %	6-12 %	12-24 %	24+ %	Total%
2018 / 1 indicted	68	19	10	4	0	100
2018 / 2 defendant	62	22	13	4	0	100
2018 / 3 + defendant	45	23	26	5	1	100
2018 / No indictment	92	5	3	0	0	100
2018 / Total	65	19	12	4	0	100
2019 / 1 indicted	66	19	12	4	0	100
2019 / 2 accused	59	22	14	5	0	100
2019 / 3 + defendant	36	21	21	17	5	100
2019 / No indictment	90	7	3	0	0	100

Year / group	0-3 %	3-6 %	6-12 %	12-24 %	24+ %	Total%
2019 / Total	62	19	13	6	1	100
2020 / 1 charged	58	24	14	4	0	100
2020 / 2 accused	49	26	17	8	0	100
2020 / 3 + defendant	42	25	20	10	4	100
2020 / No defendant	93	5	2	0	0	100
2020 / Total	56	23	14	6	1	100
2021 / 1 indicted	51	27	16	6	1	100
2021 / 2 defendant	44	30	17	8	2	100
2021 / 3 + defendant	30	24	26	15	5	100
2021 / No defendant	88	7	4	0	0	100
2021 / Total	49	25	17	7	2	100
2022 / 1 charged	54	25	15	6	1	100
2022 / 2 defendant	41	29	19	9	2	100
2022 / 3 + defendant	27	20	24	20	9	100
2022 / No defendant	88	8	3	0	0	100
2022 / Total	51	24	16	8	2	100
2023 / 1 indicted	46	27	19	8	1	100
2023 / 2 defendant	38	29	22	8	3	100
2023 / 3 + defendant	25	25	25	12	11	100
2023 / No defendant	87	11	1	0	0	100
2023 / Total	44	26	19	8	3	100

VA03, Table 11: Punishment deemed to have occurred under custody

Physical PDF page 28,29; printed page number is one lower.

Year	Penalty	Share%
2018	266	5,78
2019	244	5,56
2020	289	7,16
2021	216	5,92
2022	213	5,81
2023	197	5,86

VA03, Table 12: Proprietary proceedings

Physical PDF page 29; printed page number is one lower.

Year	Progress	Total months	Start → indictment	indictment → termination
2018	3.675	3,8	1,5	2,3
2019	3.650	4,4	1,7	2,7
2020	3.278	4,7	1,8	2,9
2021	2.951	5,5	2,1	3,5
2022	2.999	5,7	2,1	3,6
2023	2.748	6,4	2,5	3,8

VA03, Table 13: Progress of the Court of First Instance with the stated simultaneous conditions

Physical PDF page 30; printed page number is one lower.

Year	Progress	Start → indictment	indictment → byret	Start → Termination
2018	3.253	1,6	1,5	3,9
2019	3.258	1,7	1,7	4,4
2020	2.872	1,9	1,9	5,0
2021	2.616	2,1	2,3	5,8
2022	2.668	2,2	2,4	5,9
2023	2.416	2,6	2,5	6,7

VA03, Table 14: National court proceedings with the stated conjunctural conditions

Physical PDF page 31; printed page number is one lower.

Year	Progress	Start → indictment	indictment → byret	City law → national law	Start → Termination
2018	308	3,1	2,8	5,3	11,5
2019	355	3,5	3,2	6,1	13,2
2020	353	3,2	3,2	6,4	13,3
2021	330	3,7	3,9	6,6	15,2
2022	341	3,5	3,9	7,0	15,0
2023	354	4,3	4,7	7,4	17,0

VA03, Table 15: Original and latest registered basis

Physical PDF page 34; printed page number is one lower.

Basis	Initial	Last
Paragraph 762 (1) (1)	175	187
§ 762 (1) (2)	411	450
§ 762 (1) (3)	1.047	869
§ 762 (1), points 1 and 2	65	65
§ 762 (1), points 1 and 3	218	187

Basis	Initial	Last
§ 762 (1), points 2 and 3	472	404
§ 762 (1), (1), (2) and (3)	104	70
Paragraph 762 (2) (1)	201	416
§ 762 (2) (2)	24	27
§ 762 (2), points 1 and 2	11	18
Paragraph 762 (1) (1) and 762 (2) (1)	9	8
Paragraph 762 (1), points 1 and 762 (2), point 2	2	2
§ 762 (1), point 2 and § 762 (2), point 1	0	6
§ 762 (1), point 2 and § 762 (2), point 2	2	2
§ 762 (1), point 3 and § 762 (2), point 1	0	2
§ 762 (1), point 3 and § 762 (2), point 2	0	1
Paragraph 762 (1) (2) and 762 (2) (1) and (2)	1	1
§ 762 (1), points (1) and (2) and § 762 (2), point (1)	0	2
§ 762 (1), points 1 and 3 and § 762 (2), point 1	1	2
§ 762 (1), points (1) and (3) and § 762 (2), point (2)	2	0
§ 762 (1), points 2 and 3 and § 762 (2), point 1	2	1
§ 762 (1), points 2 and 3 and § 762 (2), point 2	1	1
§ 762, par. 1, nr. 1, nr. 2 and nr. 3 and § 762, par. 2, nr. 1 and nr. 2	2	1
Paragraph 763 (1) (1)	1	1
Paragraph 763 (1) (2)	7	8
Home Travel Act § 14	146	168
Other	46	51
Total	2.950	2.950

VA03, Table 16: Initial basis and subject matter

Physical PDF page 36; printed page number is one lower.

Basis	Homicide / fire	Road Transport Act	Breaking and entering	Drugs / sms Owl	Robbery	Condition
Paragraph 762 (1) (1)	3	5	19	32	10	4
§ 762 (1) (2)	26	2	54	136	47	12
§ 762 (1) (3)	178	2	19	376	94	75
§ 762 (1), points 1 and 2	2	-	15	12	7	1
§ 762 (1), points 1 and 3	25	-	19	71	14	12
§ 762 (1), points 2 and 3	37	-	33	112	56	31
§ 762 (1), (1), (2) and (3)	6	-	17	16	7	3

Basis	Homicide / fire	Road Transport Act	Breaking and entering	Drugs / sms Owl	Robbery	Condition
Paragraph 762 (2) (1)	33	10	4	84	8	25
§ 762 (2) (2)	2	1	1	-	2	4
§ 762 (2), points 1 and 2	-	-	-	2	-	3
Paragraph 762 (1) (1) and 762 (2) (1)	-	-	-	6	-	2
Paragraph 762 (1), points 1 and 762 (2), point 2	-	-	-	2	-	-
§ 762 (1), point 2 and § 762 (2), point 2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paragraph 762 (1) (2) and 762 (2) (1) and (2)	-	-	-	-	-	-
§ 762 (1), points 1 and 3 and § 762 (2), point 1	1	-	-	-	-	-
§ 762 (1), points (1) and (3) and § 762 (2), point (2)	-	-	-	-	-	2
§ 762 (1), points 2 and 3 and § 762 (2), point 1	1	-	-	1	-	-
§ 762 (1), points 2 and 3 and § 762 (2), point 2	-	-	-	-	-	-
§ 762, par. 1, nr. 1, nr. 2 and nr. 3 and § 762, par. 2, nr. 1 and nr. 2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paragraph 763 (1) (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paragraph 763 (1) (2)	-	-	-	3	1	-
Other	2	-	-	3	-	1
Home Travel Act § 14	3	4	19	14	4	-
Total	319	24	200	870	250	175

Basis	Theft	Violence	Other criminal law;	Other special law	Economic crime;	Total
Paragraph 762 (1) (1)	27	21	5	21	28	175
§ 762 (1) (2)	19	64	29	15	7	411
§ 762 (1) (3)	6	143	111	-	43	1047
§ 762 (1), points 1 and 2	12	4	3	7	2	65
§ 762 (1), points 1 and 3	33	15	20	-	9	218
§ 762 (1), points 2 and 3	17	112	26	-	48	472
§ 762 (1), (1), (2) and (3)	25	11	14	1	4	104
Paragraph 762 (2) (1)	-	7	25	2	3	201
§ 762 (2) (2)	-	10	4	-	-	24
§ 762 (2), points 1 and 2	-	4	2	-	-	11

Basis	Theft	Violence	Other criminal law;	Other special law	Economic crime;	Total
Paragraph 762 (1) (1) and 762 (2) (1)	-	1	-	-	-	9
Paragraph 762 (1), points 1 and 762 (2), point 2	-	-	-	-	-	2
§ 762 (1), point 2 and § 762 (2), point 2	-	2	-	-	-	2
Paragraph 762 (1) (2) and 762 (2) (1) and (2)	-	1	-	-	-	1
§ 762 (1), points 1 and 3 and § 762 (2), point 1	-	-	-	-	-	1
§ 762 (1), points (1) and (3) and § 762 (2), point (2)	-	-	-	-	-	2
§ 762 (1), points 2 and 3 and § 762 (2), point 1	-	-	-	-	-	2
§ 762 (1), points 2 and 3 and § 762 (2), point 2	-	1	-	-	-	1
§ 762, par. 1, nr. 1, nr. 2 and nr. 3 and § 762, par. 2, nr. 1 and nr. 2	-	-	-	1	1	2
Paragraph 763 (1) (1)	-	-	-	-	1	1
Paragraph 763 (1) (2)	-	2	1	-	-	7
Other	3	1	-	36	-	46
Home Travel Act § 14	41	10	6	25	20	146
Total	183	409	246	108	166	2950

VA03, Table 17: Switch from impact risk alone

Physical PDF page 38; printed page number is one lower.

Zone	Originally only § 762.1.3	Switch from § 762.1.3 alone
Murder, fire, etc.	178	40
Road Transport Act	2	2
Breaking and entering	19	3
Drugs and smuggling	376	84
Robbery	94	8
Condition	75	21
Theft	6	1
Violence	143	22
Other criminal law	111	24
Economic crime	43	3
Total	1.047	208

VA03, Table 18: All 208 shifters latest basis

Physical PDF page 38,39; printed page number is one lower.

Latest basis	Progress
Paragraph 762 (1) (1)	3
§ 762 (1), points (1) and (2) and § 762 (2), point (1)	1
§ 762 (1), points 1 and 3	5
§ 762 (1), (1), (2) and (3)	1
§ 762 (1) (2)	6
§ 762 (1), point 2 and § 762 (2), point 1	2
§ 762 (1), points 2 and 3	12
§ 762 (1), point 3 and § 762 (2), point 1	1
§ 762 (1), point 3 and § 762 (2), point 2	1
Paragraph 762 (2) (1)	160
§ 762 (2), points 1 and 2	9
Paragraph 762 (2) (2)	4
Other	3
Total	208

VA03, Table 19: Time phases of the CFI

Physical PDF page 41,42; printed page number is one lower.

Zone	Progress	Start → indictment	indictment → beram tn	Awarding → hearing in court;	Hearing → city ed	Start → Yield
Murder, fire, etc.	168	5,7	1,5	2,9	1,8	11,9
Road Transport Act	18	1,1	0,6	2,3	0,1	4,1
Breaking and entering	152	2,0	0,5	1,3	0,1	3,9
Drugs and smuggling	641	3,1	0,6	2,0	0,4	6,0
Robbery	132	2,4	0,7	1,8	0,2	5,1
Condition	105	2,1	1,4	3,1	0,9	7,4
Theft	149	1,4	0,4	0,8	0,2	2,9
Violence	240	1,6	0,7	1,4	1,3	5,0
Other criminal law	141	2,6	0,2	2,6	1,7	7,2
Other special law	92	0,8	0,4	0,9	0,2	2,3
Economic crime	100	1,7	1,0	1,5	0,9	5,0
Total	1.938	2,6	0,7	1,9	0,7	5,9

VA03, Table 20: Time phases of the national court

Physical PDF page 43; printed page number is one lower.

Zone	Progress	Start → indictment	indictment → byret	City law → national law	Start → national law
Murder, fire, etc.	45	8,2	6,9	13,9	28,9
Road Transport Act	3	2,0	2,9	7,8	12,7
Breaking and entering	8	1,9	2,3	6,0	10,2
Drugs and smuggling	89	4,0	4,2	8,6	16,8
Robbery	13	2,8	3,4	5,5	11,7
Condition	33	4,1	4,5	8,2	16,8
Theft	5	3,5	2,2	4,7	10,5
Violence	26	4,1	3,0	8,4	15,5
Other criminal law	24	4,4	5,6	9,3	19,3
Other special law	10	0,8	1,5	3,1	5,5
Economic crime	7	5,0	2,6	4,8	12,4
Total	263	4,5	4,4	8,9	17,8

VA03, Table 21: Preconditioning by region

Physical PDF page 44; printed page number is one lower.

Zone	Progress	The preschool	Share%
Murder, fire, etc.	319	100	31,3
Road Transport Act	24	5	20,8
Breaking and entering	200	36	18,0
Drugs and smuggling	870	160	18,4
Robbery	250	49	19,6
Condition	175	30	17,1
Theft	183	26	14,2
Violence	409	85	20,8
Other criminal law	246	50	20,3
Other special law	108	8	7,4
Economic crime	166	26	15,7
Total	2.950	575	19,5

VA03, Table 22: Time phases for pre-planned first instance course

Physical PDF page 45; printed page number is one lower.

Zone	Progress	Start → indictment	indictment → beram tn	Awarding → hearing in court;	Hearing → city ed	Start → Yield
Murder, fire, etc.	70	7,0	2,1	2,8	2,4	14,3
Road Transport Act	3	2,3	0,4	1,4	0,2	4,3
Breaking and entering	35	2,4	0,5	1,7	0,1	4,7
smuggling;	153	4,7	0,8	3,4	0,7	9,5
Robbery	34	3,2	0,9	1,0	0,3	5,5
Condition	22	3,5	0,8	1,9	1,1	7,3
Theft	17	2,4	0,3	0,9	0,3	3,9
Violence	46	1,9	0,6	1,7	0,5	4,7
Other criminal law	39	3,0	0,7	2,7	2,5	9,0
Other special law	8	0,8	0,3	0,8	0,2	2,2
nality;	22	3,7	1,1	1,0	1,1	7,0
Total	449	4,1	1,0	2,4	1,0	8,4

Legal isolation: all cells in 2024 statistics three tables

Denmark/NSK 2024 has 0 registered completed solitary-confinement trajectories. This is court-ordered solitary confinement under the specified procedural scheme; it does not mean 0 actual isolation in cells, spending 21-23 hours alone, disciplinary cells or exclusion from association. Such conditions are addressed separately in the CPT/UN/Kriminalforsorgen tracks. [VA02;chapter15-16]

Year	1 - 7 days	8-14	15-28	29-42	43-56	57 d-3 md	More than 3 months	Total	Share%
2020	1	12	1	0	0	0	0	14	0,3
2021	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	0,2
2022	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2023	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	0,2
2024	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Area / objective	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Faroes, number	3	1	0	0	11
Faeroe Islands, average days	7	7	0	0	7
Greenland, number	-	0	0	0	0
Greenland, average days	-	0	0	0	0

The Faroes 2024: 11 were conducted in 3 criminal cases, 5-7 days, precise prose-average 6,8 days versus the table rounded 7; all in the case of drug crime / risk, none below 18. The new Code of Procedure of the Faroe Islands entered into force on 1 January 2021. Greenland is first included 2021, so 2020 is no proven zero cell. [VA02, p.3-5]

Internal and historical boundaries: The Faroes and Greenland tabular headings say completed, but the method sections say started. The manual statements cannot be reconciled without case ID to the same end-time accumulation. The 2024-method says that the share previously 2019-and-before included straight judgments; however, the 2018- original of the Ministry of Justice says that the 2012@-@ and-forward did not include straight judgments. The historical percentage must be adjusted version rather than common method break. [VA02, p.2,4-5; VA04, p.3, note2]

Positive protection obligations, time-limits and necessary information

Conclusion: Prolonged actual deprivation of liberty and the data model's lack of review of legal basis/time require an independent citizen-oriented examination. **Authority's statement:** Conviction rates, changed crime profile, changes in legal basis and new training/supervision initiatives. **Original evidence:** VA01-03's different populations and tables, including courses ending in acquittal and their duration. **Deficiency:** None of these aggregates shows necessity on each day of the intervention or actual redress provided; several explanations rely on assumptions, missing data or an incorrect comparison group. **Rule:** ECHR Article 5 requires lawful deprivation of liberty and relevant review/cessation/compensation safeguards; Articles 3 and 8 may be independently relevant to conditions and family separation. **Action:** Police/prosecution request and maintain interventions, and courts review/schedule them. **Departure:** Each authority's lack of progress or insufficient specific basis must be documented per phase, rather than covered by an overall conviction rate. **Consequence:** The citizen actually loses liberty, work and family contact over months or years; later changed access to review does not automatically restore those days. **Responsibility:** The State's positive and negative obligations and the specific authority/person chain; individual punishment requires a documented act and culpability. **Requirement:** A shared de-identified course ID for arrest, each detention order and legal basis, changes, visits/correspondence monitoring, actual cessation, judgment/acquittal, compensation request/decision/payment and disciplinary/criminal proceedings consequences.

Guidelines and training concerning detainees developed in 2025 are documented in follow-up to the 2024 statistics, but no measured individual redress. The original 2025 analysis reports local experiences of earlier release without counts or the oversight case ID; this is not counted as a verified number of citizens protected in time. 2023 changed reporting to the State Prosecutor from extension submissions to the specified cases of judicial refusal or a late request. That change must be included when measuring supervisory coverage; a fall in reports does not in itself show fewer unlawful extensions. [VA01,pp.2-3;VA03,pp.45-47;VA05,p.2]

The public register must be supplemented for lengthy sequences in 2006-2017, specific compensation outcomes throughout the period, the courts' legal-basis/deadline errors and the complete annual sequence for 2025 not yet shown. Historical annual originals and solitary-confinement series are treated by version in the separate historical annex; identifying publications does not assert that all their tables are already checked. Children under 15 have a separate actual error account, which must not be added to detention age tables without person and sequence linkage.

Historical care and isolation: original numbers, time and selection

Long-term care 2006: all 19 tables

The original research report documents 657 lengthy courses of custody with 135.561 total days and 12 acquitments in the first instance. 50 were under 18 years at the beginning: 14 in 15 years, 17 in 16 years and 19 in 17 years. The report cannot provide information on the extent of custody surrogate. It measures the course of custody over 3 months until first instance in 2006. It does not count all the defendants, all the 2018- 2024 definitions completed, or only illegal prisons.

All 21 original pages have been substantively read. The 19 tables are reproduced here with our own scope definitions; table 9's continuation is combined. The study excluded incorrectly reported sequences without stating the original count or the number excluded.49 of 657 had interrupted pre-trial detention and therefore enter the stage analyses only to a limited extent. This is a specific selection limitation, meaning that stage waiting times do not cover the entire population. Source LV06, pp.1-3.

LV06 Table 1, physical page 4

657 long-term proceedings; crime is the main charge with the highest sentence, not all conditions. Intervals and totals overlap.

Crime group	>3-4 months	>4-5 months	>5-6 months	>6-9 months	>9-12 months	>1 year
Serious sexual crimes	8	5	10	12	2	7
Other sexual crimes	2	2	2	2	0	0

Crime group	>3-4 months	>4-5 months	>5-6 months	>6-9 months	>9-12 months	>1 year
Manslaughter and attempted murder	7	0	6	35	23	15
Serious crimes of violence	44	18	19	15	6	11
Other crimes of violence	5	4	1	1	1	0
Arson	12	9	10	9	1	4
Robbery	47	28	17	24	11	5
Other property crimes	26	27	11	6	0	1
Drug crimes	20	23	18	31	17	32
Other offences	0	0	0	1	0	4
Total (N)	171	116	94	136	61	79
(%)	26 %	18 %	14 %	21 %	9 %	12 %

Crime group	Number	Share	Average days
Serious sexual crimes	44	7 %	219
Other sexual crimes	8	1 %	162
Manslaughter and attempted murder	86	13 %	275
Serious crimes of violence	113	17 %	179
Other crimes of violence	12	2 %	146
Arson	45	7 %	180
Robbery	132	20 %	170
Other property crimes	71	11 %	141
Drug crimes	141	21 %	250
Other offences	5	0,8 %	422
Total (N)	657	100 %	206
(%)	100 %	-	-

LV06 Table 2, physical page 5

Subsidies mean different legal provisions, not the number of crimes according to the same provision. 340 courses with at least one is a minimum due to incomplete schedules.

Group	Number	Percentage
No side charges	317	48
A bias.	118	18
Two adjections	61	9
Three adjections	44	7

Group	Number	Percentage
Four or more adjectives	117	18
Total	657	100

LV06 Table 3, physical page 6

All 657. The group is probably based on incomplete information on secondary matters. 16 totally non-conformities include 12 acquitments; the 16 are not 16 acquitments.

Group	Number	Percentage
Yes in all cases	388	59
Yes, presumably (a)	68	10
Yes, for the main charge, but not the same / all side charges	96	15
Yes, for the main charge, but none of the secondary charges.	12	2
Yes, for the side charge (s) but not for the main charge	24	4
Convicted of action but by lender determination	52	8
Convicted of action, but after serious determination	1	0,2
No, in no case is there conformity	16	2
Total	657	100

LV06 Table 4, Physical page 7

All 657,judgment at first instance.12 acquittals do not on their own establish that all preceding detention orders were unlawful.

Group	Number	Percentage
Life imprisonment	1	0,2
Non-conditional prison sentence	495	75
Combined judgment	24	4
Conditional prison sentence	4	0,6
Judgment of the Court of First Instance	101	15
Youth asphyxia	19	3
Fine	1	0,2
Dismisses the application;	12	2
Total	657	100

LV06 Table 5, Physical page 7

Only 518 unconditional sentences, including the unconditional part of combination sentences. Six detention sentences have been omitted after the note. This distribution must not be given a mention of 657.

Group	Number	Percentage
Up to 1 year	136	26

Group	Number	Percentage
More than 1 year up to and including 2 years	141	27
More than 2 years up to and including 3 years	88	17
More than 3 years up to and including 5 years	66	13
More than 5 years up to and including 7 years	42	8
More than 7 years up to and including 10 years	26	5
More than 10 years	19	4
Total	518	100

LV06 Table 6, Physical page 8

Completed long-term courses according to the definition of the time. The year 2001-2005 is a historical context outside the reporting period and is not part of a 2006-2025 subtotal. Total days are the estimated time of the source, not a product of rounded mean numbers.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
> 3 to 4 months	98	95	119	138	176	171
> 4 to 5 months	76	103	108	105	119	116
> 5 to 6 months	49	69	86	61	80	94
Total > 3 to 6 months	223	267	313	304	375	381
> 6 to 9 months	79	111	126	113	153	136
> 9 to 12 months	67	74	50	72	84	61
Total > 6 to 12 months	146	185	176	185	237	197
> 1 year to 1 year 3 months	42	20	43	45	54	49
> 1 year and 3 months to 1 year and 6 months	32	20	25	24	25	19
> 1 year and 6 months to 1 year and 9 months	3	7	7	9	6	9
> 1 year and 9 months to 2 years	0	2	4	3	6	2
> 2 years	0	15	3	2	14	0
Total over 1 year	77	64	82	83	105	79
Total	446	516	571	572	717	657
Average duration (days)	229	230	219	222	228	206
Total number of days	101.944	118.637	125.255	126.726	163.511	135.561

LV06 Table 7, physical page 9

Each crime cell indicates the number and percentage in this order. The denominator of all pre-trial imprisonment comes from the Reich Police and counts the process started; the numerator for long-term counts end / year of judgment. The fraction is therefore not a cohort's share.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Serious Number of sexual offences%	33 / 7	35 / 7	30 / 5	30 / 5	31 / 4	44 / 7
Number of other sexual offences%	7 / 2	9 / 2	8 / 1	6 / 1	7 / 1	8 / 1
Number and attempt of manslaughter%	80 / 18	55 / 11	89 / 16	78 / 14	69 / 10	86 / 13
Number of Serious Violence Crimes%	34 / 8	53 / 10	79 / 14	80 / 14	91 / 13	113 / 17
Number of other violent crimes%	8 / 2	10 / 2	18 / 3	21 / 4	18 / 3	12 / 2
Number of arson%	27 / 6	49 / 9	32 / 6	29 / 5	44 / 6	45 / 7
Number of robbery%	111 / 25	135 / 26	128 / 22	116 / 20	159 / 22	132 / 20
Other property crimes%	42 / 9	44 / 9	66 / 12	73 / 13	78 / 11	71 / 11
Number of drug offences %	94 / 21	125 / 24	117 / 20	135 / 24	217 / 30	141 / 21
Other offences%	10 / 2	1 / 0	4 / 1	4 / 1	3 / 0	5 / 1
Total long-term Number of prisoners%	446 / 100	516 / 100	571 / 100	572 / 100	717 / 100	657 / 100
Number of long-term detention cases	5839 / 7,6	6086 / 8,5	6202 / 9,2	5907 / 9,7	5762 / 12,4	5919 / 11,1

LV06 Table 8, Physical page 10

The denominators come here from Statistics Denmark and differ from Table 7. Serious violence in the denominator only includes § 245- 246. The source 10,9% in 2006 shall not be changed to Table 7 s 11,1%.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Serious sexual crimes	29,2	30,7	25,4	24,4	26,5	33,3
Other sexual offences	25,9	26,5	40,0	12,8	16,3	29,6
Manslaughter and attempted murder	45,2	30,1	44,3	42,6	32,9	56,2
Serious crimes of violence *	12,5	17,7	21,7	18,6	20,1	21,4
Other crimes of violence	1,7	1,7	3,1	3,3	2,1	1,5
Arson	21,6	34,8	30,8	23,0	36,4	37,2
Robbery	14,6	15,4	15,5	16,9	21,2	19,9
Other property crimes	2,2	2,2	3,3	4,1	4,4	4,2
Drug crimes	18,1	23,4	18,0	19,0	32,5	17,8
Other offences	0,7	0,1	0,3	0,3	0,3	1,1

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Total	7,7	8,5	9,2	9,4	11,7	10,9

LV06 Table 9, Physical page 11

The 54 police circles before the 2007 reform. No person delusion. The table note wrongly writes 2005 about the 0% cells, although the last pillar relates to 2006; the error is retained as a local source problem.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Per cent of all - in custody. in prison; 2006
Copenhagen	106	125	115	126	232	125	9 %
Frederiksberg	4	0	2	8	7	9	8 %
Gentofte	2	5	4	7	3	4	9 %
Lyngby	7	3	6	2	10	6	6 %
Gladsaxe	5	8	12	4	17	16	11 %
Hvidover	5	10	15	3	9	10	7 %
Glostrup	20	11	16	20	22	30	15 %
Tower	2	7	0	0	7	1	3 %
Helsingør	6	12	10	21	18	18	11 %
Hillerød	11	8	6	5	13	10	8 %
Frederikssund	4	5	5	8	12	13	19 %
Roskilde	8	7	14	10	6	14	10 %
Køge	12	4	9	8	7	7	8 %
Holbæk	0	15	9	6	6	14	16 %
Kalundborg	2	0	0	1	1	6	23 %
Ringsted	6	7	18	7	6	10	16 %
Slaughter	18	6	11	11	14	37	42 %
Næstved	11	1	5	12	10	9	8 %
Vordingborg	5	5	12	16	3	7	14 %
Nykøbing F.	12	9	6	18	15	27	39 %
Nakskov	15	5	19	14	24	14	11 %
Bornholm	2	3	0	9	2	8	27 %
Odense	45	68	42	61	63	39	14 %
Svendborg	5	9	10	6	10	13	17 %
Nyborg	5	2	5	3	4	3	11 %
Assens	1	6	5	8	9	4	12 %
Medium speed	1	0	5	2	1	5	18 %

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Per cent of all - in custody. in prison; 2006
Sønderborg	6	0	6	4	6	7	12 %
Groundnuts	2	7	7	3	3	7	3 %
Peas (without pods)	0	0	2	2	0	8	9 %
Haderslev	4	6	7	4	7	7	10 %
Ribe	1	9	7	5	2	0	0 %
Esbjerg	6	9	13	10	5	11	13 %
Product	2	4	4	6	3	6	12 %
Fredericia	3	17	9	9	0	1	1 %
Cold	4	2	4	4	2	6	10 %
Vejle	7	8	14	15	14	7	8 %
Horsens	15	8	21	19	11	18	17 %
Herning	4	2	7	3	5	12	17 %
Ringkøbing	6	3	8	0	0	6	33 %
Holstebro	2	1	3	4	6	4	6 %
Århus	21	18	40	42	61	34	11 %
Oats	0	2	5	1	1	0	0 %
Silkeborg	6	3	3	8	13	3	8 %
Randers	14	10	8	8	24	12	10 %
Grenå	0	2	0	0	0	8	19 %
Viborg	1	2	1	3	1	1	2 %
Disc	0	6	2	1	2	7	23 %
Thisted	1	0	2	3	1	0	0 %
Liquorice	5	6	1	0	1	0	0 %
Aalborg	10	22	21	20	11	20	13 %
Hobro	1	11	2	0	2	5	11 %
Frederikshavn	4	2	10	1	2	3	5 %
Corner	1	15	3	1	3	5	9 %
Total	446	516	571	572	717	657	11 %

LV06 Table 10, physical page 13

200 trajectories with a relevant forensic psychiatric assessment date; uninterrupted pre-trial detention until first-instance judgment only. This is not 223 assessed trajectories or all 657 trajectories.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	83	42	221
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	10	5	186
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	42	21	233
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	33	17	202
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	18	9	235
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	10	5	255
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	2	1	303
More than 9 months and not more than one year	1	0,5	594
More than 1 year	1	0,5	630
Total	200*	100	226

LV06 Table 11, physical page 14

200 uninterrupted trajectories. An order before pre-trial detention begins and multiple forensic psychiatric assessments are excluded under the note. Mean time for the assessment itself 89 days, longest 401 days; the last bar is the entire pre-trial detention period.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	3	2	174
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	6	3	237
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	45	23	175
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	69	35	197
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	66	33	266
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	9	5	360
More than 9 months and not more than one year	0	0	-
More than 1 year	2	1	495
Total	200*	100	226

LV06 Table 12, physical page 14

65 continuous course with relevant chronology. Several investigations / opinions and a prior custody order are omitted. Average from completed mental examination to presentation 17 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Submitted on the same day	2	3	351
1 day and up to 7 days	18	28	235
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	13	20	278
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	24	37	264
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	6	9	232

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	2	3	365
Total	65*	100	262

LV06 Table 13, Physical page 15

77 uninterrupted proceedings, repeated statements omitted. The Council's opinion took an average of 41 days, median 39 days in this population.4 courses exceeded 3 months; the last column indicates the entire custody.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	3	4	294
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	29	38	265
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	34	44	253
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	7	9	339
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	4	5	271
Total	77*	100	268

LV06 Table 14, physical page 16

269 uninterrupted proceedings; more than one referral to the public prosecutor has been omitted. Average for the indictment 36 days; 8 courses over 6 months.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	86	32	152
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	33	12	205
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	49	18	235
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	51	19	280
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	17	6	291
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	25	9	391
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	8	3	444
Total	269*	100	237

LV06 Table 15, physical page 17

231 relevant uninterrupted case histories, multiple submissions/indictments excluded.21 of 252 relevant case histories had an indictment before the State Prosecutor’s completion and are not included in this sequence.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	161	70	256
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	21	9	172
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	31	13	223

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	12	5	355
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	4	2	418
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	2	1	274
Total	231*	100	252

LV06 Table 16, Physical page 17

579 uninterrupted proceedings, several indictments omitted. Average from indictment to sentence 63 days. The text after the table refers by mistake to Table 17.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	25	4	171
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	38	7	143
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	121	21	165
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	167	29	172
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	86	15	186
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	122	21	304
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	19	3	468
More than 9 months and not more than one year	1	0,2	630
Total	579*	100	209

LV06 Table 17, Physical page 18

556 courses with known number of contestants or none. Only 75% of 397 courses with one-off had reported numbers. The source's time relationships are associations, unproven cause or responsibility.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
No others	260	47	205
One subject	85	15	222
Two to three others.	129	23	187
Four to nine co-defendants	67	12	187
ten or more collateral	15	3	306
Total	556	100	204

LV06 Table 18, Physical page 19

488 with informed cause and 881 registered causes. Procenter has mentioned 881; each category is a number of courses where the cause is mentioned, with the overlap p.169 of 657 had no informed cause. The explanations given by the Authority are not independent evidence that time was necessary or legal.

Group	Number of cases for which the reason is given	Percentage
Relationship with the case	246	28
Police / Public Prosecutor	28	3
General Court	103	12
Mental examination	149	17
Other studies etc.	151	17
The defendant / defender	138	16
Co-perpetrators	32	4
Witnesses	20	2
Other	14	2
Total number of reasons given	881	100

LV06 Table 19, physical page 20

657 courses. Long-term event is one of the report's procedural stages over one month.564 has at least one, 93 none; such an event is not automatically a proven break in time or convention.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
One event with a duration of more than one month	309	47	179
Two events	139	21	251
Three events	83	13	271
Four events	23	4	299
Five events	9	1	367
Six events	1	0,2	445
No prolonged event	93	14	132
Total	657	100	206

Time-related regulatory responsibility

Conclusion: already in 2006, the State had specific knowledge of long waiting times during deprivation of liberty; responsibility must be examined for each stage and actor. Original evidence: mental examinations lasting up to 401 days,8 Regional Public Prosecutor stages exceeding 6 months and 20 cases exceeding 6 months from indictment to judgment. Significance of the evidence: these days burden liberty, not merely administrative processing. Rule: ECHR5, paragraph 3 requires special diligence and relevant, sufficient grounds for detention; Article 5, paragraph 4 requires speedy review. Action/omission: recorded waiting time, late initiation or delayed decision. Legal departure: can be established when the specific duration and lack of diligence during continued detention are proved, not from an overall average alone. Consequence: burdens on liberty and contact during the actual days. Responsibility: the State, relevant management and individual responsibility according to documented role, duty and culpability. Demand: a stage-by-stage timeline, all orders and extensions, initiation dates, reasons, appeal/release/compensation dates and any disciplinary or criminal responses. Unlawful deprivation of liberty by private individuals and abuse by public employees are compared by reference to the same specific conduct and separate criminal-law conditions in chapter 26.

Isolation 2006-2018: completed courses and actual day load

ISO18 has been read in its entirety, 10 original pages; in addition, the original table 4 has been visually checked. Nationally counted completed isolation course. The series applies to legally determined isolation under custody; it cannot replace numbers of actual single cell, disciplinary isolation or children detained by the police. None of these figures is in themselves a number of illegal interventions.

Year	Completed isolation course	Share of the Source in custody	Total isolation days specified in ISO18
2006	475	8,0%	Not specified here
2007	273	4,6%	Not specified here
2008	327	5,3%	Not specified here
2009	210	3,2%	Not specified here
2010	127	1,9%	Not specified here
2011	186	2,8%	Not specified here
2012	132	2,4%	3182
2013	55	1,0%	870
2014	36	0,7%	681
2015	32	0,7%	601
2016	37	0,9%	950
2017	17	0,4%	191
2018	14	0,3%	195

Prior to 2012, the percentage has not-updated started custody; from 2012 updated completed courses. As of 2012, straight judgments are omitted according to ISO18, s 5 Note 2. Isolation 2024, on the other hand, says that 2019 and previously included straight judgments. This is a concrete conflict between two original methodological descriptions which require clarification of the data extracts used. No artificially homogeneous percentage series is produced. The days shall be the sum of the rounded duration of each lead, not the number × rounded mean time.

ISO18 Table 3: Policy area and duration

Politikreds	Prolonged-release device b	Isolation	Share	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d
North Jutland	234	0	0,0	0	0	0
East Jutland	362	1	0,3	0	1	0
Middle and West Jutland	263	1	0,4	0	0	1
South-East Jutland	266	0	0,0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	302	0	0,0	0	0	0
Funen	217	1	0,5	1	0	0
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	241	1	0,4	1	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	188	2	1,1	0	2	0
Northern Zealand	277	0	0,0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	256	0	0,0	0	0	0
Copenhagen	1793	8	0,4	1	4	3
Bornholm	20	0	0,0	0	0	0
Total	4419	14	0,3	3	7	4

All other duration columns are 0 for all 12 ranges: 29- 42 d, 43- 56 d, 57 d-3 months and over 3 months. Including straight sentences, according to s 6 Note 5, the shares would be Middle / West Zealand 1,0%, Funen 0,4%, Middle / West Jutland 0,3% and South Zealand / Lolland-Falster 0,3%; eight others unchanged. The country share of the source is rounded 0,3%, not a known additional number of cases.

ISO18 Table 4: Crime, two years and an unresolved interval denominator

Division	Number 2017	Quantity 2018	Average 2017	Average days 2018	Interval cells 1 -7 / 8-14 / 15-28 d
Manslaughter / Trials	7	4	11	24	1/7/3
Violence / threats	1	1	14	7	1/1/0
Sexual crimes	0	1	0	15	0/0/1
Drugs	6	4	10	11	2/8/0
Weapons / explosives	3	4	13	9	1/6/0
Total	17	14	11	14	5/22/4

All four longer interval columns are 0. The original interval columns sum to 31=17+14; they are not a2018 distribution of 14,although the heading does not state their annual denominator. This has been visually verified and is retained separately. No 2018 subgroup’s processes may be inferred from these mixed columns. According to the source, no one under 18 was placed in solitary confinement in 2018. All 14 processes concerned offences carrying a maximum sentence of at least 6 years, and the source states no exceedance of statutory maximum periods; this is the source’s specific rule check, not an independent complete ECHR examination of each order.

Historical custody versions 2007-2010 and correction of children's whereabouts

Different versions tell different stories about citizens' freedom time

The original 2008 report omitted 29 lengthy courses, which were only identified in the 2009 material. The revised 2010 addition changes 650 → 679 courses, 130.781 → 136.913 days and 35 → 37 children under 18 years of age in this defined long-term population.29 already registered courses were also attributed to wrong police lines: 28 moved to South-East Jutland, 1 to South / South Jutland. It is a specific documented statistical error; the two 29 groups must not be added together as 58 people neglected. Both table versions are retained below. When summing, select one marked version per data year; the full 2008 original dataset is not automatically updated by four corrected tables.

All 19 pages of LV07,18 pages of LV08 and 5 pages of LV08R are read. The 18 tables in each annual report and all four tables of amendment are reproduced. Year before 2006 is only the historical context of the source, outside the budget of the report period. All processes are long-term before first instance, not a national number of illegal arrests.

2007 had 620 processes, 133.772 days, 12 acquittals and at least 55 children under 18(13 aged 15, 28 aged 16, 14 aged 17); missing age data may conceal more. 63 interrupted processes are excluded from important stage analyses. Psychiatric examination 214(12 repeated),Medico-Legal Council 69(4 repeated),Regional Public Prosecutor 267(34 repeated),co-suspects 397. The first-time denominator before exclusion of erroneous reports is not stated. The 2008 original had 45 interrupted, 256 psychiatrically examined(9 repeated),87 Medico-Legal Council(7 repeated),286 Regional Public Prosecutor(10 repeated),384 co-suspects; one missing relation. These sub-counts derive from the original 650 version and must not receive 679 as a new denominator.

Concrete source conflicts are preserved locally

• LV07 Tables 1 and 6 have different 2007 duration distributions despite the same 620: 132 / 141 / 75 / 124 / 65 / 83 versus 130 / 143 / 71 / 126 / 67 / 83. They must not be standardized without the original registers.

• LV07 Table 14 indicates 121 within 7 days of 169, but the 66% of the source does not correspond to 121 / 169 = 71,6%. The six printed sub-percentages sum 92%, not 100%. The numerators and printed percentages are reproduced separately.

• LV07 Table 18 writes 175 middle days in the total, while the main tables and text indicate 216.175 is also the means of the first sub-group; the document does not explain the total. The printed 175-total has not been used for the annual average of the report.

• LV08 Table 1's total row indicates 56 over 1 year, while the 10 crime rows sum 55, and Table 6 indicates 55. The ranges in Table 1's total series summer 651, although the printed total is 650. The prose on page 3 writes 87 homicides, Table 86. The figures are source conflicts, not extra people.

• A footnote marker after 619 / 649 is not an additional digit in the numerator. Notes on one missing case are included below; 619 ³ means 619 with Note 3, not 6.193 decisions.

LV07: all 18 original tables

LV07 Table 1, Physical Page 3

Main charge and duration, all lengthy procedures. Intervals and subtotals overlap.

Crime group	>3-4 months	>4-5 months	>5-6 months	>6-9 months	>9-12 months	>1 year
Serious sexual crimes	5	4	4	16	3	6
Other sexual crimes	0	3	2	0	0	1
Manslaughter and attempted murder	5	4	5	15	21	12
Serious crimes of violence	36	22	6	20	4	3

Crime group	>3-4 months	>4-5 months	>5-6 months	>6-9 months	>9-12 months	>1 year
Other crimes of violence	5	6	3	3	0	0
Arson	11	11	3	9	2	3
Robbery	32	40	8	23	9	3
Other property crimes	22	26	13	7	2	4
Drug crimes	15	22	29	30	23	43
Other offences	1	3	2	1	1	8
Total (N)	132	141	75	124	65	83
(%)	21 %	23 %	12 %	20 %	10 %	13 %

Crime group	Number	Share	Average days
Serious sexual crimes	38	6 %	236
Other sexual crimes	6	1 %	200
Manslaughter and attempted murder	62	10 %	281
Serious crimes of violence	91	15 %	163
Other crimes of violence	17	3 %	140
Arson	39	6 %	184
Robbery	115	19 %	170
Other property crimes	74	12 %	165
Drug crimes	162	26 %	277
Other offences	16	3 %	316
Total (N)	620	100 %	216
(%)	100 %	-	-

LV07 Table 2, physical page 5

Number of distinct statutory provisions in subsidiary charges, not criminal acts.

Group	Number	Percentage
No side charges	241	39
A bias.	113	18
Two adjections	106	17
Three adjections	47	8
Four or more adjectives	113	18
Total	620	100

LV07 Table 3, Physical Page 5

Consistency with the judgment: the presumed group relies on deficient data on subsidiary counts. Acquittal is 12/16, not 20/19.

Group	Number	Percentage
Yes in all cases	388	63
Yes, presumably (a)	64	10
Yes, for the main charge, but not the same / all side charges	80	13
Yes, for the main charge, but none of the secondary charges.	6	1
Yes, for the side charge (s) but not for the main charge	17	3
For the page (s) with new main features	3	0,5
Convicted of action but by lender determination	41	7
Convicted of action, but after serious determination	1	0,2
No, in no case is there conformity	20	3
Total	620	100

LV07 Table 4, physical page 6

The nature of the sentence has 619 / 649 known outcomes; one of 620 / 650 is missing.

Group	Number	Percentage
Life sentence	1	0,2
Non-conditional prison sentence	470	76
Combined judgment	21	3
Conditional prison sentence	1	0,2
Judgment of the Court of First Instance	95	15
Detention	2	0,3
Youth asphyxia	14	2
Fine	3	0,5
Dismisses the application;	12	2
Total	619 [Note3]	100

LV07 Table 5, Physical page 7

Only 491 / 499 unconditional sentences including unconditional part of combination sentences.

Group	Number	Percentage
Up to 1 year	153	31
More than 1 year up to and including 2 years	134	27
More than 2 years up to and including 3 years	57	12
More than 3 years up to and including 5 years	62	13

Group	Number	Percentage
More than 5 years up to and including 7 years	54	11
More than 7 years up to and including 10 years	19	4
More than 10 years	12	2
Total	491	100

LV07 Table 6, Physical page 8

Annual / Duration Table. Before 2006 only context; subgroups and subtotals must not be summed together.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
> 3 to 4 months	98	95	119	138	176	171	130
> 4 to 5 months	76	103	108	105	119	116	143
> 5 to 6 months	49	69	86	61	80	94	71
Total > 3 to 6 months	223	267	313	304	375	381	344
> 6 to 9 months	79	111	126	113	153	136	126
> 9 to 12 months	67	74	50	72	84	61	67
Total > 6 to 12 months	146	185	176	185	237	197	193
> 1 year to 1 year 3 months	42	20	43	45	54	49	45
> 1 year and 3 months to 1 ½ years	32	20	25	24	25	19	25
> 1 ½ years to 1 year and 9 months	3	7	7	9	6	9	6
> 1 year and 9 months to 2 years	0	2	4	3	6	2	4
> 2 years	0	15	3	2	14	0	3
Total over 1 year	77	64	82	83	105	79	83
Total	446	516	571	572	717	657	620
Average duration (days)	229	230	219	222	228	206	216
Total number of days	101.944	118.637	125.255	126.726	163.511	135.561	133.772

LV07 Table 7, Physical page 9

Crime cells: number / percent. Completed long-term divides with the beginning of the year all-custody; no cohort share.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Serious Number of sexual offences%	33 / 7	35 / 7	30 / 5	30 / 5	31 / 4	44 / 7	38 / 6
Number of other sexual offences%	7 / 2	9 / 2	8 / 1	6 / 1	7 / 1	8 / 1	6 / 1

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Number and attempt of manslaughter%	80 / 18	55 / 11	89 / 16	78 / 14	69 / 10	86 / 13	62 / 10
Number of Serious Violence Crimes%	34 / 8	53 / 10	79 / 14	80 / 14	91 / 13	113 / 17	91 / 15
Number of other violent crimes%	8 / 2	10 / 2	18 / 3	21 / 4	18 / 3	12 / 2	17 / 3
Number of arson%	27 / 6	49 / 9	32 / 6	29 / 5	44 / 6	45 / 7	39 / 6
Number of robbery%	111 / 25	135 / 26	128 / 22	116 / 20	159 / 22	132 / 20	115 / 19
Number of other property crimes%	42 / 9	44 / 9	66 / 12	73 / 13	78 / 11	71 / 11	74 / 12
Number of drug offences %	94 / 21	125 / 24	117 / 20	135 / 24	217 / 30	141 / 21	162 / 26
Other offences%	10 / 2	1 / 0	4 / 1	4 / 1	3 / 0	5 / 1	16 / 3
Total long-term Number of prisoners%	446 / 100	516 / 100	571 / 100	572 / 100	717 / 100	657 / 100	620 / 100
All custody units Number of long-term custody units%	5.839 / 7,6	6.086 / 8,5	6.202 / 9,2	5.907 / 9,7	5.762 / 12,4	5.919 / 11,1	5.919 / 10,5

LV07 Table 8, Physical Page 10

Policy circle cells: number with a share of all courses of custody in brackets. Older circles are combined into the 2007 structure.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Number of North Jutland	21 (7)	56 (17)	37 (12)	22 (7)	19 (6)	33 (10)	38 (15)
Number of East Jutland	35 (8)	30 (7)	48 (10)	50 (10)	85 (20)	54 (11)	51 (13)
Number of Central and West Jutland	20 (6)	17 (5)	26 (7)	22 (7)	28 (9)	33 (10)	22 (6)
Number of South-East Jutland	29 (8)	37 (8)	53 (12)	48 (14)	28 (9)	32 (9)	56 (19)
Number of South and South Jutland	21 (4)	35 (7)	46 (10)	34 (7)	26 (5)	46 (8)	45 (9)
Number of Funen	57 (11)	85 (16)	67 (13)	80 (17)	87 (19)	64 (15)	40 (10)
Number of South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	61 (14)	26 (5)	53 (10)	71 (13)	66 (14)	94 (20)	71 (15)
Number of Middle and West Zealand	28 (6)	33 (7)	50 (10)	32 (8)	26 (7)	51 (13)	42 (11)
Number of North Zealand	30 (6)	33 (7)	31 (6)	43 (9)	56 (13)	51 (10)	41 (10)
Number of the West Bank of Copenhagen	30 (8)	29 (7)	43 (9)	27 (6)	48 (10)	56 (12)	51 (11)

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Number of Copenhagen	112 (7)	132 (9)	117 (8)	134 (9)	246 (15)	135 (9)	161 (8)
Number of Bornholm	2 (5)	3 (6)	0 (0)	9 (29)	2 (5)	8 (27)	2 (6)
Total	446 (8)	516 (8)	571 (9)	572 (10)	717 (12)	657 (11)	620 (10)

LV07 Table 9, Physical page 11

Uninterrupted process with known date of order and declaration. Names 176 / 192.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	67	38	221
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	11	6	191
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	27	15	239
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	36	21	229
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	16	9	232
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	14	8	320
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	2	1	478
More than 9 months and not more than one year	1	0,6	388
More than 1 year	2	1	590
Total	176*	100	241

LV07 Table 10, Physical Page 12

Uninterrupted, no more than one mental examination both dates knew. Mention 167 / 184; average for the survey itself 81 / 85 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	7	4	345
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	44	26	201
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	59	35	206
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	56	34	280
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	1	0,6	292
Total	167*	100	236

LV07 Table 11, Physical Page 12

Uninterrupted, no multiple forensic psychiatric/Retslægerådet examinations, dates known. Denominators 43/41, mean time to submission 23/28 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
1 day and up to 7 days	16	37	329
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	7	16	266
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	9	21	288
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	8	19	254
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	1	2	273
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	2	5	405
Total	43*	100	298

LV07 Table 12, Physical page 13

Uninterrupted, one referral to Retslægerådet and known dates. Denominator 52/51, mean time for opinion 45/44 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	1	2	364
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	1	2	364
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	21	40	286
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	15	29	284
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	11	21	334
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	3	6	378
Total	52*	100	304

LV07 Table 13, Physical page 14

Uninterrupted, one submission to the State Prosecutor, dates known. Denominator 196/222, mean 48/37 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	40	20	192
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	27	14	183
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	40	20	238
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	33	17	314
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	28	14	331
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	21	11	446
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	2	1	280
More than 9 months and not more than one year	5	3	481
Total	196*	100	276

LV07 Table 14, Physical Page 15

Uninterrupted, one submission / one indictment and relevant order. Names 169 / 210; 2007 have 15 indictments before closure and 3 without date outside the table; 2008 has 10 before completion.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	121	66	268
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	20	11	193
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	11	6	255
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	6	3	314
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	9	5	371
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	2	1	428
Total	169*	100	268

LV07 Table 15, physical page 16

Uninterrupted, no more indictments, known date. Mention 487 / 547, average indictment → Judgment 75 / 69 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	12	3	125
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	32	7	181
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	71	15	166
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	142	29	155
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	72	15	167
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	124	26	300
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	33	7	448
More than 9 months and not more than one year	0	0	-
More than 1 year	1	0,2	771
Total	487*	100	217

LV07 Table 16, Physical page 17

Known number of co-defendants or none. Covers 613 / 649; not whole 620 / 650.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
No others	223	36	194
One subject	109	18	198
Two to three others.	145	24	246
Four to nine co-defendants	108	18	225
ten or more collateral	28	5	241

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Total	613	100	215

LV07 Table 17, Physical page 17

Reason occurrences 1.418/1.534, with overlap. Printed 96%/95% refers to trajectories with at least one reason without a precise integer numerator. Explanations are the authority's registered assessments, not an independent necessity review.

Group	Number of cases for which the reason is given	Percentage
Relationship with the case	379	27
Police / Public Prosecutor	34	2
General Court	148	10
Mental examination	190	13
Other studies etc.	276	19
The defendant / defender	209	15
Co-perpetrators	93	7
Witnesses	37	3
Other	52	4
Total number of reasons given	1418	100

LV07 Table 18, Physical page 18

Process events over 1 month, all 620 / 650. A number of incidents are not a number of illegal acts.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
One event with a duration of more than one month	308	50	175
Two events	101	16	274
Three events	91	15	274
Four events	25	4	351
Five events	11	2	375
Six events	1	0,2	393
No prolonged event	83	13	167
Total	620	100	175

LV08: all 18 original tables

LV08 Table 1, physical page 3

Main charge and duration, all lengthy procedures. Intervals and subtotals overlap.

Crime group	>3-4 months	>4-5 months	>5-6 months	>6-9 months	>9-12 months	>1 year
Serious sexual crimes	7	12	6	11	6	7
Other sexual crimes	1	1	1	2	1	0
Manslaughter and attempted murder	1	2	8	27	25	23
Serious crimes of violence	26	26	21	31	10	8
Other crimes of violence	4	0	2	2	1	0
Arson	5	15	9	16	3	1
Robbery	32	37	22	43	16	13
Other property crimes	21	24	8	9	2	2
Drug crimes	18	24	14	33	4	1
Other offences	3	2	1	0	0	0
Total (N)	118	143	92	174	68	56
(%)	18 %	22 %	14 %	27 %	10 %	9 %

Crime group	Number	Share	Average days
Serious sexual crimes	49	8 %	221
Other sexual crimes	6	1 %	189
Manslaughter and attempted murder	86	12 %	297
Serious crimes of violence	122	19 %	190
Other crimes of violence	9	1 %	168
Arson	49	8 %	182
Robbery	163	25 %	200
Other property crimes	66	10 %	152
Drug crimes	94	14 %	174
Other offences	6	1 %	128
Total (N)	650	100 %	201
(%)	100 %	-	-

LV08 Table 2, physical page 5

Number of distinct statutory provisions in subsidiary charges, not criminal acts.

Group	Number	Percentage
No side charges	183	28
A bias.	129	20

Group	Number	Percentage
Two adjections	94	15
Three adjections	73	11
Four or more adjectives	170	26
Total	649 [Note2]	100

LV08 Table 3, Physical Page 5

Consistency with the judgment: the presumed group relies on deficient data on subsidiary counts. Acquittal is 12/16, not 20/19.

Group	Number	Percentage
Yes in all cases	344	53
Yes, presumably (a)	78	12
Yes, for the main charge, but not the same / all side charges	104	16
Yes, for the main charge, but none of the secondary charges.	18	3
Yes, for the side charge (s) but not for the main charge	30	5
Convicted of action but by lender determination	54	8
Convicted of action, but after serious determination	2	0,3
No, in no case is there conformity	19	3
Total	649	100

LV08 Table 4, Physical page 6

The nature of the sentence has 619 / 649 known outcomes; one of 620 / 650 is missing.

Group	Number	Percentage
Life sentence	1	0,2
Non-conditional prison sentence	473	73
Combined judgment	26	4
Conditional prison sentence	0	0
Judgment of the Court of First Instance	120	19
Detention	2	0,3
Youth asphyxia	9	1
Fine	2	0,3
Dismisses the application;	16	2
Total	649 [Note 3]	100

LV08 Table 5, Physical Page 7

Only 491 / 499 unconditional sentences including unconditional part of combination sentences.

Group	Number	Percentage
Up to 1 year	175	35
More than 1 year up to and including 2 years	149	30
More than 2 years up to and including 3 years	65	13
More than 3 years up to and including 5 years	58	12
More than 5 years up to and including 7 years	26	5
More than 7 years up to and including 10 years	15	3
More than 10 years	11	2
Total	499	100

LV08 Table 6, Physical page 8

Annual / Duration Table. Before 2006 only context; subgroups and subtotals must not be summed together.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
> 3 to 4 months	98	95	119	138	176	171	130	118
> 4 to 5 months	76	103	108	105	119	116	143	143
> 5 to 6 months	49	69	86	61	80	94	71	92
Total > 3 to 6 months	223	267	313	304	375	381	344	353
> 6 to 9 months	79	111	126	113	153	136	126	174
> 9 to 12 months	67	74	50	72	84	61	67	68
Total > 6 to 12 months	146	185	176	185	237	197	193	242
> 1 year to 1 ½ years	74	40	68	69	79	68	70	47
> 1 ½ years to 2 years	3	9	11	12	12	11	10	8
> 2 years	0	15	3	2	14	0	3	0
Total over 1 year	77	64	82	83	105	79	83	55
Total	446	516	571	572	717	657	620	650
Average duration (days)	229	230	219	222	228	206	216	201
Total number of days	101.944	118.637	125.255	126.726	163.511	135.561	133.772	130.781

LV08 Table 7, Physical page 9

Crime cells: number / percent. Completed long-term divides with the beginning of the year all-custody; no cohort share.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Serious Number of sexual offences%	33 / 7	35 / 7	30 / 5	30 / 5	31 / 4	44 / 7	38 / 6	49 / 8
Other sex offences-Number of awards%	7 / 2	9 / 2	8 / 1	6 / 1	7 / 1	8 / 1	6 / 1	6 / 1

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Manslaughter and trials	80 / 18	55 / 11	89 / 16	78 / 14	69 / 10	86 / 13	62 / 10	86 / 12
Serious crime of violence - Number sees%	34 / 8	53 / 10	79 / 14	80 / 14	91 / 13	113 / 17	91 / 15	122 / 19
Violence crimes in other - Number rich%	8 / 2	10 / 2	18 / 3	21 / 4	18 / 3	12 / 2	17 / 3	9 / 1
Number of arson%	27 / 6	49 / 9	32 / 6	29 / 5	44 / 6	45 / 7	39 / 6	49 / 8
Number of robbery%	111 / 25	135 / 26	128 / 22	116 / 20	159 / 22	132 / 20	115 / 19	163 / 25
Number of other property crimes%	42 / 9	44 / 9	66 / 12	73 / 13	78 / 11	71 / 11	74 / 12	66 / 10
Number of drug offences %	94 / 21	125 / 24	117 / 20	135 / 24	217 / 30	141 / 21	162 / 26	94 / 14
Other offences%	10 / 2	1 / 0	4 / 1	4 / 1	3 / 0	5 / 1	16 / 3	6 / 1
Total long-term Number of returnees%	446 / 100	516 / 100	571 / 100	572 / 100	717 / 100	657 / 100	620 / 100	650 / 100
All custody prisons Number of long-term detention units%	5.839 / 7,6	6.086 / 8,5	6.202 / 9,2	5.907 / 9,7	5.762 / 12,4	5.919 / 11,1	5.919 / 10,5	6.124 / 10,6

LV08 Table 8, Physical page 10

Policy circle cells: number with a share of all courses of custody in brackets. Older circles are combined into the 2007 structure.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Number of North Jutland	21 (7)	56 (17)	37 (12)	22 (7)	19 (6)	33 (10)	38 (15)	72 (24)
Number of East Jutland	35 (8)	30 (7)	48 (10)	50 (10)	85 (20)	54 (11)	51 (13)	30 (6)
Number of Central and West Jutland	20 (6)	17 (5)	26 (7)	22 (7)	28 (9)	33 (10)	22 (6)	100 (25)
Number of South-East Jutland	29 (8)	37 (8)	53 (12)	48 (14)	28 (9)	32 (9)	56 (19)	19 (5)
Number of South and South Jyl countries	21 (4)	35 (7)	46 (10)	34 (7)	26 (5)	46 (8)	45 (9)	35 (6)
Number of Funen	57 (11)	85 (16)	67 (13)	80 (17)	87 (19)	64 (15)	40 (10)	44 (11)
Number of South Zealand and Lolland-F alster	61 (14)	26 (5)	53 (10)	71 (13)	66 (14)	94 (20)	71 (15)	61 (14)
Number of Middle and West Zealand	28 (6)	33 (7)	50 (10)	32 (8)	26 (7)	51 (13)	42 (11)	81 (21)
Number of islands in the North	30 (6)	33 (7)	31 (6)	43 (9)	56 (13)	51 (10)	41 (10)	54 (12)

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Number of the West Bank of Copenhagen	30 (8)	29 (7)	43 (9)	27 (6)	48 (10)	56 (12)	51 (11)	37 (8)
Number of Copenhagen	112 (7)	132 (9)	117 (8)	134 (9)	246 (15)	135 (9)	161 (8)	113 (6)
Number of Bornholm	2 (5)	3 (6)	0 (0)	9 (29)	2 (5)	8 (27)	2 (6)	4 (7)
Total	446 (8)	516 (8)	571 (9)	572 (10)	717 (12)	657 (11)	620 (10)	650 (11)

LV08 Table 9, Physical page 11

Uninterrupted process with known date of order and declaration. Names 176 / 192.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	72	38	242
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	8	4	167
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	36	19	199
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	37	19	218
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	22	12	273
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	13	7	324
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	4	2	368
Total	192*	100	238

LV08 Table 10, physical page 12

Uninterrupted, no more than one mental examination both dates knew. Mention 167 / 184; average for the survey itself 81 / 85 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	1	0,5	144
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	1	0,5	419
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	9	5	245
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	43	23	203
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	66	36	214
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	58	32	247
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	4	2	404
More than 9 months and not more than one year	2	1	494
Total	184*	100	231

LV08 Table 11, Physical Page 12

Uninterrupted, no multiple forensic psychiatric/Retslægerådet examinations, dates known. Denominators 43/41, mean time to submission 23/28 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
1 day and up to 7 days	12	29	328
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	4	10	276
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	14	34	275
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	5	12	328
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	4	10	374
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	2	5	426
Total	41*	100	288

LV08 Table 12, Physical page 13

Uninterrupted, one referral to Retslægerådet and known dates. Denominator 52/51, mean time for opinion 45/44 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	1	2	377
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	21	41	246
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	22	43	296
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	2	4	217
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	3	6	344
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	2	4	425
Total	51*	100	282

LV08 Table 13, physical page 14

Uninterrupted, one submission to the State Prosecutor, dates known. Denominator 196/222, mean 48/37 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	53	24	188
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	43	19	224
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	41	18	223
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	27	12	240
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	36	16	314
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	20	9	354
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	2	1	442
Total	222*	100	246

LV08 Table 14, Physical page 15

Uninterrupted, one submission / one indictment and relevant order. Names 169 / 210; 2007 have 15 indictments before closure and 3 without date outside the table; 2008 has 10 before completion.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	164	78	258
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	22	10	207
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	16	8	216
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	6	3	354
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	1	0,5	190
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	0	0	-
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	1	0,5	462
Total	210*	100	250

LV08 Table 15, Physical page 15

Uninterrupted, no more indictments, known date. Mention 487 / 547, average indictment → Judgment 75 / 69 days.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
Up to 7 days	26	5	176
More than 1 week and no more than 2 weeks	42	8	146
More than 2 weeks and maximum 1 month	84	15	166
More than 1 month and maximum 2 months	158	29	172
More than 2 months and maximum 3 months	94	17	188
More than 3 months and not more than 6 months	117	21	274
More than 6 months and not more than 9 months	17	3	413
More than 9 months and not more than one year	3	1	452
More than 1 year	6	1	520
Total	547*	100	205

LV08 Table 16, physical page 16

Known number of co-defendants or none. Covers 613 / 649; not whole 620 / 650.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
No others	265	41	202
One subject	113	17	197
Two to three others.	151	23	197
Four to nine co-defendants	110	17	218

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
ten or more collateral	10	2	118
Total	14 649	100	201

LV08 Table 17, physical page 17

Reason occurrences 1.418/1.534, with overlap. Printed 96%/95% refers to trajectories with at least one reason without a precise integer numerator. Explanations are the authority's registered assessments, not an independent necessity review.

Group	Number of cases for which the reason is given	Percentage
Relationship with the case	357	23
Police / Public Prosecutor	75	5
General Court	176	11
Mental examination	231	15
Other studies etc.	315	21
The defendant / defender	203	13
Co-perpetrators	108	7
Witnesses	26	2
Other	43	3
Total number of reasons given	1534	100

LV08 Table 18, Physical page 18

Process events over 1 month, all 620 / 650. A number of incidents are not a number of illegal acts.

Group	Number	Percentage	Average maintenance period (days),
No prolonged event	108	17	148
One event with a duration of more than one month	315	48	177
Two events	126	19	231
Three events	66	10	277
Four events	27	4	315
Five events	7	1	376
Six events	1	0,1	559
Total	650	100	201

LV08R: all four revised tables

LV08R Table 1, Physical Page 2

Revised 2008 version. The same historical years 2001-2007 are repeated; no additional cases.

Crime group	>3-4 months	>4-5 months	>5-6 months	>6-9 months	>9-12 months	>1 year
Serious sexual crimes	8	12	7	10	6	7
Other sexual crimes	1	1	1	2	1	0
Manslaughter and attempted murder	1	3	8	27	27	23
Serious crimes of violence	30	28	23	32	9	8
Other crimes of violence	4	1	3	2	1	0
Arson	6	16	9	17	2	1
Robbery	38	34	22	45	14	14
Other property crimes	22	25	11	7	2	2
Drug crimes	22	22	15	33	4	2
Other offences	4	2	2	0	0	0
Total (N)	136	144	101	175	66	57
(%)	20 %	21 %	15 %	26 %	10 %	8 %

Crime group	Number	Share	Average days
Serious sexual crimes	50	7 %	219
Other sexual crimes	6	1 %	189
Manslaughter and attempted murder	89	13 %	297
Serious crimes of violence	130	19 %	187
Other crimes of violence	11	2 %	167
Arson	51	8 %	180
Robbery	167	25 %	206
Other property crimes	69	10 %	152
Drug crimes	98	14 %	175
Other offences	8	1 %	130
Total (N)	679	100 %	202
(%)	100 %	-	-

LV08R Table 6, physical page 3

Revised 2008 version. The same historical years 2001-2007 are repeated; no additional cases.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
> 3 to 4 months	98	95	119	138	176	171	130	136
> 4 to 5 months	76	103	108	105	119	116	143	144

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
> 5 to 6 months	49	69	86	61	80	94	71	101
Total > 3 to 6 months	223	267	313	304	375	381	344	381
> 6 to 9 months	79	111	126	113	153	136	126	175
> 9 to 12 months	67	74	50	72	84	61	67	66
Total > 6 to 12 months	146	185	176	185	237	197	193	241
> 1 year to 1 ½ years	74	40	68	69	79	68	70	49
> 1 ½ years to 2 years	3	9	11	12	12	11	10	7
> 2 years	0	15	3	2	14	0	3	1
Total over 1 year	77	64	82	83	105	79	83	57
Total	446	516	571	572	717	657	620	679
Average duration (days)	229	230	219	222	228	206	216	202
Total number of days	101.944	118.637	125.255	126.726	163.511	135.561	133.772	136.913

LV08R Table 7, Physical page 4

Revised 2008 version. The same historical years 2001-2007 are repeated; no additional cases.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Serious Number of sexual offences%	33 / 7	35 / 7	30 / 5	30 / 5	31 / 4	44 / 7	38 / 6	50 / 7
Other sex offences- Number of awards%	7 / 2	9 / 2	8 / 1	6 / 1	7 / 1	8 / 1	6 / 1	6 / 1
Manslaughter and trials	80 / 18	55 / 11	89 / 16	78 / 14	69 / 10	86 / 13	62 / 10	89 / 13
Serious crime of violence - Number sees%	34 / 8	53 / 10	79 / 14	80 / 14	91 / 13	113 / 17	91 / 15	130 / 19
Violence crimes in other - Number rich%	8 / 2	10 / 2	18 / 3	21 / 4	18 / 3	12 / 2	17 / 3	11 / 2
Number of arson%	27 / 6	49 / 9	32 / 6	29 / 5	44 / 6	45 / 7	39 / 6	51 / 8
Number of robbery%	111 / 25	135 / 26	128 / 22	116 / 20	159 / 22	132 / 20	115 / 19	167 / 25
Number of other property crimes%	42 / 9	44 / 9	66 / 12	73 / 13	78 / 11	71 / 11	74 / 12	69 / 10
Number of drug offences %	94 / 21	125 / 24	117 / 20	135 / 24	217 / 30	141 / 21	162 / 26	98 / 14
Other offences%	10 / 2	1 / 0	4 / 1	4 / 1	3 / 0	5 / 1	16 / 3	8 / 1
Total long-term Number of returnees%	446 / 100	516 / 100	571 / 100	572 / 100	717 / 100	657 / 100	620 / 100	679 / 100

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
All custody prisons Number of units	5.839 / 7,6	6.086 / 8,5	6.202 / 9,2	5.907 / 9,7	5.762 / 12,4	5.919 / 11,1	5.919 / 10,5	6.124 / 11,1

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
long-term pre-trial imprisonment%								

LV08R Table 8, Physical Page 5

Revised 2008 version. The same historical years 2001-2007 are repeated; no additional cases.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Number of North Jutland	21 (7)	56 (17)	37 (12)	22 (7)	19 (6)	33 (10)	38 (15)	72 (24)
Number of East Jutland	35 (8)	30 (7)	48 (10)	50 (10)	85 (20)	54 (11)	51 (13)	30 (6)
Number of Central and West Jutland	20 (6)	17 (5)	26 (7)	22 (7)	28 (9)	33 (10)	22 (6)	71 (18)
Number of South-East Jutland	29 (8)	37 (8)	53 (12)	48 (14)	28 (9)	32 (9)	56 (19)	47 (14)
Number of South and South Jyl countries	21 (4)	35 (7)	46 (10)	34 (7)	26 (5)	46 (8)	45 (9)	42 (8)
Number of Funen	57 (11)	85 (16)	67 (13)	80 (17)	87 (19)	64 (15)	40 (10)	48 (12)
Number of South Zealand and Lolland-F alster	61 (14)	26 (5)	53 (10)	71 (13)	66 (14)	94 (20)	71 (15)	62 (15)
Number of Middle and West Zealand	28 (6)	33 (7)	50 (10)	32 (8)	26 (7)	51 (13)	42 (11)	82 (21)
Number of islands in the North	30 (6)	33 (7)	31 (6)	43 (9)	56 (13)	51 (10)	41 (10)	54 (12)
Number of the West Bank of Copenhagen	30 (8)	29 (7)	43 (9)	27 (6)	48 (10)	56 (12)	51 (11)	37 (8)
Number of Copenhagen	112 (7)	132 (9)	117 (8)	134 (9)	246 (15)	135 (9)	161 (8)	130 (7)
Number of Bornholm	2 (5)	3 (6)	0 (0)	9 (29)	2 (5)	8 (27)	2 (6)	4 (7)
Total	446 (8)	516 (8)	571 (9)	572 (10)	717 (12)	657 (11)	620 (10)	679 (11)

UC0810: 14 original tables on children, surrogate and arrest

The entire 8-page correction has been read. It concerns a different population from long-term pre-trial detention: judgments imposing a youth sanction or immediate imprisonment in 2008-2010, including short pre-trial detention. A review of 50 detention trajectories in 2010 triggered complete reanalysis of three judgment years. Kriminalregisteret's recording of residence had not adequately tracked changes. The new analysis uses POLSAS and information from Kriminalforsorgen; stays outside Kriminalforsorgen are classified as substitute custody for calculation without obtaining direct documentation of stays from those locations. The registers' data discipline is described as the authorities' assessment, not an independently verified guarantee.

Year of Judgment	All judgments	Initial only arrest	Corrected only arrest	Original total product days of revenue,	Corrected days	Original Arrest part of days	Corrected arrestandel
2008	476	121	23	21.386	20.693	41%	10%
2009	454	93	27	18.482	18.303	33%	14%
2010	456	58	22	20.061	21.436	30%	12%

This changes the recording of the location of the load, not automatically the actual historical location or its legality. Judgments and days are different units. No figures here are a number of parents or a number of unique children across the years.18 years of age at the beginning are omitted from the arrest rates of the report in notes 1-3; 2010 also covers 14 years after the age of criminal years of the time.

UC0810 Table 1, physical page 3

Initial data.

Residence	Youth asphyxia	Freedom of movement	Total
Not in custody	27	158	185
Surrogate only	44	64	108
Arrest only	27	94	121
Both	4	58	62
All judgments	102	374	476

UC0810 Table 2, physical page 3

Corrected data.

Residence	Youth asphyxia	Freedom of movement	Total
Not in custody	23	164	187
Surrogate only	41	96	137
Arrest only	2	21	23
Both	36	93	129
All judgments	102	374	476

UC0810 Table 3, physical page 3

Initial data.

Average days; brackets indicate part-time in arrest. No cell-wise integer denominator is given in the table; mean cannot be a number of children. Blank / - is not 0.

Residence	15 years	16 years	17 years	18 years	All
Surrogate only	60	80	74	-	72
Arrest only	77	70	57	64	65
Both; arrest days in brackets	87 (15)	89 (11)	87 (20)	-	88 (17)
Total	70	81	71	64	74

UC0810 Table 4, physical page 3

Corrected data.

Average days; brackets indicate part-time in arrest. No cell-wise integer denominator is given in the table; mean cannot be a number of children. Blank / - is not 0.

Residence	15 years	16 years	17 years	18 years	All
Surrogate only	53	81	77	69	73
Arrest only	13	17	46	-	40
Both; arrest days in brackets	83 (5)	79 (8)	68 (12)	-	76 (9)
Total	70	77	69	69	72

UC0810 Table 5, physical page 4

Initial data.

Residence	Youth asphyxia	Freedom of movement	Total
Not in custody	25	152	177
Surrogate only	27	42	69
Arrest only	12	81	93
Both	22	93	115
All judgments	86	368	454

UC0810 Table 6, physical page 4

Corrected data.

Residence	Youth asphyxia	Freedom of movement	Total
Not in custody	26	150	176
Surrogate only	22	62	84
Arrest only	2	25	27
Both	36	131	167
All judgments	86	368	454

UC0810 Table 7, physical page 5

Initial data.

Average days; brackets indicate part-time in arrest. No cell-wise integer denominator is given in the table; mean cannot be a number of children. Blank / - is not 0.

Residence	15 years	16 years	17 years	18 years	All
Surrogate only	73	61	92	-	75
Arrest only	30	43	55	32	46

Residence	15 years	16 years	17 years	18 years	All
Both; arrest days in brackets	70 (11)	80 (10)	81 (21)	-	79 (16)
Total	62	63	74	32	67

UC0810 Table 8, physical page 5

Corrected data.

Average days; brackets indicate part-time in arrest. No cell-wise integer denominator is given in the table; mean cannot be a number of children. Blank / - is not 0.

Residence	15 years	16 years	17 years	18 years	All
Surrogate only	69	60	84	34	68
Arrest only	28	25	32	-	31
Both; arrest days in brackets	68 (7)	65 (9)	76 (14)	-	70 (11)
Total	68	61	71	34	66

UC0810 Table 9, physical page 6

Initial data.

Residence	Youth asphyxia	Freedom of movement	Total
Not in custody	17	178	195
Surrogate only	34	85	119
Arrest only	10	48	58
Both	16	68	84
All judgments	77	379	456

UC0810 Table 10, physical page 6

Corrected data.

Residence	Youth asphyxia	Freedom of movement	Total
Not in custody	14	168	182
Surrogate only	29	93	122
Arrest only	5	17	22
Both	29	101	130
All judgments	77	379	456

UC0810 Table 11, Physical page 7

Initial data.

Average days; brackets indicate part-time in arrest. No cell-wise integer denominator is given in the table; mean cannot be a number of children. Blank / - is not 0.

Residence	14 years	15 years	16 years	17 years	18 years	All
Surrogate only	25	71	64	65	-	65
Arrest only	-	61	46	79	89	70
Both; arrest days in brackets	-	74 (26)	107 (11)	98 (32)	-	99 (24)
Total	25	69	76	80	89	77

UC0810 Table 12, physical page 7

Corrected data.

Average days; brackets indicate part-time in arrest. No cell-wise integer denominator is given in the table; mean cannot be a number of children. Blank / - is not 0.

Residence	14 years	15 years	16 years	17 years	18 years	All
Surrogate only	25	66	61	68	108	67
Arrest only	-	37	31	68	-	55
Both; arrest days in brackets	-	80 (3)	93 (9)	96 (14)	-	93 (10)
Total	25	71	76	82	108	78

UC0810 Table 13, physical page 8

Original day figures.

Days and distribution	2008	2009	2010
Total days	21386	18482	20061
Partial surrogate	59%	67%	70%
Proportion of arrest	41%	33%	30%

UC0810 Table 14, physical page 8

Corrected day figures.

Days and distribution	2008	2009	2010
Total days	20693	18303	21436
Partial surrogate	90%	86%	88%
Proportion of arrest	10%	14%	12%

Percentages with multiple boundaries

2008: pre-juvenile custody 74 → 77%, pre-custodial sentence 58 → 56%; arrest during whole / part 63 → 55%. Among boat stays 17% had only 1 arrest day and 29% maximum 2. If ≤ 2 days are classified as pure surrogate, the arrest portion becomes 42%.

2009: youth sanction 71 → 70%, prison sentence 59 → 59%, arrest whole / parts 74 → 72%. Among boats' stays, 9% had only 1 day and 20% no more than 2; alternative arrest 59%.

2010: youth sanction 78 → 82%, custodial sentence 53 → 56%, arrest whole / parts 54 → 57%. Among boats' stays, 21% had only 1 day and 25% no more than 2; alternative arrest 45%. The percentages use different denominators and 18 year delusion; they must not be converted into new integers without the specific denominators.

Thresholds above 1 week/3 weeks show the same significance of the revision: in 2008, at most 1 week's custody approximately one third→59%, more than 3 weeks approximately one quarter→10%;2009 at most 1 week 37→56%, more than 3 weeks 24→14%;2010 at most 1 week 35→62%, more than 3 weeks 20→10%. These are proportions among cases involving both a remand substitute and custody, rather than all children or all remand cases.

Long-term care 2009- 2010: excluded courses, timelimits and evidence department;

Registered time, acquittal and hidden selection

Both original reports of 16 pages have been read in full. All 14 tables in each report are reproduced. 2009:790 prolonged courses, 148.083 total days, 20 acquittals and at least 42 under age 18 (7 aged 15, 15 aged 16, 20 aged 17).2010:896 courses, 6.132 total months, 11 acquittals and 1 exempt from criminal liability due to self-defence, at least 58 under age 18 (13 aged 15, 27 aged 16, 18 aged 17). Reported days and months are different units; 6.132 months is not an exact number of days when multiplied by 30. The courses end with a first-instance judgment and exceed 3 months; the unit's definition differs from later series on actual release.

Cases closed with defendants, etc., have been explicitly omitted from both reports on page 2. In addition, incorrect data years and duration less than 3 months. The total number reported and dissorted is not reported. 55 / 67 interrupted runs limit the phase analyses. Therefore, the number of the year's acquittal cannot describe all detention exercises without subsequent conviction. Lack of age data means that the children's counters are the minimum source.

The reports' analyses of section 768 a limits examine maximum periods in the absence of special circumstances; they do not find every departure unlawful. The decisive review requirement is each order's actually documented special circumstances, diligence, necessity and time. In 2009,only 776 of 790 cases commenced after 1. July 2008 are included. The main text states 97 overruns; comparative tables 9/10 use 99 because of different criteria for interrupted cases. In 2010,tables 9/10 total 829 cases and 127 departures,not all 896. 829=896−67 interrupted cases is an independently calculated population relationship; report tables 9/10 do not expressly state the overall denominator as 829. 2010,p.12,states 15%,whereas 127/896 is 14,2% and 127/829 is 15,3%. The denominator must therefore be stated when using the proportion.

The State had shredded original evidence necessary for control

LV09,p. 11 describes four 2007 reporting forms being shredded. Researchers could therefore not establish whether the recorded pre-trial detention had been continuous. Comparison was adapted through changed 2009 criteria rather than verification of the original processes. This is a specific documented loss of the basis for review. It does not on its own prove that the four orders were unlawful; it proves that the state could no longer carry out the intended substantive verification against the originals.

Conclusion→original statement: four forms shredded, the connection no longer verifiable. Significance of the evidence: the legal classification of time in 4 processes could not be reconstructed from the material used. Relevant rule: prompt and effective review under ECHR 5,paragraph 4,and the state's duty to secure a real evidential basis for review; administrative archival/documentation duties under the specific applicable scheme. Act: disposal of original case material. Departure: documented preservation and oversight failures; a specific breach of archives legislation requires the legal basis for disposal, date and responsible role. Consequence: verification replaced by amended statistical criteria. Responsibility: the register/archive authority and identified decision-makers according to specific duty/culpability. Demand: disposal basis, original reporting IDs, orders, custody/alternative-detention logs and other preserved contemporaneous dates for all four processes. Archival disposal must therefore be included in individuals' opportunities for later accountability and compensation, not merely technical data quality.

Local conflicts in figures and legal classifications

• LV09 Table 1 lasts 210 / 178 / 110 / 161 / 73 / 58, Table 6 has 210 / 173 / 108 / 165 / 77 / 57; both total 790. LV10 Table 1 has 194 / 186 / 130 / 182 / 115 / 89, Table 6 has 186 / 190 / 126 / 187 / 118 / 89; both 896. Both versions are reproduced.

• LV09 Table 13 sub-columns 677 + 97 = 774, total indicates 776. In two rows the sum of inside / outside is one smaller than the total: 287 + 24 = 311 versus 312; 178 + 28 = 206 versus 207. The 776 totals of the tables shall not be used for a common fraction with 774 sub-registrations without precise marking.

• LV09 p.7 states 258 referrals to the Regional Public Prosecutor/36%, but 258/790=32,7%;259 mentally examined/32%is 32,8%. The denominator for the printed percentages is unexplained. Original counts and percentages remain separate.
• LV10 s 7 says decrease 2005 → 2007 at 16%, but 717 → 620 is 13,5%; 620 is not used as a revised 605 counter. The main table data takes precedence as a basis for counting, without concealing the source's wrong development statements.
• Table 10 in both years groups statutory penalty ranges as ≤6 years/>6 years, while the legal description on p. 11 uses <6 years/other. This is a specific category conflict requiring each case's provision/penalty range before classification of lawfulness.

LV09: all 14 original tables

LV09 Table 1, Physical page 3

Basic charge and duration; all 790 / 896 long courses. Totals and subgroups overlap.

Division	>3-4 months	>4-5 months	>5-6 months	>6-9 months	>9-12 months	>1 year
Serious sexual crimes	11	10	12	7	4	5
Other sexual crimes	3	3	2	0	0	0
Manslaughter and attempted murder	3	2	6	14	20	11
Serious crimes of violence	52	35	24	36	7	9
Other crimes of violence	8	5	4	4	2	0
Arson	9	9	6	13	9	2
Robbery	60	64	27	52	17	12
Other property crimes	30	27	15	15	5	0
Drug crimes	26	17	10	20	9	19
Other offences	8	6	4	0	0	0
Total (N)	210	178	110	161	73	58
(%)	27	23	14	20	9	7

Division	Number	Percentage	Average days
Serious sexual crimes	49	6	198
Other sexual crimes	8	1	134
Manslaughter and attempted murder	56	7	280
Serious crimes of violence	163	21	171
Other crimes of violence	23	3	162
Arson	48	6	202
Robbery	232	29	180

Division	Number	Percentage	Average days
Other property crimes	92	12	150
Drug crimes	101	13	223
Other offences	18	2	128
Total (N)	790	100	187
(%)	100	-	-

LV09 Table 2, physical page 5

Different types of adjections, not number of actions according to the same paragraph.602 / 656 with adjections are minimal; lack of tabular information can hide more.

Group	Number	Percentage
No side charges	188	24
A bias.	157	20
Two adjections	128	16
Three adjections	106	13
Four or more adjectives	211	27
Total	790	100

LV09 Table 3, Physical page 5

Consistency with judgment, all 790 / 896.32 / 19 no compliance is not 32 / 19 discontinuance. The suspect group has unknown adverse events. The 2010percentages sum 99 according to the source's note.

Group	Number	Percentage
Yes in all cases	456	58
Yes, presumably *	26	3
Yes, for the main charge, but not the same / all side charges	151	19
Yes, for the main charge, but none of the secondary charges.	16	2
Yes, for the side charge (s) but not for the main charge	46	6
Convicted of action but by lender determination	58	7
Convicted of action, but after serious determination	5	1
No, in no case is there conformity	32	4
Total	790	100

LV09 Table 4, Physical page 6

The nature of the penalty in the first instance, all 790 / 896.2010, contains independent 1 criminal-free in the event of an emergency. Neither fine, conditional judgment nor acquittal merely proves that prior custody was illegal.

Group	Number	Percentage
Non-conditional prison sentence	595	75

Group	Number	Percentage
Combined judgment	45	6
Conditional prison sentence	4	1
Judgment of the Court of First Instance	111	14
Detention	4	1
Youth asphyxia	7	1
Fine	4	1
Dismisses the application;	20	3
Total	790	100

LV09 Table 5, Physical page 7

Only 640 / 752 unconditional sentences, including unconditional part of the combination judgment. Average penalty 28,8 / 28,9 months. Life / detention is not a final numerical penalty length in these rows.

Group	Number	Percentage
Up to 1 year	252	39
More than 1 year up to and including 2 years	159	25
More than 2 years up to and including 3 years	85	13
More than 3 years up to and including 5 years	74	12
More than 5 years up to and including 7 years	32	5
More than 7 years up to and including 10 years	22	3
More than 10 years	16	3
Total	640	100

LV09 Table 6, Physical page 8

Annual / Duration Table. 2001-2005 only historical context. 2009 denotes days; 2010 denotes months. The subtotals of the source shall not be added to the ranges.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
> 3 to 4 months	98	95	119	138	176
> 4 to 5 months	76	103	108	105	119
> 5 to 6 months	49	69	86	61	80
Total > 3 to 6 months	223	267	313	304	375
> 6 to 9 months	79	111	126	113	153
> 9 to 12 months	67	74	50	72	84
Total > 6 to 12 months	146	185	176	185	237
> 1 year to 1 ½ years	74	40	68	69	79
> 1 ½ years to 2 years	3	9	11	12	12

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
> 2 years	0	15	3	2	14
Total over 1 year	77	64	82	83	105
Total	446	516	571	572	717
Average duration (days)	229	230	219	222	228
Total number of days	101.944	118.637	125.255	126.726	163.511

Group	2006	2007	2008	2009
> 3 to 4 months	171	130	136	210
> 4 to 5 months	116	143	144	173
> 5 to 6 months	94	71	101	108
Total > 3 to 6 months	381	344	381	491
> 6 to 9 months	136	126	175	165
> 9 to 12 months	61	67	66	77
Total > 6 to 12 months	197	193	241	242
> 1 year to 1 ½ years	68	70	49	46
> 1 ½ years to 2 years	11	10	7	11
> 2 years	0	3	1	0
Total over 1 year	79	83	57	57
Total	657	620	679	790
Average duration (days)	206	216	202	187
Total number of days	135.561	133.772	136.913	148.083

LV09 Table 7, physical page 9

Crime cells number / percent. Mention all-custody has begun, protracted completed / year of judgment; not a cohort share.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Serious Number of sexual offences%	33 / 7	35 / 7	30 / 5	30 / 5	31 / 4
Other sexual- Number of crimes%	7 / 2	9 / 2	8 / 1	6 / 1	7 / 1
Manslaughter and trials	80 / 18	55 / 11	89 / 16	78 / 14	69 / 10
Serious violence - Number of crimes%	34 / 8	53 / 10	79 / 14	80 / 14	91 / 13
Violence crimes Other%	8 / 2	10 / 2	18 / 3	21 / 4	18 / 3
Number of arson%	27 / 6	49 / 9	32 / 6	29 / 5	44 / 6
Number of robbery%	111 / 25	135 / 26	128 / 22	116 / 20	159 / 22

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Property crimes Other%	42 / 9	44 / 9	66 / 12	73 / 13	78 / 11
Number of drug offences %	94 / 21	125 / 24	117 / 20	135 / 24	217 / 30
Other legislations- Number of breaks%	10 / 2	1 / 0	4 / 1	4 / 1	3 / 0
Total%	446 / 100	516 / 100	571 / 100	572 / 100	717 / 100
All custody - Number of incarcerations	5.839	6.086	6.202	5.907	5.762
Proportion of long-term% in custody	7,6	8,5	9,2	9,7	12,4

Group	2006	2007	2008	2009
Serious Number of sexual offences%	44 / 7	38 / 6	50 / 7	49 / 6
Other sexual- Number of crimes%	8 / 1	6 / 1	6 / 1	8 / 1
Manslaughter and trials	86 / 13	62 / 10	89 / 13	56 / 7
Serious violence - Number of crimes%	113 / 17	91 / 15	130 / 19	163 / 21
Violence crimes Other%	12 / 2	17 / 3	11 / 2	23 / 3
Number of arson%	45 / 7	39 / 6	51 / 8	48 / 6
Number of robbery%	132 / 20	115 / 19	167 / 25	232 / 29
Property crimes Other%	71 / 11	74 / 12	69 / 10	92 / 12
Number of drug offences %	141 / 21	162 / 26	98 / 14	101 / 13
Other legislations- Number of breaks%	5 / 1	16 / 3	8 / 1	18 / 2
Total%	657 / 100	620 / 100	679 / 100	790 / 100
All custody - Number of incarcerations	5.919	5.919	6.124	6.509
Proportion of long-term% in custody	11,1	10,5	11,1	12,1

LV09 Table 8, physical page 10

Politicians' cells number / percent. Older circles combined to the 2007 structure; no person deluxation.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Number of North Jutland%	21 / 7	56 / 17	37 / 12	22 / 7	19 / 6
Number of East Jutland%	35 / 8	30 / 7	48 / 10	50 / 10	85 / 20
Number of Central and West Jutland%	20 / 6	17 / 5	26 / 7	22 / 7	28 / 9
South-East Jutland%	29 / 8	37 / 8	53 / 12	48 / 14	28 / 9
Number of South and South Jutland%	21 / 4	35 / 7	46 / 10	34 / 7	26 / 5
Number of Funen%	57 / 11	85 / 16	67 / 13	80 / 17	87 / 19
Number of South Zealand and Lolland-Falster%	61 / 14	26 / 5	53 / 10	71 / 13	66 / 14

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Number of Middle and West Zealand%	28 / 6	33 / 7	50 / 10	32 / 8	26 / 7
Number of North Zealand%	30 / 6	33 / 7	31 / 6	43 / 9	56 / 13
Number of Copenhagen West Region%	30 / 8	29 / 7	43 / 9	27 / 6	48 / 10
Number of Copenhagen%	112 / 7	132 / 9	117 / 8	134 / 9	246 / 15
Bornholm%	2 / 5	3 / 6	0 / 0	9 / 29	2 / 5
Total%	446 / 8	516 / 8	571 / 9	572 / 10	717 / 12

Group	2006	2007	2008	2009
Number of North Jutland%	33 / 10	38 / 15	72 / 24	47 / 13
Number of East Jutland%	54 / 11	51 / 13	30 / 6	34 / 7
Number of Central and West Jutland%	33 / 10	22 / 6	71 / 18	64 / 15
South-East Jutland%	32 / 9	56 / 19	47 / 14	85 / 16
Number of South and South Jutland%	46 / 8	45 / 9	42 / 8	54 / 10
Number of Funen%	64 / 15	40 / 10	48 / 12	65 / 15
Number of South Zealand and Lolland-Falster%	94 / 20	71 / 15	62 / 15	119 / 29
Number of Middle and West Zealand%	51 / 13	42 / 11	82 / 21	93 / 19
Number of North Zealand%	51 / 10	41 / 10	54 / 12	60 / 11
Number of Copenhagen West Region%	56 / 12	51 / 11	37 / 8	49 / 11
Number of Copenhagen%	135 / 9	161 / 8	130 / 7	116 / 6
Bornholm%	8 / 27	2 / 6	4 / 7	4 / 10
Total%	657 / 11	620 / 10	679 / 11	790 / 12

LV09 Table 9, Physical page 12

Adults; comparisons 2007 and 2009 / 2010.2009 s 97 / 99 criterion breaks and 2010 s 829 delimitation are explained above. The penalty framework and duration are separate criteria.

Penalty framework	Duration	2007	2009
Strammer < prison for 6 years	custody ≤ 6 months	76 (84 %)	102 (70 %)
Strammer < prison for 6 years	pre-trial detention; > 6 months	15 (16 %)	43 (30 %)
Strammer ≥ prison for 6 years	remand ≤ 12 months	398 (84 %)	541 (92 %)
Strammer ≥ prison for 6 years	pre-trial detention; > 12 months	76 (16 %)	49 (8 %)
Total	pre-trial detention ≤ time limit	474 (84 %)	643 (87 %)
Total	pre-trial detention; > time limit	91 (16 %)	92 (13 %)

LV09 Table 10, Physical page 12

Under age 18,comparison of 2007 and 2009/2010; 2009 has 41 against 42 in the main count, 2010 has 51 against 58. Departures are not automatically invalid orders. The group's ≤6 years/> 6 years is marked as an original classification conflict.

Penalty framework	Duration	2007	2009
Stramme ≤ prison for 6 years	custody ≤ 4 months	3 (75 %)	0 (0 %)
Stramme ≤ prison for 6 years	pre-trial detention; > 4 months	1 (25 %)	1 (100 %)
Strammer > prison for 6 years	remand ≤ 8 months	40 (78 %)	34 (85 %)
Strammer > prison for 6 years	pre-trial detention; > 8 months	11 (22 %)	6 (15 %)
Total	Proprietary custody ≤ time limit	43 (78 %)	34 (83 %)
Total	pre-trial detention; > time limit	12 (22 %)	7 (17 %)

LV09 Table 11, Physical page 13

Uninterrupted trajectories; repeated forensic psychiatric/Retslægerådet/regional public prosecutor examinations excluded in relevant cells. Each event has its own valid dataset. Rounded percentages provide no additional integer denominator.

Event	Within: number	Within:%	Outside: number	Outside:%	All: number	All:%
Mental examination	194	30 %	33	36 %	227	31 %
Presentation to the Council of Prosecutors	44	7 %	21	23 %	65	9 %
Presentation to the public prosecutor	176	28 %	43	49 %	219	30 %

LV09 Table 12, Physical page 14

Cell-by-cell counts and mean days for stages; uninterrupted sequences and exclusion of repetitions. This is not the mean for the entire period of pre-trial detention. The difference between stages is an association, not independent causal evidence.

Stage	Within: ed	Within: en Me	Outside: ed	Outside: day a	Difference
Number of days from the start of pre-trial detention to the order for a mental examination	170	31	29	74	+ 43 days
Duration of the mental examination	166	77	25	112	+ 35 days
Number of days from the end of the mental examination to be submitted to the Legal Medical Council	34	23	12	27	+ 4 days
Duration of drafting of the Opinion of the Council of Prosecutors	29	35	12	51	+ 16 days
Duration of proceedings at the Public Prosecutor's Office	152	25	36	88	+ 63 days
Number of days from the decision of the Public Prosecutor on the indictment issue until the indictment is drawn up	126	6	30	17	+ 11 days
Number of days from preparation of the indictment to judgment at 1st instance	519	60	73	112	+ 52 days

LV09 Table 13, Physical page 14

Number of contestants with time groups. 2009 sub-denominator / total conflict described above. 2010: 702 + 127 = 829, all 67 abortions outside this sum.

Subject-matter	Within: n	Within:%	Within: days
No others	287	42	163
One subject	151	22	156
Two to three others.	178	26	153
Four or more contingents	61	9	197
Total	677	100	162

Subject-matter	Outside: n	Outside:%	Outside: days
No others	24	25	404
One subject	15	16	344
Two to three others.	28	29	326
Four or more contingents	30	31	359
Total	97	100	358

Subject-matter	All: n	All:%	All: days
No others	312	40	182
One subject	166	21	173
Two to three others.	207	27	177
Four or more contingents	91	12	250
Total	776	100	187

LV09 Table 14, Physical page 15

Registered causation, overlapping. 2009: 1.321 + 271 = 1.592; 2010: 1.451 + 343 = 1.794. Percentages relate to causes, not unique events. The 97% / 93% of the source, with the stated reasons, does not give exact integer denominator. The explanations are the assessments made by the Authority.

Reason	Within: number	Within:%	Outside: number	Outside:%	All: number	All:%
Relationship with the case	310	23	74	27	384	24
Police / prosecution authority	43	3	6	2	49	3
General Court	219	17	32	12	251	16
Mental examination	184	14	34	13	218	14
Other studies, etc.	241	18	49	18	290	18
The defendant / defender	178	13	45	17	223	14
Co-perpetrators	87	7	20	7	107	7

Reason	Within: number	Within:%	Outside: number	Outside:%	All: number	All:%
Witnesses	24	2	3	1	27	2
Other	35	3	8	3	43	3
Total number of reasons given	1321	100	271	100	1592	100

LV10: all 14 original tables

LV10 Table 1, physical page 3

Basic charge and duration; all 790 / 896 long courses. Totals and subgroups overlap.

Division	>3-4 months	>4-5 months	>5-6 months	>6-9 months	>9-12 months	>1 year
More serious sexual offences	5	4	6	7	5	5
Other sexual offences	2	0	1	4	2	0
Manslaughter	1	2	3	13	17	25
Serious crimes of violence	34	38	27	24	16	8
Other crimes of violence	12	5	1	2	2	0
Arson	6	4	5	13	6	3
Robbery	64	62	44	54	34	27
Other property crimes	35	38	18	28	6	8
Drug crimes	21	23	17	33	26	10
Other offences	14	10	8	4	1	3
Total (N)	194	186	130	182	115	89
(%)	22	21	15	20	13	10

Division	Number	Percentage	Average days
More serious sexual offences	32	4	231
Other sexual offences	9	1	204
Manslaughter	61	7	335
Serious crimes of violence	147	16	185
Other crimes of violence	22	2	143
Arson	37	4	218
Robbery	285	32	209
Other property crimes	133	15	177
Drug crimes	130	15	218
Other offences	40	4	172

Division	Number	Percentage	Average days
Total (N)	896	100	208
(%)	100	-	-

LV10 Table 2, physical page 5

Different types of adjections, not number of actions according to the same paragraph.602 / 656 with adjections are minimal; lack of tabular information can hide more.

Group	Number	Percentage
No side charges	240	27
A bias.	160	18
Two adjections	117	13
Three adjections	102	11
Four or more adjectives	277	31
Total	896	100

LV10 Table 3, physical page 5

Consistency with judgment, all 790 / 896.32 / 19 no compliance is not 32 / 19 discontinuance. The suspect group has unknown adverse events. The 2010percentages sum 99 according to the source's note.

Group	Number	Percentage
Yes in all cases	565	63
Yes, presumably *	31	3
Yes, for the main charge, but not the same / all side charges	224	25
Yes, for the side charge (s) but not for the main charge	24	3
Convicted of action but by lender determination	30	3
Convicted of action, but after serious determination	1	0
For bias with new main features	2	0
No, in no case is there conformity	19	2
Total	896	100**

LV10 Table 4, physical page 6

The nature of the penalty in the first instance, all 790 / 896.2010, contains independent 1 criminal-free in the event of an emergency. Neither fine, conditional judgment nor acquittal merely proves that prior custody was illegal.

Group	Number	Percentage
Non-conditional prison sentence	687	77
Judgment of the Court of First Instance	108	12
Combined judgment	65	7
Youth asphyxia	11	1

Group	Number	Percentage
Dismisses the application;	11	1
Conditional prison sentence	6	1
Detention	3	0
Fine	3	0
Without penalty in the event of an emergency	1	0
Life imprisonment	1	0
Total	896	100*

LV10 Table 5, Physical page 7

Only 640 / 752 unconditional sentences, including unconditional part of the combination judgment. Average penalty 28,8 / 28,9 months. Life / detention is not a final numerical penalty length in these rows.

Group	Number	Percentage
Up to 1 year	264	35
More than 1 year up to and including 2 years	227	30
More than 2 years up to and including 3 years	109	14
More than 3 years up to and including 5 years	73	10
More than 5 years up to and including 7 years	32	4
More than 7 years up to and including 10 years	28	4
More than 10 years	19	3
Total	752	100

LV10 Table 6, Physical page 8

Annual / Duration Table. 2001-2005 only historical context. 2009 denotes days; 2010 denotes months. The subtotals of the source shall not be added to the ranges.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
> 3 to 4 months	98	95	119	138	176
> 4 to 5 months	76	103	108	105	119
> 5 to 6 months	49	69	86	61	80
Total > 3 to 6 months	223	267	313	304	375
> 6 to 9 months	79	111	126	113	153
> 9 to 12 months	67	74	50	72	84
Total > 6 to 12 months	146	185	176	185	237
> 1 year to 1 ½ years	74	40	68	69	79
> 1 ½ years to 2 years	3	9	11	12	12
> 2 years	0	15	3	2	14

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Total over 1 year	77	64	82	83	105
Total	446	516	571	572	717
Average duration (in days)	229	230	219	222	228
Total of months	3352	3900	4118	4166	5376

Group	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
> 3 to 4 months	171	130	136	210	186
> 4 to 5 months	116	143	144	173	190
> 5 to 6 months	94	71	101	108	126
Total > 3 to 6 months	381	344	381	491	502
> 6 to 9 months	136	126	175	165	187
> 9 to 12 months	61	67	66	77	118
Total > 6 to 12 months	197	193	241	242	305
> 1 year to 1 ½ years	68	70	49	46	73
> 1 ½ years to 2 years	11	10	7	11	13
> 2 years	0	3	1	0	3
Total over 1 year	79	83	57	57	89
Total	657	620	679	790	896
Average duration (in days)	206	216	202	187	208
Total of months	4457	4398	4501	4868	6132

LV10 Table 7, Physical page 9

Crime cells number / percent. Mention all-custody has begun, protracted completed / year of judgment; not a cohort share.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Serious Number of sexual offences%	33 / 7	35 / 7	30 / 5	30 / 5	31 / 4
Other sexual- Number of crimes%	7 / 2	9 / 2	8 / 1	6 / 1	7 / 1
Manslaughter and trials	80 / 18	55 / 11	89 / 16	78 / 14	69 / 10
Serious violence - Number of crimes%	34 / 8	53 / 10	79 / 14	80 / 14	91 / 13
Violence crimes Other%	8 / 2	10 / 2	18 / 3	21 / 4	18 / 3
Number of arson%	27 / 6	49 / 9	32 / 6	29 / 5	44 / 6
Number of robbery%	111 / 25	135 / 26	128 / 22	116 / 20	159 / 22

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Property crime -% of total	42 / 9	44 / 9	66 / 12	73 / 13	78 / 11
Drug crime - Number of hits%	94 / 21	125 / 24	117 / 20	135 / 24	217 / 30
Other legislations- Number of breaks%	10 / 2	1 / 0	4 / 1	4 / 1	3 / 0
Total%	446 / 100	516 / 100	571 / 100	572 / 100	717 / 100
All custody - Number of incarcerations	5.839	6.086	6.202	5.907	5.762
Proportion of long-term% in custody.	7,6	8,5	9,2	9,7	12,4

Group	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Serious Number of sexual offences%	44 / 7	38 / 6	50 / 7	49 / 6	32 / 4
Other sexual- Number of crimes%	8 / 1	6 / 1	6 / 1	8 / 1	9 / 1
Manslaughter and trials	86 / 13	62 / 10	89 / 13	56 / 7	61 / 7
Serious violence - Number of crimes%	113 / 17	91 / 15	130 / 19	163 / 21	147 / 16
Violence crimes Other%	12 / 2	17 / 3	11 / 2	23 / 3	22 / 2
Number of arson%	45 / 7	39 / 6	51 / 8	48 / 6	37 / 4
Number of robbery%	132 / 20	115 / 19	167 / 25	232 / 29	285 / 32
Property crime -% of total	71 / 11	74 / 12	69 / 10	92 / 12	133 / 15
Drug crime - Number of hits%	141 / 21	162 / 26	98 / 14	101 / 13	130 / 15
Other legislations- Number of breaks%	5 / 1	16 / 3	8 / 1	18 / 2	40 / 4
Total%	657 / 100	620 / 100	679 / 100	790 / 100	896 / 100
All custody - Number of incarcerations	5.919	5.919	6.124	6.509	6.663
Proportion of long-term% in custody.	11,1	10,5	11,1	12,1	13,4

LV10 Table 8, physical page 10

Politicians' cells number / percent. Older circles combined to the 2007 structure; no person deluxation.

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Number of North Jutland%	21 / 7	56 / 17	37 / 12	22 / 7	19 / 6
Number of East Jutland%	35 / 8	30 / 7	48 / 10	50 / 10	85 / 20
Number of Central and West Jutland%	20 / 6	17 / 5	26 / 7	22 / 7	28 / 9
South-East Jutland%	29 / 8	37 / 8	53 / 12	48 / 14	28 / 9

Group	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
South and South Jutland - Number of country%	21 / 4	35 / 7	46 / 10	34 / 7	26 / 5
Number of Funen%	57 / 11	85 / 16	67 / 13	80 / 17	87 / 19
South Zealand and Lol-No. country-Falster%	61 / 14	26 / 5	53 / 10	71 / 13	66 / 14
Middle and West Souls-Number of countries%	28 / 6	33 / 7	50 / 10	32 / 8	26 / 7
Number of North Zealand%	30 / 6	33 / 7	31 / 6	43 / 9	56 / 13
Number of Copenhagen West Region%	30 / 8	29 / 7	43 / 9	27 / 6	48 / 10
Number of Copenhagen%	112 / 7	132 / 9	117 / 8	134 / 9	246 / 15
Bornholm%	2 / 5	3 / 6	0 / 0	9 / 29	2 / 5
Total%	446 / 8	516 / 8	571 / 9	572 / 10	717 / 12

Group	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Number of North Jutland%	33 / 10	38 / 15	72 / 24	47 / 13	35 / 11
Number of East Jutland%	54 / 11	51 / 13	30 / 6	34 / 7	46 / 11
Number of Central and West Jutland%	33 / 10	22 / 6	71 / 18	64 / 15	56 / 15
South-East Jutland%	32 / 9	56 / 19	47 / 14	85 / 16	87 / 24
South and South Jutland - Number of country%	46 / 8	45 / 9	42 / 8	54 / 10	95 / 16
Number of Funen%	64 / 15	40 / 10	48 / 12	65 / 15	92 / 24
South Zealand and Lol-No. country-Falster%	94 / 20	71 / 15	62 / 15	119 / 29	112 / 26
Middle and West Souls-Number of countries%	51 / 13	42 / 11	82 / 21	93 / 19	118 / 24
Number of North Zealand%	51 / 10	41 / 10	54 / 12	60 / 11	66 / 11
Number of Copenhagen West Region%	56 / 12	51 / 11	37 / 8	49 / 11	57 / 11
Number of Copenhagen%	135 / 9	161 / 8	130 / 7	116 / 6	131 / 6
Bornholm%	8 / 27	2 / 6	4 / 7	4 / 10	1 / 3
Total%	657 / 11	620 / 10	679 / 11	790 / 12	896 / 13

LV10 Table 9, physical page 11

Adults; comparisons 2007 and 2009 / 2010.2009 s 97 / 99 criterion breaks and 2010 s 829 delimitation are explained above. The penalty framework and duration are separate criteria.

Penalty framework	Duration	2007	2010
Strammer < prison for 6 years	custody ≤ 6 months	76 (84 %)	118 (71 %)
Strammer < prison for 6 years	pre-trial detention; > 6 months	15 (16 %)	48 (29 %)

Penalty framework	Duration	2007	2010
Strammer ≥ prison for 6 years	remand ≤ 12 months	398 (84 %)	540 (88 %)
Strammer ≥ prison for 6 years	pre-trial detention; > 12 months	76 (16 %)	72 (12 %)
Total	pre-trial detention ≤ time limit	474 (84 %)	658 (85 %)
Total	pre-trial detention; > time limit	91 (16 %)	120 (15 %)

LV10 Table 10, physical page 12

Under age 18,comparison of 2007 and 2009/2010; 2009 has 41 against 42 in the main count, 2010 has 51 against 58. Departures are not automatically invalid orders. The group's ≤6 years/> 6 years is marked as an original classification conflict.

Penalty framework	Duration	2007	2010
Stramme ≤ prison for 6 years	custody ≤ 4 months	3 (75 %)	1 (50 %)
Stramme ≤ prison for 6 years	pre-trial detention; > 4 months	1 (25 %)	1 (50 %)
Strammer > prison for 6 years	remand ≤ 8 months	40 (78 %)	43 (88 %)
Strammer > prison for 6 years	pre-trial detention; > 8 months	11 (22 %)	6 (12 %)
Total	Proprietary custody ≤ time limit	43 (78 %)	44 (86 %)
Total	pre-trial detention; > time limit	12 (22 %)	7 (14 %)

LV10 Table 11, Physical page 13

Uninterrupted trajectories; repeated forensic psychiatric/Retslægerådet/regional public prosecutor examinations excluded in relevant cells. Each event has its own valid dataset. Rounded percentages provide no additional integer denominator.

Event	Within: number	Within:%	Outside: number	Outside:%	All: number	All:%
Mental examination	177	25 %	45	37 %	222	27 %
Presentation to the Council of Prosecutors	47	7 %	29	23 %	76	9 %
Presentation to the public prosecutor	179	26 %	62	50 %	241	29 %

LV10 Table 12, Physical page 13

Cell-by-cell counts and mean days for stages; uninterrupted sequences and exclusion of repetitions. This is not the mean for the entire period of pre-trial detention. The difference between stages is an association, not independent causal evidence.

Stage	Within: ed	Within: en Me	Outside: ed	Outside: day a	Difference
Number of days from the start of pre-trial detention to the order for a mental examination	157	32	47	67	+ 35 days
Duration of the mental examination	156	83	42	85	+ 2 days
Number of days from the end of the mental examination to be submitted to the Legal Medical Council	33	21	25	40	+ 19 days
Duration of drafting of the Opinion of the Council of Prosecutors	31	45	24	50	+ 5 days
Duration of proceedings at the Public Prosecutor's Office	167	25	62	92	+ 67 days

Stage	Within: ed	Within: en Me	Outside: ed	Outside: day a	Difference
Number of days from the decision of the Public Prosecutor on the indictment issue until the indictment is drawn up	170	1	65	16	+ 15 days
Number of days from preparation of the indictment to judgment at 1st instance	699	70	124	127	+ 57 days

LV10 Table 13, Physical page 14

Number of contestants with time groups. 2009 sub-denominator / total conflict described above. 2010: 702 + 127 = 829, all 67 abortions outside this sum.

Subject-matter	Within: n	Within:%	Within: days
No others	281	40	167
One subject	148	21	164
Two to three others.	172	25	165
Four or more contingents	101	14	224
Total	702	100	174

Subject-matter	Outside: n	Outside:%	Outside: days
No others	36	28	373
One subject	31	24	359
Two to three others.	28	22	395
Four or more contingents	32	25	423
Total	127	100	387

Subject-matter	All: n	All:%	All: days
No others	317	38	190
One subject	179	22	198
Two to three others.	200	24	197
Four or more contingents	133	16	272
Total	829	100	207

LV10 Table 14, physical page 15

Registered causation, overlapping. 2009: 1.321 + 271 = 1.592; 2010: 1.451 + 343 = 1.794. Percentages relate to causes, not unique events. The 97% / 93% of the source, with the stated reasons, does not give exact integer denominator. The explanations are the assessments made by the Authority.

Reason	Within: number	Within:%	Outside: number	Outside:%	All: number	All:%
Relationship with the case	320	22	86	25	406	23
Police / prosecution authority	49	3	14	4	63	4
General Court	293	20	43	13	336	19

Reason	Within: number	Within:%	Outside: number	Outside:%	All: number	All:%
Mental examination	169	12	47	14	216	12
Other studies, etc.	235	16	67	20	302	17
The defendant / defender	230	16	44	13	274	15
Co-perpetrators	94	6	17	5	111	6
Witnesses	28	2	1	0	29	2
Other	33	2	24	7	57	3
Total number of reasons given	1451	100	343	100	1794	100

Isolation: original annual reports, children, time volumes and versions 2006-2023

What reports and populations have actually been reviewed?

All original reports for 2006-2017 have been read, including all methodological sections, tables and children's information. Original 2019 is read on all 10 pages; 2020 / 2022 / 2023 on all 5 / 6 / 5 pages and 2021's original DOCX in memory. 2018 has already been reviewed in the previous module and 2024 in the main module. Numerical cells from all 17 additional annual originals are reproduced below with the source locator. Historical overview before 2006 is shown as context; re-use of the same annual data in the next report does not provide any new developments.

The count concerns completed solitary-confinement periods, rather than automatically distinct people, offences or unlawful court orders. 2006 records 2 interrupted cases as complete case histories;2007 counts continuous periods separately, including two periods in the same Bornholm case and two in the same South Zealand case. 2019 provides an actual link to individuals:15 periods concern 13 people, one person having 3 separate periods in the same espionage case. This must not be uncritically used as a ratio for other years. Total days in the year of completion also include days spent in the preceding year. The tables concern court-ordered solitary confinement on remand; disciplinary cells, voluntary isolation, actual contact restrictions and children’s other detention stays require separate populations.

Total time and children: Counters with their own devices

Year / version	Completed Danish isolation course;	Total days of isolation;	Average days of the source	Less than 18 years
2006 original	475	13.838	29	6
2007 original	273	7.189	27	5
2008 original	327	6.910	21	4
2009 original	210	4.642	22	0
2010 original	127	3.083	24	1
2011 original	186	4.535	24	0
2012 original	132	3.182	24	0
2013 original	55	870	16	0
2014 original	36	681	19	0
2015 original	32	601	19	0
2016 original	37	950	26	2
2017 original	17	191	11	1
2018 original, already reviewed	14	195	14	0
2019 original, August 2020	15	333	22	0
2019 retrospective in 2023	14	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified separately
2020 corrected August 2023	14	Not specified	12, previously 7	0
2021 original DOCX	6	Not specified	11	0
2022 original	0	Not separate time quantity	No positive time group	0 course
2023 original	7	Not specified	10	Not specified separately

Average days are rounded and cannot be multiplied by the number to invent a precise amount of time. Indeed, the 13.838 days in 2006 and the 7.189 in 2007 are reported sums. The six children in 2006: 17 years / 14 days in manslaughter; 16 / 16 / 17 years every 6 days in arson; 16 years / 3 days in drugs and 16 years / 6 days in robbery. 2007: three arson cases 15 / 15 / 17 years every 14 days, 17 years / 14 days in robbery and 16 years / 2 days in bodily injury. 2008: 17 years / 6 days for attempted murder; 15 years / 10 days for killings; two 16-year-olds every 10 days in drug cases. 2010: one child 17 days of isolation in homicide, age not specified. 2016: two children 26 days in terrorist proceedings and 11 days in attempted murder. 2017: one child 13 days in arms case. These are 19 records of children over these years, without evidence of identity across years. No automatic child count is derived from the course of adults or from two parents per child.

The precise meaning of the rules and the incomplete control of the reports

Act 1561/2006,§1 points 3/6/7,tightened requirements for children from 1. January 2007: wholly exceptional circumstances for solitary confinement; a maximum of 4 consecutive weeks, with a narrow exception for intentional offences under chapters 12/13; extensions of no more than 2 weeks at a time. In 2010,the 17 days in a homicide case therefore do not in themselves exceed the 4-week limit. The legal issues also include separate orders, wholly exceptional circumstances, necessity and proportionality. A statistical finding that an absolute maximum deadline was met does not answer these questions or independently address ECHR 3/5/8 and the child’s rights.

2008 s 5 indicates 4 isolates over 14 days in the case of crimes whose normal criminal framework is less than 4 years. As a possible explanation, the report states particularly serious circumstances with a higher criminal framework under § 286.2009 s 5 do the same for one 18-day fraud case. 2012 s 5 informs one company theft case over 14 days among 3 normal

lower criminal proceedings. The specific orders, increased penalties and actual time limits shall not be presented. This local deficiency is proof of incompetence; it must not be transformed into proven criminal guilt or to proven legality in the possible explanation of the report.

2007, p. 5, distinguishes between 19 periods exceeding 8 weeks:15 had already been extended in 2006 and 4 fell under new rules. The exclusion of 15 from the new rules does not remove their actual time in solitary confinement or human-rights significance. 2015-2017 and 2019 reproduce the 14-day threshold using the wording maximum sentence up to 4 years, whereas the rule delimits cases that cannot carry 4 years. At precisely 4 years, this editorial shift of the boundary must not be used in an individual legal assessment.

Conclusion → Government statements: possible increased penalties and general statements on longest periods. Original proof: Section 6 / 7 of the annual reports with 4 + 1 + 1, different years and without individual orders. Deficiency: relevant factual and legal basis for the derogation cannot be checked in the publication. Rule: legal basis, necessity, proportionality, reasoned separate order and effective review by EMRK5. Action: registered continued isolation. Deviation: lack of public control, not automatically proven illegality in each case. Consequences: the citizens concerned have been isolated beyond the normal limit and the overall statistics do not document the legality of the derogation. Liability: the requesting public prosecutor, the decision-making court and appropriate supervision according to their specific duties. Requirements: original orders, precise charges / penalties, requests, time of authorisation, start / end of isolation and actual contact / health conditions of the child.

Versions conflicts and population fractures

-The 2006 crime table has 473 trajectories against 475 overall;2 foreign cases lack a crime classification. The 2 must not be lost from the main numerator. The 2007 retrospective splits the 2006 drug figure of 328 into 323 Criminal Code+5 Act on Euphoriant Substances;328+323+5 is double counting. -From 2012 the percentage denominator changes from unupdated pre-trial detentions begun to updated completed detentions. 2020-2023 also describes immediate judgments as excluded from its own denominator and included in earlier publications; this must be compared with the specific older methodological information in the report. A common percentage curve cannot conceal the described methodological/version differences. -The 2020 correction in August 2023 changes mean duration from 7→12 days. The 2020 table A states 2016/2017/2018 proportions of 0,8/0,8/0,4%, against older originals' 0,9/0,4/0,3%. The printed 2020 percentage 0,4% becomes 0,3% in the 2021/2022 retrospective;2019's 0,3 becomes 0,4 in 2021/2022. All versions are reproduced; no additional people are inferred from the differences. -The 2019 original has 15 periods and durations 2/8/2/1/1/1/0 in the 7 intervals. The 2023 retrospective has 14 and 2/7/2/2/0/0/1. The change concerns both the total and movement between time intervals, including a new cell over 3 months. This must not be reduced to a trivial rounding difference. -The 2019 crime table shows intervals summing to 29=14+15, while the annual-total columns are 14/15. Like the 2018 original's unlabelled interval basis, it cannot be read as the 2019 total of 15 periods alone. The publication gives no separate year at the interval columns; coincidence with the sum of two years is a recalculated observation, not a stated year label. -The Faroe Islands' table title says completed, while the methodology says begun in 2020-2023. Greenland has the same title/methodology conflict in 2022/2023. The Faroe Islands changed the rules on 1. January 2021 after a temporary restriction from September 2020; a temporal connection is not independent evidence of each order's lawfulness. Older Faroese 2016-2019 counts of 6/16/7/9 and mean days of 10/12/8/9 are reproduced separately from Danish counts. Greenland's missing years before 2021 are not 0.

All numerical tables from the additional original years

The original figures below are a counting basis with their own version. Each district table shows denominator/numerator/percentage and all 7 duration intervals; these are two views of the same trajectories. Crime tables' previous-year column overlaps the preceding year's original table. The original dash is retained and does not automatically mean numerical zero.

ISO 2006: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475

ISO 2006: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	1st half-year:%	2nd half-year:%	1st half-year:mean days	2nd half-year:mean days
2001-2005	51 %	49 %	32	34
2006	57 %	43 %	31	26

ISO 2006: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
Copenhagen	1.385	251	18 %
Frederiksberg	113	1	1 %
Gentofte	46	0	-
Lyngby	97	2	2 %
Gladsaxe	145	14	10 %
Hvidover	135	11	8 %
Glostrup	195	9	5 %
Tower	32	4	13 %
Helsingør	162	10	6 %
Hillerød	122	2	2 %
Frederikssund	67	14	21 %
Roskilde * *	136	10	7 %
Køge	88	6	7 %
Holbæk	86	0	-
Kalundborg	26	4	15 %
Ringsted	61	4	7 %
Slaughter	89	3	3 %
Næstved	118	3	3 %
Vordingborg	51	4	8 %
Nykøbing F.	69	10	14 %
Nakskov	132	12	9 %
Bornholm	30	5	17 %
Odense	276	12	4 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Copenhagen	28	65	71	41	14	30	2
Frederiksberg	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Gentofte	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lyngby	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Gladsaxe	1	7	2	1	0	3	0
Hvidover	0	4	1	2	2	2	0
Glostrup	2	6	1	0	0	0	0
Tower	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
Helsingør	2	6	1	1	0	0	0

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Hillerød	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Frederikssund	1	0	3	1	4	5	0
Roskilde * *	0	4	1	1	0	4	0
Køge	0	3	0	0	3	0	0
Holbæk	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalundborg	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
Ringsted	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Slaughter	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
Næstved	0	2	0	1	0	0	0
Vordingborg	0	3	0	1	0	0	0
Nykøbing F.	3	3	4	0	0	0	0
Nakskov	1	5	2	3	0	1	0
Bornholm	2	2	1	0	0	0	0
Odense	0	0	3	4	4	1	0

ISO 2006: table extract 4, PDF 4

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
Svendborg	75	2	3 %
Nyborg	27	0	-
Assens	33	4	12 %
Medium speed	28	0	-
Sønderborg	59	0	-
Groundnuts	217	3	1 %
Peas (without pods)	86	4	5 %
Haderslev	70	3	4 %
Ribe	39	0	-
Esbjerg	82	0	-
Product	49	0	-
Fredericia	77	6	8 %
Cold	62	0	-
Vejle	90	0	-
Horsens	108	8	7 %
Herning	72	0	-
Ringkøbing	18	2	11 %
Holstebro	64	0	-
Arhus * *	308	27	9 %
Oats	25	0	-
Silkeborg	36	0	-
Randers	124	0	-
Grenå	42	0	-
Viborg	60	1	2 %
Disc	30	8	27 %
Thisted	40	3	8 %
Liquorice	23	0	-
Aalborg	154	0	-
Hobro	46	3	7 %
Frederikshavn	61	10	16 %
Corner	53	0	-
Total	5.919	475	8 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Svendborg	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nyborg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assens	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
Medium speed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sønderborg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Groundnuts	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
Peas (without pods)	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Haderslev	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Ribe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Esbjerg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Product	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fredericia	0	6	0	0	0	0	0
Cold	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vejle	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Horsens	0	0	0	0	8	0	0
Herning	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ringkøbing	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Holstebro	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arhus * *	7	4	2	5	4	5	0
Oats	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Silkeborg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Randers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grenå	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Viborg	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Disc	1	1	0	0	6	0	0
Thisted	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Liquorice	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aalborg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hobro	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
Frederikshavn	0	0	8	2	0	0	0
Corner	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	56	142	110	67	45	53	2

ISO 2006: table extract 5, PDF 5

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter, including experiments	4	6	17	7	0	0	0
Violence	0	12	2	1	2	2	0
Rape etc.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	11	10	5	3	0	1	0
Other enrichment	7	14	15	6	1	1	0
Drug crime	26	97	69	46	39	49	2
Other criminal offences	5	3	2	4	3	0	0
Total	54	142	110	67	45	53	2

Crime	2006: number	2005: number	2006: middle days	2005: middle days
Manslaughter, including experiments	34	57	22	34
Violence	19	27	25	15
Rape etc.	1	1	3	21
Robbery	30	39	16	29
Other enrichment	44	47	21	20
Drug crime	328	345	33	36
Other criminal offences	17	16	23	32
Total	473**	532	29	33

ISO 2007: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273

ISO 2007: table extract 2, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	256	1	0,4 %
East Jutland	402	3	0,7 %
Central and West Jutland	356	2	0,6 %
South-East Jutland	297	2	0,7 %
South and South Jutland	485	2	0,4 %
Funen	403	6	1,5 %
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster	489	24	4,9 %
Middle and West Zealand	376	6	1,6 %
Northern Zealand	420	16	3,8 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	454	14	3,1 %
Copenhagen	1946	186	9,6 %
Bornholm	35	11	31,4 %
Total	5919	273	4,6 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Jutland	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Central and West Jutland	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Funen	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster	7	13	4	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	3	1	2	0	0	0	0
Northern Zealand	5	6	0	0	5	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	0	11	3	0	0	0	0
Copenhagen	18	52	47	28	28	13	0
Bornholm	0	5	3	0	1	2	0
Total	37	95	60	28	34	15	4

ISO 2007: table extract 3, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	2	12	8	0	1	0	0
Violence and threats	4	5	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual crimes	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	1	3	0	0	0	0	0
Other enrichment	4	1	0	2	1	0	0
Drug crime	16	64	51	26	32	15	0
Terrorism *	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Other criminal offences	1	4	1	0	0	0	0
Law on euphorising substances	9	5	0	0	0	0	0
Total	37	95	60	28	34	15	4

Crime	2007: number	2006: number	2007: middle days	2006: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	23	34	17	22
Violence and threats	9	19	9	25
Sexual crimes	1	1	14	3
Robbery	4	30	12	16
Other enrichment	8	44	20	21
Drug crime	204	323	29	33
Terrorism *	4	-	126	-
Other criminal offences	6	17	13	23
Law on euphorising substances	14	5	8	21
Total	273	473**	27	29

ISO 2008: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327

ISO 2008: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %

ISO 2008: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	305	19	6,2 %
East Jutland	500	11	2,2 %
Central and West Jutland	393	4	1,0 %
South-East Jutland	347	7	2,0 %
South and South Jutland	548	10	1,8 %
Funen	415	12	2,9 %
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	426	22	5,2 %
Middle and West Zealand	395	12	3,0 %
Northern Zealand	450	9	2,0 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	457	30	6,6 %
Copenhagen	1.834	179	9,8 %
Bornholm	54	12	22,2 %
Total	6124	327	5,3 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	1	10	6	0	2	0	0
East Jutland	1	6	1	1	2	0	0
Central and West Jutland	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	1	5	1	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	3	7	0	0	0	0	0
Funen	0	6	2	3	1	0	0
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	3	8	7	2	2	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	3	5	1	2	1	0	0
Northern Zealand	3	0	2	4	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	0	18	3	6	1	2	0
Copenhagen	36	60	45	13	20	3	2
Bornholm	1	5	5	1	0	0	0
Total	52	134	73	32	29	5	2

ISO 2008: table extract 4, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	8	16	10	7	8	0	0
Violence and threats, etc.	2	6	0	4	1	0	0
Sexual crimes	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	2	18	10	2	0	2	0
Other enrichment	5	8	3	1	0	0	0
Drug crime	30	77	48	18	18	2	0
Terrorism	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
The Arms Act	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Other criminal offences	2	1	2	0	2	0	0
Law on euphorising substances	2	3	0	0	0	0	0
Total	52	134	73	32	29	5	2

Crime	2008: number	2007: number	2008: middle days	2007: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	49	23	24	17
Violence and threats, etc.	13	9	20	9
Sexual crimes	1	1	1	14
Robbery	34	4	19	12
Other enrichment	17	8	14	20
Drug crime	193	204	20	29
Terrorism	3	4	136	126
The Arms Act	5	-	12	-
Other criminal offences	7	6	25	13
Law on euphorising substances	5	14	9	8
Total	327	273	21	27

ISO 2009: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210

ISO 2009: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %

ISO 2009: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	360	12	3,3 %
East Jutland	484	6	1,2 %
Middle and West Jutland	430	4	0,9 %
South-East Jutland	390	3	0,8 %
South and South Jutland	524	4	0,8 %
Funen	448	3	0,7 %
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	404	32	7,9 %
Middle and West Zealand	484	9	1,9 %
Northern Zealand	530	7	1,3 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	432	40	9,3 %
Copenhagen	1.983	83	4,2 %
Bornholm	40	7	17,5 %
Total	6.509	210	3,2 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	5	3	4	0	0	0	0
East Jutland	4	0	0	2	0	0	0
Middle and West Jutland	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	2	0	0	0	1	0	0
South and South Jutland	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Funen	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	3	25	2	1	1	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	0	5	4	0	0	0	0
Northern Zealand	0	7	0	0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	2	9	11	8	2	3	5
Copenhagen	14	29	20	7	11	2	0
Bornholm	3	4	0	0	0	0	0
Total	36	90	41	18	15	5	5

ISO 2009: table extract 4, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	3	13	3	4	6	1	0
Violence and threats etc.	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual crimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	5	14	11	3	3	3	5
Other enrichment	5	0	2	1	0	0	0
Drug crime	18	53	23	9	5	1	0
Terrorism	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forb on weapons	2	3	2	1	1	0	0
Other criminal offences	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Law on euphorising substances	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Total	36	90	41	18	15	5	5

Crime	2009: number	2008: number	2009: middle days	2008: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	30	49	26	24
Violence and threats etc.	2	13	8	20
Sexual crimes	0	1	-	1
Robbery	44	34	35	19
Other enrichment	8	17	14	14
Drug crime	109	193	18	20
Terrorism	0	3	-	136
Forb on weapons	9	5	20	12
Other criminal offences	4	7	11	25
Law on euphorising substances	4	5	9	9
Total	210	327	22	21

ISO 2010: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210
2010	127

ISO 2010: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %
2010	1,9 %

ISO 2010: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	307	5	1,6 %
East Jutland	431	1	0,2 %
Middle and West Jutland	383	0	0,0 %
South-East Jutland	366	1	0,3 %
South and South Jutland	602	0	0,0 %
Funen	386	2	0,5 %
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	427	12	2,8 %
Middle and West Zealand	487	23	4,7 %
Northern Zealand	588	8	1,4 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	533	8	1,5 %
Copenhagen	2.114	63	3,0 %
Bornholm	39	4	10,3 %
Total	6.663	127	1,9 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	0	2	1	2	0	0	0
East Jutland	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Middle and West Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Funen	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	0	3	3	3	3	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	6	10	5	2	0	0	0
Northern Zealand	0	4	4	0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	0	5	1	0	2	0	0
Copenhagen	3	15	20	15	9	0	1
Bornholm	1	3	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10	44	35	22	15	0	1

ISO 2010: table extract 4, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	0	4	3	0	5	0	0
Violence and threats etc.	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Other enrichment	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Drug crime	8	36	30	21	7	0	0
Forb on weapons	1	3	0	0	1	0	0
Other criminal offences	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Law on euphorising substances	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10	44	35	22	15	0	1

Crime	2010: number	2009: number	2010: middle days	2009: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	12	30	32	26
Violence and threats etc.	2	2	26	8
Robbery	2	44	47	35
Other enrichment	2	8	28	14
Drug crime	102	109	23	18
Forb on weapons	5	9	18	20
Other criminal offences	1	4	93	11
Law on euphorising substances	1	4	4	9
Total	127	210	24	22

ISO 2011: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210
2010	127
2011	186

ISO 2011: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %
2010	1,9 %
2011	2,8 %

ISO 2011: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	312	4	1,3 %
East Jutland	476	8	1,7 %
Middle and West Jutland	369	0	0,0 %
South-East Jutland	297	5	1,7 %
South and South Jutland	580	0	0,0 %
Funen	385	7	1,8 %
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster	453	23	5,1 %
Middle and West Zealand	485	12	2,5 %
Northern Zealand	605	5	0,8 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	461	12	2,6 %
Copenhagen	2.233	107	4,8 %
Bornholm	20	3	15,0 %
Total	6.676	186	2,8 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	1	3	0	0	0	0	0
East Jutland	2	6	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	2	3	0	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Funen	0	6	1	0	0	0	0
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster	5	11	3	0	4	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	3	5	1	2	1	0	0
Northern Zealand	2	2	1	0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	4	5	0	0	0	0	3
Copenhagen	7	26	30	12	30	2	0
Bornholm	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	29	67	36	14	35	2	3

ISO 2011: table extract 4, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	4	20	5	4	15	0	0
Violence and threats etc.	1	3	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual offences	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	2	5	0	0	0	0	0
Other enrichment	2	4	0	0	0	0	0
Drug crime	16	29	24	10	19	2	0
Forb on weapons	2	6	7	0	1	0	0
Terrorism	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Other criminal offences	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law on euphorising substances	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	29	67	36	14	35	2	3

Crime	2011: number	2010: number	2011: middle days	2010: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	48	12	28	32
Violence and threats etc.	4	2	11	26
Sexual offences	1	0	6	-
Robbery	7	2	10	47
Other enrichment	6	2	11	28
Drug crime	100	102	24	23
Forb on weapons	16	5	18	18
Terrorism	3	0	107	-
Other criminal offences	1	1	6	93
Law on euphorising substances	0	1	-	4
Total	186	127	24	24

ISO 2012: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210
2010	127
2011	186
2012	132

ISO 2012: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %
2010	1,9 %
2011	2,8 %
2012	2,4 %

ISO 2012: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	284	8	2,8 %
East Jutland	387	2	0,5 %
Middle and West Jutland	414	0	0,0 %
South-East Jutland	237	0	0,0 %
South and South Jutland	431	5	1,2 %
Funen	311	6	1,9 %
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster	276	8	2,9 %
Middle and West Zealand	330	4	1,2 %
Northern Zealand	457	4	0,9 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	341	0	0,0 %
Copenhagen	2.002	81	4,0 %
Bornholm	37	14	37,8 %
Total	5.507	132	2,4

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	0	5	3	0	0	0	0
East Jutland	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	0	3	1	0	0	1	0
Funen	1	3	2	0	0	0	0
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster	0	3	1	0	0	4	0
Middle and West Zealand	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
Northern Zealand	1	3	0	0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Copenhagen	6	18	28	17	12	0	0
Bornholm	6	8	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14	48	36	17	12	5	0

ISO 2012: table extract 4, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	1	2	6	0	6	0	0
Violence and threats etc.	2	3	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual offences	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Other enrichment	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
Drug crime	11	33	22	17	6	5	0
Weapons	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorism	0	2	7	0	0	0	0
Other criminal offences	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14	48	36	17	12	5	0

Crime	2012: number	2011: number	2012: middle days	2011: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	15	48	33	28
Violence and threats etc.	5	4	11	11
Sexual offences	0	1	-	6
Robbery	1	7	13	10
Other enrichment	3	6	16	11
Drug crime	94	100	25	24
Weapons	5	16	11	18
Terrorism	9	3	22	107
Other criminal offences	0	1	-	6
Total	132	186	24	24

ISO 2013: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210
2010	127
2011	186
2012	132
2013	55

ISO 2013: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %
2010	1,9 %
2011	2,8 %
2012	2,4 %
2013	1,0 %

ISO 2013: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	286	6	2,1 %
East Jutland	330	4	1,2 %
Middle and West Jutland	360	0	0,0 %
South-East Jutland	277	0	0,0 %
South and South Jutland	418	1	0,2 %
Funen	366	0	0,0 %
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster	272	2	0,7 %
Middle and West Zealand	278	2	0,7 %
Northern Zealand	438	1	0,2 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	342	0	0,0 %
Copenhagen	2.149	35	1,6 %
Bornholm	17	4	23,5 %
Total	5.533	55	1,0 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	1	5	0	0	0	0	0
East Jutland	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Funen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Northern Zealand	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Copenhagen	1	18	9	7	0	0	0
Bornholm	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
Total	3	33	12	7	0	0	0

ISO 2013: table extract 4, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Violence and threats etc.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other enrichment	0	4	3	0	0	0	0
Drug crime	3	28	9	7	0	0	0
Weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorism	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	33	12	7	0	0	0

Crime	2013: number	2012: number	2013: middle days	2012: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	1	15	14	33
Violence and threats etc.	0	5	-	11
Robbery	0	1	-	13
Other enrichment	7	3	12	16
Drug crime	47	94	16	25
Weapons	0	5	-	11
Terrorism	0	9	-	22
Total	55	132	16	24

ISO 2014: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210
2010	127
2011	186
2012	132
2013	55
2014	36

ISO 2014: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %
2010	1,9 %
2011	2,8 %
2012	2,4 %
2013	1,0 %
2014	0,7 %

ISO 2014: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	214	4	1,9 %
East Jutland	307	0	0,0 %
Middle and West Jutland	364	0	0,0 %
South-East Jutland	260	1	0,4 %
South and South Jutland	346	1	0,3 %
Funen	241	1	0,4 %
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	269	4	1,5 %
Middle and West Zealand	335	1	0,3 %
Northern Zealand	438	4	0,9 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	261	1	0,4 %
Copenhagen	1.948	19	1,0 %
Bornholm	23	0	0,0 %
Total	5.006	36	0,7 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
East Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Funen	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Northern Zealand	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Copenhagen	0	13	3	0	3	0	0
Bornholm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	24	6	1	4	0	0

ISO 2014: table extract 4, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Violence and threats etc.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	3	1	0	0	0	0
Other enrichment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug crime	1	21	5	1	3	0	0
Weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorism	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	24	6	1	4	0	0

Crime	2014: number	2013: number	2014: middle days	2013: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	1	1	54	14
Violence and threats etc.	0	0	-	-
Robbery	4	0	16	-
Other enrichment	0	7	-	12
Drug crime	31	47	18	16
Weapons	0	0	-	-
Terrorism	0	0	-	-
Total	36	55	19	16

ISO 2015: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210
2010	127
2011	186
2012	132
2013	55
2014	36
2015	32

ISO 2015: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %
2010	1,9 %
2011	2,8 %
2012	2,4 %
2013	1,0 %
2014	0,7 %
2015	0,7 %

ISO 2015: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	203	2	1,0 %
East Jutland	295	0	0,0 %
Middle and West Jutland	291	5	1,7 %
South-East Jutland	255	0	0,0 %
South and South Jutland	297	0	0,0 %
Funen	194	1	0,5 %
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	268	1	0,4 %
Middle and West Zealand	211	5	2,4 %
Northern Zealand	284	0	0,0 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	277	2	0,7 %
Copenhagen	1.813	14	0,8 %
Bornholm	16	2	12,5 %
Total	4.404	32	0,7 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
East Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Jutland	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
South-East Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Funen	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Zealand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Copenhagen	3	8	2	1	0	0	0
Bornholm	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	16	3	1	6	0	0

ISO 2015: table extract 4, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	0	7	2	0	1	0	0
Violence and threats etc.	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
Sexual crimes	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other enrichment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug crime	6	6	0	0	5	0	0
Weapons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorism	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	16	3	1	6	0	0

Crime	2015: number	2014: number	2015: middle days	2014: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	10	1	19	54
Violence and threats etc.	4	0	22	-
Sexual crimes	1	0	14	-
Robbery	0	4	-	16
Other enrichment	0	0	-	-
Drug crime	17	31	18	18
Weapons	0	0	-	-
Terrorism	0	0	-	-
Total	32	36	19	19

ISO 2016: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210
2010	127
2011	186
2012	132
2013	55
2014	36
2015	32
2016	37

ISO 2016: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %
2010	1,9 %
2011	2,8 %
2012	2,4 %
2013	1,0 %
2014	0,7 %
2015	0,7 %
2016	0,9 %

ISO 2016: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	216	1	0,5 %
East Jutland	263	0	0,0 %
Middle and West Jutland	269	1	0,4 %
South-East Jutland	224	1	0,4 %
South and South Jutland	309	0	0,0 %
Funen	204	1	0,5 %
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	224	2	0,9 %
Middle and West Zealand	217	2	0,9 %
Northern Zealand	342	0	0,0 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	234	1	0,4 %
Copenhagen	1752	28	1,6 %
Bornholm	17	0	0,0 %
Total	4.271	37	0,9 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
East Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Jutland	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Funen	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Northern Zealand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Copenhagen	1	11	3	0	13	0	0
Bornholm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	15	5	1	13	0	0

ISO 2016: table extract 4, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	1	2	0	0	6	0	0
Violence and threats etc.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Sexual crimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other enrichment	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Drug crime	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Weapons	1	10	0	0	2	0	0
Terrorism	0	1	3	1	5	0	0
Total	3	15	5	1	13	0	0

Crime	2016: number	2015: number	2016: middle days	2015: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	9	10	33	19
Violence and threats etc.	1	4	26	22
Sexual crimes	0	1	-	14
Robbery	0	0	-	-
Other enrichment	1	0	20	-
Drug crime	3	17	11	18

Crime	2016: number	2015: number	2016: middle days	2015: middle days
Weapons	13	0	14	-
Terrorism	10	0	40	-
Total	37	32	26	19

ISO 2017: table extract 1, PDF 1

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210
2010	127
2011	186
2012	132
2013	55
2014	36
2015	32
2016	37
2017	17

ISO 2017: table extract 2, PDF 2

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %
2010	1,9 %
2011	2,8 %
2012	2,4 %
2013	1,0 %
2014	0,7 %
2015	0,7 %
2016	0,9 %
2017	0,4 %

ISO 2017: table extract 3, PDF 3

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	230	0	0,0 %
East Jutland	378	0	0,0 %
Middle and West Jutland	340	0	0,0 %
South-East Jutland	289	0	0,0 %
South and South Jutland	312	0	0,0 %
Funen	252	0	0,0 %
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	243	3	1,2 %
Middle and West Zealand	247	0	0,0 %
Northern Zealand	362	0	0,0 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	266	0	0,0 %
Copenhagen	1919	14	0,7 %
Bornholm	14	0	0,0 %
Total	4.852	17	0,4 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Funen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Zealand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Copenhagen	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
Bornholm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	15	0	0	0	0	0

ISO 2017: table extract 4, PDF 4

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	1	6	0	0	0	0	0
Violence and threats etc.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual crimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other enrichment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drug crime	1	5	0	0	0	0	0
Weapons	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Terrorism	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	15	0	0	0	0	0

Crime	2017: number	2016: number	2017: middle days	2016: middle days
Manslaughter and attempted murder	7	9	11	33
Violence and threats etc.	1	1	14	26
Sexual crimes	0	0	-	-
Robbery	0	0	-	-
Other enrichment	0	1	-	20
Drug crime	6	3	10	11

Crime	2017: number	2016: number	2017: middle days	2016: middle days
Weapons	3	13	13	14
Terrorism	0	10	-	40
Total	17	37	11	26

ISO 2019: table extract 1, PDF 3

Year	Original number /%
2001	553
2002	501
2003	476
2004	580
2005	532
2006	475
2007	273
2008	327
2009	210
2010	127
2011	186
2012	132
2013	55
2014	36
2015	32
2016	37
2017	17
2018	14
2019	15

ISO 2019: table extract 2, PDF 5

Year	Original number /%
2001	9,5 %
2002	8,2 %
2003	7,7 %
2004	9,8 %
2005	9,2 %
2006	8,0 %
2007	4,6 %
2008	5,3 %
2009	3,2 %
2010	1,9 %
2011	2,8 %
2012	2,4 %
2013	1,0 %
2014	0,7 %
2015	0,7 %
2016	0,9 %
2017	0,4 %
2018	0,3 %
2019	0,3 %

ISO 2019: table extract 3, PDF 7

Circles	Custom denominator	Isolation course	Original share
North Jutland	243	0	0,0 %
East Jutland	378	0	0,0 %
Middle and West Jutland	367	0	0,0 %
South-East Jutland	257	0	0,0 %
South and South Jutland	302	0	0,0 %
Funen	264	2	0,8 %
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	300	0	0,0 %
Middle and West Zealand	213	1	0,5 %
Northern Zealand	280	0	0,0 %
The West Region of Copenhagen	270	0	0,0 %
Copenhagen	1.809	10	0,6 %
Bornholm	20	2	10,0 %
Total	4.703	15	0,3 %

Circles	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
North Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South-East Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South and South Jutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Funen	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle and West Zealand	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Northern Zealand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The West Region of Copenhagen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Copenhagen	1	5	1	1	1	1	0
Bornholm	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2	8	2	1	1	1	0

ISO 2019: table extract 4, PDF 9

Crime	1 -7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	29- 42 d	43-56 d	57 d-3 md	>3 md
Manslaughter and attempted murder	0	1	4	0	0	0	0
Violence and threats etc.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual crimes	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Drug crime	3	11	0	0	0	0	0
Weapons and explosives	1	3	1	0	0	0	0
Other crimes	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
Total	5	15	6	1	1	1	0

Crime	2018: number	2019: number
Manslaughter and attempted murder	4	1
Violence and threats etc.	1	0
Sexual crimes	1	0
Drug crime	4	10
Weapons and explosives	4	1
Other crimes	0	3
Total	14	15

ISO 2020: table extract 1, PDF 2

Target / time group	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
1 - 7 days	3	2	3	2	1
8 to 14 days	15	15	7	8	12
15 to 28 days	5	0	4	2	1
29 to 42 days	1	0	0	1	0
57-days - 3 months	0	0	0	1	0
Total	37	17	14	15	14

ISO 2020: table extract 2, PDF 5

Target / time group	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number	6	16	7	9	3
Average duration (days)	10	12	8	9	7

ISO 2021: table extract 3, DOCX Table 3

Target / time group	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
1 - 7 days	2	3	2	1	0
8 to 14 days	15	7	8	12	6
15 to 28 days	0	4	2	1	0
29 to 42 days	0	0	1	0	0
43 to 56 days	0	0	1	0	0
57-days - 3 months	0	0	1	0	0
More than 3 months	0	0	0	0	0
Total	17	14	15	14	6
Share	0,4%	0,3%	0,4%	0,3%	0,2%

ISO 2021: table extract 4, DOCX Table 4

Target / time group	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Number	16	7	9	3	1
Average duration (days)	12	8	9	7	7

ISO 2022: table extract 1, PDF 2

Target / time group	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
1 - 7 days	3	2	1	0	0
8 to 14 days	7	8	12	6	0
15 to 28 days	4	2	1	0	0
29 to 42 days	0	1	0	0	0
57-days - 3 months	0	1	0	0	0
Total	14	15	14	6	0

ISO 2022: table extract 2, PDF 4

Target / time group	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Number	7	9	3	1	0
Average duration (days)	8	9	7	7	0

ISO 2022: table extract 3, PDF 6

Target / time group	2021	2022
Number	0	0
Average duration (days)	0	0

ISO 2023: table extract 1, PDF 2

Target / time group	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
1 - 7 days	2	1	0	0	0
8 to 14 days	7	12	6	0	7
15 to 28 days	2	1	0	0	0
29 to 42 days	2	0	0	0	0
43 to 56 days	0	0	0	0	0
57-days - 3 months	0	0	0	0	0
More than 3 months	1	0	0	0	0
Total	14	14	6	0	7
Share	0,3%	0,3%	0,2%	0%	0,2%

ISO 2023: table extract 2, PDF 4

Target / time group	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Number	9	3	1	0	0
Average duration (days)	9	7	7	0	0

ISO 2023: table extract 3, PDF 5

Target / time group	2021	2022	2023
Number	0	0	0
Average duration (days)	0	0	0

Long-term care 2011- 2023: originals, annual versions, children and actual end time

Controlled October 7, 2026. The module complements Chapter 27. It is based on the tables and methodological sections of the annual originals found, not on news summaries. All numbers below keep the original version. 2024-2025 are dealt with in the separate modules and are not included again here.

The deprivation of liberty is real; the number of the register is not automatically a count of illegality

The figures document registered trajectories of deprivation of liberty, including those ending in acquittal or abandonment of prosecution. A long duration is a specific consequence for the citizen and a line of review concerning necessity, progress, proportionality and redress. The statistical category does not, on its own, establish unlawfulness, an employee's culpability or a particular compensation claim. Conversely, a conviction does not document that all preceding deprivation of liberty was lawful or necessary. Legal scrutiny must follow every specific intervention and point in time.

The key data problem is documented in the originals: missing and incorrect registration, wrong years, changed division of interrupted runs and different end points. These facts must be kept separate from the actual breaches of rights which the report documents in the course of the decision.

Main figures with all checked annual versions

Unit: progress, non-deductive citizens. Long-term means the category of reports over three months; the interval tables simultaneously write ≥ 3 months. An accurate count of border cases requires underlying days and code delimitation. The average concerns only the long-term courses. Less than 18 years of age is the first day of imprisonment; a course can continue after the person has grown up. A line means that the shown main table does not publish an overall children's average.

The repeated years below are alternative statements of the same year and **shall not be added together;**. Each source ID identifies the original URL and the exact control location in the source list at the end.

Version	Year	All	Long-term a	%	Months	U18 all	U18 length	U18%	U18 months
LV11	2010	5641	1764	31,3	6,8	464	145	31,3	-
LV11	2011	5558	1618	29,1	5,8	434	120	27,6	-
LV11	2012	5503	1427	25,9	6	345	90	26,1	-
LV13	2012	5539	1457	26,3	6,1	358	90	25,1	-
LV13	2013	5569	1489	26,7	6,1	343	84	24,5	-
LV14	2013	5574	1489	26,7	6,1	344	84	24,4	-
LV14	2014	5006	1385	27,7	5,9	282	82	29,1	-
LV15	2014	4991	1391	27,9	5,9	280	81	29,5	-
LV15	2015	4404	1283	29,1	6,5	189	64	33,4	-
LV16	2015	4398	1280	29,1	6,5	189	64	33,9	-
LV16	2016	4271	1259	29,5	6,4	169	64	37,9	-
LV17	2014	4984	1364	27,4	6	219	65	29,7	-
LV17	2015	4408	1289	29,2	6,5	156	41	26,3	-
LV17	2016	4261	1256	29,5	6,5	162	54	33,3	-
LV17	2017	4390	1196	27,2	5,9	199	71	35,7	-
LV20	2016	4247	1163	27,4	6,1	167	51	30,5	5,1
LV20	2017	4372	1124	25,7	5,8	206	71	34,5	4,9
LV20	2018	4549	1329	29,2	5,9	174	42	24,1	5
LV20	2019	4296	1357	31,6	6,3	107	33	30,8	6,1
LV20	2020	3877	1373	35,4	6	139	37	26,6	5,2
LV21	2017	4501	1483	32,9	7,2	246	100	40,7	6,3
LV21	2018	4603	1585	34,4	7,1	199	65	32,7	5,9
LV21	2019	4385	1674	38,2	8	124	54	43,5	7,6
LV21	2020	4035	1749	43,3	7,8	173	68	39,3	6,4
LV21	2021	3618	1837	50,8	8,2	165	89	53,9	6,1
LV22	2018	4603	1585	34,4	7,1	199	65	32,7	5,9
LV22	2019	4385	1674	38,2	8	124	54	43,5	7,6
LV22	2020	4035	1749	43,3	7,8	173	68	39,3	6,4

Version	Year	All	Long-term a	%	Months	U18 all	U18 length	U18%	U18 months
LV22	2021	3618	1837	50,8	8,2	165	89	53,9	6,1
LV22	2022	3598	1765	49,1	8,5	125	57	45,6	7,7
LV23	2019	4385	1674	38,2	8	124	54	43,5	7,6
LV23	2020	4037	1749	43,3	7,8	173	68	39,3	6,4
LV23	2021	3630	1847	50,9	8,1	165	89	53,9	6,1
LV23	2022	3634	1789	49,2	8,6	127	59	46,5	7,7
LV23	2023	3291	1823	55,4	8,7	125	67	53,6	6,7

Locators: LV11 text pages 5-6 and Annex Table 1-2; LV13 text pages 4 and Annex Table 1-2; LV14 text pages 4 and LV14B Table 1-2; LV15 text pages 4 and Annex Table 1-2; LV16 text pages 4-5 and Annex Table 1-2; LV17 text pages 4-5 and Annex Table 1-2; LV20 / LV21 / LV22 table A-B p. 3; LV23 Table A pages 3 and B p. 4. LV15 s printed child percentages are preserved, but their calculation errors are explained below.

The method break in 2011-12 and the hidden 2010fix

LV11, p. 2-5, explains the transition from manual alerts to POLSAS / QlikView. The manual system mainly covered more than three months before the first instance judgment and the year followed the judgment. The new inventory also included, for example, indictment and moved a process of prior release to the year of release. The schemes cannot therefore be assimilated.

The same original, p. 3,footnote 1,corrects the earlier **896 manually reported courses in 2010 to 1.005**:109 reports submitted with the 2011 material actually concerned 2010. The manual count for 2011 was 959,whereas QlikView gave 1.618; QlikView also gave 1.764 for 2010. The documented under-registration and incorrect period allocation mean that a conclusion about “all instances” cannot rest on the original manual series. The difference 1.764−1.005 = 759 does not on its own establish 759 proved omitted persons:the schemes’ scope and period allocation differ. The 109 incorrectly assigned years, however, are specifically documented.

The data for LV11's tables were compiled 20 March 2013; LV13 1 January 2015; LV14B 13 May 2015; LV15 15 March 2016; LV16 1 March 2017. In the historical annexes, one month corresponds to 30,5 days. Records corrections and subsequent decisions may change the denominators and outcomes of the return.

New model in 2017 and actual release from 2021

LV15's p. 3 announced a new data model for the 2016statement. LV16's p. 2-3 proved that it was not finished; the challenges continued. LV17's p. 2-3 described technical optimisation and recalculation of 2014- 2016. Therefore, for example, the children's name for 2015 changes from 189 in LV15 / LV16 to 156 in LV17; these are alternative versions, not a decrease of 33 children in the same population.

LV21, pp. 2 and 6, document an additional method break: from a period ending at the time of the first instance, indictment or arrest, to **actual release from custody;**. At the same time, the interrupted course was divided into two rather than one coherent course. The statistics only cover the course completed in the year; still imprisoned have been omitted. For example, 2017 becomes 4.372 / 1.124 in LV20 and 4.501 / 1.483 in LV21. Longer recorded duration after the breach of the method cannot be easily described as a corresponding change in actual detention.

LV21's Danish data is extracted 23 September 2022, LV22's 18 January 2023 and LV23's 18 January 2024. LV22 and LV23 have later corrected notes. Therefore, the version label is not a guarantee that the entire dataset is recalculated on the revision date.

Length of forelegs: all national ranges checked

The figures show time spent within the original’s delimitation. Short and long intervals together constitute the displayed annual version’s total denominator. A register course ≥24 months may still be shorter than total deprivation of liberty if the historical statistics end at the first-instance decision.

Version	Year	0-<3 months	3-<6	6-<12	12-<24	24+	Total
LV11	2010	3877	1054	497	203	10	5641
LV11	2011	3940	1111	404	102	1	5558
LV11	2012	4076	941	381	104	1	5503
LV13	2012	4082	957	392	107	1	5539
LV13	2013	4080	924	467	98	0	5569
LV14B	2013	4085	925	467	97	0	5574
LV14B	2014	3621	875	451	58	1	5006
LV15	2014	3600	878	454	58	1	4991
LV15	2015	3121	736	445	102	0	4404
LV16	2015	3118	733	442	105	0	4398
LV16	2016	3012	749	404	104	2	4271
LV17	2014	3620	870	432	61	1	4984
LV17	2015	3119	739	444	106	0	4408
LV17	2016	3005	750	400	104	2	4261
LV17	2017	3194	791	337	67	1	4390

Locators: LV11 appendix table 4, pp. 7-8/PDF pp. 17-18; LV13 appendix table 4, pp. 6-7/PDF pp. 14-15; LV14B table 4; LV15 appendix table 4, pp. 7-8/PDF pp. 15-16; LV16 appendix table 4, pp. 5-6/PDF pp. 14-15; LV17 appendix table 4, pp. 10-11/PDF pp. 18-19. See JSON for each source-bound row.

Dismiss the application, declare the action and declare the action inadmissible;

The breakdown tables refer to: **long-term**, not all of them in custody. They shall be updated with the latest decision, including appeals. A subsequent judgment or acquittal may therefore amend a series of years already published.

Version	Year	Trailers	Not felling,	Other separately	Tied / not registered	Removed	Alleged abandoned
LV11	2010	1642	22	3	97	13	9
LV11	2011	1550	32	1	35	24	8
LV11	2012	1327	25	2	73	24	1
LV13	2012	1394	19	0	44	17	2
LV13	2013	1428	20	0	41	15	5
LV14B	2013	1430	21	0	38	16	5
LV14B	2014	1272	19	0	94	16	3
LV15	2014	1307	23	0	61	18	4
LV15	2015	1160	13	0	110	13	0
LV16	2015	1183	13	0	84	13	0
LV16	2016	1150	11	0	98	11	0

Version	Year	Trailers	Not felling,	Other separately	Tied / not registered	Removed	Alleged abandoned
LV17	2017	1035	107	0	54	73	33

Locators: Annex to the individual versions Table 6; physical PDF pages LV11 20-21, LV13 16-17, LV15 18, LV16 16 and LV17 22; LV14B Table 6. **within the** "non-felling 'and shall not be added again. In addition, LV15's 2014 has one registration of a ground-less charge, so 18 disclaimers + 4 charges + 1 ground-less charge = 23.

Conviction percentages have different denominators. LV14's 98,5 % for 2014 corresponds to 1.272/(1.272+19); 94 unresolved cases are excluded. LV17's 86,5 % for 2017 corresponds to 1.035/1.196 and includes 54 unresolved cases in the denominator. LV22/LV23 expressly state approximately 92 % of *decided* lengthy cases and do not publish exact outcome numerators. Juxtaposing 98,5→86,5→92 % without explaining denominators would mislead. Nor is it sustainable to calculate an exact "8 % without conviction" count by multiplying 0,08 by all lengthy cases.

Children and lack of age: the impact accounts cannot be resolved by percentage

LV11 annex table 2, pp. 3-4/PDF pp. 13-14, documents under age 15: 2010 **8 cases/0 long-term**, 2011 **31/7** and 2012 **1/0**. The seven long-term 2011 cases averaged 4,4 months. The footnote states that the age of criminal responsibility was 14 from 1. July 2010 to 1. March 2012. The figures are not in themselves seven established unlawful imprisonments, nor necessarily seven different children. Their actual deprivation of liberty and significance for schooling, health and family must still be shown.

The same originals document unknown age: LV11 2012 **331 course / 0 long term**, LV13 2012 after update **7/0**, LV15 2015 **1.163/122** and LV16 2016 **1.197/142**. LV17's optimized 2015 is **89/28**, 2016 **89/28** and 2017 **94/38**. All these figures are source and version dependent. The unknown ages cannot be distributed to children or adults without personal / age data; that uncertainty is concrete and must not be concealed by making a registered series of children a complete personal account.

LV16's Table 2 has also combined the 2015denominator **4.404**, while using the main table of the same version, orbital and fallout **4.398**. The original age ranges summer to 4.404. It is a proven contradiction in the printed original, visually controlled on PDF p. 12. An overall children's average is not self-calculated on the basis of rounded age averages.

Time limits: the wrong end time and changed supervision

LV15, pp. 6-7, documents that QlikView's earlier count used **the first-instance decision**, while the relevant section 768 a deadline ended at **commencement of the trial hearing**. A deadline could therefore appear exceeded in the register although it was not. LV15 and LV16 consequently excluded these Qlik tables and used regional public prosecutors' reports.

Version and delineation;	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
LV11, Qlik, adults / children	397/68	221/57	242/36	-	-	-	-	-
LV13, Qlik, adults / children	-	-	168/13	151/15	-	-	-	-
LV14B, Qlik, adults / children	-	-	-	151/14	128/10	-	-	-
LV15-17, State Advice Report	-	-	-	-	21	42	25	35

Locators: LV11 Annex Tables 7-8 / PDF pp. 22; LV13 Table 7-8 / PDF pp. 17; LV14B Table 7-8; LV15 pp. 6; LV16 pp. 7; LV17 pp. 6. **previously misappropriated records;**Not as evidence of a breach of law. The 21 / 42 / 25 / 35 procedure is not automatically unlawful either: the normal time-limits were different in the

relevant conditions. Each actual intervention requires checking the extension request, judicial order, specific reasoning and progress.

Another change affects the authority's responsibility. LV22, p. 2, describes that before 2023, the police officers submitted requests for extension beyond the deadlines of the public prosecutor's office. From **1 January 2023** shall be reported when the court fails to comply with the request or the request is not made in due time. LV23, p. 2, confirms this delimitation. Therefore, a decrease in the number of alerts over this shift would not in itself prove less long runs or less infringement of rights. The exact number of applications rejected or late submitted is not shown in these annual statistics.

Faeroe Islands and Greenland: separate populations and actual withdrawn information

Version	Zone	Year	All	Ling	%	Months	U18 all / long
LV21	Faeroe Islands	2021	27	10	37	10,9	1/0
LV22	Faeroe Islands	2021	27	10	37	11	1/0
LV22	Faeroe Islands	2022	27	7	25,9	8,9	1/0
LV23	Faeroe Islands	2023	29	8	27,6	8,9	0/0
LV22	Greenland	2022	81	42	51,8	8,9	0/0
LV23	Greenland	2023	97	59	60,8	8	4/4

The 2021 inventory of the Faroe Islands was corrected from **28 / 12, approximately 43% and approximately 8 months** to **27 / 10, 37% and 10,9 months**. LV21 p. 7 explains that some of the courses included ended in 2022, while the courses started in 2019-2020 and ended in 2021 were omitted. The file designation refers to October 2023, but the note indicates September 2023. The LV22 / LV23 overview later rounds the 2021 average to 11,0. This is a definite error in both inclusion and year.

Greenland's 2022 figures were corrected from **68/43 and approximately 8 months** to **81/42, 51,8 % and 8,9 months**. LV22, p. 10, explains the correction in December 2024. Original information that all concluded lengthy detentions resulted in conviction and approximately 93 % in institutional placement was **removed**, because outcomes could not be verified without manually examining every case. The removed percentages must appear as withdrawn information, rather than current findings.

The Faroe Islands use manual reports because NIFLHEIMR cannot extract the statistics in question; Greenland uses manual reports linked to Avannarleq. Danish POLSS series, Faroese custody and Greenlandic detentions must therefore be shown separately. Greenland's 2023 series has four children's courses, all long term, average 6,7 months; this is not a count of four deductive children. At the same time, LV23 p. 11 describes ten case-law cases in the second half of the year following the amendment of the law of 1 July 2023; they cannot be added to the 97 detentions without clarification of the overlap.

NSK: Correction of explanation is not the same as correction of numbers

The NSK was established on 1 January 2022. The previous SEV course was under Østjylland and SEØ / GCØ under Copenhagen; cross-section comparisons require the demarcation. LV22 / LV23 p. 2 describes the merger. The April 2026 notes on page 4 indicate that the NSK course may be wrongly included under the Copenhagen Police Department. It is **not** evidence that the figures shown are thus corrected.

LV22 Table C, p. 4, has for NSK 2022 **31 completed courses, 25 lengthy, 81% and 8,7 months**. LV23 figures 1-2, p. 5-6, have in the updated 2022-overview **92% and 18,1 months**; the exact 2022 counters are not shown there. LV23's 2023 table has **26 / 13, 50% and 16,4 months**. Both figure values 92% and 18,1 are visually controlled. The different 2022 versions shall not be standardised and a precise 2022 number cannot be derived from the rounded 92% label.

Documented printed contradiction - no silent correction

1. **LV15 p. 4, child percentages:** The original writes 2014 81 / 280 = 29,5% and 2015 64 / 189 = 33,4%. Own divisions give 28,9% and 33,9%, respectively, rounded to one decimal place. The original number and the mathematical control are kept separate; the page is image-controlled.

2. **LV16 Annex Table 2, PDF p. 12:** The 2015- total is 4.404, while the main table of the same version and Table 1 show 4.398. The age rows summed up to 4.404. This is not an automated exit error; the printed page is checked.

3. **LV16 Annex Table 3-4, PDF pp. 14-15:** "Other special laws" 2016 has accumulated 148 in Table 3, but 160 in Table 4. Table 3's case names summer to 4.259, although the total is 4.271; Table 4 summer to 4.271. The same table 3 writes 163 / 218 killings = 78,8%, while the division returns 74,8%. Both sides are image controlled.

4. **LV14B Table 5:** The total 2014 denominators sum up to 5.005, while the main denominator is 5.006. One non-location shall not be implicitly allocated to a group.

5. **LV15 Table 5:** LV16 p. 6 explicitly acknowledges that the previous table was described as the number of offences but actually contained the number of arrears in the complex. LV17 Table 5 describes persons in the same main relationship. These indicators are different.

These specific errors weaken the specific statements made by the statements in question. They are neither a general defence of the authorities nor proof that all other figures or all prison orders are wrong.

Knowledge of the authorities, repeated follow-up and necessary concrete requirements

The authorities' own originals document knowledge of missing and incorrect POLSAS entries and imprecise codes from LV11 p. 5 onwards. LV13 pp. 6-7 describes how the autumn 2014 consultation did not show consistent or full use of detention case management, and some police districts had started late. LV15 p. 8 requires more detailed knowledge and case review. LV16 p. 8 documents that the subsequent investigation still showed difficulties with consistent use of all elements; officers responsible for detention cases were to be designated by 1. April 2017. A described effort is not equivalent to documented effect or specific redress.

The strongest documented criticism is therefore a coherent chain: authorities' knowledge of registration and progress problems → repeated oversight and management initiatives → continuing documented methodological errors and local deficiencies → risk of inadequate detection and review of prolonged deprivation of liberty → demand for case-specific checks, correct statistics, timely review and actual redress. A criminal allegation against a particular person still requires documentation of their act, culpability and the conditions of the specific criminal provision; it must neither be invented nor dismissed through a general claim of official immunity.

For the individual citizen, the responsibility timeline must cover arrest, each extension, the start of the main hearing, the first-instance judgment, any appeal, actual release, compensation claim, refusal, judgment, payment and actual restoration of work, school and family contact. Statistics alone do not document the final links. ERVA01-ERVA03 and the known partial payments in the Suldrup sequence show why these must appear separately.

Coverage status and precise residues

The annual originals for 2011-2017 have now actually been found, and their main figures, interval tables, outcomes and central changes in methodology/time limits checked. The tables and methodology/results sections of the 2020-2023 originals have been checked; exact district figures in unlabelled 2020/2021 charts cannot be read as precise data. 2018 and 2019 are numerically covered by retrospectives in several later originals. The separate 2019 statement's four pages have now been read in the Folketing's original HTML; its 16 omitted submissions have been checked against the primary source. The 2019 appendix's 16 pages are available as 32 separately labelled transcription segments with 371 data rows, but the PDF image cells have not yet been substantively checked. The 2018 original's eight statement pages and 15 appendix pages have now been fully read visually against public archive copies:30 annual tables/363 numeric rows, all methodology notes and internal discrepancies of 44/42 child-related case histories, and 1-2 observation differences between main/interval/outcome figures. See langvarig-varetaegt-2018-fuld-original-og-versionsafstemning.md and langvarig-varetaegt-2018-originale-tabeller.md. See langvarig-varetaegt-2019-originaltekst-og-bilagsgengivelse.md/.json; these differences in the actual scope of checking are retained.

Remains: material image control of the 2019 annex (secondary 371 rows reproduced, known original URL not provided); underlying graphics data; all exact material counters for recent years; number and progress of late-onset / rejected extensions; actual compensation and payment; personal dedup and relationships with children / parents. Data coverage status shall describe these concrete residues without making previous private work phases relevant to this new public project.

Sources and control locators

• **LV11**: The use of long-term detention in 2011 and 2012; date / version 2013-06-19, RA-2013-1211-0014, 22 PDFs pages. Control: The text of the statement and the statistical tables of the annex; some non-numerical annex notes not fully read. Locators of numbers are indicated by the appropriate tables and in the compact JSON.

• **LV13**: The use of long-term detention in 2013; date / version 2015-01-26, RA-2014-1211-0016, 18 PDFs pages. Checking: All eight text pages as well as all numerical annexes; some non-numerical annex notes not fully read. Locators of numbers are indicated by the appropriate tables and in the compact JSON.

• **LV14**: Use of long-term pre-trial detention in 2014; date/version 2015-07-09,RA-2015-1211-0017, 7 PDF pages. Checked: All seven text pages. Numeric locators appear at the relevant tables and in the compact JSON.

• **LV14B**: Annex to the 2014 statement; date / version 2015-06, RA-2014-1211-0017, 12 PDFs pages. Control: All numerical table rows and key method / delimiting notes. Locators of numbers are indicated by the appropriate tables and in the compact JSON.

• **LV15**: Use of long-term pre-trial detention in 2015; date/version 2016-10-20,RA-2016-1211-0018, 18 PDF pages. Checked: All eight text pages and all ten annex pages; every numeric annex cell and all scope notes checked visually. Image check also of text p. 4. Numeric locators appear at the relevant tables and in the compact JSON.

• **LV16**: Use of long-term pre-trial imprisonment in 2016; date / version 2017-08-07, RA-2017-2100105-2, 16 PDFs pages. Checking: All nine text pages, numerical attachment rows and key notes; image control of PDF pages 12, 14-15. Locators of numbers are indicated by the appropriate tables and in the compact JSON.

• **LV17**: The use of long-term detention in 2017; date / version 2018-05-31, RA-2018-2100105-2, 22 PDFs pages. Checking: All eight text pages and all 14 annex pages. Locators of numbers are indicated by the appropriate tables and in the compact JSON.

• **LV20**: Statistics on long-term detention in custody 2020; date / version 2023-01-03 registry date; original inventory date 2021- 05-22,, 6 PDFs pages. Checking: All text and table pages; figures without precise number labels cannot be translated into exact numbers. Locators of numbers are indicated by the appropriate tables and in the compact JSON.
• **LV21**: Statistics 2021, corrected October 2023 (corrigendum indicates September 2023); date / version 2023-10 revision, 8 PDFs pages. Control: All eight pages. The figures p. 4-5 do not have precise data labels. Locators of numbers are indicated by the appropriate tables and in the compact JSON.

• **LV22**: Statistics 2022, corrected December 2024 and April 2026; date / version 2026-04 revision,, 12 PDFs pages. Control: All tables, numerical figures and method / result sections; no uncritical conversion of rounded percentages into case numbers. Locators of numbers are indicated by the appropriate tables and in the compact JSON.

• **LV23**: Statistics 2023, corrected April 2026; date / version 2026 -04 revision, 13 PDFs pages. Control: All tables, numerical figure labels and method / result sections; visual check of the figures p. 5-6.

Compact, source-bound numbers and versions: long-range -product-range -2011-2023-versions -and -original control.json. The additional historical annexes have now been translated into 109 source and side-bound segments in long-range item-original-Annex-tables. There are 1.079 data rows: 939 from the first extract (six annual rows are column headings, and one separate blank row with 54 is added) and 140 cell-controlled rows from the ten annex pages of the 2015- original. These tables continue to be alternative annual versions and can

are not converted into an additional personal account. Only own fact and analysis cards are saved; public raw PDFs files and full texts are not stored.

Long-term storage: original numerical annexes as reading tables

These loss segments complement the analytical module on 2011- 2023. All rows retain the original publication version, original table number and physical PDF page. Repeated annual versions shall not be added together. The figures are the course and outcome of the original; they are not automatic persons, illegalities or convicted employees.

Scope: 109 loss segments with 1.079 data rows. The first 944 drawn numerical rows are translated into 939 reader rows: six rows with years are column headings and appear as such; one originally omitted row "Not Determined: 54" is included. In addition, 140 rows are from the image-based 2015-original, which is controlled cell by cell visually. In six rows from the 2016 Annex, the text extract repeated each cell twice; the single figures are checked in the original table rows and retained once. These are extract fixes, which must be distinguished from the documented errors in the printed originals.

Tables can continue on the next page or contain several years. Original annual markers are shown separately; no automatic person mapping is carried out. The line shift and spacer columns of the headings are normalized, and the same original column meaning follows continued tables. A line in the exit tables is an empty original cell, not a separate zero. The analytical module explains the accounting errors, the time limits, the annual versions and the various indicators of Table 5. For combined tables, the PDF / table position shown is the determinant locator.

LV11: original Table 1, PDF p. 11, Table 1

Original title cells (change of line): 2010 Circumstances · Number of long-term detention units · Total number of detention units · Proportion of long-term detention units · Average duration of detention periods in the circle · Long-term detention period · (in percentages) · imprisonment (in months 3).

Original year heading: 2010 Circumference name.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
North Jutland Police Department	80	315	25,4	7,1
East Jutland Police Department	165	430	38,4	6,6
Central and West Jutland Police	95	339	28,0	6,7
South-East Jutland Police	126	342	36,8	7,6
Police of South and South Jutland	151	474	31,9	6,0
Fyns Police	135	376	35,9	7,5
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	162	352	46,0	7,7
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	177	405	43,7	5,6
Police of North Zealand	86	458	18,8	5,7
Copenhagen West Region Police	130	470	27,7	7,3
The Copenhagen Police Department	446	1.644	27,1	6,8
Bornholms Police	11	36	30,6	6,1
Total	1.764	5.641	31,3	6,8

LV11: original Table 1, PDF p. 12, Table 1

Original title cells (line shift combined): 2011 · Number of long-term · Proportion of long-term · Average duration · pre-trial detention in · of long-term custody · Circumstances · prisons · circle (in percentages) · prisons (in months 4).

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
North Jutland Police Department	45	284	15,8	5,9
East Jutland Police Department	139	397	35,0	5,5
Central and West Jutland Police	97	327	29,7	5,3
South-East Jutland Police	134	264	50,8	6,2
Police of South and South Jutland	180	513	35,1	5,2
Fyns Police	107	320	33,4	5,7
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	144	338	42,6	5,8
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	149	385	38,7	5,3
Police of North Zealand	114	513	22,2	5,4
Copenhagen West Region Police	102	384	26,6	5,7
The Copenhagen Police Department	405	1.817	22,3	6,6
Bornholms Police	2	16	12,5	3,7
Total	1.618	5.558	29,1	5,8

LV11: original Table 1, PDF p. 12, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2012 · Number of long-term · Proportion of long-term · Average duration · pre-trial detention in · of long-term custody · Circumstances · imprisonment · circle (in percentages) · imprisonment (in months 5).

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
North Jutland Police Department	75	285	26,3	6,1
East Jutland Police Department	116	386	30,1	5,9
Central and West Jutland Police	119	413	28,8	5,7
South-East Jutland Police	78	238	32,8	6,7
Police of South and South Jutland	115	427	26,9	5,7
Fyns Police	120	310	38,7	5,7
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	127	274	46,4	5,9
Central and West Zealand Police Department	97	313	31,0	5,4
Police of North Zealand	100	469	21,3	5,1

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Copenhagen West Region Police	80	343	23,3	6,2
The Copenhagen Police Department	394	2.008	19,6	6,6
Bornholms Police	6	37	16,2	7,0
Total	1.427	5.503	25,9	6,0

LV11: original Table 2, PDF p. 13, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total): 2010 · Number of long-term · Proportion of long-term · Average duration · Age of pre-trial imprisonment · of long-term pre-trial detention · (in percentages) · imprisonment (in months 6).

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
Less than 157	0	8	0,0	0,0
15	26	81	32,1	5,0
16	41	157	26,1	5,6
17	78	218	35,8	6,2
18-20	198	575	34,4	6,0
20-25	429	1.321	32,5	6,7
25-30	271	902	30,0	7,0
30-35	233	793	29,4	7,2
35-40	193	623	31,0	7,2
40-45	137	465	29,5	7,0
45-50	83	279	29,7	7,0
50-55	37	109	33,9	8,1
55-60	16	50	32,0	9,0
60-65	14	35	40,0	7,1
65-70	4	7	57,1	7,9
70-75	2	2	100,0	10,1
Exceeding 75	0	1	0,0	0,0
Not specified 8	2	15	13,3	3,7
Total	1.764	5.641	31,3	6,8

LV11: original Table 2, PDF p. 13, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2011 · Number of long-term · Total number of pre-trial imprisonment · Proportion of long-term detention · Average duration · Age of pre-trial prison · of long-term pre-trial detention · period (in%) · imprisonment (in month 9).

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
Less than 1510	7	31	22,6	4,4
15	14	69	20,3	4,2
16	34	137	24,8	4,9
17	65	197	33,0	5,4
18-20	145	525	27,6	5,3
20-25	371	1.279	29,0	5,4
25-30	291	949	30,7	6,0
30-35	229	782	29,3	5,9
35-40	180	647	27,8	6,3
40-45	121	439	27,6	6,4
45-50	83	277	30,0	6,3
50-55	34	117	29,1	6,6
55-60	24	54	44,4	6,9
60-65	13	22	59,1	6,0
65-70	3	10	30,0	5,6
70-75	2	3	66,7	4,2
Exceeding 75	1	2	50,0	10,1
Not specified 11	1	18	5,6	3,2
Total	1.618	5.558	29,1	5,8

LV11: original Table 2, PDF p. 14, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2012 · Number of prolonged remand deten- tions · Total number of remand deten- tions · Proportion of prolonged remand deten- tions (in per cent) · Average duration of prolonged remand deten- tions (in months.12) · Age at remand · detention.

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
Less than 1513	0	1	0,0	0,0
15	10	57	17,5	5,2
16	38	120	31,7	5,0
17	42	167	25,1	4,4

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
18-20	155	531	29,2	5,0
20-25	323	1.245	25,9	5,9
25-30	235	877	26,8	6,2
30-35	210	713	29,5	6,1
35-40	171	577	29,6	6,5
40-45	97	369	26,3	7,0
45-50	75	258	29,1	7,0
50-55	41	157	26,1	6,7
55-60	17	53	32,1	6,6
60-65	7	23	30,4	6,7
65-70	4	10	40,0	5,5
70-75	1	11	9,1	12,0
Exceeding 75	1	3	33,3	9,1
Not specified 14	0	331	0,0	0,0
Total	1.427	5.503	25,9	6,0

LV11: original Table 3, PDF p. 15, Table 1

Original header cells (line breaks combined): 2010 Offence category 15 16 · Number of lengthy remand detentions in the offence category · Total number · Proportion of lengthy remand detentions in the offence category (percent) · Average duration of · remand · lengthy remand · detentions in · detentions in · the offence category · the offence category (months17).

Original Annual heading: 2010 Subject matter 15 16.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Murder etc.	193	259	74,5	10,1
Violence	291	1.019	28,6	5,8
Condition	90	146	61,6	7,2
Robbery	444	945	47,0	6,7
Breaking and entering	107	675	15,9	5,1
Theft	53	661	8,0	5,6
Economic crime	51	238	21,4	5,9
Drugs and smuggling	302	848	35,6	7,6
Other criminal law, including use theft	203	621	32,7	5,4

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Other special laws	20	208	9,6	6,3
Road Transport Act	10	21	47,6	4,4
Total	1.764	5.641	31,3	6,8

LV11: original Table 3, PDF p. 15, Table 5

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2011 Case category 18 19 · Number of long-term pre-trial deten- tions in the case category · Total number · Proportion of long-term pre-trial detentions in the case category (per cent) · Average duration of · pre-trial · long-term pre-trial · detentions in · detentions in · the case category · the case category (in months20).

Original year heading: 2011 Subject matter 18 19.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Murder etc.	183	254	72,0	7,9
Violence	227	872	26,0	5,6
Condition	70	135	51,9	7,6
Robbery	333	795	41,9	5,4
Breaking and entering	137	757	18,1	4,9
Theft	94	806	11,7	4,2
Economic crime	56	289	19,4	4,6
Drugs and smuggling	308	942	32,7	6,3
Other criminal law, including use theft	190	511	37,2	5,5
Other special laws	11	170	6,5	4,1
Road Transport Act	9	27	33,3	3,5
Total	1.618	5.558	29,1	5,8

LV11: original Table 3, PDF p. 16, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2012 Case category 21 22 · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions in the case category · Total number · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions in the category (in per cent) · Average duration of prolonged pre-trial detentions (in months 23) · pre-trial deten- · tions in the case · category.

Original annual heading: 2012 Subject matter 21 22.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Murder etc.	129	198	65,2	9,3

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Violence	224	882	25,4	5,3
Condition	69	135	51,1	7,1
Robbery	305	680	44,9	5,3
Breaking and entering	146	729	20,0	4,7
Theft	89	863	10,3	5,0
Economic crime	40	520	7,7	4,7
Drugs and smuggling	285	901	31,6	7,0
Other criminal law, including use theft	132	388	34,0	5,9
Other special laws	4	191	2,1	6,3
Road Transport Act	4	16	25,0	5,1
Total	1.427	5.503	25,9	6,0

LV11: original Table 4, PDF p. 17, Table 1

Original header cells (line breaks joined): 2010 · >= 0 months and < 3 months · >= 3 months and < 6 months · >= 6 months and < 12 months · >= 12 months and < 24 months · >= 24 months · Total · Case area 24 25.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	66	51	71	71	0	259
Violence	728	204	71	15	1	1.019
Condition	56	43	35	12	0	146
Robbery	501	274	119	46	5	945
Breaking and entering	568	82	22	3	0	675
Theft	608	35	18	0	0	661
Economic crime	187	39	8	3	1	238
Drugs and smuggling	546	155	102	42	3	848
Other criminal law, including use theft	418	153	41	9	0	621
Other special laws	188	10	8	2	0	208
Road Transport Act	11	8	2	0	0	21
Total	3.877	1.054	497	203	10	5.641

LV11: original Table 4, PDF p. 17, Table segment 5

Original header cells (line breaks combined): 2011 · >= 0 months and < 3 months · >= 3 months and < 6 months · >= 6 months and < 12 months · >= 12 months and < 24 months · >= 24 months · Total · Offence category 26 27.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	71	76	77	30	0	254
Violence	645	170	43	14	0	872
Condition	65	35	26	8	1	135
Robbery	462	247	75	11	0	795
Breaking and entering	620	114	20	3	0	757
Theft	712	90	4	0	0	806
Economic crime	233	49	6	1	0	289
Drugs and smuggling	634	175	109	24	0	942
Other criminal law, including use theft	321	137	42	11	0	511
Other special laws	159	9	2	0	0	170
Road Transport Act	18	9	0	0	0	27
Total	3.940	1.111	404	102	1	5.558

LV11: original Table 4, PDF p. 18, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks joined):2012 · >= 0 months and < 3 months · >= 3 months and < 6 months · >= 6 months and < 12 months · >= 12 months and < 24 months · >= 24 months · Total · Case area 28 29.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	69	34	62	32	1	198
Violence	658	171	46	7	0	882
Condition	66	35	26	8	0	135
Robbery	375	222	76	7	0	680
Breaking and entering	583	124	21	1	0	729
Theft	774	69	17	3	0	863
Economic crime	480	38	2	0	0	520
Drugs and smuggling	616	152	100	33	0	901
Other criminal law, including use theft	256	89	30	13	0	388
Other special laws	187	3	1	0	0	191
Road Transport Act	12	4	0	0	0	16
Total	4.076	941	381	104	1	5.503

LV11: original Table 5, PDF p. 19, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2010 · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions · Total number of pre-trial detentions · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions (in per cent) · Average duration of prolonged pre-trial detentions (in months 30) · Number of counts against · the detainee in the · case complex.

Number of criminal cases	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
1	288	1.641	17,6	6,4
2	263	959	27,4	6,6
3	208	647	32,1	6,6
4	128	416	30,8	6,2
5 or more	877	1.978	44,3	7,1
Total	1.764	5.641	31,3	6,8

LV11: original Table 5, PDF p. 19, Table segment 5

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2011 · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions · Total number of pre-trial detentions · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions (in per cent) · Average duration of prolonged pre-trial detentions (in months 31) · Number of counts against · the detainee in the · case complex.

Number of criminal cases	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
1	264	1.643	16,1	5,5
2	216	911	23,7	5,7
3	178	634	28,1	5,4
4	147	462	31,8	5,7
5 or more	813	1.908	42,6	6,1
Total	1.618	5.558	29,1	5,8

LV11: original Table 5, PDF p. 19, Table segment 10

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2012 · Number of prolonged remand deten- tions · Total number of remand deten- tions · Proportion of prolonged remand detentions (in per cent) · Average duration of prolonged remand deten- tions (in months.32) · Number of counts against · the detainee in the · case complex.

Number of criminal cases	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
1	252	1.818	13,9	5,7
2	190	961	19,8	6,1
3	133	593	22,4	6,1
4	112	374	29,9	6,3
5 or more	740	1.757	42,1	6,1
Total	1.427	5.503	25,9	6,0

LV11: original Table 6, PDF p. 20, Table 1

Original title cells: 2010 · Decision code · Decision decisions · Non-decision · Other · Decision type 34.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Not felling decisions	Other
Judgment	01	1.325	0	0
Fine imposed	02	5	0	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	03	194	0	0
Conditional judgment	04	14	0	0
Conditional judgment and fine	05	3	0	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	98	0	0
Removed	11	0	13	0
Other	40	0	0	3
Promotional waiver with terms (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (2)	62	1	0	0
Non-conditionality (Rpl. § 722 (2) as referred to in paragraph 3)	68	1	0	0
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	0	9	0
Non-conditionality (Rpl. § 722 (1) (5)	71	1	0	0
Total	-	1.642	22	3

LV11: original Table 6, PDF p. 20, Table segment 5

Original title cells: 2011 · Decision code · Decision decisions · Non-decision · Other · Decision type 36.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Not felling decisions	Other
Judgment	01	1.252	0	0
Fine imposed	02	2	0	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	03	191	0	0
Conditional judgment	04	13	0	0
Conditional judgment and fine	05	3	0	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	88	0	0
Removed	11	0	24	0
Other	40	0	0	1
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (7)	67	1	0	0

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Not felling decisions	Other
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	0	8	0
Total	-	1.550	32	1

LV11: original Table 6, PDF p. 21, Table 1

Original title cells: 2012 · Decision code · Decision decisions · Non-decision · Other · Decision type 38.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Not felling decisions	Other
Judgment	01	1.082	0	0
Fine imposed	02	3	0	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	03	150	0	0
Conditional judgment	04	4	0	0
Conditional judgment and fine	05	1	0	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	84	0	0
Removed	11	0	24	0
Other	40	0	0	2
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (4)	66	1	0	0
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (7)	67	2	0	0
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	0	1	0
Total	-	1.327	25	2

LV11: original Table 7, PDF p. 22, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Penalty framework and duration	2010	2011	2012
<6 years in custody <6 months	3.151	3.211	3.356
<6 years in custody >= 6 months	254	145	157
>= 6 years in prison <12 months	1.629	1.692	1.560
>= 6 years in prison >= 12 months	143	76	85
Total within time limit	4780	4903	4916
Total outside time limit	397	221	242

LV11: original Table 8, PDF p. 22, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total):

Penalty framework and duration	2010	2011	2012
<6 years in custody <4 months	284	282	224
<6 years in custody >= 4 months	48	51	33
>= 6 years in prison <8 months	112	95	85
>= 6 years in prison >= 8 months	20	6	3
Total within time limit	396	377	309
Total outside time limit	68	57	36

LV13: original Table 1, PDF p. 9, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total): 2012 · Number of long-term · Proportion of long-term · Average duration · pre-trial detention in · of long-term custody · Circumstances · prisons · circle (in%) · prisons (in months 3).

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
North Jutland Police Department	74	283	26,1	6,1
East Jutland Police Department	120	385	31,2	6,0
Central and West Jutland Police	120	413	29,1	5,7
South-East Jutland Police	78	237	32,9	6,7
Police of South and South Jutland	116	430	27,0	5,7
Fyns Police	122	313	39,0	5,8

LV13: original Table 1, PDF p. 10, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	130	277	46,9	6,0
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	105	334	31,4	5,5
Police of North Zealand	114	484	23,6	5,2
Copenhagen West Region Police	79	340	23,2	6,2
The Copenhagen Police Department	393	2.006	19,6	6,6
Bornholms Police	6	37	16,2	7,0
Total	1.457	5.539	26,3	6,1

LV13: original Table 1, PDF p. 10, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2013 · Number of long-term · Proportion long-term · Average duration · pre-trial detention in · of long-term custody · Circumstances · prisons · circle (in%) · prisons (in months 4).

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
North Jutland Police Department	72	287	25,1	5,7
East Jutland Police Department	125	330	37,9	5,5
Central and West Jutland Police	97	360	26,9	5,8
South-East Jutland Police	117	277	42,2	6,2
Police of South and South Jutland	139	418	33,3	5,9
Fyns Police	143	366	39,1	6,3
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	94	272	34,6	5,7
Central and West Zealand Police Department	94	278	33,8	5,6
Police of North Zealand	91	476	19,1	5,5
Copenhagen West Region Police	129	342	37,7	5,8
The Copenhagen Police Department	384	2.147	17,9	6,9
Bornholms Police	4	17	23,5	4,1
Total	1.489	5.569	26,7	6,1

LV13: original Table 2, PDF p. 11, Table 1

Original header cells(line breaks joined):2012 · Number of long-term · Total number · Proportion of long-term · Average · Age at pre- · pre-trial deten- · pre-trial deten- · pre-trial deten- · duration of long-term · trial detention · tions · tions · tions(in per cent) · pre-trial detention(in · months5).

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
Less than 156	0	1	0,0	0,0
15	10	57	17,5	5,2
16	38	127	29,9	5,0
17	42	173	24,3	4,4
18-20	158	552	28,6	5,1
20-25	333	1.331	25,0	5,9
25-30	240	971	24,7	6,2
30-35	217	780	27,8	6,1
35-40	175	616	28,4	6,5

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
40-45	99	388	25,5	7,1
45-50	73	264	27,7	7,0
50-55	42	166	25,3	6,8
55-60	17	58	29,3	6,6
60-65	7	24	29,2	6,7
65-70	5	12	41,7	5,6
70-75	1	10	10,0	12,0
Exceeding 75	0	2	0,0	0,0
Not specified 7	0	7	0,0	0,0
Total	1.457	5.539	26,3	6,1

LV13: original Table 2, PDF p. 11, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2013 · Number of long-term · Proportion of long-term · Average "pre-trial imprisonment" duration of long-term · Age of goods "(in%) · pre-trial imprisonment (in earnings prison · m.8).

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
15	14	56	25	4,2
16	27	117	23,1	5,9
17	43	170	25,3	4,7
18-20	146	510	28,6	5,6
20-25	377	1.331	28,3	5,7

LV13: original Table 3, PDF p. 12, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Subject matter	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
25-30	258	992	26,0	6,3
30-35	189	779	24,3	6,2
35-40	162	608	26,6	6,3
40-45	109	435	25,1	7,0
45-50	91	305	29,8	6,7
50-55	39	144	27,1	6,6

Subject matter	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
55-60	14	56	25,0	7,2
60-65	9	36	25	6,3
65-70	7	15	46,7	6,4
70-75	2	3	66,7	4,8
Exceeding 75	1	2	50,0	9,1
Not specified 9	1	12	8,3	15,9
Total	1.489	5.569	26,7	6,1

LV13: original Table 3, PDF p. 12, Table 2

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2012 · Number of prolonged remand deten- tions in the case area · Total number · Proportion of prolonged · Average · remand deten- · remand deten- · duration of prolonged · Case area 10 · tions in the case ar- · tions in the case area · remand detentions · 11 · ea · (in per cent) · in the case area (in · months.12).

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Murder etc.	130	197	66,0	9,4
Violence	239	894	26,7	5,4
Condition	69	138	50,0	7,2
Robbery	311	673	46,2	5,3
Breaking and entering	151	734	20,6	4,7
Theft	89	881	10,1	5,0
Economic crime	38	519	7,3	4,6
Drugs and smuggling	289	906	31,9	7,0
Other criminal law,	132	392	33,70	6,0

LV13: original Table 3, PDF p. 13, Table 1

Original title cells: including use theft.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Other special laws	5	189	2,6	5,7
Road Transport Act	4	16	25,0	5,1
Total	1.457	5.539	26,3	6,1

LV13: original Table 3, PDF p. 13, Table 2

Original title cells (line shift combined): 2013 · Number of long-term · Total detention in custody · Proportion of long-term detention · Duration of long-term detention · Case 13-14 · In the case area (in%) · Permanent detention in custody (in months 15).

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Murder etc.	142	246	57,7	8,4
Violence	241	842	28,6	5,6
Condition	73	130	56,2	7,1
Robbery	261	609	42,9	5,5
Breaking and entering	129	680	19,0	4,7
Theft	80	866	9,2	5,3
Economic crime	65	513	12,7	5,5
Drugs and smuggling	328	1.063	30,9	7,1
Other criminal law, including use theft	162	418	38,8	5,1
Other special laws	8	189	4,2	4,4
Road Transport Act	0	13	0,0	0,0
Total	1.489	5.569	26,7	6,1

LV13: original Table 4, PDF p. 14, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2012 · >= 0 months · >= 3 months · >= 6 months and · >= 12 months · >= 24 · Total · and < 3 months · and < 6 months · < 12 months · and < 24 months · months · Case category 16 17.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	67	32	65	32	1	197
Violence	655	179	50	10	0	894
Condition	69	35	26	8	0	138
Robbery	362	223	81	7	0	673
Breaking and entering	583	129	21	1	0	734
Theft	792	70	16	3	0	881
Economic crime	481	36	2	0	0	519
Drugs and smuggling	617	156	100	33	0	906
Other criminal law, including use theft	260	89	30	13	0	392
Other special laws	184	4	1	0	0	189
Road Transport Act	12	4	0	0	0	16
Total	4.082	957	392	107	1	5.539

LV13: original Table 4, PDF p. 14, Table 2

Original header cells (line breaks combined): 2013 · >= 0 months · >= 3 months · >= 6 months and · >= 12 months · >= 24 · Total · and < 3 months · and < 6 months · < 12 months · and < 24 months · months · Offence category 18 19.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	104	49	67	26	0	246
Violence	601	164	63	14	0	842
Condition	57	33	34	6	0	130
Robbery	348	172	81	8	0	609
Breaking and entering	551	111	18	0	0	680
Theft	786	62	16	2	0	866
Economic crime	448	48	13	4	0	513
Drugs and smuggling	735	160	133	35	0	1.063
Other criminal law, including use theft	256	118	41	3	0	418

LV13: original Table 4, PDF p. 15, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Other special laws	181	7	1	0	0	189
Road Transport Act	13	0	0	0	0	13
Total	4.080	924	467	98	0	5.569

LV13: original Table 5, PDF p. 15, Table 2

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2012 Number of counts concerning the detainee in the case complex · Number of long-term pre-trial deten- tions · Total number · Proportion of long-term · Average duration of long- term pre-trial deten- tions (in months20) · pre-trial · pre-trial detentions · detentions · (per cent).

Original year heading: 2012 Number of conditions on the arrest warrant in case complex.

Number of criminal cases	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
1	258	1.802	14,3	5,6
2	198	981	20,2	6,2
3	136	605	22,5	6,0
4	113	366	30,9	6,3
5 or more	752	1.765	42,1	6,1
Total	1.457	5.539	26,3	6,1

LV13: original Table 5, PDF p. 15, Table segment 3

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2013 · Number of prolonged remand deten- tions · Total number · Proportion of prolonged · Average · remand deten- · remand detentions · duration of pro- · Number of counts against · tions · (in per cent) · longed remand deten- · the detainee in the · tions (in months.21) · case complex.

Number of criminal cases	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
1	250	1.821	13,7	5,8
2	209	973	21,5	6,1
3	167	628	26,6	6,3
4	136	422	32,2	6,2
5 or more	727	1.725	42,1	6,1
Total	1.489	5.569	26,7	6,1

LV13: original Table 6, PDF p. 16, Table 1

Original title cells (line shift combined): 2012 · Decision · Decision · Non-reference code · decisions · Decision type 23.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Judgment	01	1.128	0
Fine imposed	02	4	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	03	157	0
Conditional judgment	04	4	0
Conditional judgment and fine	05	1	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	95	0
Removed	11	0	17
Other	40	2	0
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (4)	66	1	0
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (7)	67	2	0
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	0	2
Total	-	1.394	19

LV13: original Table 6, PDF p. 16, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2013 · Decision · Decision · Decision · Decision · Type of decision 25 · Code.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Judgment	01	1.200	0

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Fine imposed	02	15	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	03	139	0
Conditional judgment	04	7	0
Conditional judgment and fine	05	0	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	64	0
Removed	11	0	15
Other	40	1	0
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (4)	66	1	0
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (7)	67	0	0

LV13: original Table 6, PDF p. 17, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	0	5
Non-conditionality (Rpl. § 722 (1) (5)	71	1	0
Total	-	1.428	20

LV13: original Table 7, PDF p. 17, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total):

Penalty framework and duration	2012	2013
<6 years in custody <6 months	2.726	2.701
<6 years in custody >= 6 months	67	62
>= 6 years in prison <12 months	2.287	2.374
>= 6 years in prison >= 12 months	101	89
Total within time limit	5.013	5.075
Total outside time limit	168	151

LV13: original Table 8, PDF p. 17, Table segment 3

Original title cells (line change total):

Penalty framework and duration	2012	2013
<6 years in custody <4 months	102	84
<6 years in custody >= 4 months	8	4
>= 6 years in prison <8 months	243	244
>= 6 years in prison >= 8 months	5	11

Penalty framework and duration	2012	2013
Total within time limit	345	328
Total outside time limit	13	15

LV14B: original Table 1, PDF p. 1, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2013 · Number of long- · Total number · Proportion of long- · Average · term pre-trial · pre-trial deten- · term pre-trial · duration of · District name · detentions · tions · detentions in · long-term pre- · district, per cent · trial deten- · tions in months3.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
North Jutland Police Department	72	287	25,1	5,7
East Jutland Police Department	125	330	37,9	5,5
Central and West Jutland Police	97	360	26,9	5,8
South-East Jutland Police	117	277	42,2	6,2
Police of South and South Jutland	139	418	33,3	5,9
Fyns Police	143	366	39,1	6,3
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falsters Police	94	272	34,6	5,7

LV14B: original Table 1, PDF p. 2, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	94	278	33,8	5,6
Police of North Zealand	93	481	19,3	5,5
Copenhagen West Region Police	128	342	37,4	5,8
The Copenhagen Police Department	383	2.146	17,8	6,8
Bornholms Police	4	17	23,5	4,1
Total	1.489	5.574	26,7	6,1

LV14B: original Table 1, PDF p. 2, Table segment 2

Original header cells(line breaks joined):2014 · Number of long- · Total number · Proportion of long- · Average · term pre-trial · pre-trial deten- · term pre-trial · duration of · District name · detentions · tions · detentions in · long-term pre- · the district in per cent · trial deten- · tions in months4.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
North Jutland Police Department	66	214	30,8	5,8
East Jutland Police Department	121	307	39,4	5,9
Central and West Jutland Police	87	364	23,9	5,6
South-East Jutland Police	102	260	39,2	6,4
Police of South and South Jutland	112	346	32,4	5,7
Fyns Police	89	241	36,9	5,6
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falsters Police	104	269	38,7	5,8
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	112	335	33,4	5,6
Police of North Zealand	116	438	26,5	5,9
Copenhagen West Region Police	103	261	39,5	6,2
The Copenhagen Police Department	364	1.948	18,7	6,1
Bornholms Police	9	23	39,1	4,7
Total	1.385	5.006	27,7	5,9

LV14B: original Table 2, PDF p. 3, Table segment 1

Original header cells(line breaks joined):2013 · Number of long- · Total number · Proportion of long- · Average · term pre-trial · pre-trial deten- · term pre-trial · duration of · Age at pre-trial deten- · detentions · tions · detentions in · long-term pre- · tion · the district in per cent · trial deten- · tions in months5.

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
15	14	56	25,0	4,2
16	27	118	22,9	5,7
17	43	170	25,3	4,7
18-20	147	511	28,8	5,6
20-25	375	1.331	28,2	5,7
25-30	257	992	25,9	6,3
30-35	188	777	24,2	6,2
35-40	162	607	26,7	6,3
40-45	108	434	24,9	6,9
45-50	91	305	29,8	6,7
50-55	39	144	27,1	6,6
55-60	14	56	25,0	7,2
60-65	9	36	25,0	6,3

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
65-70	7	15	46,7	6,4
70-75	2	3	66,7	4,8
Exceeding 75	1	2	50,0	9,1
Not specified 6	5	17	29,4	6,4
Total	1.489	5.574	26,7	6,1
15	16	56	28,6	5,3
16	29	86	33,7	4,9
17	37	140	26,4	4,7
18-20	122	399	30,6	5,4
20-25	286	1.027	27,8	5,8
25-30	233	799	29,2	5,8

LV14B: original Table 2, PDF p. 4, Table segment 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
30-35	175	620	28,2	6,3
35-40	173	555	31,2	6,1
40-45	128	428	29,9	6,9
45-50	89	277	32,1	5,8
50-55	46	142	32,4	6,2
55-60	17	65	26,2	6,1
60-65	15	35	42,9	4,8
65-70	7	14	50,0	6,8
70-75	2	3	66,7	6,1
Not specified 8	10	360	2,8	4,4
Total	1.385	5.006	27,7	5,9

LV14B: original Table 3, PDF p. 5, Table segment 1

Original title cells (line change total): 2013 · Number of long-term · Total number of goods · Proportion of long-term · Average term of custody · length of long-term imprisonment · Case area 910 · number of cases · length of custody · Permanent custody · Council in% · detention in the matter area during the month. 11.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Murder etc.	142	246	57,7	8,4
Violence	241	843	28,6	5,6
Condition	73	130	56,2	7,1
Robbery	263	614	42,8	5,5
Breaking and entering	129	680	19,0	4,7
Theft	80	866	9,2	5,3
Economic crime	65	513	12,7	5,5
Drugs and smuggling	327	1.062	30,8	7,1
Other criminal law, including use theft	161	418	38,5	5,1
Other special laws	8	189	4,2	4,4
Road Transport Act	0	13	0,0	0,0
Total	1.489	5.574	26,7	6,1

LV14B: original Table 3, PDF p. 5, Table segment 2

Original title cells (line shift combined): 2014 · Number of long-term · Total number of goods · Proportion of long-term · Average term of custody · length of long-term imprisonment · Subject matter 1213 · number of cases · Duration of custody · Number of permanent custody · Council in% · of the case in months 14

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Murder etc.	129	187	69,0	7,4

LV14B: original Table 3, PDF p. 6, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Violence	216	745	29,0	5,1
Condition	59	103	57,3	5,8
Robbery	229	502	45,6	5,7
Breaking and entering	153	693	22,1	4,9
Theft	69	776	8,9	5,2
Economic crime	51	461	11,1	5,2
Drugs and smuggling	374	1.079	34,7	6,6

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Other criminal law, including use theft	88	295	29,8	6,3
Other special laws	9	151	6,0	4,4
Road Transport Act	8	14	57,1	5,4
Total	1.385	5.006	27,7	5,9

LV14B: original Table 4, PDF p. 7, Table 1

Original header cells (line breaks joined): 2013 · > = 0 months · > = 3 months · > = 6 months · > = 12 · > = 24 · Total · and < 3 months · and < 6 months · and < 12 · months and < · months · Case area 1516 · months · 24 months.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	104	49	68	25	0	246
Violence	602	164	63	14	0	843
Condition	57	33	34	6	0	130
Robbery	351	174	81	8	0	614
Breaking and entering	551	111	18	0	0	680
Theft	786	62	16	2	0	866
Economic crime	448	48	13	4	0	513
Drugs and smuggling	735	160	132	35	0	1.062
Other criminal law, including use theft	257	117	41	3	0	418
Other special laws	181	7	1	0	0	189
Road Transport Act	13	0	0	0	0	13
Total	4.085	925	467	97	0	5.574

LV14B: original Table 4, PDF p. 7, Table segment 2

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2014 · >= 0 months · >= 3 months · >= 6 months · >= 12 months · >= 24 months · Total · and < 3 months · and < 6 months · and <12 · and <24 · Case category 1718 · months · months..

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	58	50	72	7	0	187
Violence	529	164	49	3	0	745
Condition	44	33	26	0	0	103
Robbery	273	146	77	6	0	502
Breaking and entering	540	121	29	2	1	693
Theft	707	48	20	1	0	776

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Economic crime	410	41	10	0	0	461
Drugs and smuggling	705	208	132	34	0	1.079
Other criminal law, including use theft	207	49	34	5	0	295
Other special laws	142	8	1	0	0	151

LV14B: original Table 4, PDF p. 8, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Road Transport Act	6	7	1	0	0	14
Total	3.621	875	451	58	1	5.006

LV14B: original Table 5, PDF p. 9, Table segment 1

Original heading cells (line breaks joined):2013 · Number of prolonged · Total number of pre- · Proportion prolonged · Average · Number of counts for · remand deten- · trial detentions · remand deten- · duration of pro- · the person in the case com- · tions · tions in per cent · longed remand · plex · detention in · months.19.

Number of criminal cases	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
1	250	1.822	13,7	5,8
2	209	977	21,4	6,1
3	167	628	26,6	6,3
4	136	429	31,7	6,2
5 or more	727	1.718	42,3	6,1
Total	1.489	5.574	26,7	6,1

LV14B: original Table 5, PDF p. 9, Table segment 2

Original heading cells (line breaks joined):2014 · Number of prolonged · Total number of pre- · Proportion prolonged · Average · Number of counts for · remand deten- · trial detentions · remand deten- · duration of pro- · the person in the case com- · tions · tions in per cent · longed remand · plex · detention in · months.20.

Number of criminal cases	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
1	246	1.561	15,8	6,0
2	204	843	24,2	5,7
3	179	645	27,8	5,8
4	117	357	32,8	6,0

Number of criminal cases	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
5 or more	639	1.599	40,0	6,0
Total	1.385	5.005	27,7	5,9

LV14B: original Table 6, PDF p. 10, Table segment 1

Original title cells (line shift combined): 2013 · Decision · Decision · Decision · Non-decision · Decision type 22 · code.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Judgment	01	1.203	0
Fine imposed	02	15	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code (mental illness, etc.)	03	139	0
Conditional judgment	04	7	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	63	0
Removed	11	0	16
Other	40	1	0
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (4)	66	1	0
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	0	5
Non-conditionality (Rpl. § 722 (1) (5)	71	1	0
Total	-	1.430	21

LV14B: original Table 6, PDF p. 10, Table segment 2

Original title cells (line shift combined): 2014 · Decision · Decision · Decision · Non-decision · Decision type 24 · code.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Judgment	01	1.057	0
Fine imposed	02	5	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code (mental illness, etc.)	03	133	0
Conditional judgment	04	5	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	70	0
Removed	11	0	16
Other	40	2	0
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	0	3
Total	-	1.272	19

LV14B: original Table 7, PDF p. 11, Table segment 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Penalty framework and duration	2013	2014
< 6 years in custody < 6 months	2.702	2.480
< 6 years in custody > = 6 months	62	72
> = 6 years in prison < 12 months	2.377	2.116
> = 6 years in prison > = 12 months	89	56
Total within time limit	5.079	4.596
Total outside time limit	151	128

LV14B: original Table 8, PDF p. 12, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Penalty framework and duration	2013	2014
< 6 years in custody < 4 months	83	70
< 6 years in custody > = 4 months	4	4
> = 6 years in prison < 8 months	247	202
> = 6 years in prison > = 8 months	10	6
Total within time limit	330	272
Total outside time limit	14	10

LV15: original Table 1, PDF p. 9, Table 1

Original header cells (line breaks combined): 2014 □ District name □ Number of prolonged pretrial detentions □ Total number of pretrial detentions □ Proportion of prolonged pretrial detentions in per cent □ Average duration of prolonged pretrial detentions in months.

Original year heading: 2014.

The statement is drawn on 15 March 2016; one month is calculated as 30,5 days. The figures are updated annual versions, not additional courses of custody next to the previous statements.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
North Jutland Police Department	66	214	30,8	5,8
East Jutland Police Department	123	308	39,9	6,0
Central and West Jutland Police	87	364	23,9	5,6
South-East Jutland Police	102	258	39,5	6,4
Police of South and South Jutland	112	345	32,5	5,7
Fyns Police	89	239	37,2	5,6

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	104	268	38,8	5,8

LV15: original Table 1, PDF p. 10, Table 1

Original header cells (line breaks combined): 2014 □ District name □ Number of prolonged pretrial detentions □ Total number of pretrial detentions □ Proportion of prolonged pretrial detentions in per cent □ Average duration of prolonged pretrial detentions in months.

Original year heading: 2014.

The statement is drawn on 15 March 2016; one month is calculated as 30,5 days. The figures are updated annual versions, not additional courses of custody next to the previous statements.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	114	333	34,2	5,5
Police of North Zealand	120	437	27,5	5,8
Copenhagen West Region Police	104	260	40,0	6,1
The Copenhagen Police Department	361	1.942	18,6	6,1
Bornholms Police	9	23	39,1	4,7
Total	1.391	4.991	27,9	5,9

LV15: original Table 1, PDF p. 10, Table 2

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2015 · District name · Number of prolonged remand detentions · Total number of remand detentions · Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent · Average duration of prolonged remand detentions in months..

Original year heading: 2015.

The statement is drawn on 15 March 2016; one month is calculated as 30,5 days. The figures are updated annual versions, not additional courses of custody next to the previous statements.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
North Jutland Police Department	85	203	41,9	6,1
East Jutland Police Department	110	295	37,3	5,9
Central and West Jutland Police	73	291	25,1	5,6
South-East Jutland Police	129	255	50,6	6,2
Police of South and South Jutland	90	297	30,3	5,3
Fyns Police	90	194	46,4	5,8

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	102	268	38,1	6,7
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	66	211	31,3	6,4
Police of North Zealand	83	284	29,2	5,7
Copenhagen West Region Police	93	277	33,6	5,8
The Copenhagen Police Department	359	1.813	19,8	7,8
Bornholms Police	3	16	18,8	4,1
Total	1.283	4.404	29,1	6,5

LV15: original Table 2, PDF p. 11, Table 1

Original header cells (line breaks combined): 2014 □ Age at pretrial detention □ Number of prolonged pretrial detentions □ Total number of pretrial detentions □ Proportion of prolonged pretrial detentions in per cent □ Average duration of prolonged pretrial detentions in months.

Original year heading: 2014.

The age applies in custody. The original ranges 18-20 and 20-25 are kept verbatim with their common limit. "Not specified" is due, according to the original note, to a lack of technical update, not to a documented specified age range.

Age in custody	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
15 years	16	56	28,6	5,3
16 years	29	86	33,7	4,9
17 years	36	138	26,1	4,7
18-20 years	122	392	31,1	5,4
20- 25 years	287	1.022	28,1	5,7
25 to 30 years	234	797	29,4	5,8
30-35 years	178	614	29,0	6,2
35 to 40 years	173	554	31,2	6,1
40 to 45 years	128	425	30,1	6,9
45- 50 years	90	277	32,5	5,9
50-55 years	46	143	32,2	6,2
55 to 60 years	17	65	26,2	6,1
60 to 65 years	15	35	42,9	4,7
65-70 years	7	14	50,0	6,8
70-75 years	2	3	66,7	6,1

Age in custody	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
Not specified	11	370	3,0	4,5
Total	1.391	4.991	27,9	5,9

LV15: original Table 2, PDF p. 11, Table 2

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2015 · Age at pre-trial detention · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions · Total number of pre-trial detentions · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions in per cent · Average duration of prolonged pre-trial detentions in months.

Original year heading: 2015.

The age applies in custody. The original ranges 18-20 and 20-25 are kept verbatim with their common limit. "Not specified" is due, according to the original note, to a lack of technical update, not to a documented specified age range.

Age in custody	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
15 years	12	34	35,3	6,6
16 years	17	62	27,4	5,3
17 years	35	93	37,6	5,4
18-20 years	95	270	35,2	6,0
20- 25 years	224	648	34,6	6,2
25 to 30 years	208	556	37,4	6,9
30-35 years	153	429	35,7	6,7

LV15: original Table 2, PDF p. 12, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2015 · Age at pre-trial detention · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions · Total number of pre-trial detentions · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions in per cent · Average duration of prolonged pre-trial detentions in months.

Original year heading: 2015.

The age applies in custody. The original ranges 18-20 and 20-25 are kept verbatim with their common limit. "Not specified" is due, according to the original note, to a lack of technical update, not to a documented specified age range.

Age in custody	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
35 to 40 years	151	385	39,2	6,7
40 to 45 years	85	281	30,2	6,9
45- 50 years	92	237	38,8	7,3
50-55 years	51	152	33,6	6,9

Age in custody	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
55 to 60 years	17	57	29,8	8,3
60 to 65 years	12	22	54,5	6,8
65-70 years	6	10	60,0	8,1
70-75 years	2	4	50,0	8,4
Over 75 years	1	1	100,0	7,1
Not specified	122	1.163	10,5	4,8
Total	1.283	4.404	29,1	6,5

LV15: original Table 3, PDF p. 13, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks joined): 2014 · Case area · Number of prolonged remand detentions in the case area · Total number of remand detentions in the case area · Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in the case area in per cent · Average duration of prolonged remand detentions in the case area in months..

Original year heading: 2014.

Common category key for LV15 tables 3-4: The case category follows the decision's crime category; for cases not yet decided, the charge is used. The category may therefore change later. Classification follows the police/prosecution and is not directly comparable with Forskningskontoret's categories before 2011.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment in: the scope of the case;	Total number of retention in prison, the scope of the case;	Share of lengthy remand in offence category (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions on the file in months;
Murder etc.	128	183	69,9	7,3
Violence	219	747	29,3	5,1
Condition	59	103	57,3	5,8
Robbery	229	497	46,1	5,7
Breaking and entering	153	689	22,2	4,9
Theft	69	776	8,9	5,2
Economic crime	53	459	11,5	5,2
Drugs and smuggling	376	1.076	34,9	6,6
Other criminal law, including use theft	88	298	29,5	6,3
Other special laws	9	149	6,0	4,5
Road Transport Act	8	14	57,1	5,4
Total	1.391	4.991	27,9	5,9

LV15: original Table 3, PDF p. 14, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2015 · Case category · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions in the case category · Total number of pre-trial detentions in the case category · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions in the case category in per cent · Average duration of prolonged pre-trial detentions in the case category in months.

Original year heading: 2015.

See the category key at LV15 Table 3, PDF page 13, above.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment in: the scope of the case;	Total number of retention in prison, the scope of the case;	Share of lengthy remand in offence category (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions on the file in months;
Murder etc.	134	167	80,2	8,1
Violence	179	675	26,5	5,7
Condition	64	121	52,9	6,1
Robbery	176	395	44,6	5,8
Breaking and entering	92	549	16,8	4,7
Theft	79	668	11,8	5,1
Economic crime	54	364	14,8	5,3
Drugs and smuggling	372	1.019	36,5	7,8
Other criminal law, including use theft	127	294	43,2	5,3
Other special laws	4	137	2,9	5,1
Road Transport Act	2	15	13,3	8,6
Total	1.283	4.404	29,1	6,5

LV15: original Table 4, PDF p. 15, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total): 2014 · Subject matter · >= 0 months and < 3 months · >= 3 months and < 6 months · >= 6 months and < 12 months · >= 12 months and < 24 months · >= 24 months · Total

Original year heading: 2014.

See the category key at LV15 Table 3, PDF page 13, above.

Subject matter	>= 0 months and < 3 months	>= 3 months and < 6 months	>= 6 months and < 12 months	>= 12 months and < 24 months	>= 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	55	51	70	7	0	183
Violence	528	165	51	3	0	747
Condition	44	33	26	0	0	103
Robbery	268	145	78	6	0	497
Breaking and entering	536	121	29	2	1	689
Theft	707	48	20	1	0	776
Economic crime	406	43	10	0	0	459
Drugs and smuggling	700	208	134	34	0	1.076

Subject matter	>= 0 months and < 3 months	>= 3 months and < 6 months	>= 6 months and < 12 months	>= 12 months and < 24 months	>= 24 months	Total
Other criminal law, including use theft	210	49	34	5	0	298
Other special laws	140	8	1	0	0	149
Road Transport Act	6	7	1	0	0	14
Total	3.600	878	454	58	1	4.991

LV15: original Table 4, PDF p. 15, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2015 · Subject matter · >= 0 months and < 3 months · >= 3 months and < 6 months · >= 6 months and < 12 months · >= 12 months and < 24 months · >= 24 months · Total

Original year heading: 2015.

See the category key at LV15 Table 3, PDF page 13, above.

Subject matter	>= 0 months and < 3 months	>= 3 months and < 6 months	>= 6 months and < 12 months	>= 12 months and < 24 months	>= 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	33	42	76	16	0	167
Violence	496	118	59	2	0	675
Condition	57	31	31	2	0	121
Robbery	219	109	64	3	0	395
Breaking and entering	457	79	13	0	0	549
Theft	589	61	12	6	0	668
Economic crime	310	38	16	0	0	364
Drugs and smuggling	647	164	137	71	0	1.019
Other criminal law, including use theft	167	90	36	1	0	294
Other special laws	133	3	1	0	0	137

LV15: original Table 4, PDF p. 16, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total): 2015 · Subject matter · >= 0 months and < 3 months · >= 3 months and < 6 months · >= 6 months and < 12 months · >= 12 months and < 24 months · >= 24 months · Total

Original year heading: 2015.

See the category key at LV15 Table 3, PDF page 13, above.

Subject matter	>= 0 months and < 3 months	>= 3 months and < 6 months	>= 6 months and < 12 months	>= 12 months and < 24 months	>= 24 months	Total
Road Transport Act	13	1	0	1	0	15
Total	3.121	736	445	102	0	4.404

LV15: original Table 5, PDF p. 17, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total): 2014 · Number of conditions on the person in complex · Number of long-term custody imprisonment · Total number of pre-trial imprisonment · Proportion of long-term pre-trial imprisonment in per cent · Average duration of long-term detention in months.

Original year heading: 2014.

The original's table heading and column call this criminal counts/counts against the person in the case complex. The report for 2016,p. 6,subsequently states that the 2015 report's table erroneously showed the number of detainees in the same case complex rather than the number of charges. The mislabelled original is retained; the figures cannot be used as a charge count.

Number of relationships on the person i complex	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
1	462	2.348	19,7	5,5
2	282	1.130	25,0	5,3
3	171	590	29,0	5,1
4	174	370	47,0	5,9
5 or more	302	553	54,6	7,4
Total	1.391	4.991	27,9	5,9

LV15: original Table 5, PDF p. 17, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2015 · Number of conditions on the person in complex · Number of long-term custody imprisonment · Total number of pre-trial imprisonment · Proportion of long-term pre-trial imprisonment in per cent · Average duration of long-term pre-trial imprisonment in months.

Original year heading: 2015.

The original's table heading and column call this criminal counts/counts against the person in the case complex. The report for 2016,p. 6,subsequently states that the 2015 report's table erroneously showed the number of detainees in the same case complex rather than the number of charges. The mislabelled original is retained; the figures cannot be used as a charge count.

Number of relationships on the person i complex	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in months.
1	438	2.167	20,2	5,7
2	222	925	24,0	5,7
3	172	534	32,2	6,4
4	128	262	48,9	6,7
5 or more	323	516	62,6	7,9
Total	1.283	4.404	29,1	6,5

LV15: original Table 6, PDF p. 18, Table 1

Original title cells: 2014 · Type of decision · Decision code · Decision decisions · Non-decision decisions.

Original year heading: 2014.

Appeals after the last decision, including appeals; all forms of decision are included, not only in the judgment of first instance. Original Note 23 indicates a further 61 events without a registered decision: 1.307 + 23 + 61 = 1.391.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Judgment	01	1.079	0
Fine imposed	02	6	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code (mental illness, etc.)	03	137	0
Conditional judgment	04	5	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	78	0
Removed	11	0	18
Other	40	2	0
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	0	4
The charge is unfounded - the Penal Code (Rpl. § 721 (1) (1)	74	0	1
Total	-	1.307	23

LV15: original Table 6, PDF p. 18, Table 2

Original title cells: 2015 · Type of decision · Decision code · Decision decisions · Non-decision decisions.

Original year heading: 2015.

Appeals after the last decision, including appeals; all forms of decision are included, not only in the judgment of first instance. Original Note 25 indicates a further 110 events without a registered decision: 1.160 + 13 + 110 = 1.283.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Judgment	01	978	0
Fine imposed	02	3	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code (mental illness, etc.)	03	121	0
Conditional judgment	04	7	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	49	0
Removed	11	0	13
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (7)	67	1	0
Non-conditionality (Rpl. § 722 (2) as referred to in paragraph 3)	68	1	0
Total	-	1.160	13

LV16: original Table 1, PDF p. 10, Table 1

Original header cells(line breaks joined):2015 District name · Number of long-term pre-trial detentions · Total number of pre-trial detentions · Proportion · Average · long-term · duration of · pre-trial deten- · long-term · tions in the district in · pre-trial deten- · per cent · tions in months3.

Original year heading: 2015 Circular name.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
North Jutland Police Department	85	202	42,1	6,1
East Jutland Police Department	110	293	37,5	5,9
Central and West Jutland Police	73	291	25,1	5,6
South-East Jutland Police	129	255	50,6	6,2
Police of South and South Jutland	89	296	30,1	5,3
Fyns Police	89	192	46,4	5,8

LV16: original Table 1, PDF p. 11, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falsters Police	102	265	38,5	6,8
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	66	212	31,1	6,5
Police of North Zealand	83	289	28,7	5,7
Copenhagen West Region Police	92	276	33,3	5,8
The Copenhagen Police Department	359	1.811	19,8	7,8
Bornholms Police	3	16	18,8	4,1
Total	1.280	4.398	29,1	6,5

LV16: original Table 1, PDF p. 11, Table 2

Original heading cells (line breaks joined):2016 District name · Number of prolonged remand deten- tions · Total number of remand deten- tions · Proportion · Average · prolonged · duration of · remand deten- · prolonged · tions in the district in · remand deten- · per cent · tions in months.4.

Original year heading: 2016 Circumference name.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
North Jutland Police Department	85	216	39,4	5,4
East Jutland Police Department	90	263	34,2	5,7

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Central and West Jutland Police	87	269	32,3	5,8
South-East Jutland Police	110	224	49,1	6,8
Police of South and South Jutland	91	309	29,4	5,6
Fyns Police	91	204	44,6	6,3
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falsters Police	82	224	36,6	6,6
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	68	217	31,3	5,7
Police of North Zealand	84	342	24,6	7,9
Copenhagen West Region Police	89	234	38,0	6,3
The Copenhagen Police Department	376	1.752	21,5	6,9
Bornholms Police	6	17	35,3	6,5
Total	1.259	4.271	29,5	6,4

LV16: original Table 2, PDF p. 12, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total): 2015 Age in pre-trial imprisonment · Number of long-term pre-trial imprisonment · Total number of pre-trial imprisonment · Proportion · Average · long-term · duration of pre-trial imprisonment · Long-term · in the circle in pre-trial imprisonment ·% · in months 5

Original year heading: 2015 Age in custody; 2016 Age in custody.

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
15	12	34	35,3	6,6
16	17	62	27,4	5,3
17	35	93	37,6	5,4
18-20	94	269	34,9	6,0
20-25	224	647	34,6	6,2
25-30	208	555	37,5	6,9
30-35	152	426	35,7	6,7
35-40	150	384	39,1	6,7
40-45	86	281	30,6	7,0
45-50	92	236	39,0	7,3
50-55	51	152	33,6	6,9
55-60	17	57	29,8	8,3
60-65	12	22	54,5	6,8
65-70	6	10	60,0	8,1

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
70-75	2	4	50,0	8,4
Exceeding 75	1	1	100,0	7,1
Not specified 6	121	1.165	10,4	4,8
Total	1.280	4.404	29,1	6,5
15	10	30	33,3	5,9
16	20	50	40,0	4,7
17	34	89	38,2	5,3
18-20	96	218	44,0	5,9
20-25	285	737	38,7	6,0
25-30	203	539	37,7	6,9
30-35	145	408	35,5	7,1
35-40	108	324	33,3	6,5
40-45	91	283	32,2	6,9
45-50	65	190	34,2	7,2
50-55	28	108	25,9	5,9
55-60	13	52	25,0	6,5

LV16: original Table 3, PDF p. 13, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
60-65	10	27	37,0	7,3
65-70	9	16	56,3	7,6
70-75	0	1	0	0
Exceeding 75	0	2	0	0
Not specified 8	142	1.197	11,3	5,9
Total	1.259	4.271	29,5	6,4

LV16: original Table 3, PDF p. 13, Table 2

Original title cells (line shift): 2015 Case area 9 10 · Number of long-term detention in the case area · Total number of detention in the case area · Proportion of long-term detention in the case area in% · Average duration of long-term detention in the case area in months 11

Original Annual heading: 2015 Subject matter 9 10.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Murder etc.	130	163	79,8	8,2
Violence	183	681	26,9	5,7
Condition	64	121	52,9	6,1
Robbery	175	384	45,6	5,9
Breaking and entering	91	546	16,7	4,8
Theft	80	675	11,9	5,1
Economic crime	53	365	14,5	5,3
Drugs and smuggling	371	1.016	36,5	7,9
Other criminal law, including use theft	127	297	42,8	5,3
Other special laws	4	135	3,0	5,1
Road Transport Act	2	15	13,3	8,6
Total	1.280	4.398	29,1	6,5

LV16: original Table 3, PDF p. 14, Table 1

Original title cells (line shift combined): 2016 Case area 12 13 · Number of long-term detention in the case area · Total number of detention in the case area · Proportion of long-term detention in the case area in% · Average duration of long-term detention in the case area in months 14

Original Annual heading: 2016 Subject matter 12 13.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Murder etc.	163	218	78,8	8,2
Violence	175	660	26,5	5,1
Condition	69	145	47,6	6,5
Robbery	170	342	49,7	5,5
Breaking and entering	119	524	22,7	5,3
Theft	70	646	10,8	5,7
Economic crime	42	372	11,3	6,3
Drugs and smuggling	337	875	38,5	7,6
Other criminal law, including use theft	106	312	34,0	5,4
Other special laws	6	148	4,1	4,8
Road Transport Act	2	17	11,8	4,3
Total	1.259	4.271	29,5	6,4

LV16: original Table 4, PDF p. 14, Table 6

Original header cells (line breaks combined): 2015 · > = 0 months and < 3 months · > = 3 months and < 6 months · > = 6 months · > = 12 months · > = 24 months · Total · and < 12 · and < 24 · Offence category 15 16 · months · months..

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	33	40	73	17	0	163
Violence	498	120	61	2	0	681
Condition	57	31	31	2	0	121
Robbery	209	108	63	4	0	384
Breaking and entering	455	79	12	0	0	546
Theft	595	62	12	6	0	675
Economic crime	312	38	15	0	0	365
Drugs and smuggling	645	162	137	72	0	1.016
Other criminal law, including use theft	170	89	37	1	0	297

LV16: original Table 4, PDF p. 15, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Other special laws	131	3	1	0	0	135
Road Transport Act	13	1	0	1	0	15
Total	3.118	733	442	105	0	4.398

LV16: original Table 4, PDF p. 15, Table 2

Original header cells (line breaks combined): 2016 · >= 0 months and < 3 months · >= 3 months and < 6 months · >= 6 months and <12 months · >= 12 months and <24 months · >= 24 months · Total · Offence category 17 18.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Murder etc.	55	61	79	22	1	218
Violence	485	130	43	2	0	660
Condition	76	39	23	7	0	145
Robbery	172	118	43	9	0	342
Breaking and entering	405	89	29	1	0	524
Theft	576	46	23	1	0	646
Economic crime	330	28	10	4	0	372
Drugs and smuggling	538	160	120	56	1	875
Other criminal law, including use theft	206	71	33	2	0	312

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Other special laws	154	5	1	0	0	160
Road Transport Act	15	2	0	0	0	17
Total	3.012	749	404	104	2	4.271

LV16: original Table 5, PDF p. 15, Table 7

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2015 Number of counts in the case complex · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions · Total number of pre-trial detentions · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions in per cent · Average · duration of · prolonged · pre-trial deten- · tions in months 19.

Original year heading: 2015 Number of relationships in the complex.

Number of criminal cases	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
1	218	1.292	16,9	7,0
2	179	813	22,0	6,2
3	154	504	30,6	7,2
4	110	326	33,7	6,0
5 or more	619	1.463	42,3	6,3
Total	1.280	4.398	29,1	6,5

LV16: original Table 5, PDF p. 16, Table 1

Original title cells (change of line): pre-trial detention at month 20

Number of criminal cases	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
1	196	1.219	16,1	5,9
2	163	782	20,8	6,2
3	122	487	25,1	6,2
4	87	296	29,4	6,5
5 or more	691	1.487	46,5	6,6
Total	1.259	4.271	29,5	6,4

LV16: original Table 6, PDF p. 16, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2015 · Decision · Decision · Decision · Non-decision · Decision type 22 · code.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Judgment	01	1.004	0

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Fine imposed	02	3	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code (mental illness, etc.)	03	123	0
Conditional judgment	04	10	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	41	0
Removed	11	0	13
Accountability (Rpl. § 722 (1) (7)	67	1	0
Accountability (Rpl. § 722 (2) as referred to in paragraph 3)	68	1	0
Total	-	1.183	13

LV16: original Table 6, PDF p. 16, Table segment 3

Original title cells (line shift combined): 2016 · Decision · Decision · Non-decision · Decision type 24 · code.

Type of decision	Decision code	Decisions to be taken	Non-committal decisions
Judgment	01	980	0
Fine imposed	02	5	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code (mental illness, etc.)	03	124	0
Conditional judgment	04	4	0
Partial conditional judgment	06	35	0
Removed	11	0	11
Other	40	2	0
Total	-	1.150	11

LV17: original Table 1, PDF p. 9, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2014 Police district · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions · Total number of pre-trial detentions · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions in the district in per cent · Average duration of prolonged pre-trial detentions in months 1.

Original annual heading: 2014 Circles.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1364	4984	27,4%	6,0
North Jutland Police Department	65	214	30,4%	5,8
East Jutland Police Department	121	310	39,0%	6,0
Central and West Jutland Police	83	356	23,3%	5,5
South-East Jutland Police	102	258	39,5%	6,4

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Police of South and South Jutland	115	351	32,8%	5,6
Fyns Police	85	238	35,7%	5,8
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	103	266	38,7%	5,6
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	103	331	31,1%	5,6
Police of North Zealand	120	438	27,4%	6,0
Copenhagen West Region Police	102	258	39,5%	6,2
The Copenhagen Police Department	356	1941	18,3%	6,3
Bornholms Police	9	23	39,1%	4,7

LV17: original Table 1, PDF p. 10, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1289	4408	29,2%	6,5
North Jutland Police Department	84	202	41,6%	6,1
East Jutland Police Department	110	292	37,7%	5,9
Central and West Jutland Police	76	294	25,9%	5,6
South-East Jutland Police	128	255	50,2%	6,3
Police of South and South Jutland	87	292	29,8%	5,3
Fyns Police	92	196	46,9%	5,7
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	102	266	38,3%	6,7
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	69	212	32,5%	6,5
Police of North Zealand	83	293	28,3%	5,7
Copenhagen West Region Police	93	275	33,8%	5,9
The Copenhagen Police Department	362	1815	19,9%	7,8
Bornholms Police	3	16	18,8%	4,1

LV17: original Table 1, PDF p. 10, Table 2

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2016 Police district · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions · Total number of pre-trial detentions · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions in the district in per cent · Average duration of prolonged pre-trial detentions in months 3.

Original year heading: 2016 Circles.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1256	4261	29,5%	6,5
North Jutland Police Department	83	216	38,4%	5,7
East Jutland Police Department	91	264	34,5%	5,7
Central and West Jutland Police	89	269	33,1%	6,0
South-East Jutland Police	109	224	48,7%	6,7
Police of South and South Jutland	92	309	29,8%	5,6
Fyns Police	89	202	44,1%	6,4
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	81	224	36,2%	6,4

LV17: original Table 1, PDF p. 11, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	65	212	30,7%	5,7
Police of North Zealand	84	341	24,6%	8,0
Copenhagen West Region Police	94	234	40,2%	6,6
The Copenhagen Police Department	373	1749	21,3%	6,8
Bornholms Police	6	17	35,3%	6,5

LV17: original Table 1, PDF p. 11, Table 2

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2017 Police district · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions · Total number of pre-trial detentions · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions in the district in per cent · Average duration of prolonged pre-trial detentions in months 4.

Original year heading: 2017 Circles.

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1196	4390	27,2%	5,9
North Jutland Police Department	80	228	35,1%	5,5
East Jutland Police Department	128	351	36,5%	5,6
Central and West Jutland Police	105	308	34,1%	6,0
South-East Jutland Police	81	252	32,1%	5,6
Police of South and South Jutland	91	307	29,6%	5,2

Circumstances	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Fyns Police	114	220	51,8%	6,5
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	94	210	44,8%	6,0
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	56	225	24,9%	6,1
Police of North Zealand	73	294	24,8%	6,1
Copenhagen West Region Police	61	205	29,8%	6,3
The Copenhagen Police Department	309	1779	17,4%	6,0
Bornholms Police	4	11	36,4%	5,2

LV17: original Table 2, PDF p. 12, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total): 2014 Age · Number of long-term detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Total number of detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Proportion of long-term detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Average duration of long-term detention in months. 5

Original year heading: 2014 Age.

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
Total	1364	4984	27,4%	6,0
15	9	28	32,1%	5,2
16	18	64	28,1%	5,3
17	38	127	29,9%	5,0
18-20	99	346	28,6%	5,2
20-25	275	1083	25,4%	5,7
25-30	241	882	27,3%	6,0
30-35	172	668	25,7%	6,1
35-40	178	620	28,7%	6,3
40-45	126	467	27,0%	6,7
45-50	92	312	29,5%	6,2
50-55	52	161	32,3%	6,1
55-60	16	72	22,2%	6,2
60-65	14	38	36,8%	4,8
65-70	8	17	47,1%	7,1
70-75	3	4	75,0%	5,9
Unknown 6	23	95	24,2%	5,6

LV17: original Table 2, PDF p. 12, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2015 Age · Number of long-term detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Total number of detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Proportion of long-term detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Average duration of long-term detention in months 7

Original year heading: 2015 Age.

Age in custody	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1289	4408	29,2%	6,5
15	5	16	31,3%	8,0
16	10	47	21,3%	6,6

LV17: original Table 2, PDF p. 13, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
17	26	93	28,0%	5,8
18-20	87	290	30,0%	5,7
20-25	241	857	28,1%	5,9
25-30	244	793	30,8%	6,8
30-35	177	654	27,1%	6,5
35-40	169	571	29,6%	6,6
40-45	101	386	26,2%	6,5
45-50	101	306	33,0%	7,1
50-55	57	176	32,4%	6,6
55-60	22	80	27,5%	7,8
60-65	11	28	39,3%	6,7
65-70	6	15	40,0%	7,8
70-75	3	6	50,0%	8,8
80-85	1	1	100,0%	7,1
Unknown 8	28	89	31,5%	6,0

LV17: original Table 2, PDF p. 13, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2016 Age · Number of long-term detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Total number of detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Proportion of long-term detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Average duration of long-term detention in months .9.

Original year heading: 2016 Age.

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
Total	1256	4261	29,5%	6,5
15	8	22	36,4%	4,4
16	13	47	27,7%	6,2
17	33	93	35,5%	5,3
18-20	77	228	33,8%	6,0
20-25	303	975	31,1%	6,1
25-30	244	848	28,8%	6,6
30-35	171	578	29,6%	7,0
35-40	134	488	27,5%	6,6

LV17: original Table 2, PDF p. 14, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
40-45	102	376	27,1%	7,0
45-50	72	240	30,0%	6,8
50-55	37	151	24,5%	5,9
55-60	15	68	22,1%	6,0
60-65	9	36	25,0%	7,4
65-70	10	19	52,6%	7,5
Unknown 10	28	89	31,5%	6,0

LV17: original Table 2, PDF p. 14, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2017 Age · Number of long-term detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Total number of detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Proportion of long-term detention in custody of persons under 18 years of age · Average duration of long-term detention in months. 11

Original year heading: 2017 Age.

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
Total	1196	4390	27,2%	5,9
15	3	20	15,0%	5,4
16	27	75	36,0%	5,2
17	41	104	39,4%	5,1

Age at pre-trial detention;	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention; (%)	Average duration of long duration pre-trial detention; (months)
18-20	89	303	29,4%	5,8
20-25	281	1003	28,0%	5,7
25-30	194	786	24,7%	5,8
30-35	156	598	26,1%	5,9
35-40	118	480	24,6%	6,3
40-45	92	363	25,3%	6,2
45-50	70	251	27,9%	6,8
50-55	46	168	27,4%	6,0
55-60	23	82	28,0%	7,2
60-65	7	37	18,9%	6,0
65-70	4	13	30,8%	6,1

LV17: original Table 3, PDF p. 15, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
70-75	7	11	63,6%	6,5
Unknown 12	38	94	40,4%	5,1

LV17: original Table 3, PDF p. 15, Table 2

Original header cells (line breaks combined): 2014 Case category 13 14 □ Number of prolonged pretrial detentions □ Total number of pretrial detentions □ Proportion of prolonged pretrial detentions □ Average duration of prolonged pretrial detentions in months.15.

Original Annual heading: 2014 Subject matter 13 14.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1364	4984	27,4%	6,0
Murder etc.	165	234	70,5%	7,2
Violence	176	692	25,4%	5,1
Condition	60	107	56,1%	5,9
Robbery	228	528	43,2%	5,8
Breaking and entering	164	727	22,6%	5,0
Theft	45	696	6,5%	5,1

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Economic crime	55	466	11,8%	5,2
Drugs and smuggling	368	1071	34,4%	6,6
Other criminal law, including use theft	86	297	29,0%	6,1
Other special laws	9	152	5,9%	4,5
Road Transport Act	8	14	57,1%	5,4

LV17: original Table 3, PDF p. 16, Table 1

Original heading cells (line breaks combined): 2015 Case category 16 · Number of prolonged pre-trial detentions · Total number of pre-trial detentions · Proportion of prolonged pre-trial detentions · Average duration of prolonged pre-trial detentions in months 17.

Original annual heading: 2015 Heading 16; 2016 Heading 18.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1289	4408	29,2%	6,5
Murder etc.	176	217	81,1%	8,1
Violence	141	618	22,8%	5,2
Condition	67	126	53,2%	6,4
Robbery	188	446	42,2%	5,8
Breaking and entering	108	581	18,6%	4,7
Theft	62	611	10,1%	5,4
Economic crime	60	372	16,1%	5,3
Drugs and smuggling	372	1022	36,4%	7,9
Other criminal law, including use theft	108	262	41,2%	5,1
Other special laws	5	137	3,6%	4,9
Road Transport Act	2	16	12,5%	8,6
Total	1256	4261	29,5%	6,5
Murder etc.	184	243	75,7%	8,0
Violence	151	626	24,1%	5,1
Condition	70	145	48,3%	6,5
Robbery	183	372	49,2%	5,5
Breaking and entering	131	557	23,5%	5,7

LV17: original Table 3, PDF p. 17, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Original annual heading: 2017 Subject matter 20.

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Theft	48	595	8,1%	5,2
Economic crime	46	375	12,3%	6,5
Drugs and smuggling	334	880	38,0%	7,6
Other criminal law, including use theft	101	297	34,0%	5,4
Other special laws	6	155	3,9%	4,7
Road Transport Act	2	16	12,5%	4,3
Total	1196	4390	27,2%	5,9
Murder etc.	192	272	70,6%	8,0
Violence	188	716	26,3%	5,1
Condition	84	163	51,5%	6,3
Robbery	169	426	39,7%	5,4
Breaking and entering	93	454	20,5%	5,4
Theft	35	636	5,5%	5,2
Economic crime	51	351	14,5%	4,9
Drugs and smuggling	196	721	27,2%	6,2
Other criminal law, including use theft 22	177	389	45,5%	5,3
Other special laws	7	251	2,8%	3,8
Road Transport Act	4	11	36,4%	3,8

LV17: original Table 4, PDF p. 18, Table 1

Original header cells: 2014 Subject area 23 · < 3 months in custody · >= 3 months and < 6 months in custody · >= 6 months and < 12 months in custody · >= 12 months and < 24 months in custody · >= 24 months in custody · Total

Original year heading: 2014 Subject matter 23.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Total	3620	870	432	61	1	4984
Murder etc.	69	72	83	10	0	234
Violence	516	138	35	3	0	692
Condition	47	33	27	0	0	107
Robbery	300	147	74	7	0	528

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Breaking and entering	563	129	32	2	1	727
Theft	651	33	11	1	0	696
Economic crime	411	45	10	0	0	466
Drugs and smuggling	703	205	130	33	0	1071
Other criminal law, including use theft	211	53	28	5	0	297
Other special laws	143	8	1	0	0	152
Road Transport Act	6	7	1	0	0	14

LV17: original Table 4, PDF p. 18, Table 2

Original title cells: 2015 Subject area 24 · < 3 months in custody · >= 3 months and < 6 months in custody · >= 6 months and < 12 months in custody · >= 12 months and < 24 months in custody · >= 24 months in custody · Total

Original year heading: 2015 Subject matter 24.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Total	3119	739	444	106	0	4408
Murder etc.	41	58	102	16	0	217
Violence	477	102	37	2	0	618
Condition	59	32	31	4	0	126
Robbery	258	113	72	3	0	446
Breaking and entering	473	96	12	0	0	581
Theft	549	44	12	6	0	611

LV17: original Table 4, PDF p. 19, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Economic crime	312	44	16	0	0	372
Drugs and smuggling	650	164	135	73	0	1022
Other criminal law, including use theft	154	81	26	1	0	262
Other special laws	132	4	1	0	0	137
Road Transport Act	14	1	0	1	0	16

LV17: original Table 4, PDF p. 19, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2016 Heading 25 · < 3 months in custody · >= 3 months and < 6 months in custody · >= 6 months and < 12 months in custody · >= 12 months and < 24 months in custody · >= 24 months in custody · Total

Original Annual heading: 2016 Subject matter 25.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Total	3005	750	400	104	2	4261
Murder etc.	59	67	93	23	1	243
Violence	475	118	30	3	0	626
Condition	75	38	26	6	0	145
Robbery	189	135	38	10	0	372
Breaking and entering	426	94	35	2	0	557
Theft	547	33	15	0	0	595
Economic crime	329	29	13	4	0	375
Drugs and smuggling	546	160	119	54	1	880
Other criminal law, including use theft	196	69	30	2	0	297
Other special laws	149	5	1	0	0	155
Road Transport Act	14	2	0	0	0	16

LV17: original Table 4, PDF p. 19, Table segment 3

Original header cells: 2017 Subject area 26 · < 3 months in custody · >= 3 months and < 6 months in custody · >= 6 months and < 12 months in custody · >= 12 months and < 24 months in custody · >= 24 months in custody · Total

Original Annual heading: 2017 Subject matter 26.

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Total	3194	791	337	67	1	4390
Murder etc.	80	70	94	28	0	272

LV17: original Table 4, PDF p. 20, Table 1

Original title cells (line change total):

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Violence	528	148	35	5	0	716
Condition	79	44	34	6	0	163
Robbery	257	125	39	5	0	426
Breaking and entering	361	68	24	1	0	454
Theft	601	25	10	0	0	636
Economic crime	300	44	6	1	0	351
Drugs and smuggling	525	122	55	18	1	721

Subject matter	≥ 0 and <3 months	≥ 3 and <6 months	≥ 6 and <12 months	≥ 12 and <24 months	≥ 24 months	Total
Other criminal law, including use theft	212	134	40	3	0	389
Other special laws	244	7	0	0	0	251
Road Transport Act	7	4	0	0	0	11

LV17: original Table 5, PDF p. 20, Table 2

Original title cells (line change total): 2014 Number of persons in the same main ratio · Number of long-term custody imprisonment · Total number of pre-trial imprisonment · Proportion of long-term pre-trial imprisonment in per cent · Average duration of long-term pre-trial imprisonment in months .27

Original annual heading: 2014 Number of persons in the same main ratio.

Number of persons in the main relationship	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1364	4984	27,4%	6,0
1	552	2561	21,6%	5,7
2	300	1121	26,8%	5,6
3	194	603	32,2%	6,0
4	126	324	38,9%	6,7
5 or more	192	375	51,2%	6,7

LV17: original Table 5, PDF p. 21, Table 1

Original title cells: Number of persons in the same main ratio.

Original annual heading: 2016 Number of persons in the same main ratio; 2017 Number of persons in the same main ratio.

Number of persons in the main relationship	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1289	4408	29,2%	6,5
1	516	2350	22,0%	5,8
2	236	907	26,0%	5,7
3	198	543	36,5%	7,0
4	101	214	47,2%	6,7
5 or more	238	394	60,4%	8,2
Total	1256	4261	29,5%	6,5
1	550	2345	23,5%	6,0
2	249	935	26,6%	5,8
3	165	451	36,6%	6,3

Number of persons in the main relationship	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income; (%)	Average duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
4	87	219	39,7%	6,9
5 or more	205	311	65,9%	8,3
Total	1196	4390	27,2%	5,9
1	587	2446	24,0%	6,0
2	239	994	24,0%	5,4
3	164	495	33,1%	6,0
4	76	202	37,6%	5,9
5 or more	130	253	51,4%	6,5

LV17: original Table 6, PDF p. 22, Table 1

Original title cells (line shift combined): Decision · Type of decision (AFGTYPEVEEGT) · Flattering · Non-Flattering · Not determined.

Decision	Type of decision (AFGTYPING)	Trailers	Non-felting	Not settled
Other	40	1	0	-
Conditional judgment	04	9	0	-
Conditional judgment and fine	05	2	0	-
Partial conditional judgment	06	48	0	-
Judgment	01	844	0	-
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Penal Code (mental illness, etc.)	03	129	0	-
Removed	11	0	73	-
Fine imposed	02	1	0	-
Transferred to a foreign community	99	0	1	-
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	0	33	-
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (7)	67	1	0	-
Not settled	-	-	-	54
Total	-	1035	107	54

Sources and version delineation

• **LV11**: The use of long-term detention in 2011 and 2012, 2013-06-19. Original and physical pages are given by each segment.

• **LV13**: The use of long-term detention in 2013, 2015- 01-26. Original and physical pages are given by each segment.

• **LV14B**: Annex to the 2014 statement, 2015-06. Original and physical pages are given by each segment.

• **LV15**: The use of long-term pre-trial imprisonment in 2015, 2016-10-20. Original and physical pages are given by each segment.

• **LV16**: Use of long-term pre-trial imprisonment in 2016, 2017-08-07. Original and physical pages are given by each segment.

• **LV17**: The use of long-term detention in 2017, 2018-05-31. Original and physical pages are given by each segment.

Long-term care 2019: original control findings and separate annex reproduction

Concurrent authority finding: 16 omitted references

The Director of Public Prosecutions' statement of 30. November 2020 documents that in 16 instances in 2019, police districts omitted the prescribed referral to the Regional Public Prosecutor concerning continued pre-trial detention beyond the time limits. The Regional Public Prosecutors criticised the omissions. The same section lists 82 referrals. The two counts must remain separate; the original does not determine whether the same person or case may occur several times. Calculating a national proportion requires the precise referral population and case linkage. [LV19, p. 3]

Argument chain: Conclusion: a protective oversight procedure was demonstrably breached. The authority's specific statement: 16 omitted submissions that were criticised. Original evidence: page 3 of the statement. Deficiency: the required prior review of continuing deprivation of liberty was not performed as prescribed. Rule: the statement's submission duty, linked to the Administration of Justice Act's section 768 a deadlines and requirements for special or very special reasons. Act/omission: the police district's extension request without the prescribed submission. Legal departure: the procedural deficiency described; each order's validity and the intervention's necessity must be examined in the record. Significance for the outcome: the prescribed review of the extension request did not occur; the actual extension and its days must be documented in individual records. Responsibility: the specific prosecutor, police-district and supervisory chain and the timing of knowledge must be identified. Demand: produce the 16 submission trajectories, their orders, actual duration, supervisory response and any subsequent legal consequences. The figure does not in itself represent 16 different people or 16 imprisonments already established as lacking legal authority.

Limitation and actual reading volume

All four pages of the statement are read in the Danish Parliament's original HTML reproduction. The document has file number RA-2020-2100105-2 and was transmitted as REU Annex 244 on 12 March 2021. It describes long-term custody as more than three months before judgment at first instance. Data were drawn on April 4, 2020. The period ending in 2019 is included, even if they started earlier; continued custody at the end of the year has been omitted. [LV19, pp. 1, 3-4]

The independent attachment is identified in the original Folketing registry with file number 2353614, but its PDF and image cells are not yet materially controlled. The following **32 segments with 371 data rows are controlled in PolSpy's public transcription of this Annex**. They are therefore labeled as document reproduction, not fully controlled PDF-original. Page numbers, tables, explicit annual markers and all reproduced numerical cells are preserved. Column meaning and line change are normalised; no passenger coupling is performed. An original "-" remains a line and is not tacitly renamed zero.

The Annex provides alternative annual versions for 2015- 2019. For example, the 2019 version is 4.213 completed, of which 1.406 is long, while the later statistics with the modified end point give other counters. The two versions cannot be combined or produced as a development for an unchanged population. [LV19B-G, Tables A and 1, reproduced p. 1-2]

The outcome categories include judgments imposing measures, fines and waivers of prosecution. The stated conviction rate of approximately 95 per cent concerns **decided prolonged cases**,not all remand-detention courses or all persons. The annex account's 2019 row reconciles 1.247 convictions, 66 non-convictions and 93 undecided cases to 1.406. The 48 acquittals are included in the 66 and must not be added again. [LV19,p. 2; LV19B-G, table 6,p. 15]

A concrete question for the original table check

The statement's original p. 1 gives children's average long-term pre-trial detention as 5,9 months in 2019. Table B in the reproduction repeats this. Table 2,however, reproduces two long processes for 15-year-olds averaging 6,7 months, 11 for 16-year-olds with 6,4 and 25 for 17-year-olds with 6,4. Weighting these reproduced cells gives approximately 6,42 months. This is a specific possible reconciliation problem requiring a check in the original PDF and its underlying data. It is not yet an established printing error in the original table. [LV19,s. 1; LV19B-G, table B/2,s. 1/5]

Annex reproduction: all numerical table rows

Annex reproduction: Table A, page 1, Annual Marker 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019

Indicator	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Total number of pre-trial imprisonment	4.416	4.226	4.431	4.446	4.213
Number of long-term pre-trial imprisonment	1.289	1.241	1.227	1.321	1.406
Proportion of long-term detention	29,2%	29,4%	27,7%	29,7%	33,4%
Average duration of long-term detention in custody (months)	6,5	6,4	6,1	6,0	6,7

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: table B, page 1, year marker 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019

Indicator	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Total number of detention facilities (u. 18)	166	167	210	172	106
Number of long-term detention facilities (u. 18)	47	50	77	42	38
Proportion of long-term detention of persons (u. 18)	28,3%	29,9%	36,7%	24,4%	35,8%
Average duration of long-term detention (u. 18) (months)	5,6	5,2	4,9	4,9	5,9

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 1, page 2, Annual Marker 2019

Circles	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1406	4213	33,4%	6,7
North Jutland Police Department	74	228	32,5%	6,3
East Jutland Police Department	196	339	57,8%	6,5
Central and West Jutland Police	89	330	27,0%	5,9
South-East Jutland Police	94	224	42,0%	6,4
Police of South and South Jutland	116	293	39,6%	6,1
Fyns Police	122	246	49,6%	6,2
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	106	236	44,9%	7,1
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	90	181	49,7%	6,7
Police of North Zealand	63	204	30,9%	6,4
Copenhagen West Region Police	70	219	32,0%	6,1
The Copenhagen Police Department	384	1693	22,7%	7,4
Bornholms Police	2	20	10,0%	3,6

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 1, page 2, annual marker 2018

Circles	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1321	4446	29,7%	6,0
North Jutland Police Department	90	235	38,3%	6,3
East Jutland Police Department	159	361	44,0%	6,4
Central and West Jutland Police	112	267	41,9%	5,7
South-East Jutland Police	115	267	43,1%	6,0
Police of South and South Jutland	103	299	34,4%	6,1
Fyns Police	68	219	31,1%	5,7
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	92	242	38,0%	5,8
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	68	190	35,8%	5,5
Police of North Zealand	90	279	32,3%	5,6
Copenhagen West Region Police	68	260	26,2%	6,1
The Copenhagen Police Department	353	1807	19,5%	6,3
Bornholms Police	3	20	15,0%	6,3

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 1, page 3, annual marker 2017

Circles	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1227	4431	27,7%	6,1
North Jutland Police Department	66	216	30,6%	5,4
East Jutland Police Department	129	351	36,8%	5,6
Central and West Jutland Police	112	306	36,6%	6,4
South-East Jutland Police	83	252	32,9%	5,6
Police of South and South Jutland	93	312	29,8%	5,6
Fyns Police	120	228	52,6%	6,5
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	82	201	40,8%	6,2
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	61	228	26,8%	6,1
Police of North Zealand	84	301	27,9%	6,8
Copenhagen West Region Police	74	212	34,9%	6,4
The Copenhagen Police Department	317	1811	17,5%	6,1
Bornholms Police	6	13	46,2%	5,2

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 1, page 3, Annual Marker 2016

Circles	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1241	4226	29,4%	6,4
North Jutland Police Department	98	237	41,4%	5,9
East Jutland Police Department	87	257	33,9%	5,4
Central and West Jutland Police	77	260	29,6%	5,2
South-East Jutland Police	106	214	49,5%	6,8
Police of South and South Jutland	88	303	29,0%	5,2
Fyns Police	88	199	44,2%	6,2
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	83	218	38,1%	6,4
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	73	225	32,4%	6,3
Police of North Zealand	74	335	22,1%	7,1
Copenhagen West Region Police	81	222	36,5%	6,4
The Copenhagen Police Department	381	1741	21,9%	7,1
Bornholms Police	5	15	33,3%	6,6

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 1, page 4, Annual Marker 2015

Circles	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1289	4416	29,2%	6,5
North Jutland Police Department	76	195	39,0%	5,9
East Jutland Police Department	115	301	38,2%	6,1
Central and West Jutland Police	76	277	27,4%	5,8
South-East Jutland Police	130	265	49,1%	6,6
Police of South and South Jutland	98	306	32,0%	5,3
Fyns Police	87	195	44,6%	5,9
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	102	269	37,9%	6,6
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	68	212	32,1%	6,3
Police of North Zealand	89	297	30,0%	5,7
Copenhagen West Region Police	103	292	35,3%	5,7
The Copenhagen Police Department	342	1792	19,1%	7,7
Bornholms Police	3	15	20,0%	4,4

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 2, page 5, Annual marker 2019

Age	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention;	Duration of long term pre-trial detention; (months)
Total	1406	4213	33,4%	6,7
15	2	8	25,0%	6,7
16	11	32	34,4%	6,4
17	25	66	37,9%	6,4
18-20	99	237	41,8%	6,4
20-25	342	942	36,3%	6,6
25-30	275	878	31,3%	6,8
30-35	196	648	30,2%	6,6
35-40	145	473	30,7%	6,9
40-45	120	365	32,9%	6,8
45-50	71	224	31,7%	6,4
50-55	56	169	33,1%	6,9
55-60	32	91	35,2%	6,9
60-65	18	46	39,1%	7,2
65-70	6	17	35,3%	7,3
70-75	6	11	54,5%	5,9
75-80	1	4	25,0%	4,9
80-85	1	2	50,0%	10,5

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 2, page 5, Annual Marker 2018

Age	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention;	Duration of long term pre-trial detention; (months)
Total	1321	4446	29,7%	6,0
15	3	16	18,8%	3,8
16	13	64	20,3%	4,6
17	26	92	28,3%	5,3
18-20	84	281	29,9%	5,6
20-25	363	989	36,7%	6,1
25-30	265	883	30,0%	5,9
30-35	165	636	25,9%	6,0
35-40	151	547	27,6%	6,0
40-45	88	378	23,3%	6,3
45-50	74	257	28,8%	6,6
50-55	41	152	27,0%	6,4
55-60	25	78	32,1%	5,8
60-65	14	46	30,4%	5,8
65-70	4	15	26,7%	8,4
70-75	5	10	50,0%	8,8
75-80	-	1	0,0%	-
80-85	-	1	0,0%	-

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 2, page 6, annual marker 2017

Age	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention;	Duration of long term pre-trial detention; (months)
Total	1227	4431	27,7%	6,1
15	6	23	26,1%	5,3
16	27	76	35,5%	5,6
17	44	111	39,6%	4,9
18-20	89	310	28,7%	5,7
20-25	289	1037	27,9%	5,8
25-30	212	814	26,0%	6,1
30-35	171	616	27,8%	6,3
35-40	123	482	25,5%	6,6
40-45	109	387	28,2%	6,3
45-50	71	259	27,4%	7,0
50-55	42	169	24,9%	5,8
55-60	26	87	29,9%	7,5
60-65	9	37	24,3%	6,4
65-70	4	12	33,3%	5,4
70-75	5	9	55,6%	5,4
75-80	-	1	0,0%	-
80-85	-	1	0,0%	-

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 2, page 6, Annual Marker 2016

Age	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention;	Duration of long term pre-trial detention; (months)
Total	1241	4226	29,4%	6,4
15	7	24	29,2%	5,3
16	13	49	26,5%	5,4
17	30	94	31,9%	5,5
18-20	82	239	34,3%	6,0
20-25	300	970	30,9%	6,0
25-30	246	856	28,7%	6,6
30-35	172	595	28,9%	6,6
35-40	143	498	28,7%	6,8
40-45	95	374	25,4%	7,1
45-50	76	244	31,1%	6,5
50-55	46	159	28,9%	6,0
55-60	12	65	18,5%	5,8
60-65	7	35	20,0%	7,2
65-70	12	21	57,1%	7,9
70-75	-	1	0,0%	-
75-80	-	2	0,0%	-
80-85	-	-	-	-

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 2, page 7, Annual Marker 2015

Age	Number of long periods pre-trial detention;	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial detention;	Duration of long term pre-trial detention; (months)
Total	1289	4416	29,2%	6,5
15	4	15	26,7%	5,3
16	14	51	27,5%	7,1
17	29	100	29,0%	5,4
18-20	92	297	31,0%	5,8
20-25	253	886	28,6%	6,0
25-30	239	809	29,5%	6,8
30-35	183	659	27,8%	6,6
35-40	172	583	29,5%	6,3
40-45	103	400	25,8%	6,6
45-50	101	309	32,7%	7,0
50-55	53	175	30,3%	6,8
55-60	24	82	29,3%	7,6
60-65	14	30	46,7%	6,8
65-70	4	13	30,8%	5,4
70-75	3	6	50,0%	8,8
75-80	-	-	-	-
80-85	1	1	100,0%	7,1

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 3, page 8, annual marker 2019

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1406	4213	33,4%	6,7
Murder etc.	217	273	79,5%	8,0
Violence	203	679	29,9%	5,7
Condition	80	155	51,6%	6,8
Robbery	134	263	51,0%	6,2
Breaking and entering	128	381	33,6%	5,2
Theft	58	496	11,7%	5,5
Economic crime	65	286	22,7%	8,4
Drugs and smuggling	356	1042	34,2%	7,1
Other criminal law, including use theft	146	321	45,5%	6,4
Other special laws	14	297	4,7%	4,1
Road Transport Act	5	20	25,0%	4,7

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 3, page 8, Annual Marker 2018

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1321	4446	29,7%	6
Murder etc.	204	297	68,7%	8,2
Violence	184	737	25,0%	5,6
Condition	89	203	43,8%	7
Robbery	173	370	46,8%	5,3
Breaking and entering	114	484	23,6%	5,1
Theft	94	570	16,5%	5,1
Economic crime	53	274	19,3%	5,4
Drugs and smuggling	213	848	25,1%	6
Other criminal law, including use theft	187	414	45,2%	5,6
Other special laws	7	232	3,0%	4,8
Road Transport Act	3	17	17,6%	5,2

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 3, page 9, annual marker 2017

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1227	4431	27,7%	6,1
Murder etc.	169	248	68,1%	7,7
Violence	181	719	25,2%	5,2
Condition	88	166	53,0%	6,6
Robbery	169	415	40,7%	5,4
Breaking and entering	95	460	20,7%	5,4
Theft	34	650	5,2%	5
Economic crime	61	363	16,8%	5,2
Drugs and smuggling	250	767	32,6%	7,1
Other criminal law, including use theft	169	374	45,2%	5,4
Other special laws	7	256	2,7%	3,8
Road Transport Act	4	13	30,8%	3,8

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 3, page 9, Annual Marker 2016

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1241	4226	29,4%	6,4
Murder etc.	187	246	76,0%	8,1
Violence	143	612	23,4%	4,9
Condition	59	133	44,4%	6
Robbery	187	389	48,1%	5,5
Breaking and entering	126	551	22,9%	5,7
Theft	58	593	9,8%	5,6
Economic crime	40	365	11,0%	6,2
Drugs and smuggling	338	882	38,3%	7,5
Other criminal law, including use theft	93	284	32,7%	5,3
Other special laws	7	154	4,5%	4,6
Road Transport Act	3	17	17,6%	4

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 3, page 9, Annual Marker 2015

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1289	4416	29,2%	6,5
Murder etc.	188	229	82,1%	8
Violence	148	618	23,9%	5,3
Condition	62	118	52,5%	6,4
Robbery	192	448	42,9%	5,9
Breaking and entering	123	601	20,5%	4,8
Theft	53	602	8,8%	5,1
Economic crime	57	374	15,2%	5,4
Drugs and smuggling	350	1005	34,8%	7,9
Other criminal law, including use theft	109	268	40,7%	5,1
Other special laws	4	139	2,9%	5,1
Road Transport Act	3	14	21,4%	7,8

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 4, page 10, Annual Marker 2019

Subject matter	0-3 months	3-6 months	6-12 months	12-24 months	24 months +	Total
Total	2807	789	497	113	7	4213
Murder etc.	56	70	117	30	-	273
Violence	476	136	62	5	-	679
Condition	75	40	36	3	1	155
Robbery	129	82	43	9	-	263
Breaking and entering	253	96	28	4	-	381
Theft	438	37	21	-	-	496
Economic crime	221	34	20	6	5	286
Drugs and smuggling	686	189	119	47	1	1042
Other criminal law, including use theft	175	87	50	9	-	321
Other special laws	283	14	-	-	-	297
Road Transport Act	15	4	1	-	-	20

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 4, page 10, annual marker 2018

Subject matter	0-3 months	3-6 months	6-12 months	12-24 months	24 months +	Total
Total	3125	830	430	61	-	4446
Murder etc.	93	67	112	25	-	297
Violence	553	127	51	6	-	737
Condition	114	40	43	6	-	203
Robbery	197	128	40	5	-	370
Breaking and entering	370	87	24	3	-	484
Theft	476	73	21	-	-	570
Economic crime	221	39	14	-	-	274
Drugs and smuggling	635	138	63	12	-	848
Other criminal law, including use theft	227	123	60	4	-	414
Other special laws	225	6	1	-	-	232
Road Transport Act	14	2	1	-	-	17

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 4, page 11, annual marker 2017

Subject matter	0-3 months	3-6 months	6-12 months	12-24 months	24 months +	Total
Total	3204	785	365	75	2	4431
Murder etc.	79	66	85	17	1	248
Violence	538	139	38	4	-	719
Condition	78	45	35	8	-	166
Robbery	246	124	40	5	-	415
Breaking and entering	365	69	25	1	-	460
Theft	616	25	9	-	-	650
Economic crime	302	48	13	-	-	363
Drugs and smuggling	517	133	79	37	1	767
Other criminal law, including use theft	205	125	41	3	-	374
Other special laws	249	7	-	-	-	256
Road Transport Act	9	4	-	-	-	13

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 4, page 11, Annual Marker 2016

Subject matter	0-3 months	3-6 months	6-12 months	12-24 months	24 months +	Total
Total	2985	748	395	97	1	4226
Murder etc.	59	65	98	24	-	246
Violence	469	114	27	2	-	612
Condition	74	35	20	4	-	133
Robbery	202	135	43	9	-	389
Breaking and entering	425	92	32	2	-	551
Theft	535	36	19	3	-	593
Economic crime	325	28	8	4	-	365
Drugs and smuggling	544	167	123	47	1	882
Other criminal law, including use theft	191	67	24	2	-	284
Other special laws	147	6	1	-	-	154
Road Transport Act	14	3	-	-	-	17

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 4, page 12, Annual Marker 2015

Subject matter	0-3 months	3-6 months	6-12 months	12-24 months	24 months +	Total
Total	3127	740	443	106	-	4416
Murder etc.	41	62	107	19	-	229
Violence	470	108	37	3	-	618
Condition	56	26	35	1	-	118
Robbery	256	117	70	5	-	448
Breaking and entering	478	105	18	-	-	601
Theft	549	41	9	3	-	602
Economic crime	317	41	16	-	-	374
Drugs and smuggling	655	155	122	73	-	1005
Other criminal law, including use theft	159	80	28	1	-	268
Other special laws	135	3	1	-	-	139
Road Transport Act	11	2	-	1	-	14

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 5, page 13, Annual Marker 2019

Number of persons in principal	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1406	4213	33,4%	6,7
1	602	2532	23,8%	5,8
2	269	795	33,8%	6,1
3	178	391	45,5%	6,9
4	154	229	67,2%	7,4
5 or more	203	266	76,3%	9,1

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 5, page 13, annual marker 2018

Number of persons in principal	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1321	4446	29,7%	6
1	591	2626	22,5%	5,8
2	244	883	27,6%	5,7
3	206	438	47,0%	5,8
4	143	262	54,6%	6,5
5 or more	137	237	57,8%	7,4

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 5, page 13, annual marker 2017

Number of persons in principal	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1227	4431	27,7%	6,1
1	585	2558	22,9%	5,7
2	260	989	26,3%	5,6
3	161	464	34,7%	6
4	79	181	43,6%	6
5 or more	142	239	59,4%	8,6

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 5, page 14, annual marker 2016

Number of persons in principal	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1241	4226	29,4%	6,4
1	558	2439	22,9%	5,9
2	259	921	28,1%	5,5
3	171	429	39,9%	6,8
4	76	183	41,5%	6,8
5 or more	177	254	69,7%	8,7

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 5, page 14, Annual Marker 2015

Number of persons in principal	Number of long-term duration egg imprisonment;	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of long-term product fortifications of income;	Duration of long-term custody Detention (month)
Total	1289	4416	29,2%	6,5
1	588	2598	22,6%	5,9
2	253	858	29,5%	6,1
3	181	460	39,3%	6,6
4	97	228	42,5%	6,9
5 or more	170	272	62,5%	8,4

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 6, page 15, Annual marker 2019

Decision	Type of decision (code)	Trailers	Not felling	Not settled
Total	-	1247	66	93
Judgment	1	1069	0	-
Fine imposed	2	6	0	-
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	3	131	0	-
Conditional judgment	4	2	0	-
Partial conditional judgment	6	35	0	-
Removed	11	-	48	-
Other	40	4	0	-
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	-	14	-
Case transmitted to foreign countries	121	-	4	-
Not settled	Not settled	-	0	93

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Annex reproduction: Table 6, page 15, Annual Marker 2018

Decision	Type of decision (code)	Trailers	Not felling	Not settled
Total	-	1230	63	28
Judgment	1	1037	0	-
Fine imposed	2	11	0	-
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	3	134	0	-
Conditional judgment	4	3	0	-
Conditional judgment and fine	5	1	0	-
Partial conditional judgment	6	44	0	-
Removed	11	-	38	-
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	-	24	-
The charge is unfounded - the Penal Code (Rpl. § 721 (1) (1)	74	-	1	-
Not settled	Not settled	-	0	28

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 6, page 16, annual marker 2017

Decision	Type of decision (code)	Trailers	Not felling	Not settled
Total	-	1165	57	5
Judgment	1	951	0	-
Fine imposed	2	5	0	-
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	3	138	0	-
Conditional judgment	4	11	0	-
Conditional judgment and fine	5	1	0	-
Partial conditional judgment	6	56	0	-
Removed	11	-	31	-
Other	40	1	0	-
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (4)	66	1	0	-
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (7)	67	1	0	-
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	-	25	-
Transferred to a foreign community	99	-	1	-
Not settled	Not settled	-	0	5

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 6, page 16, Annual Marker 2016

Decision	Type of decision (code)	Trailers	Not felling	Not settled
Total	-	1182	52	7
Judgment	1	1001	0	-
Fine imposed	2	5	0	-
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	3	130	0	-
Conditional judgment	4	6	0	-
Partial conditional judgment	6	39	0	-
Removed	11	-	32	-
Other	40	1	0	-
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	-	20	-
Not settled	Not settled	-	0	7

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Image reproduction: Table 6, page 16, Annual Marker 2015

Decision	Type of decision (code)	Trailers	Not felling	Not settled
Total	-	1204	84	1
Judgment	1	1012	0	-
Fine imposed	2	3	0	-
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	3	129	0	-
Conditional judgment	4	11	0	-
Partial conditional judgment	6	47	0	-
Removed	11	-	28	-
Non-conditionality (Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (7)	67	1	0	-
Non-conditionality (Rpl. § 722 (2) as referred to in paragraph 3)	68	1	0	-
Alleged (Rpl. Paragraph 721 (1) (2)	69	-	7	-
The charge is unfounded - the Penal Code (Rpl. § 721 (1) (1)	74	-	49	-
Not settled	Not settled	-	0	1

Source: LV19B-G, table and reproduction page, secondary transcription control.

Documented findings, traces of investigations and necessary documents

Documented in the original report: the 16 omitted references, the 82 references, the date of calculation and the exclusion of continued custody at the end of the year. Recording level: the 371 table rows and their internal sum control. Traces of investigation: possible variations in child characteristics and the legal basis, duration and consequences of individual deprivation of liberty. Material needed: original documents, file and order chains, file references, release dates, documented children / family relationships, consequences of liability and actual compensation. The strongest current documented criticism is the lack of control under continued care; the actual cessation and repair of the citizen must follow as independent events.

The autonomous 2018- original has also been identified: eight exposition pages and 15 attachment pages, originally REU 2018- 19, second collection, Annex 113, transmitted 25 September 2019. The current public PDF view has only been able to provide piston text and page numbers; screenshot calls have not provided image pixels. These 23 pages are therefore not yet materially read. The lack does not change the actually read historical originals or the original 2019 find.

LV 2018: full original, children, outcomes and internal number differences

The 2018 original demonstrates that the main total, duration distribution and decision-making outcomes do not have the same numeric sum. In addition, the follow-up letter indicates a different number of children than both tables. These differences shall be visible when counting detention exercises, children and subsequent tests. None of the figures shall be replaced by an estimated "true 'value.

State Advocate General *The use of long-term pre-trial imprisonment 2018*, **17 September 2019, RA-2019-2100105-2**, is now fully visually read: **8 report / follow-up pages and 15 Annex pages**. The two scanned official Folketing files, retransmitted as REU 2019-20 question 655, are obtained through public archive copies of the same official URLs. The documents also show REU 2018- 19, 2nd Collection, Annex 113. All pages are read in memory; no official original files or pages are saved.

Originals: report 2237670 and annex 2237671. The archive copies of the report and annex used are from 28. June 2024. Checksums: report SHA256 bdb84a81563d13d62cfd45841032c09a499a5885aa2d0800643877151b7914b7; annex 03e0db86a98136ca6935e680b8b20c3d08b4c949d97f7d13ea430f162bd04fbd.

They may harm them, even **30 annual tables and all 363 series of figures** is reproduced in **long-product-product -2018- original-tables.md**, with original table number, year, column designation and physical / printed sidecator. JSON file **long-range -product -2018-original control -and -all-tables .json** contains the same own cells, sources, control date, all pages read and methodical facts. All column numbers and length drawings are aligned to check the transcription; the material discrepancy between the tables is preserved.

Limitation and source chain

The report's pt.4, p.7-8, describes QlikView with POLSAS as the basis. Previous years 2014- 2017 are reextracted in this publication for comparability. They are **the audit version of this publication;**, not additional observations that can be added to the same year's other versions. The exact day of the extract shall not be given in the 23 pages; it shall not be deduced from the date of a subsequent re-transmission.

Long-term is defined as **more than 3 months before judgment at first instance**. A case begun in 2017 is included if pre-trial detention ended in 2018. Cases initiated but not yet completed in 2018 are **excluded**. This therefore covers neither all people in pre-trial detention during the calendar year nor the year's total time burden. One month equals **30,5 days**, annex p.15, note 2. The main case category is determined by the decision, but the charge is used for undecided cases; these are dynamic data that may change following amendment of the prosecution or acquittal on one count, note 3.

The report uses on s.3 the wording "total number of persons under the age of 18," but the title and cells of the Annex show **pre-trial detention at the age of the arrest;**. There is no identity list or national person dedup rule. Therefore, the report's change of words does not create evidence for 172 unique children. The original interval markings 20-25 and 18-20 of the age range are retained in the reading table; any limit days cannot be reconstructed from the labels.

The State itself states that methodology and data change continuously, and that missing/incorrect registrations and imprecise definitions/codes cause data uncertainty. This is documented, source-specific methodological information, not a general reservation about specifically verified cells. The Director of Public Prosecutions' explanations concerning crime trends and case complexity on pp.2-3 are the authority's explanations; they do not document necessity or legality in each individual pre-trial detention case.

Main table, duration table and outcome: same year, different sums

Data year in 2018-pu milking	All products Red-billed rings R, Table 1	Long-term, Table 1	Share / mean months	Sum of ≥ 3 months ranges, table 4	Sum of decisions esstatus, Table 6	Deviation from long-term Table 1
2018	4.419	1.328	30,1% /6,1	1.326	1.326	−2
2017	4.415	1.229	27,8% /6,1	1.227	1.227	−2
2016	4.218	1.241	29,4% /6,4	1.240	1.240	−1
2015	4.407	1.286	29,2% /6,5	1.286	1.286	0
2014	5.031	1.417	28,2% /6,0	1.417	1.417	0

Locators: Annex Table 1 p.1-3, Table 4 p.10-11 and Table 6 p.14-15; Main Report p.3 Table 1 and Note 1 user **more than 3 months**, while Table 4 marks the interval **≥ 3 months**. The different threshold selection is an independent method point. The missing 1-2 rows cannot be attributed without raw data to specific persons, limit days or classification errors. An explained data dynamics is not a documented reconstruction of these concrete observations.

The review of the later 2019 publication for 2018 **4.446 /1.321**(i) the number of persons employed in the production of the product; *long-term -product -2019 -original text and Annex reproduct.md*. It is a later version and must neither replace the 2018- original 4.419 / 1.328 without labelling nor be added to them. The 2019 Annex remains secondary reproduced and not fully original read, see final status below.

Children's number: 44 in the cover letter, 42 in both tables

Data year	All progress made during 18 years	Long-lasting i the main table,	Proportion long-term	Average months
2018	172	42	24,4%	4,9
2017	210	77	36,7%	5,2
2016	167	50	29,9%	5,4
2015	166	47	28,3%	5,9
2014	223	69	30,9%	5,4

Main report p.4. The age annex 2018, table 2 p.4, states **age 15:3 long-term out of 16, age 16:13 out of 64 and age 17:26 out of 92**; the long-term cases sum to **42**, and all cases to **172**. The covering letter p.1 instead states **44 long-term** and a decline of **45%** from 2017's 77. The calculated decline 77→42 is 45,45%;77→44 is 42,86%. The main table and age annex support 42, but 44 is retained as the covering letter's divergent information. This is **not two additional children**, nor a verified explanation of the error.

The report additionally states an 18,1% fall in all child courses, a12,3 percentage-point fall in the proportion prolonged and a reduction of 0,3 month/9 days in average duration. These are relative changes in the closed annual population; they do not themselves document actually fewer unique detained children or less total time when ongoing courses are excluded.

Duration and subsequent decision

Table 4, p.10, gives 2018: **3.093 under 3 months,829 from 3 to under 6,433 from 6 to under 12,64 from 12 to under 24 and 0 at least 24 months**. All 64 long cases lasting at least 1 year are counted within this completed population; absence of 2-year cases from the table does not mean no ongoing 2-year cases existed. The report, p.5, states a 6,5% increase at 3-6 months,a 19,6% increase at 6-12 and a 17,9% decrease above 1 year. The longest mean duration by offence category in 2018 is homicide etc., **8,1 months**, sexual offences **7,0** and drugs/smuggling **6,1**, appendix table 3, p.7. For cases with at least 5 people in the same principal matter, the long-case proportion is **58,1%** and mean duration **7,4 months**, table 5, p.12. None of these averages is an individual maximum duration or proof of specific lawfulness.

Data year	Coating status	Not felling status	Not settled	Dismissed within the non-decaying,	Objection dismissed § 721, paragraph 1, nr.2
2018	1.197	59	70	37	22
2017	1.158	57	12	31	25
2016	1.179	52	9	32	20
2015	1.201	84	1	28	7
2014	1.340	76	1	35	31

Annex table 6,pp.14-15. The last two columns are **subsets**,not new courses. The 2015 figure of 49 groundless charges and the 2014 figure of 9 groundless charges/1 discontinuance under no.3,and the 2017 figure of 1 transfer to another police district explain other non-conviction categories; all cells are in the full reading table. The 2018 figure of 37 acquittals represents courses in this count based on the **latest decision for the detainee concerned**,not a national minimum person count or automatically 37 unlawful deprivations of liberty. Acquittal, absence of conviction, the lawfulness of each order and entitlement to compensation must be assessed separately.

Report s.5 provides: **95,3% conviction among convicted**, calculated at 1.197 / (1.197 + 59) = 1.256 decided; 70 not settled is outside the denominator. Among the 1.197 fellows: **84,5% unconditional penalty**, **10,5% of the measure judgments under § 68-70** and **3,5% partly conditional**. This is neither 95,3% of the 1.328 main course nor 95,3% of all prisoners in custody for the calendar year. A later felling judgment does not in itself demonstrate that prior custody was necessary, properly tested and proportionate.

Overrun of § 768 a and control by the Authority

The report's s.5-6 reproduces the time frame structure at the time: adults **6 / 12 months** depending on whether the penalty is less than 6 years or 6 years or more; young people less than 18 **4 / 8 months**. Derogation requires special and exceptional circumstances, respectively. These are the 2018rules of the 2019 original and should not be called current 2026 deadlines without version control.

The Director of Public Prosecutions acknowledges on p.6 that QlikView/POLSAS **cannot provide valid duration extracts in relation to the offence's statutory penalty range**. Instead, information from Regional Public Prosecutors on prior approval and the court's order is used:

Year	Reported courses approved by the State Prosecutor exceeding § 768 a
2018	56
2017	35
2016	25
2015	42

The figures register a **described approval procedure**, not established unlawful acts or independent examination of each approval's conditions.56 in 2018 must not be confused with the 2019 statement's **16 cases without the required submission** or its 82 submissions. The populations have different years and criteria. The report's pp.6-7 say that all requests beyond the deadline must be submitted and that supervision monitors this; it gives no count of missing submissions for 2018.

The state describes the arrest warrant in all lawyers, the electronic management chart developed 2017 and tested from the second half of 2018 with feedback from early 2019. Mandatory nationwide use remained a **evaluation issues;**, p. 7 Surveillance and plan statements document knowledge and organised action options; the citizen's actual limited intervention time requires specific dates, orders and case impetus.

Completed original and remaining 2019 Annex

The former concrete remnants **LV 2018's 8 + 15 original pages** is now closed. The whole text, all 6 original tables with 5 data years each, all notes and all 363 rows of numbers are read / reproduced. Coverage status shall no longer denote these two 2018 files as only identified or unread.

For **LV 2019**,the official 4-page statement has already been read and documented. The 16-page appendix remains a checked **secondary PolSpy reproduction**,30 annual tables/32 page segments and 371 rows in the existing module. The official appendix file 2353614 has been identified through Folketing metadata; direct access and image viewing have not delivered every page for substantive reading. The public archive entry tested on 7. October 2026 yielded **no archived HTTP 200 PDF at the known URL**. This is a specific acquisition task for that primary original, rather than a national absence of data or negative proof against other possible public copies. Original checking of mean age, notes and all appendix cells remains outstanding. No new catalogue areas have been opened.

LV 2018: all original Annex Tables published 17 September 2019

30 annual tables and 363 numerical rows, visually read in the original 15 pages 7 October 2026. Table units, cells and percentage precision are maintained. The years 2014- 2017 are the review of this publication, not the extra course of custody. Table 6 sets out the most recent decision, not necessarily closing balance sheet on the year of custody. No automatic person dedup is performed.

Source for all tables: original statistical annex;; public record copy of the official original;. Each section indicates the original table number, data year and physical / printed page. Thousands of separators are removed in integer cells; decimals, percentage precision and originals' - 'are preserved. No new sightings have been created.

Table 1, data year 2018, original page 1: Number and share of long-term detention periods and the average duration of each area of policy;

Circles	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1328	4419	30,1%	6,1
North Jutland Police Department	90	234	38,5%	6,3
East Jutland Police Department	159	362	43,9%	6,4
Central and West Jutland Police	111	263	42,20%	5,7
South-East Jutland Police	115	266	43,2%	6,0
Police of South and South Jutland	106	302	35,1%	6,1
Fyns Police	69	217	31,8%	5,7
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	92	241	38,2%	5,8
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	68	188	36,2%	5,5
Police of North Zealand	92	277	33,2%	5,5
Copenhagen West Region Police	68	256	26,6%	6,1
The Copenhagen Police Department	355	1793	19,8%	6,4
Bornholms Police	3	20	15,0%	6,3

Table 1, data year 2017, original page 1: Number and share of long-term detention periods and the average duration of each area of policy;

Circles	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1229	4415	27,8%	6,1
North Jutland Police Department	67	215	31,2%	5,4
East Jutland Police Department	129	350	36,9%	5,6
Central and West Jutland Police	112	306	36,6%	6,4
South-East Jutland Police	83	249	33,3%	5,6
Police of South and South Jutland	94	311	30,2%	5,6
Fyns Police	120	228	52,6%	6,5
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	84	201	41,8%	6,4
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	61	228	26,8%	6,1
Police of North Zealand	84	296	28,4%	6,8
Copenhagen West Region Police	74	213	34,7%	6,5
The Copenhagen Police Department	315	1805	17,5%	6,1
Bornholms Police	6	13	46,2%	5,2

Table 1, data year 2016, original page 2: Number and share of long-term pre-trial imprisonment as well the average duration of each area of policy;

Circles	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1241	4218	29,4%	6,4
North Jutland Police Department	98	236	41,5%	5,9
East Jutland Police Department	87	258	33,7%	5,4
Central and West Jutland Police	78	260	30,0%	5,2
South-East Jutland Police	106	214	49,5%	6,8
Police of South and South Jutland	88	303	29,0%	5,4
Fyns Police	88	195	45,1%	6,2
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	83	218	38,1%	6,4
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	73	225	32,4%	6,4
Police of North Zealand	74	334	22,2%	7,1
Copenhagen West Region Police	81	223	36,3%	6,4
The Copenhagen Police Department	381	1741	21,9%	7,1
Bornholms Police	4	11	36,4%	7,1

Table 1, data year 2015, original page 2: Number and share of long-term pre-trial imprisonment as well the average duration of each area of policy;

Circles	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1286	4407	29,2%	6,5
North Jutland Police Department	76	195	39,0%	5,9
East Jutland Police Department	115	299	38,5%	6,1
Central and West Jutland Police	74	275	26,9%	5,7
South-East Jutland Police	130	265	49,1%	6,7
Police of South and South Jutland	98	306	32,0%	5,3
Fyns Police	87	195	44,6%	6,0
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	102	268	38,1%	6,6
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	67	211	31,8%	6,2
Police of North Zealand	89	296	30,1%	5,7
Copenhagen West Region Police	103	291	35,4%	5,7
The Copenhagen Police Department	342	1791	19,1%	7,7
Bornholms Police	3	15	20,0%	4,4

Table 1, data year 2014, original page 3: Number and share of long-term detention periods and the average duration of each area of policy;

Circles	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1417	5031	28,2%	6,0
North Jutland Police Department	71	217	32,7%	5,8
East Jutland Police Department	128	313	40,9%	5,8
Central and West Jutland Police	88	369	23,8%	5,1
South-East Jutland Police	107	256	41,8%	5,9
Police of South and South Jutland	115	347	33,1%	5,9
Fyns Police	85	243	35,0%	5,9
Southern Zealand and Lolland-Falster Police	103	264	39,0%	5,8
Central and Western Zealand Police Department	99	320	30,9%	5,5
Police of North Zealand	113	442	25,6%	6,0
Copenhagen West Region Police	118	269	43,9%	6,4
The Copenhagen Police Department	384	1973	19,5%	6,3
Bornholms Police	6	18	33,3%	6,5

Table 2, data year 2018, original page 4: Arrest sentences by age of arrest

Age	Number of prolonged pretrial detentions	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial imprisonment in %	Average duration of long duration pre-trial imprisonment in mdr [2]
Total	1328	4419	30,1%	6,1
15	3	16	18,8%	3,8
16	13	64	20,3%	4,6
17	26	92	28,3%	5,1
18-20	85	283	30,0%	5,6
20-25	364	980	37,1%	6,1
25-30	266	876	30,4%	6,0
30-35	168	639	26,3%	6,0
35-40	151	539	28,0%	6,0
40-45	88	375	23,5%	6,3
45-50	74	254	29,1%	6,6
50-55	42	151	27,8%	6,4
55-60	25	78	32,1%	5,8
60-65	14	46	30,4%	5,8
65-70	4	14	28,6%	8,4
70-75	5	10	50,0%	8,8
75-80	0	1	0,0%	-
80-85	0	1	0,0%	-

Table 2, Year of Data 2017, original page 4: Arrest sentences by age of arrest

Age	Number of prolonged pretrial detentions	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial imprisonment in %	Average duration of long duration pre-trial imprisonment in mdr [2]
Total	1229	4415	27,8%	6,1
15	6	23	26,1%	5,3
16	27	76	35,5%	5,6
17	44	111	39,6%	4,9
18-20	90	309	29,1%	5,7
20-25	290	1036	28,0%	5,8
25-30	212	809	26,2%	6,1
30-35	169	611	27,7%	6,3
35-40	123	482	25,5%	6,6
40-45	109	385	28,3%	6,3
45-50	72	258	27,9%	7,1
50-55	43	170	25,3%	6,0
55-60	26	85	30,6%	7,5
60-65	9	37	24,3%	6,4
65-70	4	12	33,3%	5,4
70-75	5	9	55,6%	5,4
75-80	0	1	0,0%	-
80-85	0	1	0,0%	-

Table 2, year of data 2016, original page 5: Arrest imprisonment by age of the arrest

Age	Number of prolonged pretrial detentions	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial imprisonment in %	Average duration of long duration pre-trial imprisonment in mdr [2]
Total	1241	4218	29,4%	6,4
15	7	24	29,2%	5,3
16	13	49	26,5%	5,4
17	30	94	31,9%	5,5
18-20	83	239	34,7%	6,0
20-25	301	970	31,0%	6,0
25-30	246	855	28,8%	6,6
30-35	171	592	28,9%	6,7
35-40	143	498	28,7%	6,9
40-45	94	372	25,3%	7,1
45-50	76	243	31,3%	6,5
50-55	46	158	29,1%	6,1
55-60	12	65	18,5%	5,8
60-65	7	35	20,0%	7,2
65-70	12	21	57,1%	7,9
70-75	0	1	0,0%	-
75-80	0	2	0,0%	-
80-85	0	0	-	-

Table 2, data year 2015, original page 5: Arrest sentences by age of arrest

Age	Number of prolonged pretrial detentions	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial imprisonment in %	Average duration of long duration pre-trial imprisonment in mdr [2]
Total	1286	4407	29,2%	6,5
15	4	15	26,7%	5,3
16	14	51	27,5%	7,1
17	29	100	29,0%	5,4
18-20	92	297	31,0%	5,9
20-25	251	884	28,4%	5,9
25-30	239	807	29,6%	6,8
30-35	182	657	27,7%	6,7
35-40	172	583	29,5%	6,3
40-45	103	399	25,8%	6,6
45-50	101	308	32,8%	7,0
50-55	53	175	30,3%	6,8
55-60	24	81	29,6%	7,6
60-65	14	30	46,7%	6,8
65-70	4	13	30,8%	5,4
70-75	3	6	50,0%	8,8
75-80	0	0	-	-
80-85	1	1	100,0%	7,1

Table 2, data year 2014, original page 6: Arrest sentences by age of arrest

Age	Number of prolonged pretrial detentions	Total pre-trial detention;	Proportion long-term pre-trial imprisonment in %	Average duration of long duration pre-trial imprisonment in mdr [2]
Total	1417	5031	28,2%	6,0
15	10	30	33,3%	5,5
16	17	66	25,8%	5,8
17	42	127	33,1%	5,2
18-20	112	361	31,0%	5,5
20-25	301	1132	26,6%	5,9
25-30	259	912	28,4%	5,6
30-35	184	693	26,6%	5,8
35-40	180	633	28,4%	6,5
40-45	120	460	26,1%	6,8
45-50	97	318	30,5%	6,3
50-55	53	164	32,3%	6,2
55-60	18	73	24,7%	7,3
60-65	13	41	31,7%	5,4
65-70	8	17	47,1%	7,0
70-75	3	4	75,0%	5,9
75-80	0	0	-	-
80-85	0	0	-	-

Table 3, data year 2018, original page 7: Long-term detention by subject matter

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1328	4419	30,1%	6,1
Murder etc.	203	297	68,4%	8,1
Violence	183	727	25,2%	5,6
Condition	90	206	43,7%	7,0
Robbery	174	372	46,8%	5,4
Breaking and entering	116	480	24,2%	5,1
Theft	93	563	16,5%	5,1
Economic crime	53	272	19,5%	5,4
Drugs and smuggling	216	841	25,7%	6,1
Other criminal law, including use theft	189	414	45,7%	5,7
Other special laws	7	228	3,1%	4,8
Road Transport Act	4	19	21,1%	5,0

Table 3, Data Year 2017, original page 7: Long-term detention by subject matter

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1229	4415	27,8%	6,1
Murder etc.	169	247	68,4%	7,8
Violence	179	714	25,1%	5,2
Condition	88	165	53,3%	6,6
Robbery	171	410	41,7%	5,5
Breaking and entering	95	462	20,6%	5,4
Theft	34	649	5,2%	5,0
Economic crime	61	363	16,8%	5,2
Drugs and smuggling	251	761	33,0%	7,1
Other criminal law, including use theft	170	376	45,2%	5,4
Other special laws	7	255	2,7%	3,8
Road Transport Act	4	13	30,8%	3,8

Table 3, data year 2016, original page 8: Long-term detention by subject matter

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1241	4218	29,4%	6,4
Murder etc.	187	246	76,0%	8,1
Violence	144	610	23,6%	4,9
Condition	59	130	45,4%	6,0
Robbery	187	390	47,9%	5,6
Breaking and entering	126	551	22,9%	5,7
Theft	58	593	9,8%	5,6
Economic crime	40	362	11,0%	6,2
Drugs and smuggling	338	882	38,3%	7,5
Other criminal law, including use theft	92	283	32,5%	5,3
Other special laws	7	154	4,5%	4,6
Road Transport Act	3	17	17,6%	4,0

Table 3, Data Year 2015, original page 8: Long-term detention by subject matter

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1286	4407	29,2%	6,5
Murder etc.	188	229	82,1%	8,0
Violence	148	617	24,0%	5,3
Condition	62	118	52,5%	6,4
Robbery	191	446	42,8%	5,9
Breaking and entering	123	601	20,5%	4,8
Theft	53	602	8,8%	5,1
Economic crime	57	372	15,3%	5,4
Drugs and smuggling	348	1003	34,7%	7,9
Other criminal law, including use theft	109	267	40,8%	5,1
Other special laws	4	138	2,9%	5,1
Road Transport Act	3	14	21,4%	7,8

Table 3, data year 2014, original page 9: Long-term detention by subject matter

Subject matter	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1417	5031	28,2%	6,0
Murder etc.	172	240	71,7%	7,6
Violence	177	699	25,3%	5,1
Condition	62	111	55,9%	5,9
Robbery	241	541	44,5%	5,6
Breaking and entering	158	723	21,9%	5,0
Theft	45	688	6,5%	5,3
Economic crime	55	461	11,9%	5,0
Drugs and smuggling	381	1081	35,2%	6,6
Other criminal law, including use theft	111	321	34,6%	5,8
Other special laws	9	153	5,9%	4,5
Road Transport Act	6	13	46,2%	5,5

Table 4, Data Year 2018, original page 10: Retaining prisoners by subject matter and duration

Subject matter	<3 months i custody;	≥ 3 months and <6 months in custody	≥ 6 months and <12 months in custody	≥ 12 months and <24 months i custody;	≥ 24 months custody;	Total
Total	3093	829	433	64	0	4419
Murder etc.	94	67	111	25	0	297
Violence	545	125	51	6	0	727
Condition	116	40	44	6	0	206
Robbery	198	128	40	6	0	372
Breaking and entering	364	89	24	3	0	480
Theft	470	72	21	0	0	563
Economic crime	219	39	14	0	0	272
Drugs and smuggling	625	137	65	14	0	841
Other criminal law, including use theft	226	123	61	4	0	414
Other special laws	221	6	1	0	0	228
Road Transport Act	15	3	1	0	0	19

Table 4, Data Year 2017, original page 10: Prison sentences by subject matter and duration

Subject matter	<3 months i custody;	≥ 3 months and <6 months in custody	≥ 6 months and <12 months in custody	≥ 12 months and <24 months i custody;	≥ 24 months custody;	Total
Total	3188	785	362	78	2	4415
Murder etc.	78	66	84	18	1	247
Violence	535	139	36	4	0	714
Condition	77	45	35	8	0	165
Robbery	239	124	40	7	0	410
Breaking and entering	367	69	25	1	0	462
Theft	615	25	9	0	0	649
Economic crime	302	48	13	0	0	363
Drugs and smuggling	512	133	78	37	1	761
Other criminal law, including use theft	206	125	42	3	0	376
Other special laws	248	7	0	0	0	255
Road Transport Act	9	4	0	0	0	13

Table 4, Year of Data 2016, original page 11: Prison sentences by subject matter and duration

Subject matter	<3 months i custody;	≥ 3 months and <6 months in custody	≥ 6 months and <12 months in custody	≥ 12 months and <24 months i custody;	≥ 24 months custody;	Total
Total	2978	747	394	97	2	4218
Murder etc.	59	65	98	24	0	246
Violence	467	114	27	2	0	610
Condition	71	35	20	4	0	130
Robbery	203	135	42	10	0	390
Breaking and entering	425	92	32	2	0	551
Theft	535	36	19	3	0	593
Economic crime	322	28	8	4	0	362
Drugs and smuggling	544	167	123	46	2	882
Other criminal law, including use theft	191	66	24	2	0	283
Other special laws	147	6	1	0	0	154
Road Transport Act	14	3	0	0	0	17

Table 4, Year of Data 2015, original page 11: Prison sentences by subject matter and duration

Subject matter	<3 months i custody;	≥ 3 months and <6 months in custody	≥ 6 months and <12 months in custody	≥ 12 months and <24 months i custody;	≥ 24 months custody;	Total
Total	3121	739	441	105	1	4407
Murder etc.	41	62	107	19	0	229
Violence	469	108	37	3	0	617
Condition	56	26	35	1	0	118
Robbery	255	117	68	6	0	446
Breaking and entering	478	105	18	0	0	601
Theft	549	41	9	3	0	602
Economic crime	315	41	16	0	0	372
Drugs and smuggling	655	154	122	71	1	1003
Other criminal law, including use theft	158	80	28	1	0	267
Other special laws	134	3	1	0	0	138
Road Transport Act	11	2	0	1	0	14

Table 4, Year of Data 2014, original page 11: Prison sentences by subject matter and duration

Subject matter	<3 months i custody;	≥ 3 months and <6 months in custody	≥ 6 months and <12 months in custody	≥ 12 months and <24 months i custody;	≥ 24 months custody;	Total
Total	3614	899	452	65	1	5031
Murder etc.	68	72	82	18	0	240
Violence	522	136	38	3	0	699
Condition	49	36	26	0	0	111
Robbery	300	157	77	7	0	541
Breaking and entering	565	128	27	2	1	723
Theft	643	33	10	2	0	688
Economic crime	406	47	8	0	0	461
Drugs and smuggling	700	210	142	29	0	1081
Other criminal law, including use theft	210	67	40	4	0	321
Other special laws	144	8	1	0	0	153
Road Transport Act	7	5	1	0	0	13

Table 5, data year 2018, original page 12: Number and share of long-term pre-trial imprisonment the number of persons in the same main proportion;

Number of persons in the same the main features;	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1328	4419	30,1%	6,1
1	592	2600	22,8%	5,8
2	248	879	28,2%	5,8
3	208	443	47,0%	5,9
4	144	263	54,8%	6,6
5 or more	136	234	58,1%	7,4

Table 5, Data Year 2017, original page 12: Number and share of long-term pre-trial imprisonment by the number of persons in the same main proportion;

Number of persons in the same the main features;	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1229	4415	27,8%	6,1
1	584	2546	22,9%	5,7
2	260	984	26,4%	5,6
3	160	465	34,4%	5,0
4	79	178	44,4%	6,5
5 or more	146	242	60,3%	8,7

Table 5, data year 2016, original page 12: Number and share of long-term pre-trial imprisonment the number of persons in the same main proportion;

Number of persons in the same the main features;	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1241	4218	29,4%	6,4
1	550	2420	22,7%	5,8
2	263	928	28,3%	6,7
3	172	430	40,0%	6,9
4	77	184	41,8%	6,8
5 or more	179	256	69,9%	8,7

Table 5, data year 2015, original page 12: Number and share of long-term pre-trial imprisonment the number of persons in the same main proportion;

Number of persons in the same the main features;	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1286	4407	29,2%	6,5
1	539	2520	21,4%	5,8
2	238	858	27,7%	5,8
3	191	466	41,0%	6,7
4	97	237	40,9%	7,2
5 or more	221	326	67,8%	8,3

Table 5, data year 2014, original page 13: Number and share of long-term pre-trial imprisonment by the number of persons in the same main proportion;

Number of persons in the same the main features;	Number of long-term duration Egg imprisonment ›	Total number of retention prison time;	Proportion of prolonged remand detentions in per cent	Average duration of long-term custody Intritions in month ²
Total	1417	5031	28,2%	6,0
1	600	2770	21,7%	5,6
2	344	1141	30,1%	5,9
3	187	525	35,6%	5,7
4	106	267	39,7%	7,0
5 or more	180	328	54,9%	6,8

Table 6, data year 2018, original page 14: Number of felling and non-felling decisions taken for the long-term pre-trial detention following the most recent decision in the case of the person concerned; arrestant

Decision	Trailers	Not felling	Not settled
Total	1197	59	70
Judgment	1011	0	0
Fine imposed	11	0	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	126	0	0
Conditional judgment	6	0	0
Conditional judgment and fine	1	0	0
Partial conditional judgment	42	0	0
Removed	0	37	0
Alleged (Rpl. § 721, par. 1, nr.2)	0	22	0
Not settled	0	0	70

Table 6, Data Year 2017, original page 14: Number of felling and non-felting decisions taken for the long-term pre-trial detention following the most recent decision in the case of the person concerned; arrestant

Decision	Trailers	Not felling	Not settled
Total	1158	57	12
Judgment	949	0	0
Fine imposed	5	0	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	136	0	0
Conditional judgment	11	0	0
Conditional judgment and fine	1	0	0
Partial conditional judgment	53	0	0
Removed	0	31	0
Other	1	0	0
(Rpl. § 722, paragraph 1, No 4)	1	0	0
(Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (7))	1	0	0
Alleged (Rpl. § 721, par. 1, nr.2)	0	25	0
Transferred to a foreign community	0	1	0
Not settled	0	0	12

Table 6, Data Year 2016, original page 14: Number of felling and non-felling decisions for the long-term pre-trial detention following the most recent decision in the case of the person concerned; arrestant

Decision	Trailers	Not felling	Not settled
Total	1179	52	9
Judgment	999	0	0
Fine imposed	5	0	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	129	0	0
Conditional judgment	6	0	0
Partial conditional judgment	39	0	0
Removed	0	32	0
Other	1	0	0
Alleged (Rpl. § 721, par. 1, nr.2)	0	20	0
Not settled	0	0	9

Table 6, data year 2015, original page 15: Number of felling and non-felling decisions taken for the long-term pre-trial detention following the most recent decision in the case of the person concerned; arrestant

Decision	Trailers	Not felling	Not settled
Total	1201	84	1
Judgment	1013	0	0
Fine imposed	3	0	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	128	0	0
Conditional judgment	11	0	0
Partial conditional judgment	44	0	0
Removed	0	28	0
(Rpl. Paragraph 722 (1) (7))	1	0	0
(Rpl. § 722, paragraph 2, cf. paragraph 3)	1	0	0
Alleged (Rpl. § 721, par. 1, nr.2)	0	7	0
The appeal is unfounded - Penal Code (Rpl. § 721, st.1, nr.1)	0	49	0
Not settled	0	0	1

Table 6, data year 2014, original page 15: Number of felling and non-felting decisions taken for the long-term pre-trial detention following the most recent decision in the case of the person concerned; arrestant

Decision	Trailers	Not felling	Not settled
Total	1340	76	1
Judgment	1115	0	0
Fine imposed	8	0	0
Judgment - Section 68-70 of the Criminal Code	132	0	0
Conditional judgment	4	0	0
Partial conditional judgment	78	0	0
Removed	0	35	0
Other	3	0	0
Alleged (Rpl. § 721, par. 1, nr.2)	0	31	0
The appeal is unfounded - Penal Code (Rpl. § 721, st.1, nr.1)	0	9	0
Alleged (Rpl. § 721, paragraph 1 (3))	0	1	0
Not settled	0	0	1

The original notes and demarcation

[1] Prolonged courses last more than 3 months before judgment at first instance. [2] A month is counted as 30,5 days. [3] The principal case area is linked to the decision; if undecided, the charge is used. These are dynamic data, so the principal case area may change when charges change or there is acquittal on one count. [4] Case areas follow police/prosecution definitions and are not directly comparable with the Ministry of Justice Research Office's 2011 division. [5] In 2018,under other Criminal Code offences, 102 courses concerning firearms in particularly aggravating circumstances, 22 concerning threats to life, 15 concerning aggravated deprivation of liberty and 12 concerning unauthorised use of a passenger car are mentioned. These four figures are not an exhaustive separate national person population and are not added to the main total.

The actual discrepancies between the main table, the duration table, the outcome table and the accompanying letter are dealt with in the **long-range-product -2018- full-original-and-version reconciliation. md**. No deviant cell is directed to a computed value.

Criminal services: intervention, changed decisions and health defects without national registration;

Tests and procedures must have different counters

The checked originals provide court referrals and outcomes back to 2006, and interventions broken down by duration. Placement in a punishment cell is a sanction against an inmate, not disciplinary punishment of a public employee. Force, security-cell placement, restraint and exclusion are interventions whose legal basis, necessity, proportionality, procedure and specific duration must be examined. Registration alone does not determine legality. Amended authority decisions are a separate review count. [KF15, KF23, KF24]

Selected original tables in three publication versions have been read:2015 PDF32-38 and 48-51;2023 PDF4-5,37-46 and 53-56;2024 PDF4-5,36-46 and 53-56. The 2024 version unavailable on the web has additionally been checked for methodology and judicial review at PDF4 and 54-56. There are 45 reader tables with 598 short data rows in the following table module. This does not constitute a full reading of all other statistical chapters or every separate annual original. The 2015 version looks back over 2006-2015; newer versions cover 2014/2015-2024. On the current statistical webpage checked, the latest listed statistical report was 2024. A missing 2025 annual table does not mean zero interventions in 2025. [KF15,KF23,KF24,KFA]

Final outcome, first instance and closed court proceedings

The 2015 original counts 91 incoming and 75 decided cases:58 affirmed,4 altered and 13 discontinued. Two of the four alterations were set aside by the high court following the authority's appeal; the year's text therefore states 2 finally altered authority decisions. This represents neither 4 final alterations nor four new people. The 2015 report's 2006 row has 36 affirmances,1 alteration and 8 discontinued cases; the footnote states that the authority's appeal of the alteration led to affirmance of the authority's decision. Footnote numbers must not be read as additional digits in alteration counts. [KF15,PDF49-51]

The newer originals indicate a statistical break in 2020: 2011- 2019 measured Table 8.2 first instance outcomes, while 2020 and later to include cross-agency final outcomes. The statements also have a specific vote deficit which must not be concealed by a common "decided 'column. [KF23 / KF24, PDF55-56]

Year and original place	Incomes	Determined in Table 8.1	Stated	Modified	Repealed / up given	Rejected	Sum Table 8.2
2018, KF24 retrospective	93	66	63	3	6	0	72
2019, KF24 retrospective	94	88	83	5	8	0	96
2020, KF24 retrospective	139	124	113	11	15	0	139
2021, KF24 retrospective	125	104	95	9	13	0	117

Year and original place	Incomes	Determined in Table 8.1	Stated	Modified	Repealed / up given	Rejected	Sum Table 8.2
2022, KF24 retrospective	146	112	93	11	7	1	112
2023, KF24 retrospective	169	167	135	21	11	0	167
2024, KF24	151	141	128	12	7	1	148

In 2018-2021,the difference between the two tables' outflow figures corresponds to the discontinuance/annulment column. In 2022 and 2023,however, table 8.1 also includes that column. The 2024 text gives 141 finally decided cases, 12 amendments and 7 withdrawn reviews; table 8.2 totals 148 including these 7. This is a documented difference in the scope of the published counts. Different years of intake and decision do not on their own explain the difference between two outflow tables for the same year. Case-record rows and a definition of closure must be produced before building a homogeneous twenty-year percentage. [KF23/KF24,PDF54-56]

For 2024, 12 / 141 = 8,51% of the declared departure including one rejection, 12 / (128 + 12) = 8,57% of the confirmation / change population and 12 / 148 = 8,11% of all table 8.2 statuses including the 7 given. Each denominator is visible; none of the percentages is an error rate for all prison decisions. The 12 amendments consist of 9 parole, 2 penalty cells and 1 reinstatement; 9 amendments are from the City Court and 3 from the National Court. In fact, prior release, termination of the penalty cell, repayment, duration of proceedings and personal liability are not included in this annual statement. [KF24, PDF54-56]

Sample access narrowed during the period

Act 661 of 11. June 2024 amended Sentence Enforcement Act § 120,subsection1,so that appeals against District Court orders require permission from the Appeals Permission Board. The Act's precise criterion is special grounds; a statistical account of special circumstances must not replace the statutory wording. Entry into force was 15. June 2024. Under § 10,subsection6,decisions made before entry into force retain the earlier rules. There is therefore no unconditional common methodological break for all appeals lodged after that date. The amendment applies here to Denmark;§ 11 of the Act excludes the Faroe Islands and Greenland. [KFL24,PDF5-7]

The 2024 original records 25 High Court appeals:19 from prisoners and 6 from the authority. Applications for leave numbered 11:6 from prisoners and 5 from the authority. One authority application had been granted, 2 prisoner applications refused, and 8 applications remained pending at year-end. The 8 pending must not be counted as refusals, and 25 appeals must not be added to 151 review entries as 25 new authority errors. Actual intervention time during the wait must be examined in linked case records. [KF24,PDF54]

Association, restraint, handcuffs and changed registration boundaries

2024 records 193 completed exclusions from association; 6 lasted over 28 days. The table excludes the institution's temporary suspension of association for order/security reasons. Therefore 193 is not all isolating conditions. Voluntary exclusions total 778,including 225 over 28 days and 277 without an opportunity for association with fellow prisoners. Calling an entry voluntary does not on its own document free choice or absence of failures of protection; the specific decision basis and reason for opting out of association must be examined. [KF24,PDF39-41]

The 2015 original's voluntary exclusions cover closed prisons and remand prisons and total 391,including 121 without an opportunity for association. Newer tables'2015 retrospective figures also include open prisons and total 644,including 197 without an opportunity for association. The two versions must not be added as 1.035 exclusions or used as unexplained growth. The 2015 observation-cell intervals 482+154+212+56+17 give 921 against the printed 924; newer retrospective figures change the two middle cells to 156 and 213,reconciling 924. Both numerical versions are included in the original tables. [KF15,PDF36-37; KF23/KF24,PDF40-42]

The 2024 security-cell count has 195 placements, including 157 with restraint;14 placements lasted at least one day, including 2 at least 3 days. Placements with restraint are a subset, and the number of restraints within each duration interval is not stated. The observation-cell count gives 937 and use of force 997 episodes. The same case may be registered under several intervention types; summing to a number of people or unlawful acts requires case-record/person linkage. [KF24,PDF41-42]

Handcuffs / conveyor belts fall back from 10.674 in 2021 to 1.368 in 2022 and 245 in 2023. The Authority took over the arrest services of the police in 2019.2023 original note states that reporting during transportation from 1 February 2022 only includes prisoners on open regimes; the 2024 note refers to the change of rule less. Therefore, the decrease does not demonstrate that the application to other regimes ceased. 2024 returns 210. [KF23 / KF24, PDF43]

The 2024 version changes the methodology for reasons for disciplinary punishments, including earlier years. The 2023 row's refusal to work thus changes from 7,0% to 8,6% between publications. The 2023 denominator for reasons for using force changes from 1.235 to 1.126, while the separate incident table lists 1.125; these are different original counts that must be clarified before conversion into people. [KF23/KF24, PDF38,42-43]

Deaths and health defects: concrete counters and a recognised national data gap

The 2015- original marks the year's 2 suicides as a provisional; recent retrospections indicate 1.2024 have 6 other deaths and 8 suicides. The 2023 registration of suicide attempts changes from 18 to 20 in the 2024 version; 2022 changes from 16 to 17. Deaths and trials must be investigated for cause of death, the authority's knowledge, treatment, supervision, prevention and investigation. The table does not simply show that a certain death is due to a liability omission. [KF15, PDF48; KF23 / KF24, PDF53]

The Minister of Justice's original reply of 23. June 2025 states that the Prison and Probation Service has no systematic records capable of counting adverse healthcare incidents over the preceding five years. The eastern region states that reports are not registered and retained after handling. The western region has a manual account for 1. April 2024-1. June 2025:38 incidents, including 35 medication deviations and one each concerning the wrong medical record, missing supervision after assault and a urine sample linked to the wrong civil-registration number. The count is described as uncertain. This is an actually documented recording gap;38 is not a national annual total or 38 unique prisoners. [KFUTH25,PDF2-3]

Executive Order 420/2025,§ 2,no.3,excludes healthcare activities in State institutions from this UTH reporting scheme. The exception does not establish that healthcare errors do not occur, and does not answer demands for adequate treatment, preservation of evidence and effective investigation. When the State also deprives the patient of liberty and controls access to treatment, the report's ECHR analysis must link the specific failure to relevant positive duties. The documented evidentiary gap makes records, medication logs, reports and supervisory follow-up necessary. [KFUTHREG25; the report's legal chapters]

The Data Protection Agency 10 July 2025 documents the wrong legal basis and long response times for inmates' insight. The study started on 19 July 2024; revised guidelines came on 9 September 2024.7 February 2025 informed the Directorate that it announced additional training had not yet been completed due to savings. The oversight ended with criticism and announced follow-up in 2026. The decision proves the failures listed and the unimplemented effort at the given time; actual recovery for each inmate must be documented separately. [KFDT25, decision 1-4]

Liability, claims for evidence and concrete action

Conclusion: national tables and the reporting scheme cannot alone show every unlawful prison intervention or affected person. Authority statements: annual-table entries/exits,amendments,annulments and the adverse-incident reply's absence of systematic counting. Original evidence: identified tables,the ministerial reply and access oversight. Deficiency: different exit boundaries,excluded intervention categories and missing linked health/time/person documentation. Relevant rule: the particular intervention's legal basis and procedure,and ECHR2/3/5/8/13 according to its nature;access under the actually applicable rules. Conduct/omission: intervention,deficient recording,missing access to information and possibly inadequate prevention/investigation. Departure: examined case by case;recording and access deficiencies are documented,automatic individual criminal liability is not. Consequence: prisoners and relatives may lose the ability to document harm,duration,cause and claims. Responsibility: managerial,authority,State and personal responsibility are examined separately. Demands: preserve contemporaneous evidence,produce the affected case rows,promptly review the continuing basis for intervention,and document cessation,treatment and actual redress.

Documented findings: the above table/version differences, absence of UTH registration and criticism concerning access to information. Investigation tracks: lawfulness of individual lengthy exclusions/restraints, causes of health injuries and any individual criminal liability. Necessary material: start/end of all interventions, release/contact/treatment dates, appeal and permission files, grounds for withdrawal, person linkage, payment and legal authority for non-retention of reports. The strongest current contention is the demand for effective

protection and documented testing during the procedure; an administratively completed control process is not evidence of timely restoration.

The original action and trial tables of the Department of Investigation

All rows below are short number extracts from the identified original tables. Publication year and PDF page are preserved. The figures are not unique citizens, not automatically illegal acts and not a sum across versions. The character - means zero; k denotes the original version correction. Multilayer lines in original row headings may be shortened to the line link bearing the numbers; the table and columns of the numerical row define its location.

Publication 2015, Table 5.1, PDF34

Row	Unconditional criminal cell	Conditional penalty cell	Fine	Total	Pr.10000 days of catch;
Closed prisons	822	328	1.909	3.059	99
Open prisons	916	1.301	5.346	7.563	192
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	841	572	2.319	3.732	68
2015	2.579	2.201	9.574	14.354	115
2014	2.867	2.311	10.691	15.869	115
2013	2.959	2.417	11.181	16.557	113
2012	2.892	2.261	11.353	16.506	114
2011	3.044	2.445	12.963	18.452	125
2010	2.849	2.323	12.270	17.442	121
2009	2.677	2.351	11.993	17.021	126
2008	2.421	2.088	10.777	15.286	119
2007	2.569	2.048	10.240	14.857	112
2006	2.574	2.113	10.710	15.397	107

Publication 2015, Table 5.2, PDF34

Row	Unconditional%	Conditional%	Boiled%	Total%
Refused to provide urine sample	4,8	25,9	7,2	9,6
Refusal of employment	1,3	0,5	1,9	1,6
alcohol, euphoric substances and weapons, etc.;	8,1	22,1	18,7	17,0
Failed to follow the instructions of the staff	5,5	13,9	5,3	6,7
Evolution or experiment	1,2	0,4	0,8	0,8
(objects) and money	44,9	29,1	40,7	39,8
Escape / absence from exit	0,5	0,6	0,9	0,8
Other misuse of exit	1,6	3,2	3,0	2,7
Other infringements of the Criminal Code	17,7	4,2	4,2	7,1
the leader of the	14,3	-	17,4	14,0
Total	100	100	100	100

Publication 2015, Table 5.3, PDF35

Row	1-3 d	4-7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	>28 d	Total	Pr.10000 days of catch;
Closed prisons	15	21	40	16	10	102	3
Open prisons	62	35	38	17	3	155	4
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	33	36	29	18	9	125	2
2015	110	92	107	51	22	382	3
2014	129	144	126	76	37	512	4
2013	154	139	149	73	31	546	4
2012	186	136	156	74	30	582	4
2011	199	170	218	124	30	741	5
2010	189	170	200	155	37	751	5
2009	263	205	177	107	36	788	6
2008	182	184	170	130	38	704	5
2007	174	132	159	127	39	631	5
2006	201	175	157	126	56	715	5

Publication 2015, Table 5.4, PDF35

Row	1-3 d%	4-7 d%	8-14 d%	15-28 d%	>28 d%	Total%
To prevent evasion	7	6	8	3	8	7
To prevent violent behaviour	32	24	20	31	32	26
In order to prevent criminal activities	22	24	30	24	14	24
Continued Community manifestly irresponsible	36	40	38	40	46	39
Opposed security measures	-	-	-	-	-	-
Opposed health measures	-	-	-	-	-	-
Refused to take up employment	-	-	1	-	-	-
To protect prisoners from abuse	4	6	3	2	-	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Publication 2015, Table 5.5, PDF36

Row	1-3 d	4-7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	>28 d	Total	Pr.10000 days of catch;
Closed prisons	62	40	44	34	102	282	9
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	18	8	15	18	50	109	2
2015	80	48	59	52	152	391	3
2014	104	75	59	69	140	447	3
2013	111	63	59	58	142	433	3
2012	99	69	50	48	137	403	3
2011	111	74	61	58	143	447	3
2010	130	79	86	86	178	559	3
2009	116	69	65	55	179	484	4
2008	106	65	72	53	143	439	4
2007	71	50	78	51	140	390	3
2006	57	54	43	46	177	377	3

Publication 2015, Table 5.6, PDF36

Row	Interview possible	Do not engage	Total
Closed prisons	195	87	282
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	75	34	109
2015	270	121	391
2014	286	161	447
2013	296	137	433
2012	260	143	403
2011	276	171	447
2010	353	206	559
2009	312	172	484
2008	259	180	439
2007	259	131	390
2006	272	105	377

Publication 2015, Table 5.7, PDF37

Row	<6 t	6- 12 t	12- 24 t	1-3 days	≥ 3 days	Total	Restrained
Closed prisons	25	14	18	4	1	62	35
Open prisons	-	-	3	-	-	3	3
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	70	21	14	3	-	108	102
2015	95	35	35	7	1	173	140
2014	111	28	57	15	4	215	176
2013	123	33	75	19	2	252	213
2012	113	47	64	14	1	239	204
2011	121	31	55	9	2	218	193
2010	90	45	58	13	5	211	157
2009	97	42	43	13	2	197	179
2008	98	34	46	12	2	192	185
2007	122	40	30	12	2	206	187
2006	89	33	50	17	2	191	140

Publication 2015, Table 5.8, PDF37

Row	Up to 6 t	6- 12 t	12- 24 t	1-3 days	≥ 3 days	Total
Closed prisons	102	36	76	21	13	248
Open prisons	27	4	9	3	-	43
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	353	114	127	32	4	633
2015	482	154	212	56	17	924
2014	542	143	242	78	23	1.028
2013	550	175	264	99	40	1.128
2012	582	172	247	80	35	1.116
2011	503	208	243	54	16	1.024
2010	538	193	281	69	16	1.097
2009	471	174	240	63	28	976
2008	452	161	239	65	18	935
2007	531	175	249	75	30	1.060
2006	496	175	249	70	29	1.019

Publication 2015, Table 5.9, PDF38

Row	2012	2013	2014	2015
Avoiding violence or overcoming resistance	17,2	12,6	14,6	13,6
Force the ordered measure	21,3	16,3	19,3	22,3
To prevent suicide or self-harm	0,5	0,5	1,2	0,6
Remove evasive or stop evasive	1,7	0,4	1,4	1,0
ring cell)	59,2	70,2	63,7	62,5
(%)	100	100	100	100
Antal episodes (n)	883	1.008	985	897

Publication 2015, Table 5.10, PDF38

Row	Closed	Open	Copenhagen / Arrest	2015	2014
Episodes / Other interventions	134	29	398	561	625
Episodes / Other	129	49	158	336	360
Episodes / Total	263	78	556	897	985
Manual / Other operations	133	29	395	557	620
Hand power / Other	127	48	153	328	350
Manual / Total	260	77	548	885	970
For other operations	-	-	10	10	15
Other staff	-	-	3	3	3
Rod / Total	-	-	13	13	18
Tar gas / Other operations	-	-	-	-	2
Tåregas / Other	-	-	-	-	3
Tåregas / Total	-	-	-	-	5
Shield / Other operations	2	1	14	17	24
Shield / Other	-	1	2	3	13
Shield / Total	2	2	16	20	37
Pepper spray / For other operations	4	1	19	24	53
Pepper spray / Other	3	-	8	11	28
Pepper spray / Total	7	1	27	35	81

Publication 2015, Table 7.6, PDF48

Row	Death excluding suicide	Suicide
2015	2	2
2014	2	2
2013	5	3
2012	1	4
2011	8	5
2010	9	2
2009	6	5
2008	1	5
2007	4	7
2006	5	1

Publication 2015, Table 8.1, PDF50

Row	Incomes	Decided
Penalty calculation	1	1
Detention of the letter	-	-
Disciplinary, criminal cell	-	-
Confiscation of objects / money	-	-
Counterpart of compensation	2	1
Refusal of parole	84	69
Re-deployment	4	4
Redeployment of conditional pardon	-	-
prison sentence / penalty cell;	-	-
2015	91	75
2014	60	54
2013	62	47
2012	54	47
2011	56	51
2010	52	38
2009	62	69
2008	62	55
2007	51	56
2006	51	45

Publication 2015, Table 8.2, PDF51

Row	Stated	Modified	Repealed	Surrender	Rejected
Penalty calculation	1	-	-	-	-
Detention of the letter	-	-	-	-	-
Disciplinary, criminal cell	-	-	-	-	-
Confiscation of objects / money	-	-	-	-	-
Counterpart of compensation	-	-	-	1	-
Parole leave	53	4	-	12	-
Re-deployment	4	-	-	-	-
Redeployment of conditional pardon	-	-	-	-	-
Permission of a prison sentence / penalty cell	-	-	-	-	-
2015	58	4	-	13	-
2014	40	1	-	13	-
2013	34	10	-	3	-
2012	42	-	-	3	2
2011	36	4	-	11	-
2010	36	2	-	2	-
2009	52	3	-	13	1
2008	45	2	-	8	-
2007	44	2	-	10	-
2006	36	1	-	8	-

Publication 2023, Table 5.1, PDF38

Row	Closed	Open	Copenhagen / Arrest	Total
Unconditional criminal cell	737	1.221	1.005	2.963
Conditional penalty cell	317	1.331	244	1.892
Unconditional visit limitation	28	30	16	74
Conditional visit limitation	11	18	7	36
Unconditional letter limitation	16	-	-	16
Conditional letter limitation	1	-	1	2
Unconditional telephone control	33	9	5	47
Conditional telephone limitation	11	2	4	17
Unconditional curfew	6	13	1	20
Conditional curfew	1	2	1	4
Fine	2.325	7.032	2.477	11.834
2023	3.486	9.658	3.761	16.905
2022	3.743	9.666	4.141	17.550
2021	3.479	8.977	4.579	17.035
2020	3.489	10.113	5.058	18.660
2019	4.639	11.452	6.161	22.252
2018	4.952	11.445	6.401	22.798
2017	4.345	11.082	6.319	21.746
2016	3.550	8.581	4.466	16.597
2015	3.059	7.563	3.732	14.354
2014	3.641	8.061	4.167	15.869

Publication 2023, Table 5.2, PDF38

Row	2019 %	2020 %	2021 %	2022 %	2023 %
Refused to be photographed	-	-	-	0,0	-
Refused to provide urine sample	4,3	4,2	7,5	5,0	4,1
Refusal of employment	1,8	2,8	1,6	3,7	7,0
smuggling / possession / consumption of alcohol, euphorising substances	8,5	7,7	15,7	8,7	7,9
Failed to follow the instructions of the staff	2,6	4,6	5,8	3,3	3,5
Evolution or experiment	0,4	0,5	0,9	0,6	0,4
Imrighted dispositions over effects (objects) and money	50,5	46,3	39,7	48,9	44,6
Escape / absence from exit	0,1	0,1	0,6	0,2	0,2
Other misuse of exit	0,6	0,6	1,7	0,7	0,7
Other infringements of the Criminal Code	5,1	5,3	8,1	5,9	7,1
Infringement of rules laid down by the head of the institution	14,4	19,2	18,5	17,1	18,6
Smoking rules	11,7	8,7	7,8	6,0	6,0
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Publication 2023, Table 5.3, PDF39

Row	1-3 d	4-7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	>28 d	Total
Closed prisons	13	13	11	7	7	51
Open prisons	27	35	23	22	5	112
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	9	2	7	1	2	21
2023	49	50	41	30	14	184
2022	113	199	76	13	12	413
2021	102	97	77	41	23	340
2020	184	250	92	35	14	575
2019	109	81	46	44	18	298
2018	122	98	95	46	30	391
2017	144	115	104	50	24	437
2016	137	125	123	70	29	484
2015	110	92	107	51	22	382
2014	129	144	126	76	37	512

Publication 2023, Table 5.4, PDF40

Row	1-3 d%	4-7 d%	8-14 d%	15-28 d%	>28 d%	Total%
To prevent evasion	6,1	14,9	6,3	16,7	18,8	11,2
To prevent violent behaviour	21,2	14,9	33,3	22,2	25,0	22,3
In order to prevent criminal activities	25,8	20,9	25,0	25,0	12,5	23,2
Prevent infection	1,5	-	-	2,8	6,3	1,3
Opposed security measures	-	-	-	-	-	-
Continuation of joint stay manifestly irresponsible	31,8	38,8	33,3	25,0	31,3	32,6
Refused to take up employment	3,0	3,0	-	-	-	1,7
To protect the inmate from assault.	10,6	7,5	2,1	8,3	6,3	7,3
2023	100	100	100	100	100	100

Publication 2023, Table 5.5, PDF40

Row	1-3 d	4-7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	>28 d	Total
Closed prisons	65	36	48	33	105	287
Open prisons	106	57	47	51	54	315
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	37	26	30	19	67	179
2023	208	119	125	103	226	781
2022	235	136	103	122	225	821
2021	222	123	95	109	219	768
2020	179	114	91	112	195	691
2019	203	124	114	126	195	762
2018	204	129	126	127	191	777
2017	225	130	119	104	216	794
2016	221	110	87	105	140	663
2015	183	97	95	80	189	644
2014	232	147	111	111	200	801

Publication 2023, Table 5.6, PDF41

Row	Interview possible	Do not engage	Total
Closed prisons	208	79	287
Open prisons	194	121	315
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	130	49	179
2023	532	249	781
2022	517	304	821
2021	449	319	768
2020	390	301	691
2019	456	306	762
2018	481	296	777
2017	506	288	794
2016	386	277	663
2015	447	197	644
2014	511	290	801

Publication 2023, Table 5.7, PDF41

Row	<6 t	6- 12 t	12- 24 t	1-3 days	≥ 3 days	Total	Restrained
Closed prisons	70	18	50	18	4	160	110
Open prisons	9	4	6	-	-	19	15
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	28	8	6	-	-	42	42
2023	107	30	62	18	4	221	167
2022	115	35	75	16	1	242	186
2021	142	46	92	27	3	310	242
2020	154	26	67	13	5	265	204
2019	154	36	81	21	5	297	235
2018	162	64	70	17	2	315	242
2017	150	51	77	11	1	290	239
2016	132	60	61	8	2	263	228
2015	95	35	35	7	1	173	140
2014	111	28	57	15	4	215	176

Publication 2023, Table 5.8, PDF42

Row	<6 t	6- 12 t	12- 24 t	1-3 days	≥ 3 days	Total
Closed prisons	170	35	75	25	3	308
Open prisons	91	22	22	9	1	145
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	356	73	89	21	2	541
2023	617	130	186	55	6	994
2022	695	133	190	49	9	1.076
2021	603	131	229	61	14	1.038
2020	671	162	216	72	29	1.150
2019	735	165	244	63	20	1.227
2018	747	186	222	52	14	1.221
2017	798	206	276	72	22	1.374
2016	651	162	234	69	18	1.134
2015	482	156	213	56	17	924
2014	542	143	242	78	23	1.028

Publication 2023, Table 5.9, PDF42

Row	Closed	Open	Copenhagen / arrest;	Transport	2023	2022	2021
Episodes / Other interventions	240	98	399	-	737	809	765
Episodes / Other	163	89	136	-	388	417	408
Episodes / Total	403	187	535	-	1125	1226	1173
Manual / Other operations	239	95	396	-	730	806	758
Hand power / Other	154	86	135	-	375	407	390
Manual / Total	393	181	531	-	1105	1213	1148
For other operations	10	-	27	-	37	41	41
Other staff	1	-	-	-	1	2	6
Rod / Total	11	-	27	-	38	43	47
Tar gas / Other operations	1	-	1	-	2	-	-
Tåregas / Other	-	-	-	-	0	1	-
Tåregas / Total	1	-	1	-	2	1	-
Shield / Other operations	8	4	5	-	17	37	18
Shield / Other	1	3	3	-	7	24	4
Shield / Total	9	7	8	-	24	61	22
Pepper spray / For other operations	21	6	14	-	41	50	61
Pepper spray / Other	15	2	7	-	24	13	23
Pepper spray / Total	36	8	21	-	65	63	84

Publication 2023, Table 5.10, PDF43

Row	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Prevent violence and over-	14,6	13,6	11,6	14	10,8	13,2	11,2	13,6	11,3	13,2
Enforce the order of	19,3	22,3	21,2	19,2	18,8	20,5	23,3	19,9	21,9	18,8
To prevent suicide or self-harm.	1,2	0,6	0,7	0,3	0,5	0,2	1	1,1	0,2	0,5
Prevent escape or	1,4	1	0,6	0,6	0,8	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,5	0,5
observation and security;	63,7	62,5	65,8	65,8	69,1	65,7	64,1	65,2	65,9	67,0
(%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100,0	100
Number of justifications (n)	985	897	1.144	1.434	1.299	1.282	1.202	1.173	1.226	1.235

Publication 2023, Table 5.11, PDF43

Row	Avoiding violence	Transport / evasive	Other	Total
Closed prisons	38	13	31	82
Open prisons	13	41	40	94
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	16	34	19	69
Transport and the guard unit	-	-	-	-
2023	67	88	90	245
2022	134	1.103	131	1.368
2021	193	10.369	112	10.674
2020	188	9.389	117	9.694
2019	234	4.540	132	4.906
2018	232	1.576	125	1.933
2017	137	1.422	123	1.682
2016	128	1.598	103	1.829
2015	113	1.311	66	1.490
2014	137	1.593	88	1.818

Publication 2023, Table 5.12, PDF44

Row	Transfers	Derogation	Substances	Done Offences	Preventive Offences	Preventive criminal	Protect inserted	Other
2023	463	106	110	113	120	202	20	5
2022	518	118	137	122	120	193	28	9
2021	507	106	116	142	133	138	17	6
2020	539	112	100	135	128	180	28	20
2019	687	136	135	173	195	206	49	9
2018	630	89	142	178	219	181	51	8
2017	601	87	149	154	175	169	42	8
2016	673	105	143	160	209	188	45	15
2015	571	93	126	110	182	155	35	17
2014	705	123	178	127	197	236	52	10

Publication 2023, Table 7.4, PDF53

Row	Number
2023	4
2022	3
2021	2
2020	1
2019	4
2018	4
2017	2
2016	9
2015	23
2014	23

Publication 2023, Table 7.5, PDF53

Row	Death excluding suicide	Suicide	Attempts etc.
2023	7	3	18
2022	5	1	16 k
2021	4	5	41 k
2020	-	4	33
2019	2	9	25
2018	3	5	32
2017	5	4	23
2016	3	8	25
2015	2	1	21
2014	2	2	28

Publication 2023, Table 8.1, PDF55

Row	Incomes	Decided
Penalty calculation	3	4
Detention of the letter	-	-
Disciplinary, criminal cell	11	6
Confiscation of objects / money	-	-
Counterpart of compensation	-	-
Refusal of parole	153	156
Re-deployment	2	1
Redeployment of conditional pardon	-	-
Refusal to compensate for the loss of earnings	-	-
2023	169	167
2022	146	112
2021	125	104
2020	139	124
2019	94	88
2018	93	66
2017	82	83
2016	96	70
2015	91	75
2014	60	54

Publication 2023, Table 8.2, PDF56

Row	Stated	Modified	Repealed	Surrender	Rejected
Penalty calculation	3	-	1	-	-
Detention of the letter	-	-	-	-	-
Disciplinary, criminal cell	5	1	-	-	-
Confiscation of objects / money	-	-	-	-	-
Counterpart of compensation	-	-	-	-	-
Parole leave	126	20	10	-	-
Re-deployment	1	-	-	-	-
Redeployment of conditional pardon	-	-	-	-	-
Refusal of compensation for wrongfully paid	-	-	-	-	-
2023	135	21	11	-	-
2022	93	11	7	-	1
2021	95	9	13	-	-
2020	113	11	15	-	-
2019	83	5	-	8	-
2018	63	3	-	6	-
2017	57	5	-	21	-
2016	54	4	-	12	-
2015	58	4	-	13	-
2014	40	1	-	13	-

Publication 2024, Table 5.1, PDF38

Row	Closed	Open	Copenhagen / Arrest	Total
Unconditional criminal cell	559	1.156	668	2.383
Conditional penalty cell	205	1.186	293	1.684
Unconditional visit limitation	65	123	94	282
Conditional visit limitation	27	149	72	248
Unconditional letter limitation	16	-	10	26
Conditional letter limitation	3	4	5	12
Unconditional telephone control	71	24	39	134
Conditional telephone limitation	31	12	22	65
Unconditional curfew	9	26	5	40
Conditional curfew	3	16	8	27
Fine	2.574	6.606	3.199	12.379
2024	3.563	9.302	4.415	17.280
2023	3.486	9.658	3.761	16.905
2022	3.743	9.666	4.141	17.550
2021	3.479	8.977	4.579	17.035
2020	3.489	10.113	5.058	18.660
2019	4.639	11.452	6.161	22.252
2018	4.952	11.445	6.401	22.798
2017	4.345	11.082	6.319	21.746
2016	3.550	8.581	4.466	16.597
2015	3.059	7.563	3.732	14.354

Publication 2024, Table 5.2, PDF38

Row	2020 %	2021 %	2022 %	2023 %	2024 %
Refused to be photographed	-	0,0	0,0	-	0,0
Refused to provide urine sample	2,9	3,3	3,5	3,0	3,4
Refusal of employment	3,3	2,0	4,5	8,6	4,1
and weapons etc.	7,2	8,3	8,1	7,4	8,5
Failed to follow the instructions of the staff	5,0	3,7	3,5	3,6	4,1
Evolution or experiment	0,5	0,5	0,6	0,4	0,3
Imrighted dispositions over effects (objects) and money	45,5	48,2	48,3	44,5	41,0
Escape / absence from exit	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,1
Other misuse of exit	0,5	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,8
Other infringements of the Criminal Code	5,8	6,5	6,3	6,6	8,3
Infringement of rules laid down by the head of the institution	19,7	18,3	17,8	18,5	20,7
Smoking rules	9,5	8,5	6,6	6,5	8,6
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Publication 2024, Table 5.3, PDF39

Row	1-3 d	4-7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	>28 d	Total
Closed prisons	11	15	12	7	4	49
Open prisons	46	46	24	9	2	127
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	9	3	4	1	-	17
2024	66	64	40	17	6	193
2023	49	50	41	30	14	184
2022	113	199	76	13	12	413
2021	102	97	77	41	23	340
2020	184	250	92	35	14	575
2019	109	81	46	44	18	298
2018	122	98	95	46	30	391
2017	144	115	104	50	24	437
2016	137	125	123	70	29	484
2015	110	92	107	51	22	382

Publication 2024, Table 5.4, PDF40

Row	1-3 d%	4-7 d%	8-14 d%	15-28 d%	>28 d%	Total%
To prevent evasion	13,3	6,5	10,5	-	-	8,9
To prevent violent behaviour	21,1	12,9	29,8	21,7	28,6	20,4
In order to prevent criminal activities	25,6	26,9	29,8	21,7	28,6	26,7
Prevent infection	-	-	-	4,3	-	0,4
Opposed security measures	-	2,2	-	-	-	0,7
Continuation of joint stay manifestly irresponsible	30,0	40,9	22,8	39,1	42,9	33,3
Refused to take up employment	-	-	-	-	-	-
To protect the inmate from assault.	10,0	10,8	7,0	13,0	-	9,6
2024	100	100	100	100	100	100

Publication 2024, Table 5.5, PDF40

Row	1-3 d	4-7 d	8-14 d	15-28 d	>28 d	Total
Closed prisons	84	47	43	52	103	329
Open prisons	95	53	44	32	52	276
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	37	16	30	20	70	173
2024	216	116	117	104	225	778
2023	208	119	125	103	226	781
2022	235	136	103	122	225	821
2021	222	123	95	109	219	768
2020	179	114	91	112	195	691
2019	203	124	114	126	195	762
2018	204	129	126	127	191	777
2017	225	130	119	104	216	794
2016	221	110	87	105	140	663
2015	183	97	95	80	189	644

Publication 2024, Table 5.6, PDF41

Row	Interview possible	Do not engage	Total
Closed prisons	227	102	329
Open prisons	154	122	276
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	120	53	173
2024	501	277	778
2023	532	249	781
2022	517	304	821
2021	449	319	768
2020	390	301	691
2019	456	306	762
2018	481	296	777
2017	506	288	794
2016	386	277	663
2015	447	197	644

Publication 2024, Table 5.7, PDF41

Row	<6 t	6- 12 t	12- 24 t	1-3 days	≥ 3 days	Total	Restrained
Closed prisons	46	6	43	11	2	108	84
Open prisons	17	5	6	-	-	28	14
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	42	7	9	1	-	59	59
2024	105	18	58	12	2	195	157
2023	107	30	62	18	4	221	167
2022	115	35	75	16	1	242	186
2021	142	46	92	27	3	310	242
2020	154	26	67	13	5	265	204
2019	154	36	81	21	5	297	235
2018	162	64	70	17	2	315	242
2017	150	51	77	11	1	290	239
2016	132	60	61	8	2	263	228
2015	95	35	35	7	1	173	140

Publication 2024, Table 5.8, PDF42

Row	<6 t	6- 12 t	12- 24 t	1-3 days	≥ 3 days	Total
Closed prisons	134	22	87	14	2	259
Open prisons	119	25	25	3	-	172
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	346	74	59	25	2	506
2024	599	121	171	42	4	937
2023	617	130	186	55	6	994
2022	695	133	190	49	9	1.076
2021	603	131	229	61	14	1.038
2020	671	162	216	72	29	1.150
2019	735	165	244	63	20	1.227
2018	747	186	222	52	14	1.221
2017	798	206	276	72	22	1.374
2016	651	162	234	69	18	1.134
2015	482	156	213	56	17	924

Publication 2024, Table 5.9, PDF42

Row	Closed	Open	Copenhagen / Arr test	2024	2023	2022
Episodes / Other interventions	193	80	402	675	737	809
Episodes / Other	132	81	109	322	388	417
Episodes / Total	325	161	511	997	1125	1226
Manual / Other operations	192	77	399	668	730	806
Hand power / Other	127	79	109	315	375	407
Manual / Total	319	156	508	983	1105	1213
For other operations	13	3	27	43	37	41
Other staff	2	1	-	3	1	2
Rod / Total	15	4	27	46	38	43
Tar gas / Other operations	-	-	-	-	2	-
Tåregas / Other	-	-	-	-	-	1
Tåregas / Total	-	-	-	-	2	1
Shield / Other operations	20	7	7	34	17	37
Shield / Other	2	-	3	5	7	24
Shield / Total	22	7	10	39	24	61
Pepper spray / For other operations	10	3	15	28	41	50
Pepper spray / Other	7	1	3	11	24	13
Pepper spray / Total	17	4	18	39	65	63

Publication 2024, Table 5.10, PDF43

Row	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
win resistance	13,6	11,6	14,0	10,8	13,2	11,2	13,6	11,3	13,4	11,6
establishment;	22,3	21,2	19,2	18,8	20,5	23,3	19,9	21,9	20,1	19,3
damage;	0,6	0,7	0,3	0,5	0,2	1,0	1,1	0,2	0,4	0,9
stop escaping;	1,0	0,6	0,6	0,8	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,5	0,5	0,5
observation and security;	62,5	65,8	65,8	69,1	65,7	64,1	65,2	65,9	65,5	67,8
(%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100,0	100	100
Number of justifications (n)	897	1.144	1.434	1.299	1.282	1.202	1.173	1.226	1.126	997

Publication 2024, Table 5.11, PDF43

Row	Avoiding violence	Transport / evasive	Other	Total
Closed prisons	52	7	37	96
Open prisons	17	24	29	70
Copenhagen Jails and Arrested Houses	10	15	19	44
2024	79	46	85	210
2023	67	88	90	245
2022	134	1.103	131	1.368
2021	193	10.369	112	10.674
2020	188	9.389	117	9.694
2019	234	4.540	132	4.906
2018	232	1.576	125	1.933
2017	137	1.422	123	1.682
2016	128	1.598	103	1.829
2015	113	1.311	66	1.490

Publication 2024, Table 5.12, PDF44

Row	Transfers	Derogation	Substances	Done Offences	Preventive Offences	Preventive criminal	Protect inserted	Other
2024	583	134	170	120	177	251	47	5
2023	463	106	110	113	120	202	20	5
2022	518	118	137	122	120	193	28	9
2021	507	106	116	142	133	138	17	6
2020	539	112	100	135	128	180	28	20
2019	687	136	135	173	195	206	49	9
2018	630	89	142	178	219	181	51	8
2017	601	87	149	154	175	169	42	8
2016	673	105	143	160	209	188	45	15
2015	571	93	126	110	182	155	35	17

Publication 2024, Table 7.4, PDF53

Row	Number
2024	-
2023	4
2022	3
2021	2
2020	1
2019	4
2018	4
2017	2
2016	9
2015	23

Publication 2024, Table 7.5, PDF53

Row	Death excluding suicide	Suicide	Attempts etc.
2024	6	8	18
2023	7	3	20 k
2022	5	1	17 k
2021	4	5	41
2020	-	4	33
2019	2	9	25
2018	3	5	32
2017	5	4	23
2016	3	8	25
2015	2	1	21

Publication 2024, Table 8.1, PDF55

Row	Incomes	Decided
Penalty calculation	4	3
Detention of the letter	-	-
Disciplinary, criminal cell	8	5
Confiscation of objects / money	-	-
Counterpart of compensation	-	-
Refusal of parole	133	130
Re-deployment	4	3
Redeployment of conditional pardon	-	-
Arrest sentence / jail cell	2	-
2024	151	141
2023	169	167
2022	146	112
2021	125	104
2020	139	124
2019	94	88
2018	93	66
2017	82	83
2016	96	70
2015	91	75

Publication 2024, Table 8.2, PDF56

Row	Stated	Modified	Repealed (abandoned)	Rejected
Penalty calculation	3	-	-	-
Detention of the letter	-	-	-	-
Disciplinary, criminal cell	3	2	-	-
Confiscation of objects / money	-	-	-	-
Counterpart of compensation	-	-	-	-
Parole leave	120	9	7	1
Re-deployment	2	1	-	-
Redeployment of conditional pardon	-	-	-	-
prison sentence / penalty cell;	-	-	-	-
2024	128	12	7	1
2023	135	21	11	-
2022	93	11	7	1
2021	95	9	13	-
2020	113	11	15	-
2019	83	5	8	-
2018	63	3	6	-
2017	57	5	21	-
2016	54	4	12	-
2015	58	4	13	-

Proprietary custody: all controlled years, durations and consequences of Justitia/ The 2025 Study of the Lawyer Society

Main findings and precise measurement of the source

I Justitia/ The 2025 version of the Bar Society decreased from 4.604 in 2018 to 2.940 in 2024, while the average duration increased from 3,3 to 6,2 months. Progress of at least 24 months increased from 18 to 107. By 2024 152 operations had been completed with acquittal of the principal; their average duration was 7,7 months and 29 had lasted over 12 months. It documents extensive deprivation of liberty before a freeing outcome, but does not in itself test the legality of each order.

The source is Mikele Schultz-Knudsen and Birgitte Arent Eiriksson, Justitia/ Legal Society (2025), *Preservation of custody - Legal certainty before judgment*, published 28.10.2025, ISBN9788797248942. Original 214 pages report. Printed page = PDF page minus 2. Chapter 5, p. 67-99, method pp. 16-17 and 101-104, as well as the legal and impact sections used here are read in the original. The checks include the tables and sections mentioned; it is not a claim for material checks on all 214 pages or on the underlying individual registry items.

The counting unit is completed in custody, not different persons (Method p. 68). A person can perform several times. The subsequent wording of the report "persons" for the same aggregates does not change this definition. Dismissed on the main proceedings; another judgment may be given in the same case.

the data withdrawal and is not automatically a definitively abandoned case. All these outcomes are subsets of the trajectories and are not added to them.

POLSS data shall be re-recorded. The 2025 data specifically provided may therefore differ from previous State Law versions; for example, 2023 exemptions were 217 earlier and now 234. The difference 17 is a version change, not 17 new separately documented citizens. The report's own tables must be displayed as a source version next to the original Danish Attorney-General's series.

Later source version: Rigsadvokaten's March 2026 revision records 2.941 completed 2024 trajectories. The Justitia2025 table below is retained with 2.940. The version difference must not be interpreted as one additional identified person. Fewer registered completions do not, on their own, document fewer distinct people deprived of liberty; starts, completions, ongoing trajectories and daily occupancy concern different populations.

Completed programme and duration

Year	All cleared	Number of months	0-3 md.	3-6 months.	6-12 months.	12-24 months.	24 + mg
2018	4604	3.3	3019	843	556	168	18
2019	4387	3.9	2713	825	558	254	37
2020	4038	4.2	2290	907	579	223	39
2021	3648	4.9	1797	913	617	263	58
2022	3668	5.0	1863	861	579	289	76
2023	3362	5.6	1482	863	648	269	100
2024	2940	6.2	1250	734	555	294	107

Source: original p.70 and 81-82. All the duration ranges to the main denominator. The boundaries of the ranges are reproduced by the source.

Year	24-36 months.	36-48 months.	48 -60 months.	60 + md.
2018	17	0	1	0
2019	37	0	0	0
2020	37	2	0	0
2021	46	10	1	1
2022	68	7	1	0
2023	75	22	3	0
2024	69	27	11	0

Source: original p.82. The rows are subdivided into the 24 + column above. In 2024, 38 courses were over 36 months, of which 11 were between 48 and 60 months. A 60 + course occurs in 2021. It's not different people across years.

Children under 18 years of age

Year	Completed less than 18	0-3 md.	3-6 months.	6-12 months.	12-24 months.	24 + mg
2018	199	134	45	16	4	0
2019	124	70	25	18	11	0
2020	173	105	45	17	6	0
2021	166	77	57	26	6	0
2022	128	68	33	20	5	2
2023	127	59	42	19	6	1
2024	104	50	28	16	7	3

Source: original pp.77 and 87. The figures are subsets of nationally completed case histories. 2022-2024 contains 6 cases lasting at least 24 months in total, but there are no person identifiers proving 6 distinct children. The source describes 5 as homicide/arson and 1 as financial crime (p.86). DST's 2024 figures for commenced cases among ages 15, 16 and 17 are 33,43 and 56, totalling 132; this uses a different annual boundary from the Director of Public Prosecutions' 104 completed cases. The difference of 28 does not document 28 additional unique children or a precise change in the caseload.

Dismisses the application;

Year	Courses ending in acquittal on the principal charge	% of all	Gns.md.	Not indicted by extract	% of all
2018	307	6.67	3.9	400	8.69
2019	236	5.38	5.0	315	7.18
2020	261	6.46	4.8	324	8.02
2021	252	6.91	4.6	269	7.37
2022	256	6.98	6.4	264	7.2
2023	234	6.96	6.4	218	6.48
2024	152	5.17	7.7	-	-

Source: original s.96-98.2024: 29 of 152 acquittal courses were over 12 months; 6 of 104 completed child courses had voluntary main outcomes, of which 1 over 12 months. They are already included in the previous figures. For 2024, the non-indictment number was not delivered. In 2023, 234 + 218 = 452 courses, 13,44% of 3.362, divided into the two categories listed; they are not 452 different persons and not a count of all illegal detention exercises.

The report also reproduces about 200 annual courses 2018- 2023, over 5%, where the time in custody was at least the subsequent penalty. The separate number of persons in custody **exceeded** the penalty is not shown in this checked aggregate material. Therefore, all approximately 200 must not be called detention beyond the sentence (p.97-98).

Police districts and scope of crime categories

Policy district / body	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
North Jutland	238	241	233	266	236	234	216
East Jutland	335	300	333	319	273	266	220
Middle and West Jutland	286	358	290	266	276	256	247
South-East Jutland	272	232	261	217	201	173	121
South and South Jutland	313	311	336	279	221	228	160
Funen	232	252	197	206	216	187	159
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	251	242	292	246	241	224	229
Middle and West Zealand	189	189	186	198	163	128	120
Northern Zealand	303	246	238	184	183	177	148
The West Region of Copenhagen	298	246	218	197	174	168	180
Copenhagen	1833	1710	1386	1225	1401	1163	969
Bornholm	21	21	28	21	19	43	21
NSK / predecessors	33	39	40	24	64	115	150

Source: original p.90. NSK was established in 2022; the row includes historical predecessors, so the institution must not be backdated. The police-district distribution is another breakdown of the same national trajectories, not an addition.

Main crime	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Homicide / fire	304	264	225	270	233	250	234
Violence	749	710	668	634	665	529	457
Condition	232	182	188	217	205	189	150
Robbery	376	275	337	328	308	252	217
Breaking and entering	491	406	323	250	229	218	230
Theft	592	499	351	244	326	271	216
Economic crime	271	289	268	255	227	239	197
Drugs / smuggling	865	1055	1037	959	903	932	845
Other criminal law	421	332	342	303	329	270	241
Other special law	282	354	273	151	206	174	132
Transport	21	21	25	37	37	38	21
Other	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Source: original p.73. Sum minus national main figure by year: [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]. Differences are retained and must be reconciled in the original version before a corrected sum is used. No crime group is itself a count of unlawfulness.

Several simultaneous denominators: start, judgments, evidence and international comparisons

Year	DST started progress	DST unconditional judgments	Gns.daily storage
2015	5221	8561	1258
2016	5715	8376	1243
2017	5832	8475	1283
2018	5797	8067	1444
2019	5537	8085	1505
2020	4570	7788	1645
2021	3949	7373	1600
2022	4084	7564	1633
2023	3692	8136	1604
2024	3318	8618	1362

Source: original s.71-72 and 77. Started courses from STRAF70, unconditional sentences from STRAF40 and daily evidence from the Department of Crime. The 2024 number of the cover is later given more precisely to 1.362,3 (p.79). Starts and endings do not cover identical time windows / populations, and evidence also includes alien-law detention, which the RA series omits. It is not possible to pull the start and the end and thus to document a precise number of accumulated citizens. The relationship between starting and sentences is not the proportion of sentenced persons who were previously held in custody.

The Nordic comparison of the report uses different years and units of measure: Norway 2023 has 2.526 starts and 2.425 endings; Finland 2024 has 2.379 starts; Sweden 2024 has 11.328 endings. Denmark 2024 has 2.940 endings. The population denominators are 5.606.944,5.636.000,10.587.710 and 6.004.342; the Danish is 2025, while the custody year is 2024. The published rates are 43,42,107 and 49 per 100.000. respectively. Daily data are Norway 2023: 704, Finland 2024: 782, Sweden 2024: 3.056 and Denmark 2024: 1.362,3; rates 12,6,13,9,28,9 and 22,7. The quantities are compared with Norway 2022: 78 days, Finland 2020: 3,4 months and Sweden 2024: 98 days. Year, start / finish and scope must be at the rates; the comparison cannot only identify a number of illegal Danish prisons (p.78-89).

Data selection, process phases and documented times

The additional 2024 analysis includes 2.950 ongoing courses from 1 January to 24 August; approximately 800 courses were sorted out due to insufficient information. There is therefore a specific selection limit. This committee included collusion hazards in 1.849 courses (62,7%), repetitive hazards 588 (19,9%), escape hazards 578 (19,6%), § 762, paragraph 2, paragraph 1 in 226 (7,7%) and paragraph 2 in 34 (1,2%). Reasons do not overlap and summer to unique persons.146 return journeys and 8 journeys under section 763 are separate boundaries in the same material; they must not be renamed ordinary criminal proceedings (p.74-75).

Among proceedings concluded in the district court, the pre-charge phase increased from 1,6 months in 2018 to 2,6 in 2023, and charge to first judgment from 1,5 to 2,5. In appealed cases, pre-charge increased from 3,1 to 4,3, charge to first judgment from 2,8 to 4,7, and first to final judgment from 5,3 to 7,4; a further phase from final judgment to serving the sentence increased from 0,3 to 0,6. The three appeal phases total 16,4 months in 2023; including the last phase, 17,0. It is therefore wrong to present 16,4 as the time of complete cessation. For homicide/arson in the 2024 committee’s appealed cases, the first three phases are 8,2,6,9 and 13,9 months, but this is a selected group (pp.83-84).

19% of the 2024 sample had advance listing and sequences 2,5 months longer than the others. This is an observation in a selected sample, not causal proof that advance listing prolongs cases. Time from indictment to listing was 0,7 months generally,1,4 for sexual offences and 1,5 for homicide/arson; listing to first judgment was 1,9. According to RA, the advance-listing measure’s apparent phase of 1 month may be affected by relisting and registration errors (pp.87-88).

Interview and question form: criticism with proper evidence status

19 interviewees comprise 5 defence lawyers,7 judges and 7 prosecutors;5 had previously been prosecutors and are already included in 19. Interviews cover 10 of 12 police districts. The questionnaire has 79 defence-lawyer responses from approximately 400 possible respondents and 58 prosecutor responses from 95 invitees. The Judges' Association did not want a questionnaire survey of judges. Bornholm, NSK, Greenland and the Faroe Islands are outside the questionnaire's scope; geographical table totals are 77 defence lawyers and 57 prosecutors and must not be presented as all 79/58 respondents. Prosecutor responses are geographically skewed, for example 3 in Copenhagen and 20 in Funen/South and Southern Jutland, and are not weighted by caseload. The report's statements about practice rest on this material, rather than full review of court orders (pp.16-17 and 101-104).

The interview material describes repeated extensions without real retesting of the grounds of suspicion, reticence in the use of precautionary surrogates and a lack of consistency in slow propulsion. These statements are essential evidence of the actions and omissions of the police, the prosecution and the courts. They must be labelled as professional experience and assessments; the study does not establish that all extensions are illegal. Defenders also describe the abandonment of appeals or acceptance of outcomes under the pressure of long-term custody; the prosecution's assessment of the absence of false confessions is not empirical evidence that such never occurs (p.158- 169,180-185 and 198).

The questionnaire figures do not print all precise column values, and answers like "don't know" are omitted in several characters. Therefore, the whole of 79 / 58 is not automatically the denominator for each question. These graphical figures cannot be translated into precise new case figures by reading or guessing.

Actual cessation and replacement: secondary documents

The legal section of the report, p. 48-49, refers to the following specific decisions. AM 2020.10.15V2, AM 2010.02.25V2 and AM 2022.10.17Ø are subsequently checked in all sides of the official original decision chains. The full time / evidence analysis is in *Weight: three original decision chains and time to restore*. The other maps below have continued **description of the source;**, not independently verified court orders:

• AM 2016.01.04V: 366 days of custody and acquittal; compensation rejected according to the source's description, referring to its own guilt in a telephone statement on ketamine. Requirements for next checks: precise date of release, causation and original justification.

• AM 2020.10.15V2: 240 days of custody in addition to the sentence imposed; compensation awarded because incorrect explanations did not cause the extra time it is reproduced. Requirement: amount, periods and actual payment.

• AM 2010.02.25V2: more than a year of custody in the Suldrup case and subsequent acquittal; the source describes damages despite concealments without the necessary causal link. Requirements: original dates and endurance status.

• U2013.1798/2H: compensation halved with reference to the partial causal significance of incorrect statements. Demand: precise deprivation-of-liberty period and amount.

• U 2009.2287E: replacement refused in the source's description with reference to lack of explanation. Requirements: precise scope in relation to the right to silence and applicable law.

• U 2000.2385H is before the reporting period. It can only be used as a historical legal reference: the source describes isolation-induced psychosis, 216 days in addition to punishment and compensation. It is not counted as a 2006-2025 course.

These references to the courts shall not be added to the national proceedings or referred to as a complete register of procedural errors. A right to compensation, an award and actual payment are different times and must be recorded separately.

Consequences and responsibilities

The dates of the order, each extension, indictment, first judgment, final judgment, physical release or transition to serving a sentence and actual compensation must be recorded separately. A lawful basis on an earlier date does not prove necessity on every later date. An acquittal examines guilt; it does not by itself restore lost family life, employment or mental health. Research on such losses is addressed in the module *Remand detention, employment and family life* with the original register study's own historical and person-related delimitation.

The report recommends the publication of several running ratios: lengths by circle and ground, termination and initiators, court and replacement outcomes. This shows specific data requirements, not evidence that the recommendations were implemented after publication (p.209-211). Liability shall link the documented phase delay to the action or omission of the individual actor, the rule to be observed and the loss of the citizen. No unconditional discretion is derived from the figures.

Additional published percentage tables: keep rounding and denominator

The tables below also reproduce the rounded percentage of the original. They describe the progress already taken into account. They are not additional events and the rounding should not be used to reconstruct unknown exact numbers. Circular change has its own base year as the denominator; duration shares use the end 2024 course of the circle.

Area changes since 2018

Circles	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
North Jutland	1	-2	12	-1	-2	-9
East Jutland	-10	-1	-5	-19	-21	-34
Middle and West Jutland	25	1	-7	-3	-10	-14
South-East Jutland	-15	-4	-20	-26	-36	-56
South and South Jutland	-1	7	-11	-29	-27	-49
Funen	9	-15	-11	-7	-19	-31
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	-4	16	-2	-4	-11	-9
Middle and West Zealand	0	-2	5	-14	-32	-37
Northern Zealand	-19	-21	-39	-40	-42	-51
The West Region of Copenhagen	-17	-27	-34	-42	-44	-40
Copenhagen	-7	-24	-33	-24	-37	-47
Bornholm	0	33	0	-10	105	0
NSK / predecessors	18	21	-27	94	248	355

Source: originals.91. All cells are percent.

Area changes since 2021

Circles	2022	2023	2024
North Jutland	-11	-12	-19
East Jutland	-14	-17	-31
Middle and West Jutland	4	-4	-7
South-East Jutland	-7	-20	-44
South and South Jutland	-21	-18	-43
Funen	5	-9	-23
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	-2	-9	-7
Middle and West Zealand	-18	-35	-39
Northern Zealand	-1	-4	-20
The West Region of Copenhagen	-12	-15	-9
Copenhagen	14	-5	-21
Bornholm	-10	105	0
NSK / predecessors	167	379	525

Source: Original s.92. All cells are percent.

Area changes from year to year

Circles	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
North Jutland	1	-3	14	-11	-1	-8
East Jutland	-10	11	-4	-14	-3	-17
Middle and West Jutland	25	-19	-8	4	-7	-4
South-East Jutland	-15	13	-17	-7	-14	-30
South and South Jutland	-1	8	-17	-21	3	-30
Funen	9	-22	5	5	-13	-15
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	-4	21	-16	-2	-7	2
Middle and West Zealand	0	-2	6	-18	-21	-6
Northern Zealand	-19	-3	-23	-1	-3	-16
The West Region of Copenhagen	-17	-11	-10	-12	-3	7
Copenhagen	-7	-19	-12	14	-17	-17
Bornholm	0	33	-25	-10	126	-51
NSK / predecessors	18	3	-40	167	80	30

Source: originals.93. All cells are percent.

2024 closed, lower bounds

Circles	less than 12 months	less than 6 months	less than 3 months
Bornholm	100	100	90
Northern Zealand	91	77	58
Copenhagen	89	76	56
Funen	91	74	47
South-East Jutland	91	70	36
North Jutland	92	69	34
The West Region of Copenhagen	83	67	42
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	91	62	28
South and South Jutland	80	61	42
Middle and West Zealand	82	61	46
East Jutland	85	59	30
Middle and West Jutland	86	59	26
NSK / predecessors	60	35	11

Source: originals p.94; NSKs.95. All cells are percent.

2018-2024 change in duration groups

Circles	0-3 md	3-6 md	6-12 md	12 + m
Bornholm	27	100	-100	-100
Northern Zealand	-57	-50	-41	-7
Copenhagen	-61	-15	-15	106
Funen	-50	-14	13	50
South-East Jutland	-70	-36	-47	-35
North Jutland	-42	35	32	6
The West Region of Copenhagen	-64	-18	47	121
South Zealand and Lolland-Falster	-54	37	53	62
South and South Jutland	-66	-44	-40	167
Middle and West Zealand	-48	-67	4	267
East Jutland	-64	-16	-5	113
Middle and West Jutland	-53	-2	35	106

Source: Original s.96. All cells are percent.

The 2024 distribution of the NSK is 60% below 12 months, 35% below 6 and 11% below 3; these are already included in the 150 series. The source gives up 60 NSK courses over 12 months, including 50 drugs / smuggling; subsets, not new courses (p.95).

Year	Starting / all-held%	Starting / non-conditionality
2015	14.84	60.99
2016	16.4	68.23
2017	17.33	68.81
2018	17.02	71.86
2019	15.34	68.48
2020	12.77	58.68
2021	11.09	53.56
2022	10.99	53.99
2023	10.74	45.38
2024	10.38	38.5

Source: original s.76-77. The last column compares different annualpopulations and is not an individual risk or proportion of convicted persons with prior custody. The rounding of the first column cannot deliver a precise national arrest warrant backwards.

Year	0-3 md.	3-6 months.	6-12 months.	12-24 months.	24 + mg
2018	66	18	12	4	0
2019	62	19	13	6	1
2020	57	22	14	6	1
2021	49	25	17	7	2
2022	51	23	16	8	2

Source: original p.82; the printed percentage table ends in 2022.2024's comparison table on p.89 uses 43%,25%,19%and 14%for 0-3,3-6,6-12 and over 12 months; the total of 101%is due to rounding. These figures must not be added to the exact 2024 counts.

Maintenance, work and family life: primary research and controlled source chain

Main findings and actual delineation

Danish register research documents a lasting decline in labour-market attachment and increased risk of ceasing cohabitation with one's own children after pre-trial detention, including in the group without subsequent conviction. The results show specific social losses that a later acquittal or abandonment of prosecution does not in itself repair. The study does not examine the lawfulness of individual detention orders and therefore is not a count of unlawful deprivations of liberty.

The primary source is Sara Wakefield and Lars Højsgaard Andersen (2020), *Pretrial Detention and the Costs of System Overreach for Employment and Family Life*, Sociological Science 7, pp. 342-366, DOI 10.15195/v7.a14. Original article. PDF page = printed page minus 341. The methodology, delimitation and central outcome tables have been read in the original. The register data are the researchers' analyses; the underlying individual register records are not available in this report.

The study covers: **75.187 cases / cases involving 50.446 different men**, 18-59 years, period **1995-2010**, with at least seven days in custody in the relevant groups. Both the beginning and the end must be in the period; the outcome is followed three years before and after. Women, children under the age of 18, under seven days of care and cross-border courses are not included. Thus, the study only covers 2006-2010 of the main period of the report and cannot be estimated at a national number of losses in 2006-2025. 78% of the different persons had one case; 95% had a maximum of three. People with multiple cases are counted several times in the case accounts; standard errors are clung to person. Original p. 346-349.

Analytical group	Cases / proceedings	What the outcome means
Convicted, never in prison, except for possible arrest under 24 hours	27.376	Reference group; **not** serving an ordinary prison sentence;
Preservation, no conviction	2.797	Dismisses the application; the category is not limited to discontinuance;
Convicted, the entire sentence served as custody	1.017	No further atonement after the judgment
Preservation and subsequent prison sentence	38.990	Further detention after detention
Remand followed by another sanction	5.007	Primarily conditional penalty / probation in article categorisation
Total	**75.187**	**50.446 persons** across the groups

Source:original table 1,pp. 354-355,compared with the definitions on pp. 346-349. The group without conviction is not 2.797 documented unlawful remand-detention orders. Nor may the whole historical cohort be added on top of the Director of Public Prosecutions' annual courses.

Work: actual measurements and interpretation

Employment income comes from tax information. Annual income is divided by 12 into a monthly measure; the employment indicator shows income from work. Precise timing before and after deprivation of liberty is uncertain by up to **±11 months** in certain cases. These months are marked in figures and excluded from the statistical models. Amounts are stated in **2010-USD adjusted for purchasing power**, not present-day kroner. Original pp. 347 and 350-356.

The Danish research communication reports labour-market attachment in the group without conviction as **16 % lower** after remand detention than before. This is a **relative change**, not 16 percentage points and not evidence that exactly 16 % of all remand detainees lost a job. ROCKWOOL Foundation's original research communication, pp. 1–2.

Article table 2, p. 356, provides controlled model estimates. In model 5 the reference group's change in the employment indicator is −0,054, and the additional change for the reference category with pre-trial detention is −0,058. The latter is **−5,8 percentage points**, in addition to the change among convicted people without imprisonment. The interaction for the group without conviction is +0,015 and not statistically significant. In model 6 with individual fixed effects, the additional pre-trial detention change is −0,053. Income model 2 estimates an additional change of −124,957 purchasing-power-adjusted 2010-USD per month; the interaction for no conviction is +30,014 and not significant. The estimates have different reference components and must not be added to the reported relative change as separate losses.

The descriptive pre- / post-share with work income in Table 1, p. 354, is 0,769 / 0,716 for prisoners without imprisonment, 0,724 / 0,625 without conviction, 0,649 / 0,555 for full custody, 0,650 / 0,526 for later prison serving and 0,731 / 0,637 for second sentence. It is descriptive group objectives and not the number of unique people who have lost their jobs. The controlled estimates are necessary because the groups already differ before imprisonment.

Family: Cohabitation, children and comparison group

Family outcomes measure common address with partner and with **own children**. They do not measure the number of children, contact, contact, parental authority or the child's subjective experience. An address breach therefore does not automatically document a complete break in contact, but is a tangible loss of common everyday life. Original pages 348 and 357-358.

The Danish dissemination indicates among men who: **before the course lived with partner and children**that the family is no longer the same for **35 %** in the reference group with a sentence without imprisonment, **46 %** in the group of custody without conviction; and **51 %** among those who served the entire sentence in custody. The difference is 11 and 16 percentage points, respectively, between the groups indicated. There is no published, common precise number in this figure which makes it justifiable to translate the percentages into a number of children or families concerned. Original Danish dissemination, p. 3.

Specific correction of the source chain: Justitia/ The 2025 Report of the Bar Association, published on p. 12, reproduces 35% as a group serving ordinary prison sentences without custody. This does not match the original article reference group and the original ROCKWOOL Foundation p. 3. **Convicted who did not stay prison,**. The error changes the comparison; it does not erase the documented additional family loss in the group without conviction. 2025 reproduction.

The article's table 3,p. 358,uses separate risk groups: **8.631 cases** with previous cohabitation with a partner and **8.280 cases** with previous cohabitation with their own children; observation time is 212.499 and 196.208 months respectively. The figures are not unique people and are not the denominator for all three percentages in the Danish figure about partner **and** children. In the model controlling for background, the relative event rate for ending partner cohabitation is 1,292 in the group without conviction, and for ending cohabitation with children 1,250; both are statistically significant at the article's stated levels. For a sentence served entirely in pre-trial detention, the figures are 1,098 for a partner, not significant, and 1,601 for children, significant. For later imprisonment, they are 2,146 and 1,711; for another sanction, 1,695 and 1,473. An event rate is not a percentage of all imprisoned people and must not be converted directly into children.

Evidence value, responsibility and concrete requirements

Researchers use individual before / after changes, background controls and personal fixed effects. The models assume that remaining selection is random depending on observed conditions and past outcomes. The design is not a randomized study; time-varying unobserved conditions may affect the relationship. This specific method limit does not make the losses invisible and does not justify a general defence of detention. Original pp. 349- 352 and 361-363.

The strongest sustainable use in the report is: Pre-trial detention may be followed by loss of income support and shared family life even without conviction; redress must therefore be examined separately for liberty, work, housing, cohabitation, child contact and compensation. If a specific deprivation of liberty or extension was unlawful or unnecessary, these outcomes may be relevant heads of loss and lines of investigation. This requires individual documentation of dates, actual loss, causation and legal responsibility; research estimates are not individual compensation amounts.

Additional information required is current personalised duplicated cohorts, women and children, subsequent jobs / income / housing / cohabitation, date of actual cessation and replacement, and link to established illegality. The national annual programme of the report cannot provide these figures by multiplying an historical percentage by the number of courses in custody.

Weight: three original decision chains and time to restore

The decisive findings

Two original decision chains document that the Regional Public Prosecutor and Director of Public Prosecutions maintained the denial or halving of compensation that the courts later set aside. In one case, the citizen was deprived of liberty for **240 days beyond the sentence imposed** and, after judicial review, was awarded **DKK 408.000** with interest. In the other case, a mother of **two minor children** was deprived of liberty for **433 commenced days** and acquitted; the halving of compensation was set aside, but her claim for further enhanced compensation was not upheld. The third case documents **12 commenced days**, discontinued prosecution and a delayed letter to defence counsel; compensation was refused also after judicial review.

The three cases are identifiable decision chains, not a representative committee or a complete national court register. They may overlap the national causes. Their administrative decisions and judgments are not counted as new persons. The sources do not document criminal liability for employees or an automatic infringement of EMRK In all three cases. The criticism below relates to the actual deviations, losses and non-recoveries of the originals.

All pages of the official configurations are read: AM 2020.10.15V2, 21 PDFs pages; AM 2010.02.25V2, 37 pages; AM 2022.10.17Ø, 9 pages. They contain original decisions and court extracts and their reproduction of previous evidence. The underlying police reports, medical records and supporting documents have not been independently obtained here. A reproduced explanation is therefore marked as an explanation, and a court premium such as the court premium.

1. E: 240 days too much; two administrative refusals, then DKK 408.000.

Conclusion: The prosecution's reasoning for eliminating all compensation could not support the necessary causal connection to the additional 240 days. Both the district court and high court set aside the refusal. This is a specifically documented incorrect compensation outcome that an internal administrative complaint did not correct.

Original: AM 2020.10.15V2, Vestre Landsret S-0338-20, 15 October 2020, with decision chain.

Date	Action, outcome and source
16 January 2017 20.08	Arrest. Initial charge attempted murder; later killing and helpless condition. PDF-p. 3, 9, 15-16
17 January 2017	Warrant detention. PDF, pp. 3 and 16
6. October 2017	indictment for murder, or, alternatively, gross violence resulting in death, threats and stabbing. PDF-p. 17
15 January 2018	Corner sentenced E to 12 years in prison for, among other things, complicit in killing; E appealed. PDF-p. 3, 17-18
12 December 2018	Vestre Landsret acquitted of murder and convicted of violent violence, threats and knife laws: 1 year and 3 months. PDF-p. 3 and 18-19
12 December 2018 kl 13.10	In fact, according to the D.A. 's parallel 2019 decision. 695 days started, penalty calculated at 455 days, difference 240. PDF-p. 19; date deviation below
20 December 2018	Claims made. PDF-pp. 3-4 and 19
21 March 2019	The district attorney in Viborg refused compensation and a lawyer's fee for his own guilt. PDF-p. 15 and 19-21
3 April 2019	The lawyer complained. PDF, pp. 4, 8 and 13
29. May 2019	The Attorney General maintained the entire refusal and the fee waiver. PDF-p. 8-14
9 July / 16 August 2019	Application for judicial review / referral and receipt. PDF-p. 4
29 January 2020	The court in Hjørring awarded DKK 408.000 for 240 days with procedural interest from December 20, 2018. The DA appealed. PDF-p. 3-7
15. October 2020	Vestre Landsret The Court of First Instance dismissed the application and ordered the Treasury to pay the costs. PDF-p. 1-2
Actual payment	Not documented in the composition; shall not be replaced by the date of the judgment

The statement of the Authority and the significance of the evidence: The Attorney General has already acknowledged the mismatch between detention and punishment, but thought that E's changing explanations had given rise to the whole detention (PDF's 10-13). On the other hand, the City Court found that the same fact of his presence at the first incident of violence had been taken into account in both criminal convictions and that there had been no significant new information between them. The change in national law related to the meaning of criminal law: it was not proven that the individual had participated in the second episode or that the cause of death originated from the first episode. E would also have been in custody if, from the outset, he had given the explanation corresponding to the fact on which the judgments were based (PDF, pp. 2 and 5-6).

Legal departure and responsibility: The rule applied was section 1018 a, subsection 2, of the Administration of Justice Act concerning disproportion, read with subsection 3 concerning the person’s own fault. The courts did not find the necessary causal connection to the additional 240 days. The prosecution had converted an assessment of the citizen’s credibility into complete loss of entitlement to compensation without a sustainable connection to the part of the deprivation of liberty to be compensated. The criticism specifically concerns the State Prosecutor’s refusal, the Director of Public Prosecutions’ affirmation and the appeal against the favourable decision; it does not require an assumption that every original remand order was unlawful or criminal.

Time and specific demand: From actual release to the first compensation judgment,**413 calendar days** elapsed; to the High Court’s affirmance,**673 days**. From the first administrative refusal to affirmance,**574 days** elapsed. These are our own date-difference calculations; they are not additional days of deprivation of liberty. The post-judgment claim is DKK 408.000, interest and the awarded costs. Actual payment and any further loss must be documented independently.

Source conflict: The district court's statement of the case, PDF p. 3, gives release on 12. December **2019**, but the same paragraph states 695 days from January 2017 and describes a compensation claim already on 20. December **2018**. The regional public prosecutor's original PDF p. 19 specifies 12. December **2018** at 13.10. The account of time uses the latter direct date and makes the discrepancy visible. Rigsadvokaten's PDF pp. 10-11 also contains 2019 dates for acts placed in 2017 by the decision's own earlier chronology and the regional public prosecutor's original. These errors must not become an additional year of actual deprivation of liberty. The district court's judgment date has separately been corrected from 30. to 29. January 2020, PDF p. 7.

2. Suldrup: 433 days, two children, loss of work, and halving set aside

Conclusion: The Regional Public Prosecutor's and Director of Public Prosecutions' halving of both compensation and lost earnings was set aside. The originals also document loss of work, very limited contact with two children and a long sequence leading to full compensation under the standard rates. The High Court's compensation review had to proceed with E's estate as a party; the date and cause of death are not stated and must not be inferred from the case.

Original: AM 2010.02.25V2, Vestre Landsret S-1566-09, 25 February 2010, with judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Communities and administrative originals;.

Date	Actual / legal process and locator
29 July 2006 kl. 03.40	E is being arrested for killing his mother. The same day they're in custody. PDF-pp. 5-7 and 34
28 August / 1 September 2006	Dismissal by the employer effective 28. August documented to the Regional Public Prosecutor; the compensation period is calculated from 1. September. PDF pp.32 and 36
6 February 2007	indictment. PDF-pp. 7 and 22
6 July 2007	Visits to the children are abolished; so far, monitored visits of half an hour per week. PDF-pp. 11 and 27
4. October 2007	Acquittal and release. 433 commenced days in the compensation count: first day + 432 subsequent days. PDF pp. 5-7 and 34-35
7 November 2007	Claims made. PDF-pp. 5-6 and 34
27 February 2008	The district attorney awards DKK 285.800 in compensation after halving. PDF-p. 34-37
6 March 2008	The DA awards DKK 164.143,84 in lost earnings after halving. PDF-p. 24 and 32-33
24 June 2008	The Attorney General will hold on to the halves and refuse any further increase. PDF-p. 24-31
25 June 2009	The District Court in Aalborg sets aside the halving: total compensation DKK 571.600 and lost earnings DKK 328.333, total DKK 899.933; an additional DKK 449.990 after deduction of amounts already paid, with interest from 7. November 2007. PDF pp. 20-23
25 February 2010	Vestre Landsret maintain the compensation outcome. The separate fee of DKK 2.900 plus VAT is abolished; additional work must be included in the court's sales. PDF-p. 2-4
Actual reunification	E explained in the District Court that the two children moved back when they were released and had since lived with her. PDF-pp. 16-17; not a separate read address / authority register
Actual payment	The first two amounts are described in the urban balance sheet as already paid out; date and possible set-off are not shown. The actual date of payment of the additional compensation has not been documented. PDF - pp. 6, 22, 33 and 37

The authority's specific statement and legal examination: The State Prosecutor held it against E that she had left the crime scene, not called 112,taken off the bloodstained clothes, wanted a bath and pointed out different clothes. The Director of Public Prosecutions adopted the same reasons. The High Court found that, in the situation after witnessing her mother's murder, she could not be blamed for running home to her minor children, not managing to summon help, taking off her clothes or wanting a bath. Concealed clothes and incorrect information about the clothing could be blamed to some extent, but had not had the necessary significance for the remand detention itself. This rested particularly on the father's account, the bloodstained clothes found and the assessment of her reaction. There was no basis for a reduction under § 1018 a, subsection 3 (PDF pp. 3-4 and 35; District Court p. 22).

Citizens with precise evidence status: The public prosecutor recognised a dismissal on account of the case, monthly wages around DKK 25.000 and a calculated loss of earnings from 1 September 2006 until the release. The reproduced psychological opinion of 20 May 2009 described stress response after both the experience of mother killing and the stay in the brig, with PTSD symptoms and the need for longer therapy. The doctor described 12 June 2009 worsening anxiety / restlessness, psychological treatment stopped for economic reasons and difficulties in using teacher training, but even provided limited grounds to separate the causes (PDF-s. 14-15). These are two reproducible health-care assessments, unindependently controlled medical history or evidence that all symptoms were solely due to care.

E explained that she had been on sick leave for the first six months after the acquittal, had been refused employment and had to give up further training; the first compensation was mainly spent on debts recovered during imprisonment. She also described psychological aid to her eldest daughter. Her statements on saliva, humiliation, misleading police report and the pressure of confession are serious concrete allegations in the original judgment, but did not establish facts solely by reproduction (PDF-pp. 16-17). The original examination of the specific complaints and records is necessary for these points. They shall not be presented as already proven or deleted from the impact accounts.

Time, redress and responsibility: From release to the favourable District Court finding,**630 days** elapsed, and to the High Court's conclusion,**875 days**. Contact during deprivation of liberty was half an hour weekly until 6. July 2007; two children were affected, but they are not two additional compensation claimants. Reunification is described at release, while full entitlement to compensation was examined only later. Occupational and psychological recovery are not documented as completed. A monetary payment is therefore not equivalent to restoration of health, education, work or lost time living together.

The judgments upheld refusal of an increase beyond the standard rate for homicide cases. That specifically changes the compensation amount; it does not make the loss of children, work and the opportunity to attend the mother's funeral unreal. The strong sustainable criticism is the halving without the necessary causal connection and the prolonged need for external review. The evidence assessment in the overall criminal case and all restrictions' compatibility with the Convention cannot be determined solely from these compensation judgments.

Local source conflicts: The PDF- p. 3 of the National Court refers to the decision of the Public Prosecutor as of 27 February 2007 and of the Advocate General as of 25 March 2008. The originals attached show 27 February **2008** and **24 June 2008**; 25 March is the date of complaint. The city court's PDF p. 8 writes one place 8 March, but the attached administrative original and RA's p. 24 show **6 March 2008**. The loss of earnings is administratively calculated at DKK 328.287,67, while the City Court grants DKK 328.333; the visible diffusers DKK 45,33 is not retained and is not hidden as complete numerical uniformity. Both sub-payments, the total amount and the additional award shall not be summed up to a new, higher amount of compensation.

3. Dismissed arms case: release, delayed notification and refusal of compensation

Conclusion: The original documents a separate information failure: the defender first received a message **273 calendar days** after the arrest. The claim was therefore not rejected as late. On the other hand, it was refused on account of its own fault and the refusal was confirmed. A person may thus have the charge dropped and yet remain without compensation; this outcome is not proof of the absence of actual loss of liberty or family life.

Original: AM 2022.10.17E, Østre Landsret S-2621-21, with administrative decisions and Glostrup judgment.

The deprivation began. **15 June 2017 kl 14.56** and terminated upon decision of the police **27 June 2017 kl 13.12**, before the time limit for imprisonment: **12 days started**. The charges were dropped. **15 December 2017**, but the defender was first informed **14 September 2018** and made claims; **17 September 2018**. The DA refused. **20 June 2019**, The Advocate General maintained: **19 August 2019**, Glostrup **1 September 2021** and Østre Landsret **17 October 2022**. The requirement was **15.300 kr.**, calculated as 6.500 DKK first day + 11 × 800 DKK; the amount was not awarded. The citizen had to pay the costs before the courts (PDF, pp. 1-5 and 8-9).

The legal assessment was based on the car having been made available as a pool car to Bandidos members and on the court's assessment that the owner should have foreseen the risk of storage of unlawful items. The person subsequently convicted in relation to the pistol found was someone else (PDF p. 9). The material read provides no basis for claiming that this refusal of compensation has already been set aside or is contrary to the Convention. The criticism can specifically maintain the delayed notification, prolonged review and absence of compensation; further examination of proportionality and contributory fault requires the underlying documents and relevant case-law.

From physical release to the end of the national court **1.938 calendar days**. It is time for an unresolved claim for compensation, not continued imprisonment. A reclaimed police interview indicates that the citizen and the girlfriend had a single child; the child is an identified possible affected relationship, not an additional prison or person seeking compensation (PDF p. 6).

Source conflict: The City Court's PDF p. 5 writes the end of the detention as 27 June **2021**, while the simultaneous originals of the Attorney General and the Attorney General show **2017** and count 12 days. The mistake must not become four years of detention. The City Court's p. 8 indicates in a paragraph found in the car as 16 June, while the administrative simultaneous incident chronology indicates 15 June; the exact date of funding must be checked, if necessary, in the police's original report. No additional day is added to the 12 days documented.

Overall control of the three chains

Measurement point	E 2020	Suldrup 2010	Armistice 2022
Various detainees in this committee	1	1	1
Explicitly referred to minors / own children	Not specified	2	1 family information reproduced
Detention	695 days started, 240 of which in addition to punishment	433 days started	12 days started
First administrative default	None	Half compensation / loss of earnings	None
Legal end-of-life in the original chain	DKK 408.000 + interest	Full rate / wage loss; additional DKK 449.990 + interest	None; cost to the citizen
Actual payment	Unknown	Early instalments described in terms of payments; last unknown	No award
Actual return to children	Unknown	Described by the mother upon release	Not specified
Work / Health Restored	Unknown	Documented continued problems in reproduced 2009 material	Not specified

The five accounts must remain separate: decisions, progress, persons, actual losses and liability / restoration. A reversed replacement decision is proven error of authority; an acquittal alone is not a judgment of each previous custody order; an award of funds alone is not documented actual or complete refund. A comparison of criminal law with the same concrete action by a private person requires its own legal basis, intention / negligence, causation and individual proof. Nothing in the three chains establishes a general authority immunity.

28. Denmark's knowledge, positive commitments and actual responsibility;

Main assessment

The report documents repeated breaches of law, specific losses of rights and authority knowledge of serious problems. This supports criticism of both the original interventions and subsequent review: Known errors must be followed through to actual cessation, correction and redress. Absence of an individual criminal conviction does not extinguish the State's duties of protection, investigation and reparation.

The key chain of responsibility is: **tampering or omission → documented deficiency → competent bodies knowledge → required action → actual reaction or inaction → continued loss of rights → responsibility and specific requirements.** The sectoral accounts of the report document the first steps in many ways. The concrete lines of citizenship and responsibility also document later stages. Each conclusion indicates where an additional indent requires original decisions, acknowledgement of receipt, contact log, journal or payment information.

The strongest valid national criticism is that control outcomes and declared improvements do not constitute a single proof for protected citizens. An administrative closure may be carried out at the same time as an unpaid loss of rights. It is therefore necessary to examine: **the impact of the checks on the citizen;**, not only its activities carried out. The findings require concrete legal assessments, but a lack of national personal union does not prevent demands in already documented processes.

1. Knowledge must be associated with competence, time and action

Three different types of knowledge

Institutional knowledge of problems arises through its own complaints, investigations, commissions, supervision, national reports and international oversight results. It documents that a problem was identified at a particular organisational level. A published report does not on its own document receipt by every individual actor.

Specific case-law follow, for example, from objections received, a rejected decision, a known non-investigation, a invalid consent, a medical warning or proven risk during continued action. It must be attached to the recipient, date, content, competence and actual means of action.

Legally grounded constructive knowledge is assessed according to the specific duty of protection. An authority's organised lack of an overview must be examined as possible separate neglect where its particular duty requires identification, control or follow-up. This is not a universal responsibility criterion. Articles 2, 3, 8 and 13 have different conditions. Article 2's criteria for operational protection against a real and immediate risk to life cannot be transferred as a general admissibility requirement for all family or remedy questions. [PFK01; see also the legal basis in chapter 26]

Personal reading by any staff member is not required to investigate institutional negligence. On the other hand, personal punishment requires an independent test of the individual's duty, action and guilt. That distinction keeps the responsibility of the State and of the management open, while at the same time the charge of individuals is anchored in concrete proof.

Documented examples of knowledge and responsibility

Progress	Documented knowledge and response	Legal significance and concrete requirements
Langeland, 2023-2026	Task Force and follow-up described continued problems. In May 2026, the Ministry overruled the basis of the previous decision of the Appeal Board not to raise a supervisory case.	Try the knowledge received, the omissions of the supervisory authority and the actual corrected or continued situation of the current citizens. [TFLAN23; TFLANISM26]
Hospital doctors' record, 2010	The Patient Complaints Board, after many years of practice, exempted hospital doctors from responsibility in the described situation. The National Health Service and the Ministry knew and accepted practices.	The Ombudsman found practices illegal. Try the decisions concerned, re-examination and institutional accreditation and accountability chain. [PFK06]
Nordfyn, 2020	The report reproduces management’s statements about financial management, insufficient intervention and an assessment backlog.	The statements are concrete clues to management knowledge. Try the simultaneous management decisions against the necessary support and intervention of the citizens concerned; the different stock targets may not be summed up as persons. [TFNOR20]
Faaborg-Midtfyn, 2020	The municipality described staff reduction, delayed assistance and the risk of continued ineffective measures.	Try known lack of follow-up against each action's continued necessity and termination. The lack of staff does not create the right to continue intervention. [FMK20]
Politiklagesængelse, 2023	The UN Committee on Torture criticised a few criminal charges and a too narrow focus on individual criminal guilt in certain investigations.	Try whether the incident and possible ill-treatment were actually resolved, even when individual criminal liability could not be established first. [PFK02, paragraphs 40-41]

Each row has its own evidence function. A municipal management statement is proof of the statement made; its actual explanation and causal significance must be checked against the control acts and citizen's progress. Several control bodies repeat the same information does not count as several independent original certificates.

Langeland shows why control fencing has to be tested independently

Conclusion: The ministry’s opinion documents an insufficiently substantiated supervisory response to information about unlawful administration. **Statement and original evidence:** The letter of 29. May 2026, particularly pp. 14-16, examines Ankestyrelsen’s decision from August 2025. **Deficiency:** Organisational measures and the municipality’s information did not provide a sufficient basis for assuming lawful practice. **Rule and action:** The ministry required renewed assessment of legality, reopening and relevant supervisory sanctions. **Significance:** Closure of the review did not document redress for the identified citizens. **Responsibility and demand:** The municipality’s and supervisory authority’s actions must be followed from first relevant knowledge to actual correction. A specific ECHR violation must be linked to the right affected and the individual sequence of events. [PFK05]

2. Immunity, Liability Exemption and Actual Punishment

The liability waiver shall have the name and precise scope;

The critical study includes both statutory exemptions, unlawful exemption practices and actual lack of responsibility. The word immunity must not replace this investigation. What rule or decision prevented the sanction? What responsibility could still be pursued? Was it actually being followed?

Mechanism	What the material documents	What to test
General public liability	Paragraphs 155to 157 of the Criminal Code contain responsibility for certain forms of abuse and misconduct.	Public employment does not give an ordinary criminal immunity. Try the specific crime scene, guilt, day-to-day law and any special exceptions. [PFK07]
Illegal administrative exemption	The Ombudsman's file shows institutionally accepted practices in breach of a statutory obligation.	Identify the decisions that were affected, who approved the practice and whether citizens had their complaints re-examined. [PFK06]
Restricted personal financial liability	Section 23 of the Liability for Damages Act may limit an employee’s liability in damages and by way of recourse. It also covers privately employed staff.	The liability of the employer and the State and the criminal trail must be assessed separately. [PFK08]

Mechanism	What the material documents	What to test
Protected reporting basis	Paragraph 201 of the Health Act protects against certain consequences of the UTH report; the scheme also includes private hospitals.	Secure independent records, logs and testimonies. The protection is not a general liability exemption for the action on any basis. [PFK09; UTHP11; UTHP20]
Proper exemption from a particular penalty	The 2026 Compensation Act concerning the contraception case in Greenland exempts authorities and their employees from section 16, subsection 2, where section 4 is not fulfilled.	The derogation applies to this obligation to provide information. Responsibility for the historical interventions and other duties shall be tested separately. [PFK10]
Actual waiving of liability	The disciplinary, Commission and judicial processes of the report show delays and concrete impediments to sanctions.	Examine both the initial action and responsibility for the delay, loss of evidence or inadequate investigation that prevented effective response. [Chapters 2 and 19-25]

The record-keeping case is a documented institutional exemption from responsibility contrary to law. The Ombudsman established both the long-standing practice and the central authorities' knowledge and acceptance. Notification to the parliamentary committee underscores the seriousness of the case. The finding documents the exemption practice; it does not on its own establish the number of patients affected by errors or their subsequent compensation. That requires identification of the affected appeal decisions and citizen courses. [PFK06,pp. 1-2]

Lack of evidence of intent shall not close the entire liability assessment;

Article 155 of the Penal Code is directed against the abuse of a public position to infringe the rights of individuals. Paragraph 157 includes gross or more frequent negligence or carelessness. Therefore, a finding of a lack of evidence of intent must be followed by verification of the other relevant provisions of law and order. The specific exceptions for publicly elected posts in § 156-157 must be applied with their precise scope. According to Paragraph 81 (8), a public position may be more stringent in the determination of penalties. Historical actions shall be tested according to the relevant day-to-day course. [PFK07]

Grounds for investigation, a substantiated allegation of responsibility and a final conviction have different evidentiary requirements. A substantiated allegation of a violation may require investigation before all circumstances concerning perpetrator and culpability are clarified. Authority or State responsibility may be documented even where the evidence cannot support an individual criminal conviction. Each responsibility track must conclude with its own reasons.

3. Effective investigation and sanction in case of serious abuse

Denmark has received a concrete international criticism

In 2023, the UN Committee against Torture expressed concern about the low number of criminal charges following police complaints and certain investigations' focus on individual criminal culpability rather than establishing whether ill-treatment actually occurred. It recommended a clearer mandate to investigate all allegations of torture and ill-treatment, including without initial indications of individual criminal culpability. This is specifically documented criticism directed at Denmark and a dated basis for examining the subsequent response. [PFK02, paragraphs 40-41]

The demand is an investigation of the incident, the course of injury and the entire authority chain. Closure on grounds of lack of personal criminal culpability does not necessarily answer whether the citizen was subjected to ill-treatment, whether protection failed or whether the institution must provide redress. The investigation's mandate, actual gathering of evidence and reasoning must therefore be produced and examined. The Committee's recommendation is an international oversight finding; it is not a criminal conviction of particular employees.

Article 3 requires a real opportunity to establish and attribute responsibility

Where there is a substantiated allegation of treatment covered by Article 3, the investigation must be effective and independent, capable of clarifying the incident and identifying those responsible. The duty does not guarantee conviction. It requires actual investigation, timely securing of evidence and a genuine possibility of accountability. An investigation may fail through delay, omitted evidence or uncritical reliance on the accounts of those involved. [PFK03, paragraphs 123-140 and 150]

It triggers a specific document requirement: original complaint, date of receipt, mandate, hearings, technical tracks, records, damage information, investigation decisions and reasons for closure. In the case of deficiencies, a

effective additional investigation and, at the same time, protection against continued injury. Citizens' help should not wait for a multiannual personal liability trail to end.

An existing sanction may still be inadequate

I *Gäfgen v Germany* the EMD considered that almost symbolic conditional fines following serious police abuse did not provide sufficient deterrence. A subsequent promotion was included in the assessment. The judgment therefore follows this conclusion: **A registered sanction does not in itself provide effective protection against serious abuse.** [PFK04, paragraphs 123-125]

For serious State ill-treatment under Article 3,disciplinary criticism or financial compensation cannot on their own replace the necessary effective criminal-law response. ECtHR case-law also imposes specific requirements that limitation and similar obstacles must not create impunity for such ill-treatment. This rule requires a specific Article 3 assessment; it is not a general repeal of all Danish limitation rules. [PFK03,paragraphs 150-155]

The report's specific warnings, reprimands and disciplinary decisions must be tested against action, seriousness, duration, vulnerability, repetition and the quality of the study. The disciplinary summaries may include internal employment and conduct outside the service. A penalty rate cannot be calculated for proven violations of citizens by using all summary items as the denominator.

What the low drop figures can actually show

Politiklagemyndigheden's 2024 figures of 542 closed criminal cases and nine cases supporting the specified criminal-law responses differ from a conviction account. They document neither nine convictions nor 533 proved crimes without punishment. A sustainable impunity analysis requires linkage between **established unlawful conduct, the relevant criminal provision, investigation, decision, sanction and effect for the victim**. [chapter 2, police-outcomes module]

This data requirement does not tone down the documented criticism. The United Nations's specific comments, the illegal exemption practices and the documented delays already provide a basis for investigating actual impunity. The next necessary statement must follow known serious circumstances in the course of their discharge, on the grounds of each non-compliance.

4. Time is both a loss of rights and an independent track of responsibility

Remittal and return home must be recorded separately

remittal for reconsideration indicates a new examination of the decision. A decision on the return, the actual termination of employment, the child's destination and the actual reunification with a parent shall be taken separately. A new decision, provided support and restored contact each has its date. All joints must be included when the procedure continues after a denial or a concrete warning of a lack of basis.

Timeline	Proof	Legal questions
First intervention	Decision, legal basis, competence, consent and actual movement	Was the decision and implementation legal at this time?
First concrete warning	Opposition, medical information, findings of inspection or appeal with receipt	Who knew what and what action was required?
Remittal for reconsideration or refusal	Original decision and precise reasons	What basis was lost and required temporary protection?
New Treatment	Information, participation, new decision and time limits	Was the missing link actually corrected and did the continuation have a current basis?
Actual Termination	Movements, contacts, processing, support or payment	When did the citizen's actual deprivation cease?
Redress and responsibility	Payment instruments, support plan, investigations and sanction decisions	What consequences were remedied, what are and who is liable?

A later legal decision does not make the previously proven deficiency historically legal. Each continuation period shall be tested against its current basis. A difference between the date of the appeal and the actual termination of the proceedings may be an independent loss of rights; the specific necessity, period and legal consequences depend on the type of action.

The State shall not allow its own delay to produce the result of the decision;

The EMD states that: *Strand Lobben v Norway*that the obligation to work for reunification arises from the beginning of the placement. Quick action is necessary because time can change relations irrevocably. If the failure of the authorities to comply with the obligation of association has caused the breach, adoption shall not be justified by the lack of ties. Parents' use of remedies for reunification must not in itself be held against them and procedural delay must not in practice determine relations throughout the course of time. [PFK11, paragraphs 205, 208 and 212]

The specific test should therefore include the provision of relationships, contact restrictions, support for the child and parents, realistic conditions for reunification and a dated assessment of continued necessity. The rights and security of the child must be specifically examined. A general reference to the best of the child does not document this study.

Demand: Produce the entire contact and support chain from the start of the intervention. Examine whether the authority's own actions or omissions weakened the relationship later used against reunification. Where unlawful separation is documented, cessation and actual redress must be demanded with an individually reasoned plan and deadlines.

Delayed responsibility requires its own investigation

The policy sources of the report describe both an almost four-year delay affecting the response and a disciplinary action which was not brought up due to a late attitude, although the State Police considered the behaviour to be totally unacceptable and disciplinary. The Tibet process shows another long line of responsibility: the two judgments of 2025 relate to false explanations in court in 2013 and are not to be renamed judgments of all initial interventions. [Chapter 2, PD01-PD02; Chapter 20]

Where possible liability lapses through the authority's own delay, the investigation must establish receipt, case allocation, evidence preservation, deadline monitoring, management decisions and grounds for closure. The citizen may at the same time suffer continuing injury and have civil claims. **Time that weakens the possibility of sanctions must not disappear from the responsibility account.**

5. Psychological, physical and social damage shall be included in the infringement investigation;

Loss of family, help, freedom of movement, bodily self-determination and subsistence support matters in the rights assessment itself. The account of consequences must therefore begin with the actual burden and trace developments over time. A late favourable finding does not document restored health or returned family time.

Consequence	Relevant documentation	Meaning
Psychological load	Contemporary descriptions, journals, sleep, anxiety, insecurity, development and function	Assess intensity, duration and cumulative load. The opinion of the citizen has an independent function of proof; a clinical diagnosis requires its own basis.
Physical injury or deterioration	Investigations, treatment, medicine logs, function before and after, known warnings	Try action, access to help, causation and possibly independent protection failure.
Family loss	Actual contact, sibling relations, relocations, support and reunification work	The loss of family life itself can be a loss of rights, even without diagnosed illness.
Social and economic consequences	Work, schooling, housing, networks, help and documented expenditure	Separate direct losses, subsequent effects, causation and relevant replacement rules.
Vulnerability and dependence	Age, disability, communication needs, health and authority control over assistance	Assessment of the protection and participation was tailored to the individual.

Concrete consequences and reactions in the report's material

Psychological injury following failure by an authority to act: Patient Insurance case 07-0120 describes the Danish Health Authority's failure to act after the hospital's timely report. From the indication on 10. August 2006 to radiotherapy on 11. October, two months elapsed. The scheme awarded 10 per cent compensation for permanent injury for psychological distress associated with a 10 per cent deterioration in the statistical survival prognosis. This documents a specific course of omission and compensation. It is not a Convention judgment or an individual criminal conviction. The demand is to examine knowledge received, treatment possibility, omission, injury and full redress. [PFOR07, printed pp. 14-15/physical PDF 8; chapters 9 and 29]

Helpless citizen and limited sanction: The police disciplinary summary from 2015, no. 21, describes a citizen with Parkinson's disease who called after a bicycle fall and explained that he could not get up himself. No rescue operation was initiated; the citizen was found in a ditch after more than 42 hours. The National Police's response was a warning. Documented knowledge of helplessness, the absent assistance and the time support a specific demand for examination of protective and service duties and the adequacy of the sanction. The emergency-call recording, rescue log and medical information are required for the full Article 2 and 3 assessment and quantification of harm. A recorded warning does not resolve these questions. [PD03, original summary 2015 no. 21, physical p. 7; chapter 2]

Family loss and late financial review: In the Suldrup sequence, two minor children moved back on their mother's acquittal and release, according to her testimony in court. The High Court concluded the compensation review 875 calendar days later and set aside the authorities' halving of compensation and lost earnings. The specific judgment documents an incorrect compensation outcome and a financial-redress claim; it does not thereby set aside every earlier pre-trial detention order. Return home, full compensation entitlement, payment and any lasting effects on health and family life each have their own documentation. [ERVA02; chapters 27 and 29]

The Article 3 assessment includes duration, psychological and physical effects, age and health. Lack of intent to humiliate does not in itself exclude a violation. *Gäfgen* illustrates these assessment elements. [PFK04, paragraphs 88-89]

Article 8 protects family life and personal integrity. Illegal action does not require the citizen first to develop a medically-diagnosed disease. In the event of a serious danger to health or life, Articles 2 and 3 shall be tested in accordance with their own conditions. Direct public intervention, lack of protection, inadequate investigation and ineffective remedies each have their own legal test. [PFK01]

Cumulation must be examined in concrete terms: repeated intervention, lack of help, uncertainty, futile testing and long duration can reinforce each other. This requires a documented course; a national error rate cannot replace this test. The lack of conclusive evidence of a particular physical injury also does not eliminate an already documented failure to participate, family or study.

6. Comparison with private must follow the actual action

The 2022 judgment read documents a specific sentence imposed on a private person:a mother's withholding of one child for 37 days led to 40 days' suspended imprisonment and 60 hours of community service. The 2017 case read, however, ended in acquittal of the mother and maternal grandmother. The prosecution's requested sentence is therefore neither a sentence imposed nor a general tariff. [PU22,physical PDF 1-6; PB01-PB03]

The comparison shall include action, child and rightholders, valid basis, actual guilt, duration, effects and the actual outcome of the proceedings. In the case of public decisions, special duties, authorisation and order chains and the duty to respond shall also be subject to review.

The clearest criticism is this: Where a private specific evasive measure is penalized, while a public removal or continuation without a valid basis has been documented, a reasoned explanation of how the public action was investigated and what traces of responsibility were tested. The investigation shall identify the subject matter and the subject matter of the proceedings; a public title or an administrative closure shall not answer them.

The term **administrative abduction;** may describe an actual public removal or detention without valid legal basis. The report does not use the term as an independent Danish penalty. In each such claim, the simultaneous legal basis, competence, consent, decision and continuation must be disclosed. A failure to participate may have significant legal significance without merely proving that all conditions for criminal abduction have been met. The specific missing link must be tested; other proven errors exist.

7. State responsibility, repair and international qualification

Acts and omissions of municipalities and other public bodies may be attributed to the State internationally. This may also apply to acts exceeding competence when the body acts in an official capacity. The ILC Articles on State Responsibility systematise, among other things, attribution, cessation and reparation for material and non-material injury. They are not in themselves a ratified treaty; application requires the relevant binding obligation and applicable rule of international law. [PFK12, Articles 2, 4, 7 and 30-31]

The State may therefore bear responsibility where the overall public decision-making and oversight chain violates a right even if responsibility cannot be concentrated in one person's criminal conviction. Individual claims for review, protection and financial redress follow the competent forum's rules. Where there is an arguable Convention claim, Article 13's effective-remedy requirement must be examined. [PFK01, Article 13]

Repair shall be recorded as actual result: termination, contact, appropriate assistance, corrected information, payment and handling of remaining consequences. A payment does not give back a lost childhood, family relationship or functional capacity. Such consequences shall continue to be included in the loss assessment and the necessary prevention.

R2P and individual international criminal responsibility have separate conditions. Genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity require their specific classification and contextual elements. The report’s complaint and error counts do not on their own prove those elements. Documented acts, patterns, and order and knowledge chains can justify a separate investigation. This does not change already sustainable demands under the ECHR, relevant UN conventions and state-responsibility rules. [chapter 26,R19-R22; the Greenland histories in chapter 24]

8. Priorities of pleas and specific requirements

1. **Stopping and protecting:** Try immediately continued intervention when the basis is overlooked or a serious deficiency is documented. Take a reasoned decision on temporary protection and appropriate measures and actually register efficacy.

2. **Investigate the entire incident:** In case of substantiated serious attacks, effective and independent investigation of facts, consequences, protection failures and chain of responsibility is required. Personal criminal liability shall not be the sole object of the investigation.

3. **Test the continuation:** Provide the current basis for each section of time following specific warning, appeal or remittal for reconsideration. In fact, in the case of families, contact and work for reunification must be included.

4. **Recover with date:** Follow the citizen's right from favourable decision to aid, termination, return, payment and handling of residual damage.

5. **Place responsibility in a timely manner:** Try case manager, management, political instructions and supervision according to the competence and knowledge of each actor. Ensure proof and deadlines before inaction creates a new sanction barrier.
6. **Documenting the Recurrence Protection System:** After a known problem, it is necessary to check the changed practices and the relevant cases concerned. A new organisation or guidance is an action the effectiveness of which must be documented.

The requirements shall be anchored in each right and the powers of the competent forum. The report calls for the simultaneous implementation of the protection and repair measures which already have sufficient grounds; other tasks of proof shall not delay such measures.

Documented find

The unlawful record-keeping practice and central authorities’ acceptance; the Ministry’s rejection of the supervisory basis in Langeland; the UN’s specific criticism of police-complaint investigations; the report’s documented breaches of law, losses of rights and delays in responsibility within their own populations. Source chains are in the named modules and primary sources.

Hypotheses and additional evidence

Specific individuals' intent or gross neglect; the precise total population of proved criminal violations against citizens; causation in each harm trajectory; and which specific circumstances meet Article 3 or international criminal law's additional conditions. These questions require original case and accountability records. They must not be used to downplay independently documented errors.

Traceability and necessary documentation

For every decisive conclusion, it must be possible to trace a source chain from original event and rule to knowledge, response, consequence and demand. Necessary annexes include decisions, signatures and consent, receipt information, records, contact and implementation logs, management instructions, supervisory files, payment files and reasons for absence of investigation or sanction. The cross-cutting factual documentation is in chapter 29; the combined principal demands conclude chapter 30.

29. Cross-cutting evidence and documented evidence consequences

Concrete consequences which the national accounts must show

Authority action; or non-compliance;	Citizen's Folk	Evidence of scope and cause	Relevant liability requirements
Removal / continued separation without valid basis	Loss of daily family life	Decision, error, date of removal, date of discontinuation	Termination / reunification, aid and compensation according to specific rules
Consistency limited by incompetent body	Loss of contact and gradual distance	Orders, actual complaints, decision-making powers	Repeal, concrete contact plan and verification of succession
Lack of disability support	Strain, possible biased parenting-capacity assessment	Application, need, refusal, functional assessment	Legal support and re-assessment not resulting from unlawful negligence
Remittal for reconsideration without timely effect	Continued lack of help or income	T2-T4 and performance / payment data	Quick execution, back payment and documented losses
Illegal coercion or excessive duration	Loss of liberty / integrity	Action record, monitoring, implementation decision and duration	Termination, investigation and actual repair
Assessment deadline exceeded/lack of information	Waiting time and lost option	Reference, plan, information, actual processing	Effective access and follow-up to concrete damage
Illegal data sharing / monitoring	Private life losses and risks	Data flow, access log, action basis	Termination, rectification / deletion where conditional and compensation
Illegal police instruction	Loss of demonstration / y tring / freedom	Orders, video, service otates and actual implementation	Examination of orders, management and legal consequences
Late examination of serious circumstances	Loss of proof and liability	Date of knowledge, catch-ups, limitation periods	Independent and timely investigation

The table is a survey model. It does not claim that all of these consequences have been assessed nationally or occurred in all the cases referred to.

Documented example of loss of privacy

FOB 2018- 26 concerned a 15-year-old boy whose SMS and phone calls were controlled. The Ombudsman found the check illegal because children and the youth committee had not taken the necessary decision and described the substantial contribution of the municipality. The specific legal order cannot be replaced by a reference to the practice of the place of stay. [L04]

The Data Protection Agency's decision of 30 January 2024 on Google Workspace included 53 municipalities and the legal basis for disclosure to specific purposes.53 is the number of authorities, not the number of children; previous injunctions and the new decision are the same chain of proceedings. [L05] The Data Protection Agency's notice on Hørsholm documents a reported fine of DKK 50.000 and the risk of loss of unencrypted information on approximately 1.600 employees. It is an institution's responsibility and a person's number in one data breach case; no identical fine is claimed for each employee or incident. [L06]

Military matters and jurisdiction

In the expanded report, Green Desert is examined through the Supreme Court’s original judgment of 31. May 2022, the ECtHR’s decision of 21. October 2025 and CAT’s observations from 2023. The operation in 2004 predates the event period; the Danish review, knowledge and subsequent international scrutiny fall within the period. The Supreme Court’s 23 claimants, the High Court’s 18 awards and the ECtHR’s 21 applicants are overlapping litigation populations and must not be added up as 62 different victims. The Supreme Court set aside the High Court’s compensation awards; the ECtHR found no violation of the right of access to a court, and the jurisdictional and procedural complaints were examined separately. Thus, this sequence contains no ECtHR judgment finding 23 Danish violations. The original government position from 2024 has now been compared with the later decision. [GD01-GD03]

The strongest documented point of criticism shall be confined to each link: Højesteret maintained information on inhumane treatment by receiving Iraqi authorities for 18 persons, while the Danish liability conditions were not considered to be met. The actual abuse and the result of the testing of Denmark's responsibility are two different conclusions. A criticism of jurisdiction, proof and effective remedies must identify the actual premise and the original proof; it must not attribute to the judgment an infringement finding which it does not contain. The separate Green Desert analysis shows both the evidence chain, the long civil process and the costs imposed. The costs claimed are not in themselves proof of actual payment.

The Samsam course shows another evidentiary conflict: the Supreme Court’s judgment of 2. September 2025 recognised paid cooperation with Danish intelligence services in 2013-2014, contrary to earlier public denials. The Danish declaratory judgment must not be renamed Spanish reopening, actual release or compensation awarded for the entire criminal proceedings. Those consequences each require their own document. [SS sources]

Research literature on family experience

VIVE's 2025 knowledge review addresses placements without consent and consent under pressure. It combines Nordic literature with existing Danish register and survey data. Quantitative experiences of 11-17-year-olds cannot represent infants' experiences, and research descriptions of experienced pressure are not specific legal determinations of each consent's validity. The material supports examining the registered category »with consent« against the actual process. [L01,pp.6-10,20-22,87-94]

VIVE’s 2023 final evaluation of targeted parental support covers 111 families and 146 children. The 35 interviewees also include professionals; municipalities selected participants, and discontinued or declined case histories were absent from the interview sample. The paired one-year measurement covers 11 parents,10 percent. There is no control group and no demonstrated positive quantitative development among children. These limits are decisive for what the study can document about the effects of support. [L02,pp.80-87,110-115] The 2023 well-being study addresses contact with parents, health and adviser relationships. It excluded “don’t know” as an answer about advisers for placed children because it assumed knowledge from the statutory child-interview requirement. A statutory requirement does not prove actual fulfilment. [L03,p.135]

The original Danish register study of remand covers 75.187 cases and 50.446 distinct men from 1995-2010. It documents weaker labour-market attachment and increased risk of ceasing to live with one’s own children after remand, including without conviction. The study measures social outcomes and does not review the lawfulness of orders. Its historical estimates can therefore support specific lines of loss and demands for redress, but cannot be converted into national numbers of people unlawfully deprived of liberty or affected children in 2006-2025. [L08,pp.346-358] The reference group comprises convicted people without prison service. Women and detained minors are not included in the cohort.

Justitia/ The 2025 law community survey shows longer completed custody in 2018- 2024. Data on repeated persons, main outcome and post-registration shall be kept separate. The 2024 denominator is 2.940 in this version and 2.941 in the National Advocate General's March 2026 audit. Fewer registered endings do not in themselves document fewer different custodians. [L09, p.68,70,81-82,96-98]

The report’s analysis of consequences rests on a separate causation requirement: recorded poor well-being documents a burden, but does not on its own establish that a particular authority error caused it. Conversely, a documented contact restriction without legal authority can violate rights without first requiring the child to establish a psychiatric diagnosis. Lost time and family life must therefore be measured in their own right.

Help, consent and restoration of the fully reviewed originals

The 2006 investigation’s case 5.22 shows a specific consent problem: the father’s request for assistance on 13. March was treated as consent to emergency placement on 27. March. The mother’s consent to assessment on 23. February is a third, different matter. The sustainable criticism is that, according to the scrutiny body’s summary, the municipality replaced documentation for the specific separation with a different request for help. The evidential chain is the original practice investigation’s summary→contemporaneous municipal consent/record appendices to be obtained→historical consent and placement conditions→the authority’s specific decision→the child’s actual separation→competent decision-making and managerial responsibility→a demand for review of continuation and actual redress. All 32 tables and repeated case codes have now been reconciled in chapter 4; this is the same 101-case sample, and 23 expected amendments are not 23 children actually returned home. [PUD06-FULD,PDF14/26-27/32,table2.7]

Case 3.4 documents placement 26 February and actual repatriation 31 March 2006, an own calendar calculation of 33 days. The plan was missing before the decision and the regulatory body would amend the decision. However, the return is described with dissatisfaction with the school; the source does not link it to a legal submission. Therefore, the comparison of the report with private 37-day evasion must lead both ways through the specific legal basis, consent, authority knowledge, guilt and legal order. In fact, the 40 days suspended imprisonment of the private judgment shows a personal penalty in that case. The absence of information on personal responsibility by the municipality original shows a lack of public responsibility in this source; it does not document a general immunity. [PUD06-FUD, PDF24 / 41; PU22]

Egedal’s complete 119-page original documents a specific loss of legal position: delayed respite care could not be delivered retrospectively.11 of 20 cases exceeded time limits by 2-20 weeks, but the original does not identify which length of overrun relates to that particular lost service in kind. The consequence is documented, while the individual calendar duration and later redress require the original case appendices.9 expected remittals,14 legal deficiencies and 20 incorrect appeal deadlines are overlapping measurements in the same 20-case sample. Remittal cannot restore lost respite-care time. The demands are documentation of the loss, actual future support, assessment of compensation and scrutiny of the documented unlawful standard rules and whether they contributed to the specific delay. [EGEDAL20,PDF54/73-74/101-110]

Frederikssund's adult original documents the cessation of cleaning aid in February 2020 and the granting of other aid only in November 2020. That is nine months apart; exact day dates and actual startup do not appear. The fact that the second aid was subsequently granted does not therefore show that the need was met in the meantime. The original also documents a placed young with extensive disabilities, a desire for repatriation, a lack of a formal transition plan and undocumented family involvement. These statements shall be followed to the actual date of residence, return, contact and support. The control of the Adult Report cannot be used to replace the separate, still not provided original 2021. [FSA22, PDF88 / 115]

Sorø’s originals reveal a specific chain of knowledge hidden by statistical years alone. The 2024 report describes a school being asked to submit concerns without labelling them a formal notification in a serious neglect case. The 2026 final report reproduces the municipality’s acknowledgement that its earlier district-adviser organisation did not comply with the law and children remained too long in mainstream provision. This is the municipality’s stated acknowledgement,reproduced in the fully read original;the separate municipal statement has not yet been independently obtained. The strongest demand is to trace specific received knowledge to legally required investigation and actual assistance,and identify who decided to omit the relevant case avenue.9 status readings,new workflows and completed organisational development do not themselves demonstrate cessation of earlier losses or decisions in the 3 referrals to the children’s office. [TFSOROE24,PDF27/29/33/35;TFSOROE26,PDF5/14/18-24/26]

The 2008 original’s consent/validity cases show why a combined error category must be unpacked into specific acts. Case 027 describes parents of a three-month-old child being pressured to choose voluntary rather than compulsory placement without understanding the choice;the scrutiny body assesses consent as invalid. Case 041 lacks the consent of the young person aged 16,and his intellectual disability does not replace examination of his legal capacity and participation. In compulsory case 125,no decision was made concerning the father sharing parental responsibility. The original describes a decision concerning both parents as a validity condition and also criticises missing reasons. The strongest accountability chain runs from each specific consent document and decision-making powers to actual separation,its continuation and a dated legal consequence. Case 065,by contrast,was not actually implemented:it can document a deficient decision,but not a period of physical separation. The 22 cases with missing consent and the 21 cases in the report’s primary consent category are different counts within the same 143-case sample. [PUD08-FULD,PDF22-24/30-32/45-46/53-54]

Copenhagen's political presentation in March 2008 claims that none of the municipality's investigated cases had been misdealt with. The attached original annex, on the other hand, indicates 3 correct and 7 wrong decisions from 10, including 2 with no basis for voluntary placement. The inconsistency is a proven source conflict between the submission of the municipality and its annexes. The existence of an investigation or plan does not document its timeliness, content or valid consent. The requirement is to provide the basis for the political insurance, the subsequent individual follow-up and who received the opposing knowledge of the Annex. Planned workflows and a statement of no economic consequences do not show restoration for the families concerned. [KK-SUD93 / 2008; PUD08-FUD, PDF63-65, Annex 3, Tables 1-5]

The 2011 study of moves and returns home documents 67 incorrect decisions among 81, but Ankestyrelsen expressly states that no case was taken up on its own initiative. Municipalities received case-specific feedback. The authority's knowledge and a specific review decision are therefore documented, while the municipalities' individual redress remains to be proved. Case 136 describes suicide attempts also after the move and later extensive support; the specific harm requires original case records and timeline material to establish the municipality's causal responsibility. Return to a partner's home in case 058 is termination of placement, but not parent-child reunification. The necessary demand is a separate account of destination, support, contact and loss, and a reasoned examination of why known validity and support errors did not trigger action on the authority's own initiative. [PUD-H11-FULD, PDF4/13-14/52-53/60-65]

In its final UN report for 2026,Denmark declares responsibility to protect the population and respect Conventions in child placements. The UN treaty-body compilation reproduces already known findings concerning disability-appeal time,coercion,family interventions and access to effective review. The report's analysis compares these findings with Denmark's compliance declarations. A supported recommendation,a budget and future legislative change have a different evidential function from a documented date of cessation and redress.265 recommendation positions are not 265 new violation cases;174 supported and 91 noted are recorded as meeting statements in the UN's automatic transcript,while individual status matching against the written reply appendix still requires its acquisition. International-law responsibility must therefore be traced from the specific body and knowledge received to effective action and reparation,without allowing the missing national person total to suspend demands in documented cases. [UPR26-NAT,sections1/34/96;UPR26-UN,sections11/21/37-44/61-64;UPR26-MOEDE;R19-R22]

The 2009 original restricts review of the placement basis itself to cases satisfying the specific procedural requirements. A recorded procedural error can therefore prevent further substantive scrutiny within that investigation. The error rate consequently cannot serve as full scrutiny of every basis. Case 097 describes an actual emergency voluntary placement of a child aged 10 without the father's necessary consent;the emergency assessment exception does not replace the consent condition. Case 135 describes the municipality recording voluntariness even though,according to the case-note account,the seriously ill mother did not understand the meeting. The original states zero own-motion cases. The strongest chain is therefore the specific missing condition→actual separation→the scrutiny body's received case material→individual decision on legal consequence and continuation→date of actual redress.130 holders of parental responsibility in 91 cases and 83 missing offers of a separate plan must remain their own units;they are not 83 additional families. [PUD09,PDF4/12/18-19/24/29/60-62]

The 2011 original on voluntary measures reveals another blind spot: the main classification excludes the four-month assessment deadline,assessment consent,plan duration and systematic participation. It also excludes review of the decision's form,reasons and appeal guidance by reference to voluntary measures. These methodological exclusions abolish no specific statutory duty.41 deadline overruns among 78 relevant assessments may overlap the main measurement's 75 erroneous cases among 121;they must not be added as new children. Case 048 describes an actual contact person only one year after the decision. Case 131 describes almost four years waiting for a PPR report and family treatment that never began. The documented departure therefore includes actual missing help over time,beyond the paper error. The demands are support logs,knowledge and management chains,individual loss assessment and relevant redress. The original mentions two decisions without consent in the own-motion avenue;their original decisions and actual effects are required before they can be called redress. [PUD-I11F,PDF5/18-21/38-39/71/81/83/106]

Obstacle, contact and actual correction after check

A scrutiny outcome cannot replace documentation of what actually happened to the citizen. Example 20 in the external-provider investigation describes subsistence payments being stopped while a final decision awaited medical information. About nine months later, when Ankestyrelsen made contact, the municipality had still not decided. The citizen's problem comprised both lost subsistence and the absence of a final decision to challenge. Five other incorrect cases involved unlawful delegation; those five and example 20 form the same six incorrect cases among 48. AMS's communication of 17. January 2012 required reopening of other cases involving unlawful delegation too, information, investigation, party consultation, a new decision and prompt payment where entitlement was documented. The strongest accountability chain runs from the municipality's received knowledge and contractual/signature arrangements to suspension, continuation, a new decision and actual financial redress. Back payment in example 20 is not documented in the report. [PAKT13-FULD,PDF44-47/105-107/113]

The rehabilitation study shows another oversight mechanism:11 of the 26 cases concerning other measures assessed for correctness contained no oral or written decision. The Appeals Board assumed that the municipality had followed the team's recommendation when the material did not show otherwise. These 11 and 11 other procedural steps were excluded from the examination of the information basis, a total of 22 of 37 cases. These are documented assumptions and exclusions in oversight, not evidence of assistance actually initiated. A claim for support or redress must therefore be traced from the team's recommendation to the competent decision, the support/treatment log and the citizen's actual course. The two groups of 11 must not be conflated or added to the main cohort as new persons. [REH14F,PDF67-69]

Relief and redress may be separated by additional waiting time. Housing-benefit study case 8 documents that the new calculation decision came only five months after relief was granted, although the authority had stated two to three months. This documents five months awaiting a new calculation, not the bank payment date. Maternity-benefit study case 34 took 135 calendar days from refusal to relief. Case 33 obtained relief concerning the deadline but then refusal concerning medical documentation, while case 32 had timeliness confirmed and received a deadline refusal the same day. The account of time must therefore separately record original intervention, complaint, reconsideration, new calculation/decision and actual payment. Relief on one question cannot be called fully restored rights. [GEN-UDK21,HovedPDF50-51,case 8;PUDK22-FULD,HovedPDF18-19/25-26/30-35]

The same distinction applies to occupational-injury compensation. In example 4 of the AES investigation, a loss was assessed at 30 percent and later rejected as below 15 percent on the employer's account of reduced orders and discontinued overtime. The citizen had given a different account concerning limitations following the injury. On remittal, 377 calendar days after refusal, Ankestyrelsen required specific clarification of the conflicting information. According to the scrutiny body's own assessment, the employer's account could not stand as sufficient fact without investigation. Actual subsequent compensation, payment date and redress through interest are not stated. The demands are the original evidential chain, a reviewable fresh decision and separate accounting for losses during the wait. [PAES23-FULD,HovedPDF21-23,eksempel4]

Contact figures describe serious loss of relationships and a distinct selection in the scrutiny body's explanations. Reasons figure 2.2 covers 331 affirmed or amended cases;annulled decisions are excluded. The 367 appeal cases and 382 decisions under individual statutory provisions concern the same cohort with 15 double cases. An interview concerning two children who had not seen their father for years,and a most recently fixed two-year period,shows a specific official statement concerning prolonged separation. It is neither a national duration statistic nor documented actual reunification. The authorities' own descriptions of unsubstantiated allegations,fact-finding after the most intrusive measure and party consultation with limited information must be traced to contemporaneous original evidence. Every continuing interruption of contact requires specific reasons and review;a general statement about the child's needs does not prove every factual premise. The demands are the first actual interruption,every decision and extension,contemporaneous information and the child's statements,appeal outcomes and the date of genuine restoration of contact. [PSAM20-FULD,PDF16/30-31/35-38/41-42/48]

The pension study shows two documented cases with an excessively late award date in Struer and six oral team decisions made without competence in one municipality; the municipality table places all six hypothetical remittals in Bornholm. Ankestyrelsen's dialogue with the municipality documents the authority's knowledge, but not a new competent decision or payment of arrears. Only awards following a rehabilitation team are included, while refusals and obvious cases without a team are excluded. It therefore cannot measure the total loss following unlawful pension refusals. The authorities' own descriptions of repeated sanctions against citizens with misunderstood support needs and responsibility lost between departments provide specific lines of investigation. Knowledge of need, necessary support, decision-making responsibility, actual delivery and consequences must be documented for each citizen; internal disagreement about responsibility cannot document that the need was met. [PPEN25-FULD,HovedPDF16/21-22/32-37/48-50;BilagPDF4-6/12-13]

The combined demands are thus actual cessation, a new decision by the competent authority with reasons, payment or support with a documented start, restored contact where that is the relevant legal consequence, and assessment of losses that a later decision cannot in itself remove. The same child, the same stoppage of subsistence support or the same back-payment sequence is counted only once in the person and loss account. The review report's findings, the authority's declared correction and the citizen's documented redress must stand as three distinct evidential links.

Information and support must not be turned against the citizen

Case 35 in the sanctions investigation shows a specific reversed burden of proof. The citizen stated that he had actually attended on the two disputed days. The municipality asked him to contact the programme provider himself and imposed a sanction without clarifying attendance. Ankestyrelsen required the authority's own investigation. Recorded non-attendance therefore cannot stand as proven conduct merely because it appears on the provider's list. Case 90 shows another necessary distinction: the municipality's awareness that one sanctioned day should be repaid is a statement about correction, rather than proof of actual repayment. The demands are original attendance records, the citizen's objection, the municipality's investigation and decision, and account/payment evidence. [SAN15F,PDF47-48/61]

Pension-study case 44 describes a 38-year-old mother alone with five children, PTSD, anxiety and chronic pain. The trauma rehabilitation centre's reproduced assessment warns of deterioration even from further assessment or clarification. Ankestyrelsen nevertheless requires a specialist psychiatric examination. The published chain contains no independent clinical risk justification addressing that particular warning. The demand for more information must therefore be tested against the original statement, specific necessity, risk and assistance for the mother and children. This is a documented conflict between a professional warning and an authority's demand; it does not prove a particular later deterioration without the medical records. In case 20, the refusal's reasoning about missing employment measures stands against the same report's dated clarification and ongoing work placement on the decision date. The original decision and record list are required before the authority's adverse premise can be accepted. [PEN15F,PDF16-17/19-21/27-28]

The historical pension investigation from 2006 shows that missing documentation cannot be rewritten as the citizen's lack of interest either. Among 99 cases with a meeting offer, attendance was recorded in nine, non-attendance in 36 and the outcome unstated in 54. A general explanation about interest cannot fill those 54 unknown case histories. The report's account of the older principle decision P-19-05 criticises both the municipality's and board's use of incomplete resource-profile summaries: both had to investigate all relevant original information. Repetition by two instances therefore does not strengthen an incomplete basis. The decisions in the investigation and principle case predate 2006 and are not added to the period's incident figures. They document already known evidential and participation requirements against which subsequent administrative practice must be tested. [PEN06F,PDF19/53]

The 2015 Youth Survey shows that a correct category of business does not prove timely support either. Among the same 102 cases, 85 entries were judged correct, while 52 interviews did not follow the rules, and an offer of coordinating case handler was documented only in eight of 48 relevant cases. Case 62 describes a previously placed young who was still waiting for psychological treatment and requested support. The needs described and the lack of information must be tested before training requirements are used as proof that the citizen can already cope with them. The cohort examined omits performance calculation; therefore, possible incorrect activity allowance must be documented through the actual decisions and payments. [UNGE15-FULD, PDF16 / 26-27 / 33-34 / 45]

The sickness-benefit reassessment from the same year documents 26 decisions with significant deficiencies in medical information. In the scrutiny body's assessment,case 31 should have received an extension rather than cessation and a job-clarification programme. Case 56 received a new extension decision only 25 days after the reassessment point,and the agency still found the basis inadequate. There is also a specific break between legal versions: the report's instruction in 16-15 to stop payments despite missing information was discarded in 75-15 on 11. November 2015. Earlier practice was described as an error of law,and a valid cessation decision and consideration of reopening were required. The original's historical cessation instruction therefore cannot prove that the citizen's subsistence could lawfully be stopped. The demand runs from invalidity and a known practice error to a timely new decision,restored benefit,actual payment and specific loss assessment. [SYREV15-FULD,PDF38-39/42/56/102;SYREV15-75,PDF1-5]

The relationship of the child and the evidence of the intervention

The 2013 family/network investigation documents that a plan does not itself preserve a child's relationships. Among 252 children,17 had contact with fewer groups of people than planned. Interview material describes a child who has not seen half-siblings since Christmas and has not told an adult about missing them, and a child who does not know why a regular arrangement with a grandmother ended. Municipalities' explanation about parents cancelling cannot be derived from a table measuring frequency alone. The child's own experience, original contact records and specific causes must be traced to action and contact actually preserved or restored. The nine interviewed children are not documented as the same as the case sample's 252;542 contact-group occurrences are not 542 visits or people either. [NET13-FULD, PDF49-55/65-66/69-72/79]

The 2012 parenting-capacity investigation shows the same need concerning the evidential basis. Three of ten assessments examined had only low validity; two of four older assessments should have been supplemented. In one account, the psychologist lacked relevant records. Ankestyrelsen's contemporaneous overall assessment of the parental material does not cancel these specific deficiencies. The demands are the original assessments, interaction observations, appendix lists, current supplements and parents' comments, followed by specific review of what the information can actually support. The 104 placement cases were reused from Barnets Reform and are neither 104 parenting-capacity assessments nor a new population of individuals. The complete FKU review, physical PDF11/16-19.

The 2014 foster-family study provides an additional, separate oversight signal:132 of 340 defined responses report fewer than two supervisory visits in 2013. Former foster families were excluded, and responses concerned one selected child. The figure is therefore a documented signal of missing supervision in this particular sample, not a national proportion of unlawful placements. The demand is for contemporaneous supervision records, the child's own interview, any specific grounds for exceptions and subsequent support. The foster family's assessment of the child's reactions must also be examined independently and cannot on its own prove that family contact is harmful. [PF14P, PDF28/49-50] See the overall foster-family review.

Priority Arguments Map

A. Participation of the citizen in an accommodation case

Conclusion: Documented failure to hear the parties must be examined as a defect affecting rights and validity. **Authority statement:** The Citizens' Adviser's investigation criticises the absence of relevant hearings. **Original evidence:** R03, the displayed thematic table and methodological delimitation. **Deficiency:** The decision-making process has not ensured the affected person's opportunity to correct the basis. **Rule:** § 19 of the Public Administration Act and Article 8's procedural protection. **Action/omission:** An intrusive decision is made without the required procedural step. **Legal departure:** The safeguard is disregarded; specific validity and Convention consequences must be determined from the original file. **Effect on the outcome:** The family loses participation, and unanswered information may affect the intervention; each decision's causal chain must be shown. **Responsibility:** The deciding municipality and identified duty/management chain; personal culpability is a separate question. **Requirement:** Case review, access to documents, specific determination of cessation/redress and documented consequences.

B. Checks must be carried out to the actual effect

Conclusion: A closed supervisory case does not on its own document restored rights. **Authority statement:** Rigsrevisionen criticises the supervisory approach and follow-up. **Original evidence:** RR18/2024,sample and response table. **Deficiency:** The effect on the individual is not systematically verified. **Rule:** The specific substantive duty and, for an arguable Convention claim, the requirement for an effective remedy. **Omission:** Information about correction is not followed through to its actual effect. **Legal departure:** The oversight weakness requires examination of whether the specific duty of protection/remedy owed to the individual was breached; zero use of responses does not automatically prove this in every case. **Significance for the outcome:** Unremedied loss may continue after closure. **Responsibility:** Competent authority, supervisory authority and potentially management according to their specific duties. **Demand:** Documentation of implementation date, continuing loss and subsequent independent verification.

C. Legality of the duration of the obligation

Conclusion: Approved initiation must not be presented as approval of the entire period of coercion. **Authority statement:** The Patient Complaints Board counts initiation and duration separately. **Original evidence:** PPKN25, tables 11-12. **Deficiency:** A main total without duration outcomes conceals a separate review result. **Rule:** The relevant legal authority for coercion and, following specific application to the facts, the ECHR's protection of liberty/integrity. **Action:** Coercion continues through a period requiring its own legal justification. **Legal departure:** The part set aside must be recorded and examined independently. **Significance for the outcome:** The citizen's loss of liberty and integrity extends beyond the initial decision. **Responsibility:** The competent decision/oversight chain and institution; personal culpability must be investigated separately. **Demand:** Complete timeline, actual cessation, investigation and specific reparation.

D. Incorrect refusal of compensation after custody

Conclusion: Refusals and halvings in ERVA01-ERVA02 were incorrect authority outcomes and were set aside by the courts. **Authority statement:** The Regional Public Prosecutors and Director of Public Prosecutions referred to the citizen's own fault. **Original evidence:** Administrative decisions, District Court reasoning and High Court outcomes in AM 2020.10.15V2 and AM 2010.02.25V2. **Deficiency:** The criticised conduct lacked the necessary causal connection with the relevant deprivation of liberty. **Rule:** Section 1018 a of the Administration of Justice Act, including own fault under subsection 3, applied in the original judgments. **Action:** Compensation was refused or halved, and this was maintained on internal appeal. **Legal departure:** The specific reasoning did not satisfy the causation requirement. **Effect on the outcome:** The citizens had to pursue further litigation for DKK 408.000 and full compensation/lost earnings respectively. **Responsibility:** Institutional decision-making responsibility and the State's payment obligation are documented; personal criminal culpability was not determined in these compensation judgments. **Demand:** Actual payment with interest, verification of residual loss and a separate investigation of the decision-making and management chain. The judgments examine compensation and do not set aside every previous pre-trial detention order as a whole.

E. Known child-case errors require verification of actual redress

Conclusion: The Langeland case documents that closure of supervision must be examined against documented lawfulness and each citizen's actual circumstances. **The authority's specific statement:** Ankestyrelsen rejected a new supervisory case in August 2025 and closed follow-up in May 2026; later that same month the Ministry required fresh processing. **Original evidence:** The 2023 Task Force analysis and the Ministry's 16-page opinion of 29. May 2026, with dated accounts of intervening oversight steps. **Deficiency:** A 2024 follow-up described continuing insufficient compliance with the law without planned checks of whether current cases were actually corrected. Organisational improvements did not document redress. [TFLAN23;TFLANISM26]

Relevant rule: The social-law safeguards then applicable, the specific supervisory powers under the Local Government Act and ECHR8's protection of family life must each be examined separately. **Action or omission:** The review was closed without the documentation of corrected cases requested by the ministry. **Legal departure:** The ministry's direction required renewed consideration of legality, possible sanctions and redress; it is not a judgment on the validity of every individual placement. **Effect on the outcome:** Closure did not dispel the risk of continuing unremedied loss of rights. A documented action plan 11 months after placement is a specific temporal element that must be connected with the original decision-making basis, actual contact and later cessation. **Responsibility:** The municipality's decision-making and management chain and the supervisory authority's knowledge and response must be investigated separately. **Demand:** Produce the original supervisory opinion, follow-up records, the identified citizens' contemporaneous decisions and evidence of correction, support, contact, return home and any reparation. [TFLAN23, PDF31; TFLANISM26, PDF1-16; R04, R19]

F. Management knowledge, economic governance and continued intervention

Conclusion: The original Task Force reports provide concrete evidence to investigate whether known lack of support and lack of decision-making were continued through the municipality's management. **Concrete statement by the Authority:** The Nordfyn analysis reproduces the Director's statement that an earlier strategy and quality standard placed too much emphasis on economics and contributed to the sub-measure. At the same time, it describes the prioritisation of new studies from 1 January 2020, while the older ones continued to lack study. **Original proof:** TFNOR20, PDF8 and 21. At the end of 2019, a backlog of 155 studies will be reported; in March 2020, 143 ongoing, 116 of which are over the deadline, and 103 parallel cases will be reported. These four targets are different stock / activity cuts with unknown overlap. There are no 397 different children or 116 illegal places for them.

Non-conformity or deficiency: The sample documents 7 / 14 missing surveys / updates, while the larger backlog is the report's reproduction of municipal quarterly data. The original quarterly annex has not yet been independently tested. The concrete impact of the economy on the individual citizen's help requires the simultaneous management decisions and records. **Relevant rule:** The day-to-day investigation, support, participation and follow-up obligations as well as the EMRK8 requirements for intervention in family life. **Action or omission:** Assistance and intrusive decisions will be implemented or continued without the required simultaneous assessments. **Legal deviation:** The breach of the guarantee found must be linked to the substantive conditions and the continuing necessity of the decision; a subsequent investigation does not in itself demonstrate a sufficient previous basis. **Result significance:** Delayed or insufficient support may change the actual situation of the family, which is then part of a later action decision. Such a chain of reasons is a specific investigation requirement and not already proven for all sample cases. **Responsibility:** Decentralised staff, professional management, economic / political management and control body shall be tested;

according to each one's documented knowledge, competence and duty. **Specific demand:** Produce budget and quality decisions, quarterly underlying data, contemporaneous needs assessments, decisions and implementation logs; examine whether necessary support could and should have been provided before the intervention and whether actual redress was ensured after errors were established. [TFNOR20,PDF8,21,34,36-40;R04,R19]

The Odense analysis's two specific placement examples lack a professional assessment of support needs at placement. In one sequence, a decided assessment update is not completed until after 8 months; the child has already been placed beforehand. The report states that information in both sequences was known long before the later need for placement. This makes the time before the move and the rejected support options decisive evidential links. The original decisions, the validity of consent and any grounds for compulsion are necessary for a conclusion on the legal basis of the specific placement. [TFODE22, PDF28; own document keys TFODE22-HOVED-P28-ANBR1 and ANBR2]

Odense's professional management also confirms action plans after the decision and states that the requirement was previously unknown. The Task Force describes municipal guidance from 2020 that departs from the child-interview requirement. This is a lead to organisationally produced errors:the original guidance, approval, distribution and actual use must be examined, and affected decisions identified. Solrød's adviser interviews describe measures continuing longer than necessary because of changes of adviser. This is a specific lead to unnecessary intervention time, but neither number, duration nor type of intervention is stated. These statements must neither be deleted as mere administration nor converted into unproved national person and day counts. [TFODE22,PDF32,37; TFSOL22,PDF38]

G. Consent, child consultation and decision-making basis after placement

Conclusion: The new original courses document interventions before the required participation and assessment steps and a specific need to examine whether an intervention registered as voluntary had valid consent. **Authority's specific statement:** The Morsø analysis describes a nine-year-old child placed without a documented child welfare assessment and without a prior interview; the first interview is recorded only 14 months after the decision. The father shared parental responsibility and was largely not involved; only the mother had signed the declaration of consent. **Original evidence:** TFMOR18A,PDF36-37, reread in this analysis; the public report reproduces an anonymised record sequence, while the original records and declaration are not published. **Discrepancy or deficiency:** The child's views were not included before the decision, and the report does not document the father's consent.14 months is the time until the interview; it does not document 14 months of uninterrupted separation or an actual return-home date.

Relevant rule: The historical Social Services Act versions SL16H and SL17H,sections 48,50,52-54, link the decision to prior participation, assessment, specific need and consent. Consent to placement must include its purpose. ECHR8 also requires scrutiny of the intervention's legal basis, necessity, procedure and family life. **Act or omission:** The municipality carried out the described decision-making process without the documented prior requirements and without the report showing consent from both holders. **Legal departure:** An interview 14 months later cannot move the child's participation back to the decision date. Examination of contemporaneous consent and competence must determine whether any basis for voluntary placement existed at all. **Significance for the outcome:** The child and overlooked parent lost influence before a separation decision; an inadequate basis affects the very protection against unjustified intervention. **Responsibility:** The decision-maker, approving level and management's later knowledge must be followed through the records. **Specific demand:** Produce the consent declaration including purpose, contemporaneous statements by both holders of parental responsibility, the decision, any other legal basis for intervention, actual relocation/contact/cessation logs and later correction. Examine invalidity and continuing legal authority; documented removal or detention without legal authority requires cessation, reunification, reparation and separate assessment of responsibility.
[TFMOR18A,PDF36-37;SL16H;SL17H;R04,R09,R19]

Sønderborg2019 shows a related specific consent track: the mother of a14-year-old was informed that 14 days of silence would be treated as consent to assessment and forthcoming measures. The report does not document later obtaining consent. An announced automatic consequence of silence does not in itself document specific informed consent to the purpose of a placement not yet determined. Cooperation in assessment and consent to placement must each be examined separately; in the 2016/2017 statutory text, the assessment is conducted in cooperation as far as possible, while placement has a separate consent requirement. The original notice and all subsequent expressions must establish what measure was actually decided and what consequence it had. [TFSON19A, PDF34; SL16H, §§50,52-53; SL17H, same provisions]

Middelfart 2020 documents two placement decisions for which assessment updates were only completed approximately 7,5 and 2,5 months after the decisions. A separate case involving age 14 runs from a decision in early December 2018 to an update in late February 2019 and a return-home decision in early April 2019 after consent was withdrawn. This is an actual decision sequence towards return home; the physical moving date is unstated. Only when the request date, decision on a return-home period and physical return are linked can the seven-day deadline and specific legal authority for the period be examined. What the authority knew and lacked at each point must be investigated, and whether continuing intervention was independently justified. A subsequently completed assessment does not make the earlier missing decision basis historically present.
[TFMID20,PDF49/53;SL18H,section68;R04,R09,R19]

H. Actual return and known risk of non-termination

Conclusion: The new originals provide concrete information on actual repatriation and on local knowledge of circumstances that may delay cessation. A measure must be tested on its current purpose and basis; economic or organisational governance does not in itself demonstrate necessity.

Authority's specific statement and original evidence: Faaborg-Midtfyn's final report reproduces the municipality's information on a 19,4% reduction in posts, slower support, missed deadlines and the risk of ineffective measures continuing. The external final measurement finds deterioration in legal compliance. VISO describes a parental plan that does not answer the parents' specific questions about what must change to bring the child home.
[FMK20,PDF29,40-41; FMK20H]

Non-conformity or deficiency: Thus the municipality itself has described a possible failure in the end-of-life test. The report shall not give up the total child population concerned, day-by-day duration or actual repair. The unknown total does not erase the proven knowledge. Parents' ability to work against reunification is weakened when the concrete requirements and support needs are not clarified and followed up.

Rule, action and legal departure: The historical Social Services Act rules on continuing follow-up, support and cessation must be examined together with ECHR8's necessity requirements and actual efforts towards reunification. Under SL18H,section 68, a measure must cease when its purpose is achieved or is no longer fulfilled. A continuing intervention must have its own current basis. Recorded consent cannot, on its own, document a valid basis for all subsequent periods either. Withdrawal requires examination of the request date, a competent new decision and any return-home period.

Effect on the outcome and responsibility: If a known lack of follow-up perpetuates an intervention after the condition for cessation is met, time is an independent part of the specific loss of rights. The responsibility chain runs through caseworker, professional management, resource decisions and supervision, according to each actor's documented competence and knowledge. Staff shortages are here an evidential link in the management chain, not legal authority for continued separation.

Specific demand: Identify the measures whose effect and cessation the municipality itself stated had not been adequately examined. Produce contemporaneous plans, effect measurements, parents' requests for return home, support decisions, relocation/contact logs and management decisions. Examine each child's current basis, deliver necessary support and require actual redress with a date. This annual report alone does not establish a particular individual penalty or invalidity of all placements.

Middelfart's separate welfare check documents a specific return-home flow: 101 placement cases reviewed, 11 selected with potential for return home, and a municipality-reported status in October 2019 of five children actually returned home, four with continuing potential and two without short-term potential. 5+4+2=11, but there is no case-record linkage to the Task Force's 20 cases and no stated error/invalidity reason. The figures must therefore be retained as actual return-home information and must not be rewritten as five documented unlawful removals remedied. [TFMIDV19,item103]

Faaborg-Midtfyn's 2017 report describes an actual return home after approximately 2½ years in placement, with respite care by the former foster family and treatment for the mother. The 2020 measurement mentions another anonymous return-home example before the six-month follow-up. Svendborg describes an actual return home in summer 2017 after years of placement, but finds an inadequately documented professional justification and uncertain support needs; six hours of weekly support under section 11 are stated. Physical return home ends the separation but does not alone document fulfilment of support duties or redress for earlier errors. The three source examples must not be added as three unique children whose errors have been remedied.
[FMK17,PDF41;FMK20,PDF23-24;SV18,PDF63]

I. Recognised incorrect practice requires re-processing until actual payment

Conclusion: The Patientforsikringen originals read document specific incorrect refusals and incorrect application of rules that required reconsideration. **The authority's specific statement:**The 2007 annual report states that five 2006/2007 partial foot-drop cases were to be reopened because the institution's practice wrongly required complete foot drop. The 2008 annual report identifies an incorrect interpretation of the radiotherapy waiting-time rules and plans review of all waiting-time cases, even though previously appealed decisions had been upheld. **Original evidence:** PFOR07, printed 12/physical 7; PFOR08, printed 6/physical 4; our original tables and versions in the health chapter.

Discrepancy or deficiency: Earlier affirmation had not disproved the misunderstanding of the rule. The reopening decision documents a need for redress but states neither five actual payments nor the number of corrected radiotherapy-waiting-time cases. **Relevant rule, conduct and departure:** Compensation entitlement must be examined under the rule and practice actually applicable to the injury. An acknowledged overly restrictive definition requires identification and a correct new decision in affected cases. **Significance for outcomes:** The affected patient may have lost compensation or received it late; specific amounts, interest and periods of deprivation require original payment records. **Responsibility and specific demand:** Identify first knowledge, all affected decisions, reopening, new outcome, first and last payment and residual loss. Institutional redress and possible personal accountability must be distinguished and examined under their respective conditions.

In case 07-0120, the 2007 annual report describes the Danish Health Authority's failure to act after the hospital's timely notification: indication on 10. August 2006 to radiotherapy on 11. October. The institution awarded 10% permanent-injury compensation for psychological distress associated with a 10% deterioration in the statistical survival prognosis. This is a specific public omission and compensation chain, not merely an abstract procedural error. The status at 4. April 2008, with 18 accepted claims among 136 decisions/159 notifications, includes three accepted SST case-processing sequences among eight; those three are already included in 18. [PFOR07, printed 14-15/physical 8]

The own public hospital boards 2006-2010 include 3755 / 4056 / 3701 / 5122 / 5319 cases decided after each original version. Recognized is 1310 / 1291 / 1232 / 1834 / 1982. They include several rules on compensation, including speciality deviation and rare serious damage; therefore, a recognised course of damage is not merely a judgment of the criminal negligence of a public servant. At the same time, a serious disability or death may have irreversible consequences, even if financial compensation is awarded. The impact account of the report must maintain this actual loss without calling a payment restored health. [PFR06H / M / N / S / Y; PFOR07-10]

Documented errors and findings

The following are documented findings within the populations listed. The level of evidence of the control body which has actually been examined in the case of the underlying cases shall be as follows:

1. **Municipal bases for decisions are repeatedly rejected.** The complaint series checked contains 45.022 alterations/remittals in 2018-2024; error type and individuals require separate linkage. [A20,A21,A24]

2. **Copenhagen children's cases had serious procedural and power deficiencies.** The original study indicates the number of themes and both established facts and concrete signs. [R03]

3. **Return home and moving have their own documented errors.** Ankestyrelsen's 2011 study and FOB2018-33 must be included alongside removal statistics. [Personbilag2011; R10]

4. **Supervisory enforcement and verification of corrections were weak in the population studied.** Response, closure and actual redress must be kept separate. [RR18/2024]

5. **Psychiatric coercion was set aside or found formally unlawful in delimited points of complaint.** Duration decisions must be included separately. [PPKN25]

6. **Child and adolescent psychiatry had missed diagnostic-assessment deadlines and documented inadequate information/registration.** Courses are not unique patients, and the suspension period must be included in delimiting lawfulness. [RR10/2023]

7. **Denmark has EMD judgments with specific infringement findings during the 20-year period.** The annual tables are full of judgments; they are not a full count of all Danish violations. [EMD-annual tables]

8. **A minister was punished for the illegal separation scheme, and Commission material documents other unlawful conduct of authority.** Personal guilt and institutional criticism have different levels of evidence and decision-making. [R14-R15]

9. **The UN Committees and the CPT have given concrete and repeated warnings.** The documents provide a level of knowledge to be linked to subsequent practice. [UN / CPT Annex]

10. **The duration of the product should be increased in the 2018- 2024 pre-run series.** It is also a long process for minors. This is a documented duration and load finding requiring individual lawfulness testing. [L09, p.70,81-87]

11. **Specific administrative refusals of compensation and reductions by half were set aside.** The judgments did not find the necessary causal connection between criticised conduct and the relevant deprivation of liberty. Incorrect compensation outcomes are documented; final payment is a separate link. [ERVA01-ERVA02]

12. **The expulsion of a three-year child with disabilities by a municipality was unlawful discrimination.** The decision came 961 calendar days after the expulsion and awarded DKK 5.000. The Ombudsman's previous resignation from the inquiry does not prove the legality of the action. [KEN9536 / 2021, p.12-14]

13. **The Department of Investigation lacks a national systematic account of unintended health incidents.** East states that alerts are not recorded and stored after handling; West's 38 manually recorded events only cover 1 April 2024-1 June 2025. The lack of conservation may weaken the evidence of damage and liability of the inmates and require concrete verification of the duties of evidence and record. [KFUTH25, p.2-3]

14. **The Prison and Probation Service's intervention and review figures have specific methodological and reconciliation deficiencies.**The 2024 statement lists 141 decided cases, while the outcome categories sum to 148. The reporting scope of handcuff figures has changed, and intervention types may overlap for the same person. The 45 checked tables with 598 data rows must therefore neither conceal omitted interventions nor be transformed into 598 victims. [KF15; KF23; KF24, pp.39-43,54-56]

15. **The old objective of municipal appeal was replaced by a longer one.** The checks were completed after times under 30 weeks, while 2025 later also exceeded this target by about 35 weeks. Controlling and changing target does not document supplied assistance or repaired legal loss; target overshoot is not automatically exceeding any legal deadline. [AT07, p. 3-4; AT13, p. 8-11]

16. **The pilot barometer shows errors in cases which were not brought before Ankestyrelsen.** The 228 cases include separate error tests with 70 / 228 missing current investigations / updates without legal exception, 64 / 100 investigation deadlines and 99 / 226 conversation errors. Complaints alone therefore do not cover the level of error investigated; the errors are not a verified union of children or parents. [BBP19; BBP19M, PDF5]

17. **The Langeland course led to a ministerial order for renewed supervisory consideration after earlier closure.** The Ministry required specific examination of lawfulness, redress and possible sanctions. In the original sample, the minimum follow-up in all nine relevant cases was delayed, and parents in all three families with children in care lacked an offer of support under § 54 as then in force. The figures each have their own denominator and may overlap. [TFLAN23,PDF29,33;TFLANISM26]

18. **Næstved's 2023 analysis shows both exclusions and continuing follow-up errors.** Nine § 52 cases had no clear decision date; only six could enter the examination of the three-month deadline, and none of those six met it. Two cases had not yet reached the deadline, and one intervention had not been implemented. Those three are excluded from this deadline denominator. A municipal closure news item in 2025 describes continuing documentation and emergency-assessment problems; it does not prove that every citizen's rights had been restored. [TFNAE23, PDF28-36; TFNAENY25]

Suspects and hypotheses requiring further evidence

These points are open and must not be presented as already proven:

• That a particular number of children in the national placement population were removed without a valid basis.

• That certain employees deliberately removed or retained children without right; guilt and each stage of action require proof of cause.

• That time after a remittal for reconsideration in a particular child's case was unlawful continued separation; applicable decisions and day-to-day basis must be available.

• That the municipality's lack of support caused a specific subsequent parenting-capacity assessment or adoption.

• The creation of sanctions is due to an actual investigation / enforcement deficit in each case; data on notifications, evidence, outcomes and obsolescence are missing.

• That the international criminal context and intentional requirements for R2P crimes are met in a particular pattern.

These hypotheses do not downgrade the above documented shortcomings. They specify precisely the additional evidence required for a stronger conclusion.

Source and evidence chains for decisive statements

Consignment	Controlled chain	What the chain does not, on its own, prove
Number of municipal alterations/remittals	Annual statements→outcome table→amended+remitted→annual sum	Unique citizens, all errors or individual criminal liability
The cases of the 77 children in Copenhagen	Original Citizens' Adviser report→sampling/exclusion→theme counts; municipal minutes/UN later	All 77 homeless or independent extra UN cases
EMD infringement find	Original yearseries → 25 historical breaches; complaint number / Grand Chamber Association → 24 final infringement proceedings	Unique victims or overall Danish infringement rate
Non-response of the supervisory authority	Original National Audit → extracts / exclusions → reaction table	Zero personal penalties in any other scheme
Number of children placed	DST table / version / dimensions → status 31 December	Number of children illegally placed or 20 years of unique children
Waiting time after remittal for reconsideration	→ dates / duration → defined result	National mean or full child separation time
Change in time of appeal and completion of checks	Original final note C108 / 25 → 13 to 30 weeks → Annual Report 2025 around 35 weeks	Each case's specific deadline, actual help or redress; an administrative average is not automatically an individual Convention violation
Specific penalties and acquitments by individuals	Reference practice → identified court reference; PB01-PB03 full originals → same case, two free-found and one child; PU22 full court composition → one actual private punishment and one child	Appeals shall not be subject to penalty; other summaries shall not be fully authentic; no automatic penalty shall be imposed in the event of any error of authority;
Denmark knows the re-association requirement	Strand Lobben original § 8 on Danish post → § 205,208 on reunification	The actual illegality of all subsequent Danish cases
International criticism	Original Committee / CPT report → section → concrete recommendation / warning	Judgment or unique number of victims
The duration of the stay is longer	Justitia 2025 p.68 unit of measurement → p.70 / 81-82 annual / long tables → coordinated annual series	Not unique persons; not a judgment on the legality of all denominations
Wrong release / halving	Administrative originals → identified justification → byret premium → national court outcome	Original datings have specific errors; in fact last payment is missing
Social loss after custody without conviction	Wakefield / Andersen 2020 method → 75.187 cases / 50.446 men → Table 2 / 3	Historically cohort, women / children omitted; family loss measures cohabitation and cannot become the number of children affected
Municipal unlawful discrimination against children	KEN9536/2021 with chronology→reasoning on necessity/proportionality→relief/5.000 kr.	Mail and PPV reproduced in the decision; payment and restored access not documented

The private evidence chain is supplemented by PU22, physical PDF1-6: one child, 37 days of date, 40 days of conditional prison / 60 hours of community service and the acquittal of the other defendant. The imponed family law premium continues to require the independent family law act; the reproduced deficiency is not the punishment of a separate public servant.

Lack of data and necessary investigative measures

A public, de-identified account of consequences and responsibility with shared event identification is required. It must cover the entire sample, including cases excluded, already appealed, reconsidered, upheld with errors or closed without consideration on the merits. Such registration must preserve the reason for exclusion; it must not give excluded cases a fictitious finding of lawfulness.

Each relevant authority shall be able to provide: intervention / decision; type of error; date of finding; original legal basis and actor; new decision; actual recovery; unique rightholders concerned; economic and non-economic consequences; notification, indictment, judgment, professional reaction and compensation. In fact, in the case of children, reunion and loss of access are added. In the case of coercion, the whole duration and sub-periods are added without any right.

The expansion has checked many further historical practice studies and annual series, complete police and asylum annual series and specific ministerial and military cases. The coverage account must be read through three separate questions: is a source identified, is its relevant original content checked, and are the citizen's actual consequences published? Only the last can complete an account of consequences. An unpublished person or implementation register is not filled in by assuming lawful trajectories or converting a sample percentage to the entire population.

Prioritized strongest valid pleas

1. **Termination and concrete basis review:** no further action may be based on a valid basis; take the full decision chain and require a position on the current proceedings. [R01, R04, R07-R08]

2. **Time as independent harm and duty:** demand a complete timeline and rapid actual redress; examine authority-created loss of family ties. [R09, T22]

3. **Known repeated errors require effective response:** documents knowledge, subsequent action and actual cessation; an action plan is insufficient to prove this last indent. [RR18 / 2024, UN / CPT]

4. **Investigate event and state responsibility without waiting for individual conviction:** the offence and the obligation to protect / investigate are separate issues. [R04, R19, UN-CAT23]

5. **Require concrete repair:** indicate the loss items, period, causal link and responsible subject; avoid any loss of contact or freedom being hidden in a general "process error 'label. [R04, R11, R19]

6. **Examine personal and managerial responsibility:** identify the specific duty, act, knowledge, culpability requirements and deadline; no general civil-servant immunity is assumed. [R05,R14-R15]

Legal context in the documented procedures

An overall account of liability

The extended course allows you to try responsibility through actual dates. The table sets up different kinds of time; no common middle time is calculated over invemsurable events.

Progress	Documented time or order	Actual consequence of the material	Result of liability and balance performance joints;
Played boys ko munikati on, 2015-2 016	357 days between the first and the last disclaimer; 1.123 days from the first disclaimer to the Ombudsman's opinion	Private communication controlled and transmitted without the required decision	Illegality and municipal involvement documented; exact date of harvest, reimbursement and individual penalty not published in the opinion
Egely	1.217 days from inspection in 2007 to follow-up in 2011; two intervention reports of 5 and 15 minutes	Two illegal internal and inadequately informed regional controls	No documented individual punishment or payment in the source used; the minutes cover total use of force, not measured door-locking time

Progress	Documented time or order	Actual consequence of the material	Result of liability and balance performance joints;
Randers, A	Released on 10 January 2017; written decision 26 January	Return effected prior to the documented written decision; guarantees were lacking	16 days of documented sequence error, not 16 additional separation days
Randers, B	Requesting immediate aid 30 October 2017; municipal implementation 20 and 24 November	21 and 25 days before the actual required bets started	The child's support and actual follow-up must be tested; the municipality's explanation of cooperation is not independent proof of family responsibility
Indexssa gene	Documented pair separation days; the 21 pairs with a stated duration among the 24 pairs of the form give 2.557 pairs	Separation, contact limitation and specific loads; the duration of three pairs is unknown	The Minister sentenced to 60 days of unconditional imprisonment; couple days are not individual days of children / parents or total time for all concerned.
Foreigners excl, ERH 2024 / 35	In May 2024 the agency had not complied with the November 2022 remittal	Living and family life continued without the timely new review	The Board itself overturns the decision and orders a residence card; actual issuance of the card and full reparation require a separate evidentiary step
Tibet	Intervention 2012 / 2013; later commissions; two conditional judgments 29 October 2025	Interference with expression and demonstration; elapsed time affected the criminal-law response	Conditional judgments are actual criminal proceedings; Commission criticism, civil compensation and staff cases have their own procedures
Stateless	Action brought on 10 July 2012 Højesteret 21 August 2026: 5.155 days	Long-term review of delayed citizenship and compensation; time before citizenship varies individually	Three awards of 10.000 kr. each in the High Court in 2025; 22 appellants received no further award in 2026. Limitation and lack of evidence were applied on different grounds
Mink	Commission Criticism 2022; five documented warnings later revoked	Deficiencies and errors in order and information chains	Revocated warnings are a concrete outcome of the staff case; they do not automatically cancel the Commission's documented objective course
Green Desert	Operation 2004; Landsret 2018; Højesteret 2022; EMD 2025, final 2026	Information about later Iraqi abuse and long Danish case of responsibility	Compensation decisions set aside; the ECtHR's decision and jurisdiction elements must be described precisely, not as a new finding of a Danish violation
Samsam	Public denials 2018; recognition by the Supreme Court of paid cooperation 2025	Misuse of public information and long review	Recognition judgment has not been proven Spanish reopening or Danish compensation for the whole of the criminal proceedings
Children of Greenland	1952 return to Greenland involved for 16 children orphanages, not home to parents; six survivors were offered conciliation 2022	The country, the institution and actual family reunification were different endpoints	Six awards of 250.000 kroner in the documented settlement; the historical 22 children and six settlement parties are overlapping populations
Greenland's anti-conc injection	Historical intervention 1960-1991; investigation 2025; law and decision status 2026	Body integrity and reproduction processes documented through defined reports	138 recognition of 300.000 DKK per case in the read balance sheet, not proof of 138 actual payments; the law provides for a specific exemption from fines for the obligation to provide information
E, AM 202 0.10.15V2	695 days started; 240 against punishment; 413 days of release → first sentence; 673 → national law	Freedom loss in addition to sentenced sentence; the entire compensation first denied by SAogRA	DKK 408.000 + interest awarded; actual payment and other losses not documented
Suldrup, AM 2010.0 2.25V2	433 commenced days;630 days release→favourable District Court finding;875→High Court	Two children; weekly half-hour supervised visits until 6.7.2007; job / salary loss	Halving cancelled; early instalments already paid, last payment unknown; children left by release following mother's sentence; continued health / job problems in reproduced 2009 material

Progress	Documented time or order	Actual consequence of the material	Result of liability and balance performance joints;
Staff case, AM 2022.10.17E	12 commenced days;273 days prosecution discontinued→defence counsel notified;1.938 days release→high-court refusal	Absence of liberty; a common child referred to in the reproduced statement	Replacement denied; delayed notification acknowledged as an excuse for late claims; cost of citizens
Three-year-old child, KEN 9536/2021	961 days of expulsion → decision; 816 days of complaint → decision	Excluded from specific age-oriented municipal offers; the period is not evidence of exclusion from all activities	Illegal discrimination, 5.000 kroner awarded; actual payment / access unknown
Langeland, location 2023	11 months from actual placement to action plan	The young person was placed in the period of education without the timely plan to manage action and follow-up.	Documented lack of plan; other validity of the decision, effective consultation and repatriation require original documents
Langeland, supervision 2022-2026	Law Enforcement Opinion 2022; continued missing 2024; new case dismissed 2025; follow-up closed 6 May 2026; Ministerial notice 29 May 2026	A completed check did not show that the rights of the identified citizens were right	Fresh consideration of lawfulness, redress and sanctions ordered; actual outcome and individual reparation following the order are separate links
Visiting, Informing and Survey 2021	Psychiatric notification in February to decision to investigate in November: nine months	The information requested was initiated after the long waiting period indicated.	Documented delimited example; not evidence of nine months of homelessness or full national delay
Morsø 2018, nine year old child	First child interview 14 months after placement decision	The child's information was not included before the decision; only mother's signature documented, father with common authority largely not involved	Consent, decision and actual separation / termination period require the original record; 14 months is the delay in the call
Sønderborg 2019,14-year programme	14 days of silence announced in consent to future measures	Recording of volunteers requires checking of the concrete, informed expression	Original notification, subsequent consent, actual effort and continued basis must be tested; no duration of placement given for this particular example
Median 2020, two application decisions	BFUs updates finished about 7,5 and 2,5 months after decision	Decision taken before the required updated basis	Actual move/cessation dates and legal redress not stated; the intervals are not the entire placement period
Median speed 2020, 14-year period	Early December 2018 decision→late February 2019 update→early April 2019 return-home decision	Consent was withdrawn and return later decided	Return-home decision documented; request date, return-home period and actual return date required for precise scrutiny of timing/legal authority
Rudersdal 2024, released young	Actual return referred to; date and duration not disclosed	The young person was asked himself to assess support	Individual aid assessment by the Authority and aid actually provided must be provided; the return does not in itself document the repaired breach of the guarantee;
Police 2007, private conflict, No 31	Unjustified arrest / retention attempt; duration unknown	Private conflict supported by police identification and freedom intervention	800 kr. civil fine; criminal decision, original event and compensation required; no specific private comparative penalty can be calculated

Medium speed , welfare check 2019	101 placement cases→11 with potential for return home→5 children actually returned home as of October 2019	Local information on physical return, 4 still possible and 2 without short-term potential	No connection to 20Task Force cases, cause of error, precise moving dates; or replacement; 5 is not a documented illegality union,
Otter 2017, application for race	Child welfare assessment deadline exceeded by just over 2 years beyond the four-month deadline; one plan approximately 11 months after actual placement	Guarantees were missing during the procedure; the overlap of BFU and plan examples is unknown.	Original decisions, prior legal basis, consent and effective termination shall be linked; no two-year home-free course shall be calculated by the deadline;

Medium speed , welfare check 2019	101 placement cases→11 with potential for return home→5 children actually returned home as of October 2019	Local information on physical return, 4 still possible and 2 without short-term potential	No connection to 20Task Force cases, cause of error, precise moving dates; or replacement; 5 is not a documented illegality union,
Faaborg-M idtfyn 2017	Actual return after approximately 2 ½ years of placement	Return and subsequent relief / treatment mentioned	No identity coupling for the recorded errors, calendar date or repair; the entire period has not been deemed illegal in the source
Faabord- M idtfyn 2020	Actual return home before six-month follow-up; another course with withdrawal of consent and follow-up one month late	Return in one example; withdrawal of consent in another	The examples are kept separate; the withdrawal does not merely represent return
Svendborg 2018	Actual return summer 2017 after yearlong placement; 6 hours weekly § 11 support	Physical return, inadequately justified support needs	Four § 65 openings in the take-off measurement, two in the final measurement; final decisions and repair require separate proof
Health Discipline 2011	12,9 months on average for decided complaints;100 reopening requests,75 rejected,5 amendments	Long trial period and limited evidence of changed critical outcome only	Not the patients' full injury/payment period;1 request for prosecution is not 1 judgment

Patient complaint FOB 2009-12-2	1.957 days Receipt → decision; 561 days Board meeting → decision; 1.141 days first regret → decision	The father's complaint after the son's death got very late formula review;	The Ombudsman's very serious time-critical; material processing; outcome and replacement not tested in the opinion;
Health care	20 September 2011 decision → 29 February 2012 transmission; 10 December 2012 injunction	7 out of 11 additional patient sessions were sent to the Board and criticised with invigoration; scheduled meeting never called	Recognised lack of prioritisation and reporting; local conflict over "20 months" retained; actual subsequent damage / execution not quantified
Patient insurance, five drop-out cases	Rejection 2006 / 2007 → Decision to resume 2007 Annual Report	Too strict practice had to be corrected; patients had lost proper redress	Five identified cases, not five documented paid patients; dates, amounts and residual losses are required
Patient insurance, radiation waiting time	Recognised incorrect interpretation autumn 2008 → planned review / re-examination 2009	Previously resigned refusal could be wrong	The number of cases actually examined / amended / paid must be reconciled; the admissibility of the appeal did not contradict the error.

Hospital medical-record practice, FOB 2010-4-4	20 years of accepted practice described in 2010; concrete treatment 2005 / 2006	Hospital doctor was (b) administrative exemption from a tax; statutory record liability on unlawful basis	Name, Board and Ministry had known practice; Amendment and Folketingets notification, but none; actually counted re-treatment / personal union i the opinion;

The table's sources are the separate sequence analyses BK01-BK03, HG01-HG03, IF01-IF06, the immigration-complaint module, TB01-TB08, the statelessness, mink, Green Desert, Samsam and GL-K01-GL-K04 analyses. They contain dates, original references and evidential boundaries. The report's timeline must not erase the distinction between intervention time, appeal time, review time and responsibility time.

Task Force rows refer to TFLAN23, physical page 31 / printed 29; TFLANISM26, physical 1-16; and TFNAE23, physical 31 / printed 29. The cases described do not have public personal identifiers. Own document keys connect source passages and do not prove that several examples concern the same or different people.

The new rows refer to ERVA01-ERVA03 and KEN9536 / 2021 with original URL, page number and dates in the case modules. Daily figures between events are their own calendar differences; they must not be confused with the detention of the person concerned during the replacement process.

Relief must therefore be checked at the actual next stage. An order for payment requires payment information; annulment of a contact restriction requires a contact log; remittal requires a new decision and assistance delivered; acceptance

The Court of First Instance has consistently held that it is necessary to verify whether the original order was altered. If there is not such a follow-up in the original source, the impact accounts are open on that very point. The original infringement or error of authority found will not be solved for that reason. The Suldrup chain actually documents early part payment; the rest applies to the payment date, set-off and payment of a further DKK 449.990.

From detected errors to actual nullity and termination

For a citizen who continues to lose family life or freedom, the first question must be: what is the valid basis for the intervention? **now**. The specific authority shall provide the legal basis, the competent decision, the current factual conditions and the necessary procedure. A detected error shall be subsumed against each of these indents. No information becomes true or sufficient because it is repeated by the municipality, board and court in the same source chain.

Removal without a valid basis is actual administrative separation without legal authority. It can be described through the specific effect: the child has been taken or kept apart from their caregivers without the lawful decision. The expression »administrative abduction« may express this criticism, but is not a separate Danish criminal provision. An allegation of child abduction under section 215 or deprivation of liberty under section 261 must also show the respective elements of conduct and culpability. The report's strongest demand is therefore to identify **the precise unlawful act and its period**, require effective cessation and redress, and investigate the criminal track on this documented basis. [R05-R06]

This only delimits what can be concluded from each error. It is not an argument that procedural deficiencies are immaterial: lack of participation, insufficient facts and a decision by an incompetent body may affect the very safeguard against unjustified interventions. BK01 shows that a lawful placement would not legitimise separate unlawful monitoring of communications. Conversely, BK03 shows that errors concerning return home do not in themselves prove that the original removal lacked legal authority. Each act and omission must have its own legal consequence.

Placement oversight 2026: breaches of law, ongoing delays and continuing family loss

Conclusion: Rigsrevisionen’s measurement of breaches of law requires individual legal review and follow-up through to actual redress. **The authority’s specific statement:**69 per cent of 3.148 selected children’s first placement sequences had at least one measured breach of the requirements examined. **Original evidence:** Figure 2, table A and the methodological annex document the child union, the different denominators and exclusions. **Deficiency:** Not all children are checked against every requirement; among other things, additional registrations and cancelled interviews may conceal further failures. The report itself describes 69 per cent as a lower-bound estimate. The remaining 31 per cent therefore provide no documentation of full legality. [RRAN26, PDF22-32,38-54]

Relevant rule: The requirements then in force for assessment, a competent decision, involvement, a plan, follow-up and supervision must be linked to ECHR8's requirements concerning interference with family life and an effective process. **Act or omission:** Delayed or missing steps have been established in the respective subpopulations. **Legal departure:** Each breach of a safeguard must be examined at the time of intervention; a document prepared later cannot, on its own, document an adequate basis at that time. **Significance for the outcome:** A decision on an insufficient factual basis may cause unjustified separation, while a missing plan and follow-up may prolong a case or weaken contact and reunification. The specific effect must be documented from contemporaneous records and residence/contact logs. There are not 3.148 independently examined invalidity decisions here. [RRAN26;R04,R08-R09]

The timing samples show a further delimitation: among 693 completed delayed, non-urgent child welfare assessments the median overrun was 77 days; among 742 completed delayed plans it was 44 days, and among 391 completed delayed follow-ups 24 days. Unfinished delays are excluded from these distributions. They must therefore not be used as a ceiling on families' waiting time or as return-home times. The demand is for both a completed-case distribution and a separate register of continuing, unfinished safeguard breaches with actual intervention duration. [RRAN26,PDF25,28,31,42-48]

Responsibility: The municipality’s specific decision-making and management chain and the ministry’s separate knowledge/response link must be investigated. The reference to 98 per cent upheld decisions in selected compulsory-placement appeal populations examines neither the same children nor the same safeguards. The minister’s 2026 commitment and the audit’s continuing review document a response, but not completed reparation of every child’s trajectory. **Demand:** Produce each child’s contemporaneous decision-making basis, all five requirements with review status, any emergency basis and consent; examine invalidity and the current basis; record

[RRANSM26, PDF1-4; RRANC11126, PDF2-3]

The additional time series refer to TFMOR18A, PDF36-37; TFSON19A, PDF34; TFMID20, PDF49 / 53; TFRUD24, PDF30; PD2007K, nr. 31 / PDF8. There are no record keys to deduplicate Middfart's two BFUs with the 14th year; they must not be added together as three different children placed.

Stevns: Recognized Untopical Basis and Miscorrection

Conclusion: Reaching adulthood does not make an earlier failure of safeguards timely or document redress for the lost period. **The authority's specific statement:** The status report recounts that in February 2020, the municipality acknowledged to a young person that the assessment should have been updated, but refrained because the young person would turn 18 a few days later. **Original evidence:** TFSTE20, physical page 26/printed 25: an assessment from November 2015 was used for a placement decision around four years later. **Deficiency:** The described update did not exist before the intrusive decision, and the acknowledged deficiency was not corrected by this subsequent conversation. [TFSTE20]

Relevant rule: Contemporaneous requirements for investigation,fact-finding,participation and proportionality,and ECHR8 procedural protection. **Conduct or omission:** The municipality decided on the described old basis and subsequently refrained from updating it. **Legal departure:** The documented safeguard deficiency must be examined at the decision date;an approaching 18th birthday does not document that the earlier decision rested on lawfully established facts. **Significance for outcomes:** The young person had been placed following a process in which the current basis was not documented as required. Four years is the age of the assessment basis at decision,not four years of documented placement without legal authority. **Responsibility:** The municipality's actual decision-makers and management's knowledge must be identified in contemporaneous records. **Demand:** Produce the decision,assessment,need for updating,consent/coercive basis,interviews and subsequent cessation;examine invalidity,actual loss and redress for the specific period. [TFSTE20;R04,R08-R09,R19]

Another source example describes an interview with a child just under ten on the day after the placement agreement, while the adviser collected and drove the child. The later interview does not prove the child's opportunity to influence a decision already made. A separate VISO example describes insufficient family support before emergency placement. However, the VISO sample of five cases required an assessment to exist; cases without an assessment therefore fall outside this professional examination. The demand is to investigate whether documented insufficient support created or intensified the risk used to justify intervention. No person or causal union between the examples is proved. [TFSTE20, PDF25,35]

Preservation of evidence is part of an effective investigation

The original of the Disciplinary Board 2011 documents 22 decisions concerning the same private specialist whose records were destroyed. The name could not try treatment and information itself, but criticised storage. The hospital case in the same original describes a missing triage schedule and conflicting information that weakened the trial. These are concrete evidence mechanisms, not an estimate of all health defects. Where the State is required to investigate a serious intervention or an arguable breach of the Convention, simultaneous records and logs shall be ensured and no refusal of competence shall appear as acquittal of the act itself. In addition, the information provided by the annual report on past practices of uncritical record deviation shows that the category "no criticism 'does not demonstrate the absence of all legal errors. [SDN11FT, p.15- 22]

The full Ombudsman's original 2010- 4-4 shows a further effective administrative liability exemption: hospital doctors were, through a long-standing practice, not held responsible for certain record deficiencies when a secretary wrote the decree. The Board and the Ministry had known and accepted the practice; the Ombudsman described it as illegal and informed the Folketing. According to his review, the law made no such difference between the hospital doctor and the practitioner. This is a concrete proven failure of responsibility, which must be compared with the duties of individuals. This is not a general criminal immunity. At the same time, the opinion required that a recorded breach of law be notified at least to the doctor, even where, on the basis of a concrete assessment, disciplinary criticism was not expressed. Therefore, "no criticism" cannot be used as a national law counter. [FOB10J, print1,9-12 / PDF2,10-13]

Statistics cannot replace the legal document

Verification of Statistics Denmark's methodological description of Statistics Denmark's method reveals that, for certain deficient submissions, the placement register recodes sequences according to assumptions about legally consequential changes. A registered legal-basis category is therefore not independent evidence that the required decision by the competent authority was actually made in time. It must be checked against the original decision. The register's corrected category must neither be used to explain away a documented deficiency nor conversely converted into an unknown number of unlawful cases. [Person extension, DST methodology card]

The same distinction applies to alteration/remittal rates. A case altered or remitted may have multiple errors and rights holders; an affirmed case may also have documented procedural errors. An unappealed case may feature in a practice sample excluding all appealed cases. The report must therefore include separate error populations and retain all denominators before forming a union. A consolidated citizen account must be a linkage, not an addition of different oversight bodies' headlines.

The 2019 pilot barometer gives concrete expression to the exclusion: the cases could not be appealed. The 228 pilot cases and the 3.629 cases in 2020-2024 give 3.857 case cases investigated in six publications. This is a count of study volume, not of different children or illegal locations. Each fault sample retains its denominator and the later collector report does not add any additional population. The strongest documented criticism is that the outcome of the complaint cannot be a comprehensive description of legal certainty in these uncontested cases. [BBP19M, PDF5; BBP19; barometric annual modules]

The historical tax and vehicle-support matrices show a related blindness to outcomes. Landsskatteretten's »other« may contain actual relief, while remittal has no separate cell in the 2009-2012 tables checked. In the 2010 vehicle-support table, 17 remittals are excluded from the printed alteration percentage of 2; a further 66 board decisions are excluded because information about the municipality's decision is missing. This documents specific statistical exclusions. It does not prove all excluded cases were erroneous, but requires them to be recorded as known separate populations with unresolved outcomes rather than disappear from the account. [LSRH11-LSRH12;HB10,table4.3 and methodology annex]

The concrete asymmetry of responsibility

The private original-judgment chain from 2017 shows the necessary precision: the prosecutor sought 2-3 months' immediate imprisonment for a mother and grandmother, but both were acquitted under section 215, subsection 2. The High Court found that the then criminal provision could not be extended from disagreement about parental responsibility to the specific residence disagreement, contrary to its wording and Criminal Code section 1. Three primary documents concern the same case with two defendants and one child. This specific missing offence element limits the criminal-law comparison; it provides no authority for public intervention without a valid basis. [PB01,pp.1-3;PB02,pp.2-5;PB03,pp.3-5]

The fully read 2022 original AM 2022.06.16V, by contrast, shows actual punishment of a private individual:37 days between dates of withholding led to 40 days' suspended imprisonment and 60 hours' community service, affirmed by the High Court. A co-defendant was acquitted. The criminal judgment also reproduces a family-law premise that the original interim parental-responsibility decision lacked a basis, yet was maintained by reference to the later situation and time since the child's handover 65 days earlier. This specific line requires independent scrutiny of the administrative decision, original evidence, effects of time and responsibility. The private individual's punishment does not prove the lawfulness of every official step. The full sequence, source-chain limits and specific document demands appear in the 2022 judgment module. [PU22,physical PDF1-6]

The immunity claim must be examined at several separate levels. Public office does not confer general permission to separate or surveil children without legal authority. The Liability for Damages Act's employer/employee rules may limit an employee's personal financial liability; they are not criminal-law authority for the intervention. Personnel response, punishment, authority responsibility and reparation for the citizen must each be recorded. Absence of one response does not remove the other duties. [R05-R06,R11]

Health also has a specific legal protection of sanctions. Article 201 of the Health Act protects the rapporteur and, from 1 January 2021, health professionals involved in an UTH reporting against disciplinary, supervisory and criminal consequences of the reporting. The rule must be included in the liability assessment. It also applies to private hospitals and does not provide general immunity to a municipal caretaker in a home-free separation. The

historical guidance expressly distinguishes between this reporting basis and sanctions on another basis. The specific demand is to secure contemporaneous records and other independent evidence, and examine each responsibility chain, while the citizen's harm may still require cessation and reparation. [UTHP11, PDF6; UTHP20,§1nr4-5og§5; UTHP25,§§201-202]

The 2026 Greenland Compensation Act nevertheless contains an **express, specific exemption**. Under§16, subsection 2, failure to provide necessary information under the duty in§4 may be fined, but public authorities and their employees are exempt from this fine provision. A private and a public party subject to the same information duty therefore face different sanctions. The exemption does not remove the information duty itself. The applicant's knowingly false declaration on honour has different offence elements under§16, subsection 1, and a penalty range of a fine or imprisonment up to 2 years. It must not be presented as the penalty for precisely the same omission as the authority's. [GL-K03,§§4 and 16]

The actual responsibility cases also show that sanction deadlines and opportunities for proof can expire while the citizen's loss of rights and civil review continue. The Stateless Persons Commission's specific information on disciplinary and criminal-law time limits, subsequent closure of personnel cases and the 14-year civil proceedings provide a documented basis for criticism of this asymmetry. Intent need not be presumed on the part of every employee to demand timely preservation of evidence and determination of institutional responsibility.

The most direct demand is a parallel responsibility track from the first documented serious error: immediate review of the citizen's continuing intervention, preservation of original files and logs, identification of the responsible decision chain and a decision on financial and non-financial redress. The citizen's claim to protection must not be postponed until years-long personnel or criminal proceedings have concluded.

Modified target bar must not hide the actual time of the citizen

The new 30-week term of the Appeal Board replaced the old 13-week term. The subsequent control agreement thus says something about the fulfilment of a modified internal target; it does not prove that the citizen's legal loss ceased more quickly or was repaired. Around 35 weeks by 2025 shows that the new target was also exceeded. The specific legal test is still required to establish time, necessity and effective protection for each right and case. [AT07, p. 3-4; AT13, p. 8-11]

The original referred-back case shows why dates are necessary: 97 calendar days from complaint to remittal for reconsideration, 44 of which to municipal transmission and 53 thereafter. The printed eight and five weeks do not match these starting points. It is a documented time vote; no information is given on the amount of the penalty, the amount of the penalty and the aid actually provided. The requirement is the whole chain of events, including reassessment, receipt, remittal for reconsideration, new decision and payment. A date of receipt or reopening shall not conceal the previous deprivation of the citizen. [AT02, physical PDF33-34]

Psychiatric control: end and modified target stick

The overall legal test of knowledge, continued loss of rights and actual reaction is set out in Chapter 28. The main conclusion and the priority requirements are set out in Chapter 30. The following original runs shall demonstrate separately what a control line actually covers.

The psychiatric follow-up provides a similar examination of what administrative closure means. A review may close the issue of correct registration or improved information while the assessment deadline continues to be exceeded and the family's actual treatment start remains undocumented. The 75 referral sequences from September 2024, the 71 assessable rights letters and the national quarterly averages each have their own denominator. They must not be added up as a person union. The new rights from 2026 apply to new referrals under the transitional rule; they do not erase earlier breaches or the need for specific reparation. [CPsy25, PDF4-10; PsyL25,§§1-2]

The conclusion of the follow-up on coercion also changes the metric: the earlier target of halving the proportion of patients subjected to belt restraint is replaced by a target for 2030 of a 30 per cent reduction in three types of episode per 100.000 inhabitants. Completed follow-up on the new monitoring system does not document achievement of the old target, timely termination of every unlawful intervention or payment to the affected patient. Each form of coercion requires a start, duration, specific legal basis, review, actual cessation and reparation. [CTv25,PDF3-5;H08 time account]

2. The impact of the proof on the rules

Appeal and investigation findings document repeated failures in decision-making bases and protective procedures. ECtHR decisions and international legal sources establish that procedure, effective review and time may be part of the right itself. When an error continues to affect family life, liberty or assistance, redress requires actual action. A new letter, remittal for reconsideration or administrative closure does not necessarily fulfil this duty. [R04,R09,R19]

Direct unlawful interference by a public authority shall be tested as an intervention. Its lack of prevention, support or investigation shall be tested as a positive obligation or obligation to process where the conditions of the relevant Article are met. You have to show the right, the risk, the knowledge and the possible / necessary action for the specific duty. There must be no torture alone from any procedural error or a well-founded allegation of maltreatment simply because individual convictions are lacking.

The right to review must also be assessed under the rules for the case type. Under Ferrazzini, ordinary tax claims fall outside Article 6's civil scope; a tax penalty may require separate examination under the provision's autonomous criminal concept. This specific delimitation removes neither domestic review of lawfulness, property protection under the First Additional Protocol nor Article 13 where there is an arguable Convention claim. Prolonged tax-appeal processing and a hidden outcome category must therefore be connected to the rule actually applicable, rather than automatically classified under Article 6. [FXTAX01,§§25-31;FXTAX02;R04,R11,R19]

3. Action, omission and legal deviation

The strongest valid criticism arises where the chain can be documented: illegal or unintentional intervention; practical knowledge of the authority; lack of timely correction; continued loss of rights. In families, this is particularly true of separation and contact. Time may weaken attachment and the Authority may not use the consequences of its own negligence as a self-created argument to cut off reunification. [R09]

In psychiatry, the lawfulness of initiation and duration must be examined separately. Approval of the starting point does not mean the entire period is lawful. In disability courses, missing timely support must be examined before the consequences of that very absence are used against the citizen’s functional or parenting capacity. In supervision, closure must be assessed against actual effect, not the municipality’s own explanation alone.

Detention: known registry and control failures

State responsibility, repair and the practical comparison with private individuals are grouped together in Chapter 28, paragraphs 6 to 7.

Register quality is a specific accountability track. Rigsadvokaten's historical originals document 109 late-reported 2010 trajectories placed in the wrong year, earlier incorrectly delimited deadline tables and continuing deficiencies in detainee case management. An institution's description of a new application or designated responsible person documents knowledge and initiative, but not in itself effects or redress for people deprived of liberty. The specific demand is for both correct public statistics and scrutiny of individual orders, requests, deadlines and periods. [LV11 pp. 3-5; LV15 pp. 6-8; LV16 p. 8]

The main 2019 account also documents 16 non-compulsory references to the public prosecutor and subsequent criticism from the public prosecutor. The limited requirement is to identify the course of proceedings concerned and to check the application, knowledge, time limit for submission, order and actual continuation. A subsequent management system or statistical correction does not in itself restore the protective control that was lacking in each course. The 16 are not simply 16 different persons and the statistics do not determine the legality of each extension. [LV19, p. 3-4]

The solitary-confinement module documents 19 entries concerning children in 2006-2017 and the stated durations; there is no cross-year deduplication. The 2010 original’s 17 days of child solitary confinement do not in themselves exceed the four-week limit. This does not answer whether wholly exceptional circumstances, necessity, reasoned separate orders and the child’s specific conditions were satisfied. The solitary-confinement statistics’ maximum-period check must therefore not replace individual examination of the child’s rights. [ISO2006-2017,children’s section; Act 1561/2006,§1 nr. 3/6/7,see the solitary-confinement module’s rule check]

Reference to the overall main requirements

The final priority requirements are grouped together in Chapter 30. Chapter 28 sets out their legal basis and the concrete evidence chains in this chapter indicate necessary documents and individual implementation.

Greenland cases and international legal classification questions

State responsibility and R2P's separate scope of application appear in chapter 28, section 7. The Greenland courses require the following specific examination of legal classification.

The Greenland documentation requires particular attention because both measures affecting births and transfers of children have a possible connection to the types of act listed in Article II of the Genocide Convention. That connection is a specific line of investigation. Legal classification additionally requires evidence of the specific intent to destroy a protected group, in whole or in part, as such; neither a serious consent deficiency nor a high recorded proportion without consent proves that intent on its own. Knowledge of minority, the authority's purpose, contemporaneous decision notes, target group and repeated warnings must be examined in the original material. [GL-K01-GL-K04;R20-R22]

In the case of crimes against humanity, the widespread or systematic attack on a civilian population and the perpetrator's knowledge of this connection must be proved together with the actual act. War crimes require the appropriate link to armed conflict. The four categories of R2P must therefore have separate subsumptions. On the other hand, international public liability may relate to a breach of the Convention by a competent public body, even where the particular international straitjacket or individual intention has not been proven. The requirement of termination, effective investigation and repair shall be carried through this directly documented track without waiting for any further classification. [R19-R22]

Detention: specific data and protection requirements

The joint test of authority knowledge and effectiveness is set out in Chapter 28 and the final requirements of Chapter 30 of the report. In the area of freedom, the following documented conditions and requirements are of independent relevance.

Total data requirements in the area of freedom: A race register must follow the person and the documented children / family relationships, maintain actual start and end and distinguish between legal decision and physical freedom. Separate registers of time and liability must be kept for continued care, isolation, time-limit control and compensation. Initial annual versions, post-registration and withdrawn information shall remain visible; the same citizen or the same annual course shall not be counted once for each report version.

Health protection during deprivation of liberty by the State: The State controls both the intervention and the prisoner's practical access to treatment. The documented absence of a national UTH account and Øst's failure to retain reports after handling make demands for contemporaneous records, medication logs, reports and follow-up specific. An exception from the particular UTH reporting scheme does not document fulfilment of treatment, protection or investigation duties. For a specific risk to life or serious treatment, examination under ECHR Articles 2 and 3 must follow the State's knowledge, opportunities to act, omission and actual harm. Vest's 38 incidents cannot replace this examination or constitute a national error rate. [KFUTH25,pp.2-3;KFUTHREG25,§2,no.3]

Review during continuing prison interventions: The 12 amendments in 2024 show decisions overturned in the population reviewed; the statistics do not state each intervention's actual date of cessation or redress. Under Act 661/2024, interlocutory appeals against new district-court orders require Procesbevillingsnævnet's permission under the "special reasons" criterion, subject to the Act's transitional rule. The eight applications pending at the end of 2024 are not eight refusals. Processing time, continuing intervention and actual effect must be tracked alongside final outcome so access to a new decision is not confused with timely access to liberty or treatment. [KF24,pp.54-56;KFL24,section3 and section10,subsection1/6]

Traceability check

The central statistical amounts of the report can be traced back to the annual series and source versions shown. The exclusion of sources and known conflicting figures are visible. Specific penalties refer to the source actually read, even when it is a summary of the authority. EMD, UN and CPT material are marked by decision type. Own legal analysis is separate from the findings of the control bodies. No national number of unique victims, no homelessness or personally responsible staff has been invented.

Reconciliation of the requested extension and specific document status

These accounts indicate what has actually been verified in the course of the enlargement and what continues to require an original or register connection. An updated bibliography and a localized report title do not in itself document that the original has been read. Published controls may lack a common personal identifier, subsequent date of payment or actual relocation. This information may not be invented to declare completeness. Each finite find can still be used with its own documentation.

The rows below reproduce the updated working records; words which refer in part to the specified remainder and do not change the probative value of the findings already checked. The status without material completion is an examination step. No request for access or register data has been sent by this report. The modules and the list of literature identify the original sources.

K01 · Municipal complaints 2006-2016

Substantively checked: national 2006/2012 originals, all 43 pages/13 tables/262 rows;2006 social boards with 28043 closed/24915 considered on the merits/6393 overturnings,2012SN/BAN35496/32066/8202.2006 percentage denominator is all closed cases; from 2007, cases considered on the merits. 2007-2011 national boards and the 2014-2016 portal version checked separately. The local 2006 statutory extract of 9417 overlaps the national report and is not an additional national population;819/818 and integration 6/5 retained. A national 2013 transition row and person/reconsideration/effect linkage remain missing. The official archive overview labelled 2013 does not link to a 2013 outcome table; this does not prove that the data never existed. New actual original-source check for 2013: SFV13H scanned 20 pages, read 1-8/15/19-20, and SFV13A29 pages, read 1-13/25-29, contain 16.780 first-half-year decisions=7.696BAN+9.084SN, all 27 case-area/subtotal rows with regional cells reproduced. AS13A34 pages, read 1-20, states approximately 11.000 municipal appeals, rounded rather than an exact annual outcome. The first-half-year count gap is closed; complete four-outcome data for 2013, transferred case-record keys/second instance/persons/effect remain outstanding. See ankestatistik-2013-overgang-originale-maal-og-naevnere.md/.json.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen / previous social boards.

K02 · Municipal complaints 2025

Filled for the 26 eligible municipal law groups: 2025 reality 22927, city 15505, modified 1767, home 5655, rejected 2755. Disposal / re-evaluation / persons are not covered; primary portal + compact JSON in municipal module.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen.

K03 · Municipal reassessment before appeal

Partial substantive verification: Varde 2023/Q1 2024; København Social 2009-2014 and BIF 2023-2024; UDK 2021 before/after review; AS 2026 workflows separately. A national reconsideration series and complete local publication register are missing. Overlap and specific data requests: genvurdering-og-klagepopulationer.md/.json. The original 2006 FOB inspection sections 4.2.4-4.2.5 are now read at physical 68-74:18/40 missed deadlines,9/25 social and 9/15BIF; at least 8 missing notifications overlap deadline breaches. Other waiting times deducted; an earlier oral complaint not entered in the records and internal resetting of the receipt date treated separately. See the 2006 annex module.

Document / registry tracks: The municipalities / Ankestyrelsen.

K04 · Practical studies 2006-2025

Five historical originals now read fully as text: placement 2006, all 63 pages/32 tables, 174 rows;2008 all 73 pages/44 tables, 265 rows;2009 all 94 pages/41 tables+2 methodology blocks, 263 rows; involvement 2011 all 107 pages/31 main tables+4 municipal annexes+3 figure/prose blocks, 224 rows; relocation/return home 2011 all 65 pages/28 tables+1 figure,120 factual rows and 23 local example IDs. Same earlier 101/143/125/121/81 cohorts, no additional error sum. Local case-ID deduplication 32/38/38/45/23 is not a cross-report union of individuals. Further completed originals: UDK 2021 all 90 pages/15 tables, 91 rows/16 case codes;rehabilitation 2014 all 112 pages/31 main+2 municipal tables and 7 figures=40 blocks, 201 rows/18 case codes;day club 2025 all 58 pages/9 blocks, 78 rows;work placements 2014 all 103 pages/32 tables+8 figure/methodology blocks, 185 rows/16 case codes;sanctions 2016 all 142 pages/30 tables+7 figures/47 case codes. Assets 2014 and flexible employment 2010 earlier specific municipal/subtable gaps have been supplemented without claiming that all earlier prose/rule pages were read in full. Submission/exclusion/already-appealed status, raw missing cells and actual redress are separate data requirements. The later consolidated 21-row list is now complete:flexible employment 2006, pension-psychiatry 2007, sanctions 2015, reassessment 2015, assessment of young people 2015, pension 2015, low hours 2016, pension-without 2019, BPA 2023, ethnic background 2023, lost earnings 2022, main+annex,work placements 2022, main+annex,contact 2016, force 2018, additional expenses 2014, sickness benefits 2016, dementia 2015 and sanctions 2024, main+annex. PEN06 all 59 pages supplemented with all 20 blocks, 108 rows. SAN17/22/23, external provider 2013, AES 2023, UDK 2022, contact 2020 and pension 2025 are also complete in the named separate modules. Foster families 2014 parts 1/2/4+summary,all 108 pages/40 numbered tables/61 blocks, 373 rows; FKU 2012 all 20 pages/22 tables+3 reconciliations, 142 rows. Specific main originals not obtained:Barnets Reform 2012 and foster relocation 2014 part 3, plus named FKU 2012 annexes. Not automatically unpublished. Survey/family/interview/case-record review cohorts remain separate. Latest specific retrieval attempt: CDX wildcard ast.dk/publikationer/*barnets* and *plejefamilie* both returned 503; archive.org/wayback/available returned 429 for three publication routes guessed from names, which are not verified catalogue IDs, without a repeated call. The old ast.dk/publikationer overview redirected and web access returned 500; SL robots.txt/sitemap.xml returned 404. Targeted Folketinget searches for 2012/2013/2014 and SL searches for Barnets Reform/relocation did not find these main originals. None of the errors proves non-publication. A separate 2013 family/network study with 252 cases does not replace 120/12 or 57/20.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen.

K05 · Children's Day Barometer and Practice Checking

Partial substantive verification: child case barometers 2020-2024 and the use-of-force practice check 2018 (46 interviews/7 municipalities; 96 participant occurrences, no error count). Pilot 2019 is now fully checked against the originals:42+6+20 pages,228 unappealed cases/12 municipalities,18 main figures divided into 19 denominator subsets/67 category rows,12 municipality methodology rows and 17 municipal figures/204 rows.115 family treatment+113 placements (4 compulsory);198 cases/248 checked notifications.70 assessment errors,64 deadline errors,99 interview errors,52 plan errors, each with its own denominator; no error/person union. Obtaining the 2019 originals is completed; exact submission/exclusion counts, the direction of two consultation changes and actual redress/person linkage remain missing. See boernesagsbarometer-pilot2019-originalkontrol.md, -originale-tabeller.md and -originale-tal.json. The 2025 barometer is not in the current catalogue; the official 2026 plan describes the first new edition under the Child’s Act. All published 2020-24 municipal annexes have now actually been read:2059 municipal rows in boernebarometer-kommunebilag-2020-2024.md. All case-type annexes 2021-24 actually read, retaining original denominator discrepancies. BB 2020: all 17 raster tables checked visually and registered. See the annual modules and boernebarometer-pause-og-nye-kontroller.md. The complete practice-check inventory and other originals are missing. See boernesagsbarometre-2020-2024.md/.json and praksistjek-magtanvendelse-2018.md/.json. Use of force 2018: all 85 pages now actually reviewed, including visual review of raster annexes 66-85 and tablePDF63:5 blocks,67 rows in praksis-magt2018-fulde-originaltal-og-erkendte-garantiproblemer.md/.json.46 interviews/15 interviews with relatives are not national incidents/people; the original did not assess quality/legality.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen.

K06 · Task Force children and disabilities

Central 2024 list:43 trajectories/42 municipality names;28 with at least one substantively checked analysis/status original and 15 without such an original obtained after specific municipal/archive routes. This does not mean 28 fully completed trajectories. All currently obtained necessary main-text/annex originals in the named TaskForce modules have now been substantively reviewed, including KK 2020 all 48 pages, Odsherred 2023 all 44 pages and Sorø children 2024/2026 all 42+27 pages. Other schemes are outside the 43:LTK adults 80 pages;Egedal child disability 119 pages;Sorø adults 119 pages;Nordfyn adults 103 pages;Frederikssund adults 133 pages. Phases and specific retrieval routes tested are in taskforce-daekningsafstemning.md/.json. Initial/final originals not obtained must not be called unpublished solely because of access errors. Exclusion, a union of individuals and actual cessation/redress are separate register/record requirements;2026 final reports have not been redated to 2006-25.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen / Social Security and Housing.

K07 · A's own decisions overruled

Substantively completed for selected judgment/review courses and AS court-case denominators for 2019-2021:3541 closed registrations by level of jurisdiction, not 3541 unique persons or findings in the party's favour. The 2021 original table 2.12 has been read; it contains no outcome breakdown. Specific orders/findings in the party's favour, remittals and responsibility have been examined in the court, return-home and compensation modules. Remaining gaps:all 20 years' administrative case→court level→outcome→actual reconsideration/payment/return home; judgments/judicial closures and persons require deduplication. See the T01 module's court section. New AS13A original table 7/PDF13:665 findings in the authority's favour among 704 judgments delivered in 2013,visually checked. The own difference of 39 represents other outcomes, not 39 unique persons/full findings in the party's favour/unlawful placements. All 39 outcomes/judgment IDs/persons and actual effects remain to be linked.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen Court of Justice.

T01 · Complaint handling time 2006-2025

Substantively expanded: historical board processing time 2008-2013 and Rigsrevisionen's review 2014-2025; Ankestyrelsen's original annual reports 2019/2021-2025, case counts 2020-2022 and monthly figures 2025-2026.14 original tables/200 numerical data rows.13→30 weeks changed target;2025 approximately 35; deadlines/time pending/reopening dates/exclusions and version discrepancies separately. Four 2014 individual histories, a remitted sanction 97 days from appeal→decision and 44/53-day step differences versus the printed 8/5 weeks. Outstanding: all earlier years' original time/deadline subsets, complete reopening/person union and actual loss/redress; averages are not national error/person counts. See ankestyrelsen-tid-kontrolmaal-og-faktisk-beskyttelse.md and the time-reading annex. New AS13A/SFV13H/SFV13A original verification:19 time/service targets, regional 2013 targets/waiting time/time pending and historical AS06-13 flow cells reproduced. AS13 table 9 excludes merger-relevant cases:18.607 under 12 months+1.262 over=19.869 versus prose 21.347; parts 11.371+3.041+6.935 confirm 21.347. 94,1% must not stand for the entire population. SFV13H unweighted 24,6BAN/23,6SN differs from AT02; versions retained. Exact inclusions/exclusions and actual individual redress outstanding. The new 31-page 2007 interim original LSRLEAN07 has been read in full as text in RAM, and PDF9/26/28/29 checked visually:5×3 backlog cells,25 targets and 32 deadline/function rows. The minister acknowledges budget prioritisation and increasing time; the terms of reference require safeguards to be preserved. Planned written voting in the absence of a reply is not documented actual refusal of a hearing. Backlog/full-time equivalents/targets must not be counted as outcomes/people. See landsskatteretten2007-ledelsesviden-liggetid-og-procesplan.md/.json.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen.

T02 · After remittal for reconsideration back

Partial: 2013 report on 2012 execution 131 adult cases + 202039 shipping cases. National annual cohorts and actual new outcomes are missing; see municipal complaints -expansion.md.

Document / registry tracks: The municipalities / Ankestyrelsen.

T03 · Actual cessation and reunification

Specific courses checked substantively:four families with actual return home and support/contact dates in boern-kontakt-frihed-og-hjemgivelsesbeviser; procedural remittal for reconsideration/suspensive effect in hjemvisning-hjemgivelse-og-midlertidig-beskyttelse without automatic actual return home. Suldrup:two children returned on release according to the mother's reported court testimony; status closure 875 days later, early partial payments documented, final payment unknown. Three-year-old child with a disability:961 days until a finding in the party's favour, actual access/payment unknown. National remittal for reconsideration→actual return-home/register linkage not published here; specific demand for contact/residence/benefit/payment logs.

Document / registry tracks: The municipalities / Ankestyrelsen / Statistics Denmark.

P01 · Launched locations 2006-2010

Partly completed: 2007-2010 actually implemented cases involving ages 0-17 in AS 2010 figure 1.1=3693/3502/3254/2864; current ANBIVS1 all ages 2011-25 fully extracted. BU20/21 decision populations 2006-17 checked separately. Outstanding: original 2006 initiations, unit/version linkage; DST/AS historical register and revision dates. AS 2010 entire 56-page original now read in full:all 18 numbered tables/38 numerical blocks, 325 rows in anbringelsesstatistik2010-originale-tabeller.md/.json. Implementations 2007/08=3693/3502, not reversed; versions/decisions/year-end stocks kept separate.

Document / registry tracks: Statistics Denmark.

P02 · Duration of placement and repatriation

Partly completed: all reason rows for cessation in 2007-15 across three AS original versions;BIS66 duration 2006-09;BU25 changes 2014-18 and BU32 breakdowns 2013-16. Reasons may overlap;cessation at age 18 is not reunification. Outstanding: public cessation/duration aggregates for 2006 and 2016-25,actual returns home and interventions following errors. Register inquiry specified;none sent. New-publication check:44 relevant active/inactive table metadata sets and every dimension read among 5737 catalogue entries. Only BIS66 has duration status for 2006-09;BIS7 closures 2001-05 predate the period;no published 2016-25 return-home/completed-duration dimension within scope. Research registers describe precisely cessation/move destination;data must be obtained there. See dst-offentlig-hjemgivelses-og-varighedsdaekning.md/.jsonmetadata. AS 2010,the complete 56-page original,has now been fully read.3253 cessations include 2280 at age 18 even with continuing aftercare,rather than 3253 returns home.69% same placement type=1079/1560 sibling groups,not a proportion of individuals or proof of the same physical location. Original total/percentage conflicts and recalculated aftercare are retained in the AS 2010 reader module.

Document / registry tracks: Statistics Denmark.

P03 · Unique children and parents affected by errors

Method and source verification: national case errors → unique children / parent roles → effective reunification has not been published in the controlled tables. Determined 2011 bug cases and VIVE-return selection have been documented; no multiplication with population or two-parent-pr- child. Rest: unidentified complaint ID / decision ID → BUAH / BUAF → CPR / parent role and event dates at DST / AS / municipalities.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen / the municipalities / Danmarks Statistik.

P04 · Disabled adults 2006-2025

Partly completed: HAND02A 2018-2025 and unique NYT populations separately; HANDBIL 2011-2025, 2010 refusals, time and 2025 reconsideration checked. A new original-source check closes vehicle grants 2006-2010: specific flow and grant tables in five AS annual originals and the 2010 methodology read in RAM. Original purchase series 2006-2009: 2.956/2.479/2.249/1.873; HB10 revised 2006-2010: 2.964/2.699/2.309/1.916/1.898. Late reports for 2007 and HB08's printed 5.802 against its own sum of 5.805 retained. Boards 2010: 382 + 66 excluded = 448 known decisions, not persons. Grants, full/partial refusals, reconsideration and appeals have different denominators. Outstanding: other disability-benefit curves 2006-2017 and all refusals, unique documented victims of errors and effective redress 2006-2025. Register trails RA12705/12706 identified; individual data not extracted.

Document / registry tracks: Statistics Denmark / municipalities.

P05 · Disability register quality 2025

Substantively reconciled:115.909 reproduced exactly as the HAND02A2025K4 sum of 23 benefits×9 age groups×3 sexes; recipients of multiple benefits overlap. NYT88.400 are unique recipients. Metadata on cells and missing Aarhus/Holstebro data documented. Outstanding: full revision account, missing municipal benefits and evidence of the effect on the unique-person total; DST data request specified.

Document / registry tracks: Statistics Denmark.

P06 · Copenhagen 2019 location data

Partly completed: DST's concrete Copenhagen 2019 variabel deficiencies, system shift 2020 and ongoing historical fixes source controlled. NYT version 13.600 / 2.624 against current 13.435 / 2.501 retained; 165 / 123 differences cannot be attributed to Copenhagen alone. Remaining: exact rows / extent / decryption of the deficiency and date / version of the post-correction at DST / Copenhagen; no source-based zero assumption.

Document / registry tracks: Danmarks Statistik / Copenhagen Kommune.

P07 · Forced children

Partly completed: BU03A all legal bases 2006-10; ANB6 all four categories 2011-25 and ANBIVS4 start-up basis 2011-25; new / older encoding and automatic registry assumptions checked. The others are not optional and zeros prior to separate reporting are not absences. Residual: individual under-distribution SEL65 / 75 / 76, criminal law, UNKN / Aliens / BLs and actual simultaneous home decisions; the validity of the legal basis cannot be proved on the register label.

Document / registry tracks: Statistics in Denmark / Ankestyrelsen.

O01 · Ombudsman's case coding

Partially completed: 2006-2025 years series for completed file cases and criticism / recommendation / recommendation as well as specific FOB 2018- 26, Egely 2011 and FOB 2018- 33 with source, time and person delineation. See below. md and boern-contact-freedom-and-return documents.md. Rest: all basic originals, full critical encoding, persons and overlap with other complaint systems; no national personal union.

Document / registry tracks: Folketingets Ombudsmand.

O02 · OPCAT and institutional supervision

Partial original coverage: specific Ombudsman investigations/Egely in boern-kontakt-frihed-og-hjemgivelsesbeviser.md. The full CPT/Inf(2013)11 original reports Danish supervision in Nuuk 1993/1999/2001/2006, September 2013 planned;over 1000 institutions eligible for OPCAT/~75 planned visits per year from 2013 and a Greenland NPM psychiatric visit in March 2012 under Act 8/2009§ 17. This is the State’s contemporaneous information, not a full national OPCAT register or substantive reading of the visit reports mentioned. Outstanding: all 2006-2025 visits, findings, recommendations, actual follow-up and person overlap;CPT kept separate. See cpt-2013-dansk-svar-fuld-originalkontrol.md.

Document / registry tracks: Folketingets Ombudsmand / DIGNITY / Institute for Human Rights.

D01 · Police outturn 2006-2025

Substantively checked: all 20 years' police/DUP outcomes; disciplinary entry series 2006-2025 with 1.454 numbered summary entries, including 124 in 2006-07 and 1.330 in 2008-25. The recovered 2006-07 copies at KRIM have 17+10 pages, all read as text, four pages visually checked in memory; binary identity with the authority copy unverified,2007 categories reconciled with report 1507 printed p.97. Complaints about police operational decisions 2018-2020 with outcomes/categories/timing errors;2019 has 55 delays for which regret had already been expressed in addition to 18 new criticism cases. Other operational-decision years not completed; the public annual series ceased after 2020. Judgment/person/response linkage and actual redress require registers. See politi-disciplin-2006-2007-originalkontrol.md and the other police/operational-decision modules.

Document / registry tracks: Attorney General / DUP / Police Commissioner.

D02 · Police unique employees

Material tested in the Disciplinary Module: 1.454 numbered summary items 2006-2025 (124 in 2006-07 + 1.330 in 2008-25) and separate DUP / penalty outcomes, individual cases with one employee and multiple responses. The anonymisation of the summaries and the various entities hinder national employee union. Rest: stable anonymous employee key and event / case coupling between DUP, Public Prosecutor, Judgment and Staff Decision; dedup both within and between years. See police disciplinary and liability accounts.md, PD05 with penalty fine DKK 3500 + disciplinary DKK 1000 same employee; no two-person calculation. New 2006-07 originals show similar employees in different posts and multiple employees in one post; no union of employees. News reports 77 / 46 and suspensions 5 / 9 are separate counting units. See Police Discipline-2006-2007-original control.md.

Document / registry tracks: DUP / National Police / Public Prosecutor.

D03 · Police recurrent errors

Substantive review findings: prolonged disciplinary proceedings, a case held in abeyance for two years, several cases closed due to elapsed time; a cyclist with Parkinson’s left>42 hours; a shared child removed by a police officer acting privately through colleagues; a refusal concerning pre-trial detention later overturned by judgment;2018-2020 dispositions involving unlawful handover of a car, unlawful collection of a child, reminders and delayed decisions. Identified summaries, responses and durations are reproduced. Full national follow-up of recurrence/payment/return home is missing; precise queries in the disciplinary/disposition modules. A new 2006-07 module has 124 specific record locators and four specific evidence/force/child chains PDH01-04. The report’s 55 selected criticism/regret cases exclude 3 known cases=58 known pool;31/38/69/31 per cent are rounded and not exact cells. An overall person/incident/redress union is still unpublished; copy authenticity and individual original judgments are local evidential gaps.

Document / registry tracks: DUP / Reich Police.

H01 · Patienterstatningen consistent series

Substantively checked annual originals 2006-2010: exact processing denominators/findings in parties’ favour/refusals, pharmaceutical classifications and amounts;77 tables 712 factual rows, all publication revisions retained. The 2009 original 6676/2298 changes in 2010 to 6733/2379;2007 internal 1488 vs 1495 acknowledged. Earlier 2006-25 register series and actual 2022 interest redress remain valid. Outstanding:2011 exact processing denominator, pharmaceuticals 2012, original 2011/2012 full-year documents and a common current revision. 2011/12ODA/official archive links found, but original figures not read; no denominator constructed from a rounded percentage.

Document / registry tracks: The patient's replacement.

H02 · Patienterstatningen public / private

Public/private hospital decisions 2006-2010 now substantively checked against originals;2006 five regions,20 tables,216 rows give public 1310 accepted/3755 decided and private 53/142.2007-10 coverage matrices, municipal schemes, specialist/tolerability rule and amounts scoped separately;2017/2021/2025 historical versions retained. Remaining: full public/private outcomes for all other years, organisational/individual responsibility linkage and person deduplication. Regional public financing of compensation for private harm is not public employment.

Document / registry tracks: The patient's replacement.

H03 · Unique replacement patients

Annual unique claimants 2006-11(both areas) and 2013-17(separate areas) previously checked against originals. New 2006-10 decision, child-example and amount matrices are not person counts;the 1996-2006 total of 21 findings in children’s favour must not be redated to the reporting period. Outstanding: annually/period-unique patients with recognised claims, age/disability, public/private and deduplication against complaints/appeals. Recalculation of 8744/8785 cases represents version layers; reopening/actual payment must be linked separately.

Document / registry tracks: The patient's replacement.

H04 · Health complaints 2006-2025

Partly substantively completed: activity and specific time versions for 2006-2025;exact criticism denominators in selected originals 2011-2012/2014-2017;the 2020 original has percentages,2021-2025 precise current aggregate categories. The 2014 supplement has 122 factual rows with denominator exclusions and profession/site components. See sundhedsaar-serier.md;sundhed-restudfald-udvidelse.md. Outstanding: exact original adverse outcomes for 2007-2010/2013/2018-2019,public/private status,employee/patient deduplication and complete criminal follow-up. Current migration exclusions are not a complete historical series. New PKNA10:scanned 2010 annual report,21 pages,six selected pages actually read visually in memory,3 original tables with 16 rows+6 own version rows. Contemporaneous 09/10 receipts of 3416/4147 and decisions of 3098/4247 differ from later statistics of 3294/3910 and 3094/4221;both versions retained. This concerns production/time,rather than the missing adverse-outcome categories. PKS06 original 2006 statistics have now been read as text for all 27 pages/visually checked for 8 pages;36 reader tables/328 numeric rows,567 criticism+2 prosecution requests+1648 no criticism=2217 excluding psychiatric appeals,including appeals 590+2+1713=2305. No additional count of unique people. See patientklager2006-originalkontrol-og-naevnerkritik.md and patientklager2006-originale-tabeller.md. Expanded SDN11FT:official Folketing HTML containing 34 pages actually read;2011 outcomes 1721/629/86/1=2437,reopenings 100=75+1+4+11+9. No image/PDF visual certification. This is the board’s annual report;the separate 2011 annual statistics are not automatically closed. See disciplinarnaevn2011-originale-udfald-og-bevismangler.md/.json. The same 2437 criticism matrix had already been checked within a delimited scope in sundhedsaar-serier.md;the full 34-page text expands methodology/case/evidence checking and reopenings,rather than a new population.

Document / registry tracks: The Patient Complaints Board.

H05 · Health complaints public / private

Partially completed: processing site / complaint, 2014 trade / place sub-decisions and 2021-2025 critical classes with separate denominators; selected references and criminal follow-up in historical originals. See health yearsery.md; health-residual-extension.md. Rest: full public / private division of employment, unique therapists / patients and connection to STPS supervision / current criminal convictions.

Document / registry tracks: Patient Complaints Board / Patient Safety Board.

H06 · Psychiatric compulsion 2006-2025

Partly substantively completed: national first-instance output and intervention outcomes 2011-2025 in source versions; regional originals North Denmark 2008-2010, Central Denmark 2009-2012 and Capital Region 2010-2012. Duration set-asides, formally unlawful approvals, mixed outcomes and 2024-2025 methodological discontinuities recorded. See psykiatrisk-tvang-udfald-2006-2025.md/.json. Outstanding: national/all regional first-instance outcomes 2006-2010, remaining detailed tables and unique patient/intervention linkage.

Document / registry tracks: Name House / Patient Complaints Board.

H07 · Forced tanks and court

Partly substantively completed: independent appeal-board annual originals 2014-2025 and 2013 entries/time viaA14, with parts/cases, revision conflicts and changes without automatic patient benefit. Historical PPKN counts partially overturned judgments as upheld; departure from the rule made visible. See psykiatrisk-tvang-udfald-2006-2025.md/.json. Outstanding: complete central appeal originals 2006-2013, direction of every change, overall court outcomes and case/person deduplication between instances.

Document / registry tracks: The Board of Patient Complaints / Court of Justice.

H08 · Forced cessation and injury

Substantively expanded with duration set aside at first instance/on appeal, specific CPT safeguards and all 6 pages of Rigsrevisionen's C117/25. The full target table per100.000 and new 30% target for 2030 checked; the former halving target concerns a different population. Closed oversight is not documented cessation/redress. Outstanding: intervention/case-record ID→order/relief→actual cessation and unlawful subperiod→unique patient/age/disability→harm/compensation/payment; hospitals' contemporaneous intervention and medication logs. See psykiatri-opfoelgning-2025-tid-tvang-og-rettigheder2026.md and the coercion module.

Document / registry tracks: Regions / Board / Patienterstatningen.

H09 · Accidental events 2006-2025

All 20 years have source-checked figures with different selections/versions. New original-year checking for 2007 and 2012:19 table/figure extracts/128 reader-table rows/59 factual rows. 2007 statistics/methodology/the full regional appendix checked in the 67-page original;2012Part 1 all 18 pages. 2007 primary 20368/secondary 19217/SAC3 353/summary58;2012 created 155791/completed 125870 versus sector average 106193. Internal discrepancies retained; no annual sum. Separate annual originals for 2009/2013 remain unobtained after documented primary-archive checks; no assertion of non-publication. Remaining tasks concern local 2014/15 contributions and old graphs without exact data cells. Deduplication of people, employment status and specific compliance/accountability require independent evidence. No inquiry has been sent. New DPSD12L/DPSD12D2:the learning appendix's complete 12 pages actually read as text;Part 2 PDF1-389; all substantive answer fields read,contact blocks/repetitive questions omitted from the RAM display from PDF55. PDF384 actually checked visually in RAM; no original files or images saved. 531 compact factual rows. See dpsd2012-del2-og-laeringsbilag.md/.json. Regional/hospital/cross-sector-analysis/private contributions overlap; no summed count of unique people/unlawfulness/employment. Part 2 and the learning appendix are now fully substantively read; other local 2014/15 contributions remain separate original-source tasks, rather than merely person-linkage tasks.

Document / registry tracks: Agency for Patient Safety / Health Quality Institute.

H10 · Child psychiatry by RR

Substantively completed for public follow-up C121/25:all 13 pages read, figures 1-2/table 1 checked visually.14 printed quarterly cells 2023K4-2025K2,75 processes=15 per region;72 capacity-delayed,45/71 informed,26 uninformed+one letter not located. Both original pages of Act 1762/2025 checked, new right/transition clarified. Outstanding: exact regional curve cells, figure 1 data-footnote explanation of 15.9.2024 versus 2025K2, national annual person union and actual treatment/parental loss/reparation. Register routes specified; no request sent. See psykiatri-opfoelgning-2025-tid-tvang-og-rettigheder2026.md.

Document / registry tracks: Regions / Rigsrevisionen.

G01 · Data Protection 2006- 2025

Original controlled 2006-17 in dissemination module as well as 2018- 25 in Data Protection -2018- 2025-extension.md / .json: 320 figures, 16 defined supervisory groups, 19 public fines, 3 appeals, 11 court documents date / operational outcome. Rest is concrete register: all completed public / private criticism / injunction / injunction, persons, actual compliance / payment; committee ≠ nationalalkorte; 2018 reform + version breach and RHbride separated. The road date of judgment not disclosed in follow-up.

Document / registry tracks: The Data Protection Agency.

G02 · GDPR public / private all years

Historical public participation 2006-2017 completed: state, county / region, municipality, permissions and miscellaneous; 2006-2010 public / private security cases. These are control records and not affected persons. Remaining: 2018- 2025 all government breaches, government types and data subjects per event, including personal dedup. See Data Protection -2006-2017-tal.json.

Document / registry tracks: The Data Protection Agency.

G03 · GDPR effective sanctions

Partly substantively completed: all 19 public authority/matter entries in the Data Protection Authority's published selection of fines followed to associated follow-up;11 judgment documents' dates/operative outcomes checked, other outcomes through fixed-penalty notices or open/undated. See datatilsyn-2018-2025-udvidelse.md/.json. The Region of Southern Denmark's two matters have a single shared judgment/fine; appeal retained. Outstanding: a complete national criminal-case register, final appeal outcomes, personal employee responsibility and actual compliance/redress.

Document / registry tracks: Data Protection Agency / Public Prosecutor / Courts.

R01 · Rigsrevisionen full list

Materially completed for the 2006-2023 main conclusions, ministerial columns, annual distributions and follow-up annexes; 2018@-@ 2023 both annual originals and 2021-2023 complete theme atoms. See National Audit Years -Historisk.md / json and rr-concrete-consequences- and -tables.md / json. 2024 / 25 annual originals and 20.11.2025 follow-up controlled in own modules. The 17 previous residue tables 2018T2-6 / T10,2019T2-4 / T7,2020T2-6,2021T1-2 are now textual / visually controlled: 86 rows / 165 numerical cells in the National Audit -2018- 2021-remaining -annual tables .md / .json. New report 11 / 2025 published 9.4.2026: all 54 pages + 4 pages of ministerial statement + 7 pages of note read, 80 factual rows and 84 municipal annexes; government audit posts 2026.md / json. Catalogue 796 entries since 2000 including 2026 are metadata, non-material controls. Concrete residues: other individual criticism / method figures 2006-17 and remaining special reports / opf. No error sum / person union; later effective termination / payment dates require separate notes / register coupling.

Document / registry tracks: Rigsrevisionen / State auditors.

R02 · Municipal supervision Table C 2024

Original substantively/visually examined: tableC adults rejected 2024=191, total 202 and examined 101; figure 5 rejected 270 versus 169 children+191 adults. No concealed cell correction. See daekning.md, original 18/2024, physicalPDF 44/printed 37. The documented source discrepancy is established as actually printed, but correction/raw data and the correct alternative cell value remain missing from Rigsrevisionen/Ankestyrelsen.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen / Rigsrevisionen.

R03 · Monitoring and responsibility

Partly substantively completed:18/2024 examines 1669 supervisory cases, excludes 154; four powers unused, response/follow-up have separate denominators of 545/498. Disability follow-up 2026 checked against originals with completed initiative tracks, continuing missing application/decision data and no documented direct effect. See daekning.md; handicap-tilsyn-opfoelgning-2026.md. Outstanding: other sanctions/litigation and person-linked actual compliance; closed oversight is not redress.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen / municipalities / Rigsrevisionen.

S01 · Tax office 2006-2025

Substantively expanded: all 12 original 2014-2025 outcome tables for five appeal bodies; 129099 closures/35759 wholly-partly favourable findings are decision entries. Historical 20 tables 86 rows supplemented by LSRH11/12:26 tables 154 rows with administrative 2009-2012 percentage matrices/exact N and complete 2009/2010 court outcomes. LSR06O:31 tables 146 rows, administrative 2006 groups, all relevant court outcomes, actual 11,6/corrected 10,7 months; upheld includes closures with potentially actual favourable findings. Our 55/283 outcomes favourable to individuals in 2006 litigation, including 18 by judgment, are not 55 judgments finding illegality. A specific primary-access investigation for 2007/2008/2013 is documented with 12 access results; no sought original outcome document recovered. Outstanding: administrative 2007/2008/2013 matrices; exact historical cell counts, remittal codes and hidden favourable findings; court outcomes 2007/2008; separate compensation outcomes 2006-08/2011-12; own-year originals 2009/2010 as independent versions. Union of people, actual repayment/interest/loss and individual responsibility require process linkage. FXTAX01/02 clarifies Article 6 by tax claim/sanction; no percentage back-calculation or cross-population sum. The new 31-page 2007 interim original LSRLEAN07 has been read in full as text in RAM, and PDF9/26/28/29 checked visually:5×3 backlog cells, 25 targets and 32 deadline/function rows. The minister acknowledges budget prioritisation and increasing time; the terms of reference require safeguards to be preserved. Planned written voting in the absence of a reply is not documented actual refusal of a hearing. Backlog/full-time equivalents/targets must not be counted as outcomes/people. See landsskatteretten2007-ledelsesviden-liggetid-og-procesplan.md/.json.

Document / registry tracks: Tax Appeals Board / National Tax Court.

S02 · Tax actual loss and liability

Outcomes and processing times 2014-2025 substantively checked in skatteklager-udfald-og-tid-2014-2025.md/.json. This does not close the separate loss/responsibility track: case-linked repayment/interest, consequences of debt collection, compensation and personnel responses remain missing; no national zero value or union of persons can be inferred from findings in parties' favour. New primary-source check of FOB 2007.525:40 cases closed in 2004, knowledge/response 2006-07; all 34 time-distribution rows and 4 expectation rows; final 15 criticisms of delay against provisional 16, as well as visible breaches of safeguards and the Ministry's undocumented premise that absence of lawsuits proves correctness. The 2004 events are not counted as new 2006-25 errors; specific reopenings/payment/responsibility remain missing. See landsskatteretten-2007-garantier-og-tidskritik.md. A new 31-page 2007 original midterm document LSRLEAN07 fully read as text in RAM and PDF9/26/28/29 visually checked:5×3 pending-case cells,25 targets and 32 deadline/function rows. The Minister acknowledges budget prioritisation and increasing time; the terms of reference require safeguards to be maintained. Planned written voting in the absence of a response is not documented actual refusal of an oral hearing. Pending cases/full-time equivalents/targets must not be counted as outcomes/persons. See landsskatteretten2007-ledelsesviden-liggetid-og-procesplan.md/.json.

Document / registry tracks: Tax administration / Attorney General / Courts.

U01 · Aliens 2006-2025

Partly completed: the Refugee Appeals Board's full 20 years of original core, spontaneous-asylum, reopening-request and time rows, and Dublin 2014-2025; the Immigration Appeals Board's 13 originals 2013-2025, exact outcomes 2013-2021, more recent rounded percentages. Outstanding: other FLN complaint types/children across 20 years, overall without-decision data from 2022, full union of persons, predecessors' immigration-appeal outcomes before 2013; actual residence/return and responsibility. 2021 reopening requests have a published total of 194 against a category sum of 205. See flygtningenaevn-udfald-og-personer-2006-2025.md and udlaendingenaevn-udfald-og-tid-2013-2025.md.

Document / registry tracks: Udlændingenævnet / The Refugee Board.

U02 · Foreigners actual intervention time

Partial substantive population: national board processing times in udlaendingenaevn-udfald-og-tid-2013-2025.md and flygtningenaevn-udfald-og-personer-2006-2025.md; specific reopening/return/residence links in UN A.H., Domina/Bendtsen and F.K., and statelessness/Court of Impeachment/GreenDesert sequences. Remaining: complete person-linked intervention/separation time and actual implementation for the entire national population; board processing time is not actual separation time.

Document / registry tracks: Udlændingestyrelsen / Home Travel Agency / Police.

N01 · Justice and detention

Substantively checked: DSK 2020-2025 and historical research 2013-2019 separately from the original series;Director of Public Prosecutions 2025 all 22 tables/317 rows and 2024. Solitary-confinement originals 2006-2023 and 2024:62 numeric tables/676 rows;19 child occurrences 2006-2017,rather than 19 unique children;2019 15 periods/13 people. LV 2006-2017 and 2020-2023 relevant originals with versions/methods;2008 revision and child remand 2008-2010 separately. LV reader appendix 109 tables/1079 numeric data rows;2019 statement's 4 original Folketing HTML pages actually read,including 16 omitted submissions;the appendix's 32 segments/371 rows separately marked as transcription checking.LV 2018 original's 8+15 pages have now been fully checked for content with 30 annual-version tables/363 rows;44 children in the letter versus 42 in tables are retained,and 1328 lengthy cases versus 1326 duration/outcome rows kept distinct. Only the LV 2019 appendix's 16 original PDF pages remain a specific acquisition task;the labelled secondary transcription does not replace original checking. Data before/after the 2021 methodological break must not be added uncritically. Under-15 series 2016-2023 and all legal findings 2021-2023;three original compensation case histories,actual partial payments and precise remaining tasks. 2025 liberty data,historical Klageretten originals,national person linkage and compensation/payment series remain missing.

Document / registry tracks: Court of Justice / Special Complaints Court / Attorney General.

N02 · Criminal services

Substantively checked: KF 2015/2023/2024 selected intervention, disciplinary, death/suicide and court tables actually read,45 tables/598 numerical-data rows with historical 2006-2024 cells, original footnotes and denominator/version discrepancies. Discipline concerns prisoners. The 2020 court methodology changes to final outcomes at each instance;2024 closed 141, status sum 148 retained. Handcuffs 2022 reporting scope, voluntary exclusion, restraints, death revisions and the 2024PBN transition examined. REU1157/2025 original,all 4 pages, documents no consolidated national UTH register; Øst does not retain reports after handling, Vest 38 manually counted for 1.4.24-1.6.25. Datatilsynet's 10.7.25 decision actually read;2026 follow-up is a plan, not a proved effect. Outstanding: all other annual originals/subtables, complaint cases/supervisory follow-up,2025 series, case/person/time/payment linkage and full legal scrutiny of each intervention. See kriminalforsorg-indgreb-proevelse-og-sundhedsblindhed.md and kriminalforsorg-originale-tabeller.md.

Document / registry tracks: The Department of Criminal Affairs / Ombudsman.

N03 · Equal treatment

Partly completed: original 2019-2025 name outcomes visually verified, newer historical departure rows back to 2018, source conflicts and concrete SA / CERD knowledge chain. Remains: original 2009- 2018 full denominators and predecessors 2006- 2008, all years of public / private division, unique persons, court order and actual payment. See equaltreatment- fallout -reductionandrestation.md / .json.

Document / registry tracks: Ligebehandlingsnævnet / the courts.

N04 · Environment, industry and other bodies

Partially populated: nine Nævnenes Hus originals 2017-2025, the NMKN original 2016 and Plan originals 2022-2024 with historical flows 2019-2024; time and sample differences, and all three Plan outcome figures visually verified. Remaining: original environment/nature/NMKN 2006-2015, annual outcomes separated by environment/planning 2017-2025, other business boards, people and actual redress. NH totals are not solely environmental cases. See miljoe-plan-udfald-tid-og-afgraensning.md/.json.

Document / registry tracks: Name's House / Business Authority.

N05 · Defence and intelligence

Partly completed: TET 34 originals and 651 factorial rows, all material control / follow-up / indirect inspection / time sections. Categories overlap and are not persons. Residues: control ID and natural / legal person, action start / finding / cessation / deletion, PET / FE / PNRs overlap and Wamberg 2006-2013registry. No request sent.

Document / registry tracks: Ministry of Defence / TET / FE / PET / Danish Parliament.

A01 · Ministerial and service responsibilities

Commission/accountability chains substantively checked: instruction case/impeachment, Tibet, statelessness, mink, Greenland interventions and the legally delimited 2026 section 16 exemption; disciplinary personnel responses and closed/amended cases separately. Specific commission findings/volumes/locators are reproduced in individual modules. A complete national catalogue of every ministerial/disciplinary accountability case and non-public final personnel decision remains a specific outstanding task; no general immunity is concluded. Specific protection from sanctions for adverse-incident reporting has been checked against originals:2003 section 6/2008 section 201,2011 guidance,the complete 2020 Act 1855 of 4 pages extending protection to those involved from 1.1.2021,2025 sections 200-202 and 406,the complete 2 pages. Protection arises from reporting, rather than general immunity for conduct; private hospitals are also covered. See sundhedsrapportering-sanktionsbeskyttelse-og-ansvar.md.

Document / registry tracks: Parliament / Ministries / Commissions.

A02 · Public / private liability comparison

Substantively completed legal matrix and specific time/action comparisons: §§ 155-157/261/215/260, ministerial responsibility, ECHR responsibility and damages each have their own conditions. A public employee in a private role, family removal, unjustified arrest, a private taxi driver's acquittal on grounds of self-defence and a specific public/disciplinary sanction are compared in the discipline module. Statutory sentencing ranges for private persons are not sentences actually imposed in an unknown case. Administrative invalidity/errors concerning legal authority and criminal abduction each require their own body of evidence. Individual comparable judgments and all elements of culpability/action must be produced before further personal responsibility is established. Three original judgments concerning private persons from 2017 now actually read: the same single case concerning a mother/maternal grandmother and one child, both acquitted under § 215; the prosecutor's requested sentence of 2-3 months is not a sentence imposed. The judgments delimit parental responsibility/dispute/residence and proof of knowledge. The ECLI publication year 2022 is not the judgment year 2017; the contact/return sequences in testimony are not independently verified logs. See privat-boernebortfoerelse-originaldom-og-anklage.md. Now the 2022 original private-person judgment document AM 2022.06.16V, all 6 pages read:37 d between dates→40 d suspended/60 h community service, the other defendant acquitted. The reproduced family-law reasoning criticises the initial basis but upholds it with reference to subsequent stay/time; the full separate family-law file/original evidence is required. See privat-unddragelse-2022-straf-tid-og-myndighedspraemisser.md. UTH protection and the scope shared by public/private actors, independent other evidence and the period of responsibility have now been examined in a separate module with 6 primary legal sources. The protection against sanctions must be included specifically and must not be extended to general permission for unlawful family separation.

Document / registry tracks: Court / Public Prosecutor / Personnel Administration.

A03 · Green Desert primary certificates

Materially controlled Green Desert: full Supreme Court judgment 35 pages and identified EMDtesting; separate knowledge, transfer, damage and evidence chain. The 2004 operation is historical; the subsequent 2006-2025 review is part of the period. The evidence, evidence, grounds and the state's well-known denied liability shall be parted. All simultaneous operational orders and individual injury / transfer documents not published / provided in this report; actual original documentation requirements in green-deserts proof-time and liability.

Document / registry tracks: Ministry of Defence / Courts.

I01 · UN Treaty Committees

Lists completed and checked against originals: 20 periodic observations, 265 individual decision documents/263 communication numbers in 2006-2025 and five in 2026. 57 favourable opinions on the merits, a separate CAT Article 22 violation in a rejected case; mixed CCPR rejection/partial discontinuance separately. Outstanding: all State replies and actually updated follow-up for each favourable case, a full union of individuals and three date/version points. See fn-kontrolkatalog-udvidet.md and fn-individuelle-klagesager.md.

Document / registry tracks: OHCHR / relevant Danish ministries.

I02 · UPR

2011 / 2016 / 2021: 620 numbered recommendations and acceptance / version checks. 2026 feather cycle: all 26 + 21 + 10 + 10 = 67 pages in A / HRC / 63 / 10 and WG.6 / 52 / DNK / 1-3 actual RAM read; 265 numbers comment.174 supported + 91 recorded are verified in FNautomatic meeting printout 25.9.2026, explicitly not official protocol or individual written response. A / HRC / 63 / 10 / Add 1 continued not to be provided after 6 tested routes; no artificially recommended acceptance mapping. Actual compliance / personal effect requires separate evidence. See uppr2026 -full -originals -and -afterlife-given.md / .json.

Document / registry tracks: OHCHR / Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

I03 · CPT

Complete visit/reply list: six visits/reports and seven State replies in 2006-2025. CPT/Inf(2013)11 now read fully and visually in the original:31 pages,31 paragraphs answered and 30 numerical/time rows;2010/11 disciplinary corrections,2012 complaint/duration counts and specific health/contact-data deficiencies. Outstanding: other replies beyond sections actually read, the original URL for the 2020 partial reply, full actual compliance, individual cases/person deduplication and redress. See cpt-kontrolkatalog-udvidet.md and cpt-2013-dansk-svar-fuld-originalkontrol.md.

Document / registry tracks: CPT / Ministry of Justice of the Council of Europe.

I04 · EMD full case register

All 59 English judgment records and 110 English decisions in the public HUDOC register checked against originals; finality, 57 judgment-case groups, 24 final violation cases and 16 closed/eight open executions as of 7.10.2026. All 11 distinct closure resolutions checked against originals for date. Decisions cover 136 application numbers and at least 846 person occurrences before overlap. Outstanding: anonymised cross-case union of individuals and full actual individual redress in every case; unpublished single-judge rejections have no public person register. See hudoc-beslutnings-og-personregnskab.md and emd-fuldbyrdelse-regnskab.md.

Document / registry tracks: HUDOC / Committee of Ministers.

I05 · EMD non-distributed complaints

20 years of legally allocated / communicated / refused- deleted / sentenced complaints are originally controlled in the subject-complaints -2006- 2025.md / .json; 2006 the original has also 108 submitted. The rest is concrete: all pending and administrative non-compliance with Danish country code 2006-2025. No fully published country series is established; requires EMDRegister extraction. The difference between administered and distributed from different cohorts must not be assumed to be the counter.

Document / registry tracks: EMD Registry.

Z01 · 2026 separate status

Partly substantively completed with separate 2026 events and 2025 publications: UN5 part-year decisions, ECtHR finality, disability follow-up, Greenland reparation/law, FEII expected 2028, stateless persons Supreme Court, current municipal/monthly and health-register versions. See module dates and introduction. Outstanding: full inventory and content check of all relevant part-year publications as at7. October 2026; no full 2026 year constructed, and a 2026 publication concerning 2025 is not counted as a new 2026 event.

Document / registry tracks: Each registry authority.

Z02 · Overlap cards and national union

Partial substantive overlap check: ECtHR59 records→57 sequences and 63 application numbers; UN265 documents→263 communication numbers, F.K. person union locally; regional/national retrospectives, case/partial decision and repeated review/payment phases kept separate. Senior pension 2024 formal-error/overturning union of 338 is documented. Remaining: common case/person keys across all sectors/years, period-unique children/parents/employees and a national error/injured-person union. Partial unions yield no national total.

Document / registry tracks: Each registry authority / Statistics Denmark.

K08 · Practice surveys of the Regional Board before 2013

Partial substantive review: Beskæftigelsesankenævnet Midtjylland social-assistance cessations 2012,17 main tables and 42 municipal rows with all published figures.80 cases,76 hypothetical alterations/remittals,4 correct; already appealed and previously examined cases excluded. Original table discrepancies and a destruction plan documented. See regionale-naevn-midtjylland-kontanthjaelp2012.md/.json. Other available regional originals still require processing; a complete historical register and actual repayment are separate data needs.

Document / registry tracks: Ankestyrelsen / formerly State Administration / National Archives.

N06 □ The Youth Crime Board

Partly substantively completed: all seven annual reports 2019-2025 read for entries, principal/new decisions, appeal outcomes, deadlines, duration, specific return home and errors also in upheld cases. 358 appeal decisions, 88 wholly/partly amended/set aside; version discontinuities and denominators retained. See ungdomskriminalitetsnaevn-2019-2025.md/.json. Not published exactly in the sources read: 2019 re-entry, full court-outcome series, unique children/parents and appeal-linked actual return-home date. A precise case-record/person query is set out. Remaining original-source check: other detailed tables and the Youth Probation Service's independent supervision/responsibility sources.

Document/register trail: Court Administration / Youth Crime Board / Youth Probation Service.

Final cover audit: 59 areas and 43TaskForce programme

Updated October 7, 2026 against the finished material modules. This accounts closes completed reading tasks; it does not state that undelivered originals, unpublished raw cells or missing person / repair couplings are completed. An access error doesn't prove unpublished. Meta data recording does not prove content control.

Balanced original reading versions

K04: Placing 2006 / 2008 / 2009, involvement 2011 and relocation / return 2011 are now reviewed throughout the known originals: 63 + 73 + 94 + 107 + 65 pages. The published cohorts 101 / 143 / 125 / 121 / 81 are kept separately; no collective union is formed. AS 2010 is a further 56 pages / 18 tables / 325 rows; 2007 / 2008 effectuations 3693 / 3502 and 3253 stoppages including 18 years are precisely delimited. UPR 2026 s four basic originals are fully read 67 pages; written reply / Add 1 is not provided separately. DPSD2012Part 2 all 389 pages material response fields and 12 pages are reviewed: 531 factorial rows, not a new personal cohort.

TaskForce:28 of 43 central trajectories have at least one checked analysis/status original;15 have no such original obtained. Five other schemes are separate. Checking a final report does not automatically resolve a missing baseline or actual redress for citizens. All current phase statuses and routes tested are in taskforce-daekningsafstemning.md/.json.

Current control and residue of the 59 areas

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
K01	Municipal complaints 2006-2016	An exact national full-year outcome cell for 2013 does not appear in the three transition documents now checked against originals; a data/register query is required.	Substantively checked: national 2006/2012 originals, all 43 pages/13 tables/262 rows;2006 social appeals boards with 28043 closed/24915 merits/6393 overturnings,2012 SN/BAN35496/32066/8202.2006 percentage denominator is all closures; from 2007 merits cases.2007-2011 national boards and 2014-2016 portal version checked separately. Local 2006 legislative subset 9417 overlaps the national report and is not an additional national population;819/818 and integration 6/5 retained. The national 2013 transition row and person/reconsideration/effect linkage are still missing. The official archive overview labelled 2013 does not link a2013 outcome table; this does not prove that data never existed. New actual 2013 original verification: scanned SFV13H20 pages, read 1-8/15/19-20, and SFV13A29 pages, read 1-13/25-29, contain 16.780 first-half-year decisions=7.696BAN+9.084SN; all 27 case-area/subtotal rows with regional cells reproduced. AS13A34 pages, read 1-20, states approximately 11.000 municipal appeals, a rounded figure rather than exact annual outcomes. The first-half-year count gap is closed; complete four-outcome 2013 data, transferred file keys/second instance/people/effects remain outstanding. See ankestatistik-2013-overgang-originale-maal-og-naevnere.md/.json.	Personal / re-assessment training and actual performance
K02	Municipal complaints 2025	No residue in 26 groups published 2025 portal outcomes	Filled for the 26 eligible municipal law groups: 2025 reality 22927, city 15505, modified 1767, home 5655, rejected 2755. Disposal / re-evaluation / persons are not covered; primary portal + compact JSON in municipal module.	Reconsideration, individuals and actual redress
K03	Local authority re-evaluation	National re-assessment series and local full register missing. Copenhagen 2014 known 8 pages annexes are reviewed; exact raw outcome matrix is not printed in the read annex. UDK 2021 now all 90 pages reviewed.	Partial substantive check: Varde 2023/Q1 2024; Copenhagen Social Services 2009-2014 and BIF 2023-2024; UDK 2021 before/after check; AS 2026 workflows separately. National reconsideration series and a full local publication register are missing. Overlap and specific data requests: g envurdering-og-klagepopulationer.md/.jso n. Now FOB inspection 2006 original sections 4.2.4-4.2.5 read at physical pages 68-74:18/40 missed deadlines,9/25 social services and 9/15BIF; at least 8 missing notifications overlap with missed deadlines. Other waiting times deducted; an earlier oral appeal not recorded and resetting of internal receipt treated separately. See the 2006 annex module. Supplemented by koeben havn-klager2014-fuldt-bilag-og-udfaldsgr ænser.md/.json:2256 considered on the merits+598 on procedural grounds;642/584 conflicts with 598 and 6,9%;only table 7 provides 12 exact annual figures.	Municipal reassessment log, complaint ID and subsequent progress

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
K04	Practical examinations 2006-2025	None of the 21 specific entries of the original reading / sub-table remains are now unread; all are completed in k 04-diff-original restregister.md / .js on. BarnetsReform 2012 main report / care flight 2014 Part 3 and FKU 2012 named attachments are not obtained after precise search / archive / access attempts. Unknown national raw cells and individual repair couplings are separate data requirements.	Five historical originals now fully read as text: placement 2006 all 63 pages/32 tables 174 rows;2008 all 73 pages/44 tables 265 rows;2009 all 94 pages/41 tables+2 methodology blocks 263 rows; participation 2011 all 107 pages/31 main tables+4 municipal annexes+3 figure/prose blocks 224 rows; relocation/return home 2011 all 65 pages/28 tables+1 figure,120 factual rows and 23 local example IDs. The same earlier 101/143/125/121/81 cohorts, no additional error total. Local case-ID deduplication 32/38/38/45/23 is not a union of persons across reports. Further completed originals: UDK 2021 all 90 pages/15 tables 91 rows/16 case codes;rehabilitation 2014 all 112 pages/31 main+2 municipal tables and 7 figures=40 blocks 201 rows/18 case codes;day club 2025 all 58 pages/9 blocks 78 rows;work placement 2014 all 103 pages/32 tables+8 figure/methodology blocks 185 rows/16 case codes;sanctions 2016 all 142 pages/30 tables+7 figures/47 case codes. Assets 2014 and flex jobs 2010:previous specific municipal/subtable gaps supplemented without claiming all earlier prose/rule pages fully read. Submission/exclusion/already-appealed, raw missing cells and actual redress are independent data requirements. The later combined 21-row list is now completed:flex jobs 2006, psychiatric pension 2007, sanctions 2015, reassessment 2015, assessment of young people’s eligibility 2015, pension 2015, few hours 2016, pension without 2019, BPA 2023, origin 2023, lost earnings 2022, main+annex,company work placements 2022, main+annex,contact 2016, force 2018, additional expenses 2014, sickness benefits 2016, dementia 2015 and sanctions 2024, main+annex. PEN06 all 59 pages supplemented with all 20 blocks 108 rows. SAN17/22/23, other provider 2013, AES 2023, UDK 2022, contact 2020 and pension 2025 also completed in the named separate modules. Foster families 2014 parts 1/2/4+summary,all 108 pages/40 numbered tables/61 blocks 373 rows; FKU 2012 all 20 pages/22 tables+3 reconciliations 142 rows. Specific main originals not obtained:Child’s Reform 2012 and foster placement moves 2014 part 3 and FKU 2012 named annexes. Not automatically non-publication. Survey/family/interview/case-file-sample cohorts kept separate. Last specific retrieval: CDX wildcard ast.dk/publikationer/*barnets* and *plejefamilie* both returned 503; archive.org/wayback/available returned 429 for three guessed publication routes, which are not verified catalogue IDs, without repeated calls. The old	Dissorted / already-anketI D, overlap and actual new decision

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			ask.dk / publications-overview redirected and webadgang gave 500; SL robots.txt / sitemap.xml gave 404. Targeted Folketing- searches 2012 / 2013 / 2014 and SLsearches on the Child's Reform / Moving did not find these main originals. None of the errors prove undisclosure. A separate 2013 family / network survey with 252 cases does not replace 120 / 12 or 57 / 20.	
K05	Children's Day Barometer and Practice Check	2019 pilot all 42 + 6 + 20 pages and power 2018 all 85 pages including 20 raster attachments are fully read. No specifically assigned readable original page has been left unread. Other unknown practice checks are further inventory / procurement sscopy.	Partial substantive verification: child case barometers 2020-2024 and the use-of-force practice check 2018 (46 interviews/7 municipalities; 96 participant occurrences, no error count). Pilot 2019 is now fully checked against the originals:42+6+20 pages,228 unappealed cases/12 municipalities,18 main figures divided into 19 denominator subsets/67 category rows,12 municipality methodology rows and 17 municipal figures/204 rows.115 family treatment+113 placements (4 compulsory);198 cases/248 checked notifications.70 assessment errors,64 deadline errors,99 interview errors,52 plan errors, each with its own denominator; no error/person union. Obtaining the 2019 originals is completed; exact submission/exclusion counts, the direction of two consultation changes and actual redress/person linkage remain missing. See boernesagsbarometer-pilot2019-originalk ontrol.md, -originale-tabeller.md and -originale-tal.json. The 2025 barometer is not in the current catalogue; the official 2026 plan describes the first new edition under the Child's Act. All published 2020-24 municipal annexes have now actually been read:2059 municipal rows in boernebarometer-kom munebilag-2020-2024.md. All case-type annexes 2021-24 actually read, retaining original denominator discrepancies. BB 2020: all 17 raster tables checked visually and registered. See the annual modules and boerneba rometer-pause-og-nye-kontroller.md. The complete practice-check inventory and other originals are missing. See boernesagsbarometre-2020- 2024.md/.json and praksistjek-magtanvend else-2018.md/.json. Use of force 2018: all 85 pages now actually reviewed, including visual review of raster annexes 66-85 and tablePDF63:5 blocks,67 rows in praksis-magt2018-fuld e-originaltal-og-erkendte-garantiprobleme r.md/.json.46 interviews/15 interviews with relatives are not national incidents/people; the original did not assess quality/legality.	Case/person deduplication and actual redress

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
K06	Task force children and disabilities	15 central course without provided analysis / status original. The names, phase and specific tested access tracks can be found in 43 votes; separate	Central 2024 directory: 43 courses / 42 municipal names; 28 with at least one materially controlled analysis / status original and 15 without	All selections/exclusions, person overlap, actual cess ation/reunification/responsi bility

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
		the absence of phase originals is also indicated.	obtained such an original following specific municipal/archive trails. These are not 28 fully completed courses. All currently obtained necessary main-text/annex originals in the named TaskForce modules have now been substantively reviewed, including KK 2020 all 48 pages, Odsherred 2023 all 44 pages and Sorø children 2024/2026 all 42+27 pages. Other schemes kept outside 43:LTK adults 80 pages;Egedal child disability 119 pages;Sorø adults 119 pages;Nordfyn adults 103 pages;Frederikssund adults 133 pages. The phases and specific procurement routes tried are recorded in taskforce-daekningsafstemning.md/.json. Initial/final originals not obtained must not be called unpublished solely because of access errors. Exclusion, union of persons and actual cessation/redress are separate register/file requirements;2026 final reports have not been redated to 2006-25.	
K07	A's own decisions are overruled	Remaining judicial / reopening outcome of historical annual originals	Substantively completed for selected court/oversight trajectories and AS 2019-2021 litigation denominators:3541 closed registrations at instances, not 3541 unique people or successful claims. The 2021 original table 2.12 has been read; it contains no outcome breakdown. Specific orders/relief, remittals and responsibility have been examined in the court, return-home and compensation modules. Outstanding: all 20 years of administrative case→court instance→outcome→actual reconsideration/payment/return home; judgments/judicial closures and individuals must be deduplicated. See the court section of module T01. New AS13A original table 7/PDF13:665 outcomes in favour of authorities among 704 judgments delivered in 2013, visually checked. Our difference of 39 represents other outcomes,not 39 unique people/full relief/unlawful placements. All 39 outcomes/judgment IDs/individuals and actual effects still require linkage.	Case-law of the Court of First Instance

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
T01	Complaint processing time 2006-2025	Past years time / free margins other than controlled cuts	Materially extended: Historical denominator time 2008- 2013 and the National Audit Control 2014- 2025; Original Annual Reports 2019 / 2021- 2025, Case Reports 2020- 2022 and Months 2025- 2026.14 original tables / 200 numerical dataer.13 → 30 weeks modified targets; 2025 ca 35; deadlines / recasting dates / exclusions and version deviations separately. Four 2014 citizen's programme, remitted penalty 97 dcomplaint → decision and 44 / 53 dstep differences to printed 8 / 5 weeks. Residues: original time / temptation of all previous years, complete	Individual rest time, municipal retreatment and actual losses

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			reopening/person union and actual loss/redress; averages are not national error/citizen counts. See ankestyrelsen -tid-kontrolmaal-og-faktisk-beskyttelse.md and the time-reading annex. New AS13A/SFV13H/SF V13A original verification:19 time/service targets, regional 2013 targets/waiting/idle time and historical AS06-13 flow cells reproduced. AS13 table 9 excludes merger-related cases:18.607 under 12 months+1.262 over=19.869 against prose 21.347;parts 11.371+3.041+6.935 confirm 21.347. 94,1% must not represent the entire population. SFV13H unweighted 24,6BAN/23,6SN differs from AT02;versions retained. Exact inclusions/exclusions and actual redress for citizens remain outstanding. New 31-page 2007 interim original LSRLEAN07 read fully as RAM text and PDF9/26/28/29 visually checked:5×3 stock cells,25 targets and 32 deadline/function rows. The Minister acknowledges budget prioritisation and increasing time; the terms of reference require safeguards to be retained. Planned written voting in the absence of a reply is not documented actual denial of an oral hearing. Stocks/full-time equivalents/targets must not be counted as outcomes/people. See landsskatteretten200 7-ledelsesviden-liggetid-og-procesplan.m d/.json.	
T02	After remittal for reconsider ation back	Other published efficacy studies / annual originals not obtained	Partial: 2013 report on 2012 execution 131 adult cases + 202039 shipping cases. National annual cohorts and actual new outcomes are missing; see municipal complaints -expansion.md.	Remittal for reconsideration to new decision / payment / physical change
T03	Actual cessation and reunification	Specific non-delivered original logs / files in the case modules	Specific histories substantively checked: four families with actual return home and support/contact dates in boern-kontakt-fri hed-og-hjemgivelsesbeviser; procedural remittal/suspensive effect in hjemvisning-hjemgivelse-og-midlertidig-b eskyttelse without automatic actual return home. Suldrup: two children returned upon release according to the mother’s court testimony as reproduced; status conclusion 875 days later, early part-payments documented, final payment unknown. Three-year-old disabled child, 961 days to a favourable finding, actual access/payment unknown. National remittal→actual return-home/register linkage not published here; specific demand for contact/residence/benefit/payment logs.	Domestic remittal to actual return home/contact/payment

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
P01	Placing in place from 2006 to 2010	The 2006 start-up cell and audit / unit coupling are not established in the read historical section.	Partially populated:2007-2010 actually implemented placements of 0-17-year-olds in AS 2010 figure 1.1=3693/3502/3254/2864; current ANBIVS1 all ages 2011-25 fully extracted. BU20/21 decision populations 2006-17 checked separately. Remaining: original 2006 implementations, unit/version linkage;	Individual implementation / decision coupling

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			DST/AS historical register and revision dates. AS 2010 entire 56-page original now fully read:all 18 numbered tables/38 numerical blocks 325 rows in anbringelsesstatistik2010-origina le-tabeller.md/.json. Implementations 2007/08=3693/3502, not the reverse; versions/decisions/year-end kept separate.	
P02	Duration and return of employment	No published 2016-25 return-home/completed-duration dimension found in 44 table metadata records checked; research register extract required.	Partly completed: all reason rows for cessation in 2007-15 across three AS original versions;BIS66 duration 2006-09;BU25 changes 2014-18 and BU32 breakdowns 2013-16. Reasons may overlap;cessation at age 18 is not reunification. Outstanding: public cessation/duration aggregates for 2006 and 2016-25,actual returns home and interventions following errors. Register inquiry specified;none sent. New-publication check:44 relevant active/inactive table metadata sets and every dimension read among 5737 catalogue entries. Only BIS66 has duration status for 2006-09;BIS7 closures 2001-05 predate the period;no published 2016-25 return-home/completed-duration dimension within scope. Research registers describe precisely cessation/move destination;data must be obtained there. See dst-offentlig-hjemgivelses-og-varighed sdaekning.md/.jsonmetadata. AS 2010,the complete 56-page original,has now been fully read.3253 cessations include 2280 at age 18 even with continuing aftercare,rather than 3253 returns home.69% same placement type=1079/1560 sibling groups,not a proportion of individuals or proof of the same physical location. Original total/percentage conflicts and recalculated aftercare are retained in the AS 2010 reader module.	2006 and 2016- 25 termination / duration extracts from research registers and errors to actual return
P03	Unique Malfu nctioning Children and Parents	No national publicly established source of error in the controlled tables	Method and source verification: national case errors → unique children / parent roles → effective reunification has not been published in the controlled tables. Determined 2011 bug cases and VIVE-return selection have been documented; no multiplication with population or two-parent-pr- child. Rest: unidentified complaint ID / decision ID → BU AH / BUAF → CPR / parent role and event dates at DST / AS / municipalities.	Afidentified complaint / determine lsse- / CPR / parentrelleforinging-

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
P04	Handicapvo ksne 2006-2025	Early other performance series and precise rejection population	Partly completed: HAND02A 2018- 2025 and unique NYT populations separately; HANDBIL 2011- 2025, 2010refusal, time and 2025 retreatment controlled. New original controls close the car authorisation 2006-2010: five AS-year-originals' concrete flow and allocation tables and the 2010 method read in RAM. Original	Discharge / error / disability / person coupling

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			purchase series 2006-2009: 2.956/2.479/2.249/1.873; HB10 revised 2006-2010: 2.964/2.699/2.309/1.916/1.898. Retrospective reports for 2007 and HB08's printed 5.802 against our sum of 5.805 are retained. Board 2010: 382 + 66 excluded = 448 known decisions, not people. Awards, full/partial refusals, reconsideration and complaints have different denominators. Outstanding: other disability-benefit series for 2006-2017 and all refusals, unique documented victims of errors and effective redress 2006-2025. Register routes RA12705/12706 identified; individual data not extracted.	
P05	Handicapre gaster quality 2025	Fully published audit accounts not provided	Substantively reconciled:115.909 reproduced exactly as the HAND02A2025K4 sum of 23 benefits×9 age groups×3 sexes; recipients of multiple benefits overlap. NYT88.400 are unique recipients. Metadata on cells and missing Aarhus/Holstebro data documented. Outstanding: full revision account, missing municipal benefits and evidence of the effect on the unique-person total; DST data request specified.	DSTaudits and impact on unique person total
P06	Copenhagen 2019 information	Original correction tables / versions for Copenhagen 2019 not provided	Partly completed: DST's concrete Copenhagen 2019 variabel deficiencies, system shift 2020 and ongoing historical fixes source controlled. NYT version 13.600 / 2.624 against current 13.435 / 2.501 retained; 165 / 123 differences cannot be attributed to Copenhagen alone. Remaining: exact rows / extent / decryption of the deficiency and date / version of the post-correction at DST / Copenhagen; no source-based zero assumption.	DST / Copenhagen reporting and decoding logs
P07	Forced children	Additional detailed statutory originals under scheme	Partly completed: BU03A all legal bases 2006-10; ANB6 all four categories 2011-25 and ANBIVS4 start-up basis 2011-25; new / older encoding and automatic registry assumptions checked. The others are not optional and zeros prior to separate reporting are not absences. Residual: individual under-distribution SEL65 / 75 / 76, criminal law, UNKN / Aliens / BLs and actual simultaneous home decisions; the validity of the legal basis cannot be proved on the register label.	Contemporary / collective / emergency basis per child

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
O01	Encoding of the Ombudsma	All other basic FOB originals	Partially completed: 2006-2025 years series for completed file cases and criticism / recommendation / recommendation as well as specific FOB 2018- 26, Egely 2011 and FOB 2018- 33 with source, time and person delineation. See below. Md and boern-contact-freedom-and-return	Citizen / error / sanction / construction union

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			ser.md. Rest: all basic originals, full critical encoding, persons and overlap with other complaint systems; no national personal union.	
O02	OPCAT and in stitutions	National OPCATT Visits Register and other Visits / Answers originals	Partial original coverage: specific Ombudsman investigations/Egely in boer n-kontakt-frihed-og-hjemgivelsesbeviser. md. The complete CPT/Inf(2013)11 original states Danish supervision in Nuuk in 1993/1999/2001/2006, September 2013 planned; over 1000 OPCAT-eligible institutions/~75 planned visits annually from 2013 and a Greenland NPM psychiatric visit in March 2012 under Act 8/2009§ 17. This is the State's contemporaneous information, not a complete national OPCAT register or substantive reading of the mentioned visit reports. Remaining: all 2006-2025 visits, findings, recommendations, actual follow-up and person overlap; CPT kept separate. See cpt -2013-dansk-svar-fuld-originalkontrol.md.	Monitoring of actual change of action / person / responsibility
D01	Police outage 2006-2025	All 20 disciplinary years are now registered; 2006 / 07KRIMcopies read 17 + 10 pages. Official binary identity is an authentication residue, not unread copies pages.	Substantively checked: all 20 years' police/DUP outcomes; disciplinary entry series 2006-2025 with 1.454 numbered summary entries, including 124 in 2006-07 and 1.330 in 2008-25. The recovered 2006-07 copies at KRIM have 17+10 pages, all read as text, four pages visually checked in memory; binary identity with the authority copy unverified,2007 categories reconciled with report 1507 printed p.97. Complaints about police operational decisions 2018-2020 with outcomes/categories/timing errors;2019 has 55 delays for which regret had already been expressed in addition to 18 new criticism cases. Other operational-decision years not completed; the public annual series ceased after 2020. Judgment/person/response linkage and actual redress require registers. See p oliti-disciplin-2006-2007-originalkontrol.m d and the other police/operational-decision modules.	Event / staff / DUP / d om / staff union
D02	Police unique employees	No official stable employee key for deduplication; 1.454 numbered summary items are not 1.454 employees.	Material tested in the Disciplinary Module: 1.454 numbered summary items 2006-2025 (124 in 2006-07 + 1.330 in 2008-25) and separate DUP / penalty outcomes, individual cases with one employee and multiple responses. The anonymisation of the summaries and the various entities hinder national employee union. Rest: stable anonymous employee key and event / case coupling between DUP, Public Prosecutor, Judgment and Staff Decision; dedup both within and between years. See p. Politietsdiscipline- and liability accounts.md, PD05 with penalty fine 3500 kr. + disciplinary 1000 kr. same employee; no two-person calculation. New 2006-07 originals show similar employees in different posts and multiple employees in one post; no union of employees. News reports 77 / 46 and suspensions 5 / 9 are separate counting units. See Police Discipline-2006- 200 7-original control.md.	Stable anonymous employee key, incidents and sanctions

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
D03	Police behind the flaws	Original final judgments / staff decisions in the coordinated summaries may require consultation; 20 years of summary content have been reviewed.	Substantive scrutiny findings: prolonged disciplinary proceedings, a two-year case on hold, several cases closed because of elapsed time; a cyclist with Parkinson's left>42 hours; a shared child removed by an officer acting privately through colleagues; a remand-compensation refusal later overturned by judgment;2018-2020 police actions involving unlawful handover of a car, unlawful collection of a child, reminders and delayed decisions. Identified summaries, responses and durations are reproduced. Full national follow-up on recurrence/payment/return home is missing; precise inquiries appear in the disciplinary/police-actions modules. A new 2006-07 module has 124 specific entry locators and four concrete evidence/force/child chains PDH01-04. The report's 55 selected criticism/regret cases exclude 3 known cases=58 known pool;31/38/69/31 percent are rounded rather than exact cells. A consolidated count of unique people/incidents/redress is still unpublished; copy authenticity and individual original judgments remain local evidential tasks.	Recurrence, effective payment / termination and execution of penalties
H01	Clinical trial consistent series	Original 2011 / 12 full-year documents not provided / read after documented ODA / official / archive tracks; no verified readable original stands as unread.	Substantively checked annual originals 2006-2010: exact processing denominators/findings in parties' favour/refusals, pharmaceutical classifications and amounts;77 tables 712 factual rows, all publication revisions retained. The 2009 original 6676/2298 changes in 2010 to 6733/2379;2007 internal 1488 vs 1495 acknowledged. Earlier 2006-25 register series and actual 2022 interest redress remain valid. Outstanding:2011 exact processing denominator, pharmaceuticals 2012, original 2011/2012 full-year documents and a common current revision. 2011/12ODA/official archive links found, but original figures not read; no denominator constructed from a rounded percentage.	Year / person coupling and actual payment
H02	Patient record public / private	The other years' full public / private outcomes are a registries / t assessment requirement; the 2006-10 extensions of the originals have been carried out.	Public/private hospital decisions 2006-2010 now substantively checked against originals;2006 five regions,20 tables,216 rows give public 1310 accepted/3755 decided and private 53/142.2007-10 coverage matrices, municipal schemes, specialist/tolerability rule and amounts scoped separately;2017/2021/2025 historical versions retained. Remaining: full public/private outcomes for all other years, organisational/individual responsibility linkage and person deduplication. Regional public financing of compensation for private harm is not public employment.	Public employment, organisational / individual error, personal union
ID	**Zone**	**Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs**	**Actual control and accuracy number limitations**	**Case / person / e required power coupling;**
H03	Special allowances	Remaining year-unique recognised patient populations require separate original / registry basis, not	Year-sunt notifiers 2006-11 (both areas) and 2013@-@ 17 (split areas) previously originally controlled. New 2006-10	Recognised patient, age / disability and complaint / cashing

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
		number decisions.	decision, child-example and amount matrices are not person counts;the 1996-2006 total of 21 findings in children’s favour must not be redated to the reporting period. Outstanding: annually/period-unique patients with recognised claims, age/disability, public/private and deduplication against complaints/appeals. Recalculation of 8744/8785 cases represents version layers; reopening/actual payment must be linked separately.	
H04	Health care 2006-2025	Original Critical Outcome 2007- 10 / 2013 / 2018- 19 not fully obtained; 2006 autostatistics 27 pages now actually controlled	Partly substantively completed: activity and specific time versions for 2006-2025;exact criticism denominators in selected originals 2011-2012/2014-2017;the 2020 original has percentages,2021-2025 precise current aggregate categories. The 2014 supplement has 122 factual rows with denominator exclusions and profession/site components. See sundhedsaar-serier.md;sundhed-restudfald-udvidelse.md. Outstanding: exact original adverse outcomes for 2007-2010/2013/2018-2019,public/private status,employee/patient deduplication and complete criminal follow-up. Current migration exclusions are not a complete historical series. New PKNA10:scanned 2010 annual report,21 pages,six selected pages actually read visually in memory,3 original tables with 16 rows+6 own version rows. Contemporaneous 09/10 receipts of 3416/4147 and decisions of 3098/4247 differ from later statistics of 3294/3910 and 3094/4221;both versions retained. This concerns production/time,rather than the missing adverse-outcome categories. PKS06 original 2006 statistics have now been read as text for all 27 pages/visually checked for 8 pages;36 reader tables/328 numeric rows,567 criticism+2 prosecution requests+1648 no criticism=2217 excluding psychiatric appeals,including appeals 590+2+1713=2305. No additional count of unique people. See patientklager2006-originalkontrol-og-naevnerkritik.md and patientklager2006-originale-tabeller.md. Expanded SDN11FT:official Folketing HTML containing 34 pages actually read;2011 outcomes 1721/629/86/1=2437,reopenings 100=75+1+4+11+9. No image/PDF visual certification. This is the board’s annual report;the separate 2011 annual statistics are not automatically closed. See disciplinarnaevn2011-originale-udfald-og-bevismangler.md/.json. The same 2437 criticism matrix had already been checked within a delimited scope in sundhedsaar-serier.md;the full 34-page text expands methodology/case/evidence checking and reopenings,rather than a new population.	Public / private employment, patient / handler dedup and penalty

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
H05	Public health / private	Other organisational / criminal registration originals	Partial material completed: place of treatment / complaint, 2014 trade / place / sub-decisions and 2021-2025 critical classes with separate denominators;	Recruitment status, STPS / criminal / patient coupling

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			selected references and criminal follow-up in historical originals. See health yearsery.md; health-residual-extension.md. Rest: full public / private division of employment, unique therapists / patients and connection to STPS supervision / current criminal convictions.	
H06	Psychiatric coercion 2006-2025	National / other regional first instance originals 2006-10	Partially substantively populated: national first-instance output and intervention outcomes 2011-2025 in source versions; regional originals Nordjylland 2008-2010, Midtjylland 2009-2012 and Hovedstaden 2010-2012. Findings setting aside duration, formally unlawful approvals, mixed outcomes and 2024-2025 methodological discontinuities are registered. See psykiatrisk-tvang-udfald-20 06-2025.md/.json. Remaining: national/all regional first-instance outcomes 2006-2010, remaining detailed tables and unique patient/intervention linkage.	Unique patient / interventions to actual cessation / injury
H07	Court of Justice	Central anchor originals 2006-13	Partly substantively completed: separate appeals board annual originals 2014-2025 and 2013 inflow/time via A14, with parts/cases, revision conflicts and alterations not automatically benefiting patients. Historical PPKN counts partially overturned judgments as affirmed; rule breaches made visible. See ps ykiatrisk-tvang-udfald-2006-2025.md/.jso n. Outstanding: full central appeal originals 2006-2013, direction of every alteration, overall court outcomes and case/person deduplication across instances.	Cases / individuals between agencies and effective protection
H08	Forced termination and injury	Concrete action / medicine acts, not national annual table	Substantively expanded with adverse duration findings at first instance/on appeal, specific CPT safeguards and all 6 pages of Rigsrevisionen’s C117/25. The full target table per 100.000 and new 30%2030 target checked; the old halving target concerns a different population. Completed review is not documented cessation/redress. Outstanding: intervention/case-record ID→order/favourable finding→actual cessation and unlawful partial period→unique patient/age/disability→har m/compensation/payment; hospitals’ contemporaneous intervention and medication logs. See psykiatri-opfoelgning-2025-tid-tvang-og-rettigheder2026.md and the coercion module.	Action ID for unlawful period, damage, compensation / payment

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
H09	Accidental events 2006-2025	Own 2009 / 2013 annual originals have not been obtained after actual archive / access attempts. 2012Part 2 and learning annexes are materially fully read; other local 2014 / 15 contributions are not established as a full original series.	All 20 years have source-checked figures with different selections/versions. New own-year original verification 2007 and 2012:19 table/figure numerical extracts/128 reader-table rows/59 factual rows.2007 statistics/methodology/entire regional annex checked in the 67-page original;2012Part1 all 18 pages.2007 primary 20368/secondary 19217/SAC3 353/summary 58;2012 created	DPSDpersonunion, recruitment, concrete responsibility / effect

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			155791/completed 125870 versus sector average 106193. Internal discrepancies retained; no annual sum. Separate annual originals for 2009/2013 remain unobtained after documented primary-archive checks; no assertion of non-publication. Remaining tasks concern local 2014/15 contributions and old graphs without exact data cells. Deduplication of people, employment status and specific compliance/accountability require independent evidence. No inquiry has been sent. New DPSD12L/DPSD12D2:the learning appendix's complete 12 pages actually read as text;Part 2 PDF1-389; all substantive answer fields read,contact blocks/repetitive questions omitted from the RAM display from PDF55. PDF384 actually checked visually in RAM; no original files or images saved. 531 compact factual rows. See dpsd2012-del2-og-laeringsbilag.md/.json. Regional/hospital/cross-sector-analysis/private contributions overlap; no summed count of unique people/unlawfulness/employment. Part 2 and the learning appendix are now fully substantively read; other local 2014/15 contributions remain separate original-source tasks, rather than merely person-linkage tasks.	
H10	Children's psychology by RR	Figure 1's underlying data / version explanation not provided	Substantively completed for public follow-up C121/25:all 13 pages read, figures 1-2/table 1 visually examined.14 printed quarterly cells 2023K4-2025K2,75 courses=15 per region;72 delayed due to capacity,45/71 informed,26 not informed+one letter not found. Act 1762/2025:both original pages checked, new right/transition clarified. Outstanding: exact regional curve cells, explanation of figure 1 data footnote 15.9.2024 vs 2025K2, national annual union of persons and actual treatment/parental loss/redress. Register trails specified; no request sent. See psykiatri-opfoelgn ing-2025-tid-tvang-og-rettigheder2026.md .	Patient history of actual treatment, parental loss / repair
G01	Data Protection Agency 2006-2025	Remaining national completed control / critical / impose registers	Original controlled 2006-17 in dissemination module as well as 2018-25 in datatilsyn n-2018- 2025-extension.md / .json: 320 figures, 16 defined supervisory groups, 19 public fines committee posts, 3 appeals, 11 court documents date / operational outcome. Rest is concrete register: all completed public / private criticism / injunction / injunction, persons, actual compliance / payment; committee ≠ nationalalkorte; 2018 reform + version breach and RHbride separated. The road date of judgment not disclosed in follow-up.	Personal dedup, actual compliance / penalty payment

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
G02	GDPR public / private all years	All public incident registries 2018-2025	Historical public participation 2006-2017 completed: state, county / region, municipality, permissions and miscellaneous; 2006-2010 security cases	Registered per event and period person union

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			public / private. These are control records and not affected persons. Remaining: 2018- 2025 all government breaches, government types and data subjects per event, including personal dedup. See Data Protection -2006-2017-tal.json.	
G03	GDPR effective sanctions	Complete national criminal-case list and appeal originals not obtained	Partly substantively completed: all 19 public authority/matter entries in the Data Protection Authority's published selection of fines followed to associated follow-up;11 judgment documents' dates/operative outcomes checked, other outcomes through fixed-penalty notices or open/undated. See datatilsyn-2018-2025-udvidelse.md/.json. The Region of Southern Denmark's two matters have a single shared judgment/fine; appeal retained. Outstanding: a complete national criminal-case register, final appeal outcomes, personal employee responsibility and actual compliance/redress.	Final payment, employee responsibility and actual redress
R01	Rigsrevisione n complete inventory	Remaining special reports and follow-up originals; other individual criticism / methodology figures 2006-17	Materially completed for the 2006-2023 main conclusions, ministerial columns, annual distributions and follow-up annexes; 2018@-@ 2023 both annual originals and 2021-2023 complete theme atoms. See National Audit Years Historic.md / .json and rr-concreteConsequences and tables. 2024 / 25 annual originals and 20.11.2025 follow-up controlled in own modules. The 17 previous residue tables 2018 T2-6 / T10,2019T2-4 / T7,2020T2-6,2021T1 -2 are now textual / visually controlled: 86 rows / 165 numerical cells in the National Audit -2018- 2021-remaining -annual tables .md / .j son. New report 11 / 2025 published 9.4.2026: all 54 pages + 4 pages of ministerial statement + 7 pages of note read, 80 factual rows and 84 municipal annexes; government audit posts 2026.md / json. Catalogue 796 entries since 2000 including 2026 are metadata, non-material controls. Concrete residues: other individual criticism / method figures 2006-17 and remaining special reports / opf. No error sum / person union; later effective termination / payment dates require separate notes / register coupling.	Cases / persons and subsequent effective clearance / payment
R02	Municipal supervision Table C 2024	Rigsrevisionen's original correction/raw data not obtained	Original substantively/visually examined: tableC adults rejected 2024=191, total 202 and examined 101; figure 5 rejected 270 versus 169 children+191 adults. No concealed cell correction. See daekning.md, original 18/2024, physicalPDF 44/printed 37. The documented source discrepancy is established as actually printed, but correction/raw data and the correct alternative cell value remain missing from Rigsrevisionen/Ankestyrelsen.	Case ID and personal consequences (if any)

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
R03	Monitoring monitoring and responsibility	Other sanctions / judicial / follow-up originals	Partly substantively completed:18/2024 examines 1669 supervisory cases, excludes 154; four powers unused, response/follow-up have separate denominators of 545/498. Disability follow-up 2026 checked against originals with completed initiative tracks, continuing missing application/decision data and no documented direct effect. See daekning.md; handicap-tilsyn-opfoelgning-2026.md. Outstanding: other sanctions/litigation and person-linked actual compliance; closed oversight is not redress.	Municipality / error case for actual compliance and liability
S01	Tax Board, 2006-2025	Administrative 2007 / 2008 / 2013 and outcome 2007 / 2008 not obtained after documented tracks. The 2013 financial original is fully read and contains no administrative outcome matrix.	Substantively expanded:all 12 original outcome tables for 2014-2025 for five appeal bodies; 129099 closures/35759 findings wholly-partly in the party's favour are decision instances. The historical 20 tables with 86 rows are supplemented by LSRH11/12:26 tables with 154 rows containing administrative percentage matrices/exact N for 2009-2012 and complete court outcomes for 2009/2010. LSR06O:31 tables with 146 rows, administrative groups for 2006,all relevant court outcomes, actual 11,6/corrected 10,7 months; upholding includes closures with possible actual findings in the party's favour. Own count of 55/283 citizen-favourable court outcomes in 2006,including 18 by judgment, not 55 judgments establishing unlawfulness. Delimited primary-access investigation for 2007/2008/2013 documented with 12 access outcomes; none of the requested outcome originals recovered. Remaining gaps:administrative matrices for 2007/2008/2013; exact historical cell counts, remittal codes and hidden findings in the party's favour; court outcomes for 2007/2008; separate compensation outcomes for 2006-08/2011-12; original annual publications for 2009/2010 as independent versions. A union of persons, actual repayment/interest/loss and individual responsibility require linkage of courses. FXTAX01/02 specifies Article 6 according to tax claim/sanction; no back-calculation from percentages or cross-population sum. The new 31-page 2007 mid-term original LSRLEAN07 has been fully read as text in RAM and PDF9/26/28/29 visually checked:5×3 stock cells, 25 targets and 32 deadline/function rows. The Minister acknowledges budget prioritisation and increasing processing time; the terms of reference require safeguards to be retained. Planned voting in writing in the absence of a response is not documented actual denial of a hearing. Stocks/full-time equivalents/targets must not be counted as outcomes/persons. See landsskatteretten200 7-ledelsesviden-liggetid-og-procesplan.m d/.json. The LSR 2013 financial-year report, all 16 pages/623 web-text lines, has actually been read; no administrative outcome matrix in this file.	Exact cell/remittal counts, payment and person/responsibility linkage require register extracts

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
S02	Tax actual loss and liability	Concrete return / liability originals can be found without full register	Outcomes and processing times 2014-2025 substantively checked in skatteklager-udfald -og-tid-2014-2025.md/.json. This does not close the separate loss/responsibility track: case-linked repayment/interest, consequences of debt collection, compensation and personnel responses remain missing; no national zero value or union of persons can be inferred from findings in parties' favour. New primary-source check of FOB 2007.525:40 cases closed in 2004, knowledge/response 2006-07; all 34 time-distribution rows and 4 expectation rows; final 15 criticisms of delay against provisional 16, as well as visible breaches of safeguards and the Ministry's undocumented premise that absence of lawsuits proves correctness. The 2004 events are not counted as new 2006-25 errors; specific reopenings/payment/responsibility remain missing. See landsskatteretten-2007-garanti er-og-tidskritik.md. A new 31-page 2007 original midterm document LSRLEAN07 fully read as text in RAM and PDF9/26/28/29 visually checked:5×3 pending-case cells,25 targets and 32 deadline/function rows. The Minister acknowledges budget prioritisation and increasing time; the terms of reference require safeguards to be maintained. Planned written voting in the absence of a response is not documented actual refusal of an oral hearing. Pending cases/full-time equivalents/targets must not be counted as outcomes/persons. See landsskatteretten200 7-ledelsesviden-liggetid-og-procesplan.m d/.json.	Recovery, loss, compensation and staff reaction
U01	Foreigners 2006-2025	Previous sources before 2013 and remaining FLN complaints / children's tables	Partly completed: Flygtningenævnet's full 20 years of original core, spontaneous, reopening-request and time rows plus Dublin 2014-2025; Udlændingenævnet's 13 originals 2013-2025, exact outcomes 2013-2021 and more recent rounded percentages. Outstanding: other FLN complaint types/children over 20 years, overall closures without decision from 2022, a full union of individuals, predecessors' immigration-complaint outcomes before 2013; actual residence/return and responsibility. The 2021 reopening requests have a published total of 194 against a category sum of 205. See flygtningenaevn-udfald-og-personer-2 006-2025.md and udlaendingenaevn-udfal d-og-tid-2013-2025.md.	Personal union, actual residence / return and liability

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
U02	Foreigner e actual intervention time	Concurrent Individual Residence / Separation Acts	Partial substantive completion: national board processing times in udlaendingenae vn-udfald-og-tid-2013-2025.md and flygtnin genaevn-udfald-og-personer-2006-2025. md; specific reopening/return/residence steps in UN A.H., Domina/Bendtsen and F.K. and stateless persons/Court of Impeachment/GreenDesert courses. Outstanding: full person-linked intervention/separation time and actual	Personal segregation / exposure / reunification

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			effectiveness for the whole national population; omnibus processing time is not actually separation time.	
N01	Court of Justice and Freedom	LV 2019 Annex's 16 originalPDFsider missing collection; Historical Complaints and 2025 originals of freedom	Substantively checked: DSK 2020-2025 and historical research 2013-2019 separately from the original series;Director of Public Prosecutions 2025 all 22 tables/317 rows and 2024. Solitary-confinement originals 2006-2023 and 2024:62 numeric tables/676 rows;19 child occurrences 2006-2017,rather than 19 unique children;2019 15 periods/13 people. LV 2006-2017 and 2020-2023 relevant originals with versions/methods;2008 revision and child remand 2008-2010 separately. LV reader appendix 109 tables/1079 numeric data rows;2019 statement’s 4 original Folketing HTML pages actually read,including 16 omitted submissions;the appendix’s 32 segments/371 rows separately marked as transcription checking.LV 2018 original’s 8+15 pages have now been fully checked for content with 30 annual-version tables/363 rows;44 children in the letter versus 42 in tables are retained,and 1328 lengthy cases versus 1326 duration/outcome rows kept distinct. Only the LV 2019 appendix’s 16 original PDF pages remain a specific acquisition task;the labelled secondary transcription does not replace original checking. Data before/after the 2021 methodological break must not be added uncritically. Under-15 series 2016-2023 and all legal findings 2021-2023;three original compensation case histories,actual partial payments and precise remaining tasks. 2025 liberty data,historical Klageretten originals,national person linkage and compensation/payment series remain missing.	National personal union, intervention time and compensation payment; 19 child deposits are not 19 unique children

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
N02	Crime scene.	Other KFår originals / sub-tables and 2025 series	Substantively checked: KF 2015/2023/2024 selected intervention, disciplinary, death/suicide and court tables actually read,45 tables/598 numerical-data rows with historical 2006-2024 cells, original footnotes and denominator/version discrepancies. Discipline concerns prisoners. The 2020 court methodology changes to final outcomes at each instance;2024 closed 141, status sum 148 retained. Handcuffs 2022 reporting scope, voluntary exclusion, restraints, death revisions and the 2024PBN transition examined. REU1157/2025 original,all 4 pages, documents no consolidated national UTH register; Øst does not retain reports after handling, Vest 38 manually counted for 1.4.24-1.6.25. Datatilsynet's 10.7.25 decision actually read;2026 follow-up is a plan, not a proved effect. Outstanding: all other annual originals/subtables, complaint cases/supervisory follow-up,2025 series, case/person/time/payment linkage and	Complaints/supervision to i ntervention/person/cessatio n/payment; UTH-register limitation specified

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			full legal review of each action. See criminal protection -action-testing-and-health blindhed.md and criminal protection-original -tables.md.	
N03	Equal treatment	Name originals 2009- 18 and predecessors 2006- 08	Partly completed: original 2019-2025 name outcomes visually verified, newer historical departure rows back to 2018, source conflicts and concrete SA / CERD knowledge chain. Remains: original 2009-2018 full denominators and predecessors 2006- 2008, all years of public / private division, unique persons, court order and actual payment. Take a look at the treatment-outcome-limitation-and-geno treatment.md / .json.	Unique person, court order and actual payment
N04	Environment, industry and other bodies	Environment / Nature / NMKN 2006-15 and other original names	Partly completed: nine Nævnenes Hus originals 2017-2025, NMKN original 2016 and Plan originals 2022-2024 with historical flows 2019-2024; timing and sampling differences, all three Plan outcome figures visually verified. Outstanding: original environment/nature/NMKN 2006-2015, environmental/planning annual outcomes 2017-2025, other business appeals boards, individuals and actual redress. NH totals are not environmental cases alone. See mi ljoe-plan-udfald-tid-og-afgraensning.md/.j son.	People and actual change/redress
N05	Defence and intelligence	Wamberg 2006-2013 original register and other defence originals	Partly completed: TET 34 originals and 651 factorial rows, all material control / follow-up / indirect inspection / time sections. Categories overlap and are not persons. Residues: control ID and natural / legal person, action start / finding / cessation / deletion, PET / FE / PNRs overlap and Wamberg 2006-2013registry. No request sent.	Confidential control lists, personal dedup, cessation / deletion / replacement
A01	Ministerial and service r esponsibilitie s	Full national Commission / Liability Catalogue and other volumes / Decisions	Commission/accountability chains substantively checked: instruction case/impeachment, Tibet, statelessness, mink, Greenland interventions and the legally delimited 2026 section 16 exemption; disciplinary personnel responses and closed/amended cases separately. Specific commission findings/volumes/locators are reproduced in individual modules. A complete national catalogue of every ministerial/disciplinary accountability case and non-public final personnel decision remains a specific outstanding task; no general immunity is concluded. Specific protection from sanctions for adverse-incident reporting has been checked against originals:2003 section 6/2008 section 201,2011 guidance,the complete 2020 Act 1855 of 4 pages extending protection to those involved from 1.1.2021,2025 sections 200-202 and 406,the complete 2 pages. Protection arises from reporting, rather than general immunity for conduct; private hospitals are also covered. See sundhedsrapportering-sanktionsbeskyttelse-og-ansvar.md.	Non-public final personnel decisions / fault / reactor

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
A02	Public / private liability comparison	Separate family-law originals and contemporaneous annexes for comparison cases	Substantively completed legal matrix and specific comparisons of time/actions: sections 155-157/261/215/260, ministerial responsibility, ECHR responsibility and damages each have their own conditions. A public employee acting privately, removal from family, unauthorised arrest, a private taxi driver's acquittal on self-defence grounds and specific public/disciplinary sanctions are compared in the disciplinary module. Private sentencing ranges are not sentences actually imposed in an unknown case. Administrative invalidity/legal-authority errors and criminal abduction each require their own evidence. Comparable individual judgments and every element of culpability/conduct must be produced before further personal responsibility is established. Three private primary judgments from 2017 have now actually been read: the same single case involving mother/grandmother and one child, both acquitted under section 215; the prosecutor's sentencing request of 2-3 months was not a sentence imposed. The judgments delimit parental responsibility/dispute/residence and evidence of knowledge. The ECLI publication year 2022 is not the judgment year 2017; contact/return sequences in testimony are not independently verified logs. See privat-boernebortfoe relse-originaldom-og-anklage.md. Now the 2022 private original judgment record AM 2022.06.16V, all 6 pages read:37 days between dates→40 days suspended/60 hours of community service, second defendant acquitted. The reproduced family-court reasoning criticises the original basis but maintains the result with reference to later residence/time; the complete separate family-court record/original evidence is required. See privat-unddragelse-2022-straf-tid-og-myndighedspraemisser.md. UTH protection and its shared public/private scope, independent other evidence and accountability timing have now been examined in a separate module with 6 primary legal sources. Protection against sanctions must be specifically included and must not be extended into general permission for unlawful family separation.	Individual act / guilt / injury before actual crime comparison
A03	Green Desert primary certificates	Simultaneous operational orders and individual claims documents not provided	Materially controlled Green Desert: full Supreme Court judgment 35 pages and identified EMDtesting; separate knowledge, transfer, damage and evidence chain. The 2004 operation is historical; the subsequent 2006-2025 review is part of the period. The evidence, evidence, grounds and the state's well-known denied liability shall be parted. All simultaneous operational orders and individual injury / transfer documents not published / provided in this report; actual original documentation requirements in green-deserts proof-time and liability.	Transfer / knowledge / injury / person chain

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
I01	United Nations Treaty	Remaining State replies and follow-up documents for each favourable case	Records completed and original checked: 20 periodic observations, 265 individual decision documents / 263	Union of individuals across cases and actual redress

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			communication numbers in 2006-2025 and five in 2026. 57 favourable opinions on the merits, a separate CAT Article 22 violation in a rejected case; mixed CCPR rejection/partial discontinuance separately. Outstanding: all State replies and actually updated follow-up for each favourable case, a full union of individuals and three date/version points. See fn-kontrolkatalog-udvidet.md and fn-individuelle-klagesager.md.	
I02	UPR	Written A / HRC / 63 / 10 / Add 1 not obtained after 6 routes; not they already read 4 basic originals.	2011 / 2016 / 2021: 620 numbered recommendations and acceptance / version checks. 2026 feather cycle: all 26 + 21 + 10 + 10 = 67 pages in A / HRC / 63 / 10 and WG.6 / 52 / DNK / 1-3 actual RAM read; 265 numbers comment.174 supported + 91 recorded are verified in FNautomatic meeting printout 25.9.2026, explicitly not official protocol or individual written response. A / HRC / 63 / 10 / Add 1 continued not to be provided after 6 tested routes; no artificially recommended acceptance mapping. Actual compliance / personal effect requires separate evidence. See uppr2026 full e-originals and afterlife.	Individual impact and enforcement evidence
I03	CPT	Other statsvar and 2020 delsvar's original URL	Complete visit/reply inventory: six visits/reports and seven State replies 2006-2025. CPT/Inf(2013)11 has now been read visually in full against the original:31 pages,31 answered paragraphs and 30 numerical/time rows;2010/11 disciplinary corrections,2012 complaint/duration figures and specific health/contact data gaps. Remaining: other replies beyond the sections actually read, the original URL of the 2020 partial reply, and full actual compliance, individual trajectories/person deduplication and redress. See cpt-kontrolkatalog-udvidet.md and cpt-2013-dansk-svar-fuld-originalkontrol.md.	Personal overlap and actual cessation / repair
I04	Full register of EMD	Non-public single judge rejections	All 59 English judgment documents and 110 English decisions in the public HUDOC register checked against originals; finality, 57 judgment-case groups, 24 final violation cases and 16 closed/eight open execution processes as at 7.10.2026. All 11 distinct final resolutions checked against originals for their dates. Decisions comprise 136 application numbers and at least 846 person occurrences before overlap. Outstanding: anonymised cross-case union of persons and full actual individual redress in every case; unpublished single-judge inadmissibility decisions have no public person register. See hudoc-beslutnings-og-personregnskab.md and emd-fuldbyrdelse-regnskab.md.	Anonymous personal union and actual individual repair

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
I05	EMD not allocated	No established full-country public series of applications / cancellations	20 years of legally distributed / communicated / of certain-deleted / convicted complaints are	EMDRegistration country code-out drag and personal case coupling

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
	complaints		original checked in emd-klager-2006-2025.md/.json;2006 original also has 108 applications lodged. The outstanding requirement is specific: all applications lodged and administrative removals before judicial allocation with Danish country code 2006-2025. No complete published country series has been established; an ECtHR Registry extract is required. The difference between lodged and allocated applications from different cohorts must not be assumed to be the removals count.	
Z01	2026 separate balance sheet	Other relevant 2026 interim publications not fully obtained	Partly substantively completed with separate 2026 events and 2025 publications: UN5 part-year decisions, ECtHR finality, disability follow-up, Greenland reparation/law, FEII expected 2028, stateless persons Supreme Court, current municipal/monthly and health-register versions. See module dates and introduction. Outstanding: full inventory and content check of all relevant part-year publications as at7. October 2026; no full 2026 year constructed, and a 2026 publication concerning 2025 is not counted as a new 2026 event.	Actual 2026 redress and individual trajectories
Z02	Overlap and national union	Not a new catalogue problem; delunions controlled	Partial substantive overlap check: ECtHR59 records→57 sequences and 63 application numbers; UN265 documents→263 communication numbers, F.K. person union locally; regional/national retrospectives, case/partial decision and repeated review/payment phases kept separate. Senior pension 2024 formal-error/overturning union of 338 is documented. Remaining: common case/person keys across all sectors/years, period-unique children/parents/employees and a national error/injured-person union. Partial unions yield no national total.	Cross-sector / Year / Person keys
K08	Regional Board's pre-2013 studies	Other regional practices originals and historical full registers	Partial substantive check: Employment Appeals Board for Central Denmark, cessation of cash assistance 2012,17 main tables and 42 municipal rows with all published figures.80 cases,76 hypothetical amendments/remittals for reconsideration,4 correct; cases already appealed and previously examined excluded. Original table discrepancies and shredding plan documented. See regionale-naevn-midtjyl land-kontanthjaelp2012.md/.json. Other available regional originals remain to be processed; the historical full register and actual repayment are separate data needs.	Hypothetical remittal for reconsideration to actual new decision / refund

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
N06	Youth education	Ungekriminalforsorgen's separate supervision/responsibility sources	Partially completed: all seven annual reports 2019-2025 read for entries, main / re decisions, outcome of complaints, deadlines, duration, actual return and errors also in confirmed	Unique children / parents and actual date of removal

ID	Zone	Current outstanding documents / acquisition needs	Actual control and accuracy number limitations	Case / person / e required power coupling;
			cases. 358 complaint decisions, 88 fully/partly altered/annulled; version breaks and denominators retained. See ungdomskriminalitet snaevn-2019-2025.md/.json. Not published exactly in the sources read: 2019 resubmissions, a complete court-outcome series, unique children/parents and complaint-linked actual return-home dates. A precise case-record/person request is set out. Remaining original verification: other detailed tables and Ungekriminalforsorgen's independent supervisory/accountability sources.	

Residues must not be mixed together

The 15TaskForce sequences without an obtained analysis/status original constitute a specific public source/access gap with municipal/archive trails, not merely a person-linkage gap. There are also separate missing phases, e.g. København 2018, Odsherred 2021, Fredericia's introductory phase and Tårnby's introductory phase, where later originals have been read. By contrast, the known readable Egedal 119 pages, Frederikssund adult 133 pages, Sorø adult 119 pages and Nordfyn adult 103 pages are completed. The central Frederikssund child analysis 2021 remains a different original requirement.

A read original may miss exact figure cells, a submitted form or an explanation of an internal sum deviation. These values can only be closed at the back of the data, not by constructing numbers from rounded percentages. National staff / staff / parent numbers and actual return, delivery, payment and intervention time after detected errors require documented case and person couplings. No request has been sent.

Broad catalogue areas such as all the Ombudsman's individual cases and all the National Audit Office's special reports constitute further scope for full registration. They are not described as completed solely through annual series or catalogue titles. The specific completed annual tables and case chains are shown above and in separate modules.

30. Main conclusions and concrete requirements

Known breaches require effective protection and liability

The report documents serious and repeated failures in the exercise of public authority. It documents also concrete loss of contact, help, freedom, support, privacy and bodily self-determination; and institutional knowledge of major problems. It carries a sharp criticism of the interventions and of the controls. knowledge: the citizen's right must actually be protected and restored.

The criticism can be advanced without inventing a national victim total. Appeal cases, selected studies, judgment courses and specific citizens have different denominators. The delimited findings stand independently: 45.022 overturnings among 150.345 municipal appeals considered on the merits in 2018-2024; at least one measured breach of law in 69 per cent of 3.148 selected children's first placement courses in 2022-2024; an unlawful record-keeping practice known and accepted centrally; ministerial correction of insufficiently reasoned supervision; and international criticism of the scope of police-complaint investigations. None of these figures is a national count of placements lacking legal authority or proven criminal offences. [Chapters 1, 3, 7, 15 and 28]

Denmark's responsibility encompasses the act, its continuation and the response after knowledge. A subsequent closure of oversight, remittal for reconsideration or new decision does not on its own document actual cessation or redress. For children, both the legal decision chain and physical separation must be followed, including contact provided and assistance with reunification. Time can change relationships and possibilities for responsibility; it must be included as part of the loss of rights. [Chapters 18 and 28-29]

Relief from liability shall be documented and tested;

The report identifies unlawful administrative exemption practices, limits on personal financial liability, reporting protection, a specific statutory fine exemption and actual obstacles to sanctions caused by delay. These mechanisms have different legal consequences. They must be examined on their precise basis and not hidden within a collective term of immunity. [Chapters 26 and 28]

Absence of an individual conviction does not exempt the State from responsibility. The original intervention, the authority's duty to protect, the effective investigation, the remedy and redress must each be assessed separately. In cases of serious State ill-treatment, a symbolic sanction may be insufficient, and the investigation must be capable of clarifying the incident and leading to accountability. Lack of initial evidence of individual criminal culpability does not answer whether ill-treatment occurred or protection failed. [Chapter 28, PFK02-PFK04]

The comparison with individuals must be conducted through the same concrete action, valid basis, guilt, duration and consequences. The documented private sentence for 37 days of evasion does not require an automatic identical public sentence. It makes it relevant to require a reasoned, verifiable explanation of how a documented public removal or continuation was investigated without valid basis and why liability might not be realised. [Chapters 26 and 28, PU22]

Priority requirements

1. **Termination and protection.** Immediately try every continued intervention with neglected or seriously deficient basis. Take a reasoned decision on temporary protection and check the actual effect.

2. **Effective, independent investigation.** Clarify serious incidents, injuries, authority knowledge and the overall decision and control chain. Secure original evidence before they are lost.

3. **Actual redress with a date.** Follow the decision through to return home, contact, support, treatment, corrected information and payment. Examine separately the consequences that persist after cessation.

4. **Timely location of responsibility.** Examine case handler, management, instruction and supervision according to competence, duty and documented knowledge. Try to continue, gross or repeated neglect and institutional responsibility according to their own rules.

5. **Oversight after an acknowledged error.** Identify affected decisions and document correction completed. New plans and organisational changes must be assessed by their effects on citizens.

6. **A linked account of consequences and responsibility.** Retain each source figure’s denominator and exclusions, link cases and people according to actual documentation, and trace the loss of rights through to redress and accountability.

The requirements shall be linked to the relevant right and competent body. The protection and repair measures that are already sufficiently substantiated must be carried out while further examining separate debts and injuries.

Evidence completion

Documented findings: Specific breaches of law, decisions setting measures aside, authorities' statements about their own knowledge, timelines and international oversight results are given with original sources and locators in the documentation chapters. Chapter 29 gathers evidential chains, documented errors, hypotheses and necessary document requirements.

Further proof: Personal conduct or gross negligence, each cause of injury, certain actual cessation and payment dates and the specific context of international action shall require the original documents specified. A precise deficiency in this link does not alter an independent documented breach of law or an obligation to investigate.

Traceability: Each decisive plea must be capable of being referred back to original proof, applicable rule, competent actor, proven knowledge, action or omission and the consequences of the citizen. A repeat government narrative is not an independent new proof.

The direct legal requirements of the report follow EMRK, relevant UN conventions, national law and applicable State liability rules. R2P and international individual criminal liability require a separate sample of the relevant crime and context links. These additional qualifications shall not delay already durable requirements for protection, investigation and repair.

Denmark must be judged on whether or not known violations are actually halted, investigated and remedied. Documentary institutional knowledge, continued loss of rights and inadequate response can establish a independent State responsibility. The absence of a criminal sentence is not the end of the citizen's demands.

31. Literature and source list

The sources are available in this review up to 7 October 2026. Source codes and locators at the finds identify the tables and sections used. Legal texts, original control reports, research and later reproduction have different evidentiary functions. The list documents the use of the listed sections; a source on the list is not in itself proof of full reading of the entire publication.

Research literature on restoration

Aysel Küçüksu, *Not all responses are remedies: Scandinavian implementation of ECtHR judgments*, International Journal of Constitutional Law 23(3), 800-827, publiceret 15. november 2025, DOI 10.1093/icon/moaf046.

The study examines Scandinavia's unfavourable EMD judgments, conciliation and communication with the Committee of Ministers and combines systematic coding with 28 interviews. The method codes, inter alia, applicants, payments, individual and general actions, as well as the communication of the authorities. The author distinguishes between a reported reaction and an actual remedial action. In Figure 1 and Note 137, 36,8% of the Danish leading cases have been completed with the sole dissemination of the judgment as reported general measures. The figure omits conciliation; otherwise several actions in the same case can be coded in several categories. The proportion is a research result on implementation forms in the population of the study, not an error rate for Danish administration or evidence that each of these cases lacked any individual restoration. § 6.2 reviews the Danish description of Aggerholm as an isolated event and the documented opposition of civil society. Original article § 3, 5-6.3, Figure 1, Note 137.

Use in this report: State commitments, dissemination, legislative amendment, changed actual practice and individual redress each have their own field. The report's own specific inferences are built on original judgments, action plans, follow-up reports and verifiable consequences. The ECtHR account's 16 closed and eight open cases can therefore coexist with, but must not be confused with, the research finding on implementation.

Bibliographic verification: The journal issue is labelled July 2025, while the article itself was published on 15. November 2025. The report must retain both dates and not present the November article as publicly accessible knowledge in July. The full bibliography is placed after the main conclusion in the combined report.

Encoded sources of law, control and research

The actual outcome of the police complaint 2006-2025

• [POL- OLD2011] The Attorney General 2010-2011; Printed p.135 Table 4 b; p.139 Table 5 c; p.132 Table 4.
https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Documents/rigsadvokatens-bertening-2011.pdf

• [POL- U2012] DUP 2012; PDFs pages 39,40,41; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Aarsberetning_2 012 _ netversion.pdf

• [POL- U2013] DUP 2013; PDFs pages 43,44,45; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/aarsberetning_2 013 _ netversion.pdf

• [POL- U2014] DUP 2014; PDFs pages 43,44,45; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/aarsberetning_2 014.pdf

• [POL- U2015] DUP 2015; PDFs pages 47,48,49; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/aarsberetning_2 015 _ netversion.pdf

• [POL-U2016] DUP 2016; PDF pages 54,55,57; tables 4/5/6/8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/den_uafh_ngige _politiklagemyndigheds__aarsberetning_for_2016.pdf

• [POL- U2017] DUP 2017; PDF pages 55,56,58; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Aarsberetning_2 017 _ - _ corrected _ 22.03.18.pdf

• [POL- U2018] DUP 2018; PDFs pages 57,58,60; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Aarsberetning_2 018.pdf

• [POL- U2019] DUP 2019; PDFs pages 65,66,68; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Aarsberetning_2 019.pdf

• [POL- U2020] DUP 2020; PDFs pages 56,57,58,60; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Politiklagemy ndighenden -annual report -2020.pdf

• [POL- U2021] DUP 2021; PDFs pages 62,63,64,66; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Politiklagemy ndighenden -annual report -2021.pdf

• [POL- U2022] DUP 2022; PDFs pages 112,113,114,116; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Politiklag Authority -Years Report -2022.pdf

• [POL- U2023] DUP 2023; PDFs pages 93,94,95,97; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Politiklagemy ndighenden -annual report -2023.pdf

• [POL- U2024] DUP 2024; PDF pages 124,125,126,128; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/Politiklag Government Annual Report -2024.pdf

• [POL- U2025] DUP 2025; PDFs pages 121,122,123,125; Table 4 / 5 / 6 / 8.
https://online.fliphtml5.com/eopap/ugzf/files/download/9c3691b9fccb417 5cb0737471213fb14.pdf

Police disciplinary proceedings 2006-2007: the recounted summaries and chain of responsibility

• **PD2006K** National Police, *Summary of disciplinary cases decided in 2006*. Public document copy held by KRIM, 17 PDF pages; entire text read in RAM, PDF11/14 visually checked. Document copy. SHA-256 fb7e228270b9403c4ef613f8f6219679632fc5b92d6f2b79e47dd75c31f2da42.

• **PD2007K** The State Police, *Summary of disciplinary proceedings 2007*. Public document copy at KRIM, 10 PDFs pages; entire text read in RAM, PDF8 / 10 visually controlled. Document copy. SHA-256 80d5a0c6e4d1ae7dddb5adc220b891895ad3f3865cbe5d768649a3822361a368.

• **PDB1507** Committee of the Ministry of Justice on the handling of complaints against the police, *Report No 1507 / 2009*. Public original of the Folketing, printed on pages 96-99, paragraphs 6.7-6.10 and footnotes on page 97. These sections actually read through the original reproduction of the web tool; direct RAM download gave HTTP403. No full reading of all 346 pages or visual inspection of the pages of the report is claimed.

Complaints about conduct: findings in favour, hidden timing errors and discontinuation of publication

• **DKL01** The State Police / Attorney General, *Overview of complaints about police actions 2018*, April 2019,13 pages; the entire original read, exit table s.3 controlled cell by cell. Original 2018.

• **DKL02** Same. *Overview 2019*, April 2020,24 pages; p.1-12 and the statistics in Figures 1-7 read; specific additional annex examples require their own original assumptions. Original 2019.

• **DKL03** Same. *Overview 2020*, April 2021,35 pages; statistical / demarcation sections p.1-13 and the specific chains used here p.27-34 controlled. Original 2020.

• **DKL04** The prosecution's current statistics page: the joint annual publication on operational decisions has ceased; three public originals 2018-2020. Publication status.

Case number, selection and time sequences of the Board of Appeal

• **A17:** Ankestyrelsen's annual statement 2017, official Ankestyrelsen publication in KL's annex folder. Table 5.24 printed page 15 (PDF page 17); table 4.21 printed page 13 (PDF page 15). Primary publication in a public annex folder.

• **A20:** Annual Declaration 2020. Table 4.1 page 37, Table 4.2 page 38, Table 4.5 page 41. PDF.

• **A21:** Annual Declaration 2021. Table 4.2 on page 35, Table 4.5 on page 39. PDF.

• **A24:** Annual Declaration 2024, August 2025. Table 4.3 pages 26, 4.4 pages 27, 4.6 page 28; version note 11 April 2025. PDF.

• **A25:** Annual Report 2025, March 2026, page 11. PDF.

• **D25S:** Social area 2025 and comparison 2024.

• **D25B:** Children's disability area 2025 and comparison 2024.

• **D25V:** Adult disability area 2025 and comparison 2024.

• **D26L:** Read guide 23 June 2026, page 1-3.

• **P24:** Practical examination of penalties in case of non-appearance from offers or interviews, Table 2.1.

• **P16:** Section 7 of the Health and Safety Act concerning incapacity for work, April 2016;, page 29-30.

• **SP24:** Senior Pension Unit complaint cases 2024, page 6.

• **T22:** Case-processing times in the adult-disability sector, 2022, methodology page 6, case trajectories pages 33 and 44-45.

Primary chain: Ankestyrelsen's register → dated annual statement/count → the specific table row above → our addition of amended and remitted. Danmarkskort: Ankestyrelsen's appeals determined on the merits → the ministry's specific map; activity data come from another register chain and another year. Samples: selected original records → Ankestyrelsen's case review → assessed hypothetical appeal outcome. Without case linkage, none of these chains gives a count of unique injured individuals or personally criminally responsible employees.

National appeals statistics found 2006 and 2012

Ankestyrelsen: *Ancillary statistics for the Social Boards 2006*, July 2007, ISBN 978- 87- 7811 - 032 - 9, 19 pp.; all pages read, all seven numbered tables visually controlled. Official publication address, official PDF address, archive copy. Copies 557.554 bytes, SHA256 d000e32ada62ca311005403003c425a2655a0971c4d61810e813b8en8430095a.

Ankestyrelsen: *Ankestatistic. Annual statistics 2012*, July 2013, ISBN 978- 87- 7811- 209- 5, 24 physical pages; all pages read, all six numbered tables visually controlled. Official publication address, official PDF address, archive copy. Copies are 305.727 bytes, SHA256 c0536639764f089bc8555dc0d2556297b684b568651d9c422of4057c03becd9.

Transitional year 2013: original case numbers, omitting complaints and waiting time targets

• **SFV13H** Original publication, 20 physical pages; actually read pages and visual checks indicated above. 1462293 bytes; SHA256 3e1b2753b5b52ca82812d95a89b8ce11d1d953b6aa4d47312e1ece2e14a84ab6.

• **AS13A** Original publication, 34 physical pages; actually read pages and visual checks indicated above. 650757 bytes; SHA256 11c0e3e4e8697b0bd63b3660c9731a1509907efd05742ab93f8a459e86ff6c84.

• **SFV13A** Original publication, 29 physical pages; actually read pages and visual checks indicated above. 1827285 bytes; SHA256 cee55251a5bcafe6807ff21e91of864f28d113fc6c73a2ac1d6b19d07c9fbfea.

AT02: The control of restructuring by the State Audit 2014 has already been dealt with in the time module; its different period term is retained, no additional case or personal sum.

Municipal 2006 figures: defined national committees and original re-assessment checks

• **K06A:** Committee Report 10 January 2008, point 5, full text of the case read; the images of the tables are checked through the annexes.

• **K06B:** 2006 Annex 1, municipalities and nationally defined committees, only page read and visually controlled.

• **K06C:** 2006 Annex 2, breakdown of benefits, both sides read; page 1 visually controlled.

• **K06D:** The Ombudsman's inspection of the City of Copenhagen 9, 14 and 27 November 2006, Physical PDF68-74, clauses 4.2.4-4.2.5 and notification; Report 2010. The other 67 pages of the original have not thus been fully read.

Reassessments, objections and complaint populations

• [GEN- VAR24] Var, Citizens' Adviser's Annual Report 2024: https://vardekommune.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Borgerraadgiverens-aarsreport-2024.pdf - SHA-256 a077a9c9fe4ff0eeab7c43db0688fd7d2606cc90a3d352dba59eac3cdfa27ccd.

• [Gen- KK14] Copenhagen, Social Services Complaint Statistics 2014, original Annex: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/d95150a3-1dd7-4149-99ff-7e8aeaf8b585/50a90070-7c96-470e-8346-b8c2170035ab-bilag-1.pdf - SHA-256 479651d7a24ec95d1a2e61bb773264980a8916d58deb6d42405cf2b1b6866f88. Agenda: https://www.kk.dk/dagsordener-og-referater/Socialudvalget/m%C3%B8de-22042015/referat/punkt-10.

• [Gen- KKBIF24] Copenhagen, Information on complaint statistics 2024: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/2025-09/Orientering%20til%20BIU%20o m% 20Citizens% C3% A5dgiverens% 20report% 202024% 20and% 20BIF% C2% B4s% 20complaints statistics _ t.pdf - SHA-256 2311b00bbba20a7cadcab989758b0c02325ebbc1919e77daeb6b59d5440737f7.

• [GEN- UNK21] Ankestyrelsen, decisions on the recalculation of housing support 2021: https://www.ast.dk/Media/639136624739533665/18-30107-2-afgoerelser-om-genberegning-af-boligstoette-ankestyrelsens-undersoegelse-af-u-20890868 _ 1024439 _ 0.pdf - SHA-256 b59629e0ed69afce5be44571d7f7b2ea46ff77503beea8a18d0525b41f17ba03. Publications page: https://www.ast.dk/for-myndigheder/publikationer/2021/apr/afgoerelser-om-genberegning-af-boligstoette-en-undersoegelse-af-udbetaling-dan market reassessment of pending decisions.

• [GEN- AS26] Ankestyrelsen, inspiration for re-assessment in the field of children with disabilities 2026: https://www.ast.dk/Media/639243882557332149/god-borgerdialog-i-arbejdet-med-genvurderinger.PDF - SHA-256 b29fc62en4ffbccaac92460b1300ad948c10f36cb1aadafc86717507db26c3ec. Publications page: https://www.ast.dk/for-myndigheder/publikationer/2026/sep/inspiration-til-kommuners-arbejde-med-genvurderinger-paa-boernehandicapomragiven.

Copenhagen complaints statistics 2014: the whole annex and unlabelled outcomes

• **GEN-KK14F** City of Copenhagen,*Appeal-case statistics in the Social Services Administration 2014*,13. March 2015,8 pages,all read as text;PDF2-7 visually checked in memory. Full original annex. SHA256 479651d7a24ec95d1a2e61bb773264980a8916d58deb6d42405cf2b1b6866f88.

• **GEN- KK14POL** The submission and decision of the Social Affairs Committee on 22 April 2015, paragraph 10, all the web text of the reference verified. Political presentation;.

Time of the Board of Appeal, revised control objectives and effective protection

• **AT01:** Ankestatistik 2011, physical PDF17-20; Tables 4.1 and 4.2, the method and delimitation of the original.

• **AT02:** Rigsrevisionen 19 / 2013: times of proceedings for the restructuring of the state administration, physical PDF24-27 and 31-34.

• **AT03:** Follow-up note 303 / 17All seven sides.

• **AT04:** Follow-up note 302 / 19, p.1-2 and 4, transfer of follow-up.

• **AT05:** Rigsrevisionen 16 / 2018: Duration and productivity of the Board of Appeal, physical PDF17-28,49-50,53 and 56; Table 3 physical PDF26 visually controlled.

• **AT06:** Follow-up note 305 / 22All seven sides.

• **AT07:** Final NotatC108 / 25All four sides.

• **AT08:** Annual Report 2019 of the Appeal Board, physical PDF12-13 read fully; other selected text passages about times and goals. No claim for full tabulation of the annual report.

• **AT09:** Annual Report of the Appeal Board 2021, physical PDF9-12; target table physical PDF10 visually controlled.

• **AT10:** 2022 Annual Report of the Appeal Board, physical PDF10-13; physical PDF11 visually controlled.

• **AT11:** 2023 Annual Report of the Appeal Board, physical PDF12-15; 12-13 visually controlled; 13-week target in main text and time section.

• **AT12:** 2024 Annual Report of the Board of Appeal, physical PDF10-11 and 14-18, selected time sections 20-22.

• **AT13:** Annual Report 2025, physical PDF8-11.

• **AT14:** The Board of Appeal's case report 2020, physical PDF2-4,13-14; time and rest tables visually controlled.

• **AT15:** The Board of Appeal's case report 2021, physical PDF2 -3,11-14 and 20-22. Physical figures differ from printed figures; tables 4.21 and 4.22 are fully read.

• **AT16:** Case-file of the Board of Appeal 2022, physical PDF23-25, all time and rest tables.

• **AT17:** Current figures and statistics of the Board of Appeal, monthly graph data and markings checked 7 October 2026. Graphics data and accessibility text have different period versions.

Current time and number series of the Appeal Board 2025-2026

• Duration of proceedings by the Board of Appeal, original table section and date footnote, read 7 October 2026.

Practical studies: controlled extensions

• PUD06: Ankestyrelsen, *Placing of children and adolescents*, December 2006: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20061/almdel/sou/bilag/125/333666.pdf

• PUD08: Ankestyrelsen, *Placing of children and adolescents*, February 2008, original report on the official minutes of the meeting of the City of Copenhagen: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/bb368c96e4e1260e084332b32c01cbf574f6bbe2/12-bilag-2.pdf. SHA-256 977b85a31e6c95ef5fcafef77e5ea4d88ff36b8cf7630ee75dc3e65f009e2b70.

• PUD09: Ankestyrelsen, *Placements of children and young people*December 2009: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20091/almdel/SOU/bilag/129/791241.pdf

• PUD-F06: Ankestyrelsen, *Flex jobs*, January 2006: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20051/almdel/sou/bilag/185/241392.pdf

• PUD-P07: Ankestyrelsen, *Early retirement pension for persons with a mental illness*, December 2007, original report in public municipal documents: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/75305e21a0a10b6223416f17caf6ba6638ba9410/12-bilag-2.PDF

• RR16-B2: Rigsrevisionen, *Action against placed children*, August 2016, Annex 2, printed p. 44 / PDF p. 50: https://cdn.rigsrevisionen.dk/rigsrevisionen/Media/A/E/sr2115.pdf. SHA-256 159a85dc06b1c3f0f91a764f332c40350a4296e2f69eda8f3d012c472c8ff828.

• PUD-I11: Ankestyrelsen, *Involvement of children and parents in voluntary action cases*, 2011: https://viden.sl.dk/media/4551/inddragelse_af_boern_og_foraeldre_i_sager_om_frivillige_foranstaltninger.pdf

• PUD-H11: Ankestyrelsen, *Movement and repatriation of young people placed on the labour market*, November 2011: https://viden.sl.dk/media/4811/flytning_og_hjemgivelse_2011.pdf

• BB24: Ankestyrelsen, *Children's Day Barometer 2024*: https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/639228074573458091/boernesagsbarometret-20 24.pdf

Relocation and return 2011: all tables, method and concrete citizen's programme

• **PUD-H11-FUL** Ankestyrelsen, *Movement and return*, November 2011,65PDFs pages. All pages actually RAM text read; 28 original tables, repetitions and the revised case summaries are corrected. Original report. Hash and locators are shown above.

Inclusion 2011: full original tables and impact chains

PUD-I11F, HA256 64ffbcc669756cd60ebaadb69e6fd30d21373c04806c3f24eed9dea53277251b.

Placement study 2006: all 32 tables, parental roles and specific separations

• **PUD06-FULD** Ankestyrelsen, *Placement of children and young people. Practice study*, December 2006.63 PDF pages, all 32 numbered tables 2.1-2.29 and 5.1-5.3; methodology and summaries read throughout the original on 7. October 2026. Table and page references above. Public original. The original states at PDF2 that quotation with clear attribution is permitted. Only our summaries and factual tables are stored here; no original file has been saved.

Appointment 2008: full original, all tables and actual meaning of consent

• **PUD08-FULD** Ankestyrelsen, *Placement of children and young people*, cover January 2008/publisher February 2008.73 PDF pages, tables 2.1-2.39 and annex 3 tables 1-5 plus figure 1. Entire original read as text on 7.10.2026;PDF10 and 56 also visually in RAM. SHA256977b85a31e6c95ef5fcafef77e5ea4d88ff36b8cf7630ee75dc3e65f009e2b70. Municipality's public original annex. No original file or original images saved locally.

• **KK-SUD93 / 2008** The City of Copenhagen, Social Committee 12.3.2008, point 12, j.nr.78 / 2008. Original political presentation. The full content of the proceedings read in the web tool; own defined summary above.

Placing practice 2009: the entire original tables, denominators and citizen's programme

PUD09: Appeals Board, *Placements of children and young people*, December 2009, ISBN 978-87-7811-105-0, 94 pages. Public original at the Danish Parliament; actually read archive copy of the Appeals Board's original. Archive PDF SHA256 4e869c2bc33a8aa94fb8db9128674ddb99ea7a0696699787337f6083a24faa61. All 94 pages read as text. No public original, full source extraction or original pixels saved locally. The previous PUD09 partial check is replaced by this fuller coverage of the same original and cohort.

Family and network contact 2013: full numbers, children's statements and evidence chains

NET13-FULL - Ankestyrelsen: *How family and network get involved in child cases*, December 2013,79PDFsider, ISBN 978- 87- 7811- 213-2. Full report with annexes. Physical locators are shown in each table, figure and evidence card. SHA256 c6df436a55861b36582f4c5b52ac8ab7ae1400c111df68bf86c73f46b3fb04ba. Own structured figures: family and network works 2013- full -tables and children's votes. Same document, not extra source population.

Residential families 2014: full sub-reports, supervision and populations

PF14K — original subreport;all 37 pages read;RAMvisual[8, 10, 19, 29, 30];SHA256:3d62e81204f4b73908a3aacbbe0cfbed8f707dcef821756431a6078f46f4c1f0. PF14P — original subreport;all 53 pages read;RAMvisual[17, 26, 28, 32, 45, 49, 51, 52];SHA256:20ff9ba213e727281baa8cc383d34d7933e6767be204a3f2395605882db879d0. PF14N — original subreport;all 11 pages read;RAMvisual[5, 9];SHA256:f261abfe72cff1d4596e7d4942ce35268ed386071fd34aaccbd1421054842c03. PF14S — original subreport;all 7 pages read;RAMvisual[4];SHA256:ef4bf263e3b57b5b8c213f67a5d502c7ca123e365f67bc194297749d9071f2f2.

Business practice and wage subsidy 2014: full original tables and citizens' programme

PPR14-FULL Ankestyrelsen, Business practice and wage subsidy, March 2014,103PDFsider. All actual text read; figures PDF4 / 53 / 54 / 62 and municipal cells PDF66 visually read. ISBN978-87-78-11-225-5. SHA256 290a8104cf52c9521151b613c00aac2920e94c32d004fbab036fc241b50f9fd5. Full public original. Own structured cells in practice-practice2014-full-original tables.json; no original text / PDF / pixels saved.

AES 2023: all original tables and nine citizens' programmes

PAES23-FULL Ankestyrelsen, March 2023, ISBN978- 87- 7811- 459-4. Main Report 39 s, HA256 c06dfc00ffcb8899fe475ebf6fe6929d8ac0bdd60bf0a385db1321367e361482; Annex 28 s, August 2022, HA256 3752c68bb0fe96dac32dc0d25991107676ff549bec92f72cc9baa00847729f5d. All 67 pages actually read in memory. Own tabular cells / paraphrases and calculated date differences stored in practice -AES2023-full -tables- and -citizen-forloeb.json. No official original text / PDF / pixels stored.

Date of birth 2022: full method and 30 case codes

PUDK22-FULL Ankestyrelsen, May 2022. Main Report 49 s, ISBN978-87-7811-425-9, SHA256 a622752ec2970f8158b398bb344396fcf4132a1eddb88cbe6acfbd22bdd9ee38; Annex 27 s, ISBN978-87-7811- 430-3, SHA256 882e05ebab3e6422df7f2b155811a6e24d57765732970cb85a4d65159a05b81c. All 76 pages actually read in memory. Own numbers / paraphrases / time differences in practice -UK2022-full-method and -30-case-loeb.json; no original text / PDF / pixels saved.

Disrupted contact and contact: all original numbers and documented interviews 2020

PSAM20-FULD Ankestyrelsen, January 2020. Public original 55 pages, ISBN978-87-7811-381-8, SHA256 b5a5f0addf6d114cd8e7d6aa9e841288b454ac2ce2f9f0cda861ac408dff9203. Physical PDF pages and printed page numbers match. All 55 pages and all 17 original numerical figures/tables read, the numerical figures checked visually in memory. Our figures, source scopes and paraphrases stored in praksis-samvaer2020-fulde-originaltal-og-kontaktforloeb.json; no original PDF/text/pixels stored.

Pension 2015: all tables, medical certificates, selection and citizen's programme

• **PEN15F:** Ankestyrelsen, Early retirement, April 2015, all 65 physical pages. All tables, annexes, tables and individual cases read in RAM.

• **PEN15-KK:** Copenhagen, political presentation and resolution 17 September 2015. All published page read; status statements / policy table delimited separately.

Pension 2006: all results tables, citizens' programmes and authorities' knowledge

• **PEN06F:** Ankestyrelsen, Early retirement by work efficiency method, July 2006, all 59 physical pages. ISBN87-7811-477-2. SHA256d3d171a0343078bbbd5b7e917bf6473034109e6d426bed1c08d5004a54fcd2dad.

Flekjob 2006: full original control, all tables and citizens' programme

• **F06F:** Ankestyrelsen, Flekjob, January 2006,72 physical pages, printed page = PDFside − 1 from PDF3;fully readable municipal annex original.

Early retirement and mental disorders 2007: full tables, families and evidence

• **PP07F:** Ankestyrelsen,*Early retirement pension for persons with a mental illness*, December 2007,86 physical pages; printed page = PDFside − 1 fraPDF3.Full municipal annex original.

Penalties 2015: full original numbers, actual dependencies and control chains

• **SAN15F:** Ankestyrelsen, Commune application of sanctions, 2015, all 116 pages. All tables and annexes read; physical PDF locator. HA256a67523a22e2e0605f46786b2b31289022ad806f561a0f6f5cab6d87ed4c4d5d3.

• **SAN15-KK:** Copenhagen, political presentation and resolution 12 November 2015. The published overall page read; own mention of status statements kept within the page boundary.

• **SAN15-ERR:** Corrigendum 29 October 2015, one page. The entire original read in memory; only the political process changed.

Penalties 2016: all original result matrices and citizens' programmes

SAN16F:Ankestyrelsen's practice study on the use of sanctions,June 2016,all 142 physical pages;PDF81-82 municipal distribution;PDF135-142 request for cases and blank submission forms. SHA256:bcc87b8cda029245502462c861aff2f4e5c058722416e6d4c204362bef821951. Original bytes and original images have been processed only in memory.

Penalties 2017: all result tables, contact guarantees and citizens' programme

• **SAN17F:** Ankestyrelsen, municipal sanctions 2017, full 98-page original. SHA256 265a45584a20875fc508b94e3595e70818adec1e08eaae5fd3e1b13da012a52e. All pages text read in memory; visual check on PDF7,16,23,26,27,29,31,34,37,41,50-53.

• **KK-SAN17:** Copenhagen City Council 22 June 2017, item 48. Municipal follow-up; statements about implementation are not bank documentation.

Penalties 1,2022: all tables and limits of evidence of the investigation

• **SAN22F-H:** Appeals Board,sanctions 1, main report April 2022,69 pages. SHA256 a1a999a6723f7cd6a3621958d122274fc6ff42f15e420dce1242345cf7922d95.

• **SAN22F-B:** Ankestyrelsen, sanctions 1, annex report April 2022,25 pages. SHA256 fd4cc31f1bbf11d38faafe4cdea0a4aa0e85f0abf7a0bcea3a05bd907fb3a75a.

Penalties 2,2023: full tables, family support and agreed intervention time

• **SAN23F-H:** Ankestyrelsen, sanctions 2, main report April 2023,54 pages. SHA256 738fd71d0eae9de0b88e8379b6e32a26dcc2189813a5a5606d4af3fe89818e05.

• **SAN23F-B:** Ankestyrelsen,sanctions 2, annex report April 2023,16 pages. SHA256 a1861e798a6d25f0501c268d2cd2d845dee94edeb6f3adc15fb2be9041ce4fa8.

Early retirement 2025: all original tables, municipal cells and citizens' programme

PPEN25-FULL Ankestyrelsen, May 2025. Main report 51 pages, HA256 42da8edc5e377d63e333f31eeb14ae20412c60f8b144538fb596c9c571010753; Annex Report 28 pages, HA256 79e7366d33a132a3dde90835be45f07268f8f3fcb586235bde330d3f5d249bd3. Both ISBN9788778115447. H / Provider physical PDFside, corresponding to printed page. All 79 pages actually read, graphics titles H23-24 and commune cells B12-13 visually controlled in memory. Own structured figures / paraphrases in practice -pension2025-full -original tables -and -citizens-loeb.json; no public original PDF / full text / pixels stored.

Flekjob 2010: T3.5 andsamænge kommunale / omningsalbilitet

PFLEX10B · Flexjob / unemployment benefit 2010, PDF35-38 / 58-75; visualPDF64-67.SHA25627178ef1b5cd64d5ddea3f330faccf8057 1cc5874adf7d01a66b03b57496c542.No original / pixels saved.

Flekjob in very few hours 2016: full original tables and citizens' programme

FF16F - Original report of the Appeal Board, public document copy; Official transmission to the Danish Parliament. SHA256: da3227b68a178cb00f2e1ed28e1c1b82cd94c2cee53195c59026146b0595f87a.

Youth Visitation 2015: full original tables and citizens' programme

[UNGE15-FULD] Appeals Board,March 2015, ISBN978-87-7811-272-9. All 86 pages read. Official FT URL: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20151/almdel/beu/spm/371/svar/1328632/1639498.pdf. AST archive actually read: https://web.archive.org/web/20200919111428id_/https://ast.dk/publikationer/praksisundersogelse-om-kommunernes-visitation-af-unge-under-30-ar-uden-uddannelse-kontanthjaelpsreformen/@@download/publication. SHA256 73319e5e8d978e78283848fd39e29d3d840aa8ad5d292826c850198442db8e1c. Public PDF and images only in RAM; the report’s own figures/paraphrases are its documentation.

Pension without rehabilitation team 2019: full originals and control limits

PEN19F - original report, municipal document copy. All 41 pages RAM text; visual 12 / 13 / 15 / 16 / 18. SHA256: 68ba408d9238462cfaf962add188f85040650c7d7ffe1d260d9c7ea9218a5f1b.

PEN19BF - original report, municipal document copy. All 27 pages RAM text; visual 7 / 8 / 24 / 25 / 26 / 27. SHA256: 97080909917f5b46cc85cea4c152de108f945d0f17f6b916eb263a99d068d5de.

Official transmission to Parliament.

Regional Employment Appeals Board Midtjylland 2012: all sanction figures and exclusions

[BANMIDT12] State administration of Midtjylland's original 2012 survey, public municipality copia; 64PDFsider; all statistical tables and municipal / method / consultation documents actually read; legal standard / measurement document annexes PDF48-61 are not claimed to be fully reread. SHA-256 cf20afa504559bfe885e0b618d31cf30560ff883a449ab57b2a7be03929683ab. No original stored locally.

Form 2014: municipal annex and age / gender figure fully aligned

PFORM14B · Anchorship's cash / fortune 2014 original, PDF38-65; visualRAMkontrollPDF41 / 43.SHA25649dccfce343ea6b3e562625de 17527787d426d4eb0d46be0e0621d70127b9c29. No original or pixels saved.

Rehabilitation 2014: full tables, annexes and documented citizens' programmes

REH14F:Appeals Board,Municipalities’ use of rehabilitation teams,October 2014;official Copenhagen meeting-file copy.SHA256:7a7c49c76a0f1d2f53ebcf323a4ecac6f129e2d3f77b4a69e6894409e7a08e24.No original saved locally.

Special day and club offers 2025: full registries and control limits

DAG25F:Ankestyrelsen, Practical study on the use of special day and club offers by municipalities, September 2025.SHA256: 2eb4d09b9381034197770ce1d0455e0d3aa706d7ee4580b7710e00fea2573d23.

Additional material practice controls: delegation, assistance arrangements and ancestry

• [PAKT13] Appeals Board, municipalities’ use of other providers in sickness-benefit cases, July 2013: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/almdel/beu/bilag/224/1268502.pdf. Physical PDF page is printed page+3, also in the relevant annexes. The earlier statement of+2 from p.78 has been corrected following the full original-source check. Official municipal summary: https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/7bdfff17-46d0-4691-b948-de594e28932f/70493e2c-13bf-42aa-8384-84183bfd0c73-bilag-3.pdf (14 pages, not the full report), SHA-256 cc0132b569a5dcd5bbc6f9fc0291a37faa4b5e27f9e754e98dc741d6c2d22c19.

• [PBPA23] Ankestyrelsen, practice on determining amounts and eligibility in assistance schemes, June 2023: https://www.ast.dk/Media/639137551265142991/18-30107-2-kommunernes-udmaalings-og-visitationspraksis-i-sager-om-%C3%82%C2%A7%C3%82%C2%A7-95-og-96-21875350_1024439_0.pdf. SHA-256 3dd0bffa55dffccf985642bab2461816d287b2aaf577041cdfecc2fc9a622108. Pages 14-18,81-83 checked.

• [PHER23] Ankestyrelsen, municipal practice in cases concerning vulnerable children and young people of non-Western background, January 2023: https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732199378231181/Kommunal-praksis-i-sager-om-udsatte-b%C3%B8rn-og-unge-med-ikke-vestlig-baggrund.pdf. SHA-256 51565bc7dca3e3a2fb0dc979bbf660f46b4bdeafbe9be08f3efbaf1bc242b684. Specified results/methodology sections checked; no claim of full individual-case scrutiny across all 43 pages.

Second actor 2013: full tables, cessation of dependency and municipal responsibility

PAKT13-FUD Ankestyrelsen, The use by municipalities of other players in sickness benefits, 180 pages. CoverJuly 2013, colofon / Annex declaration maps 2013; instrument November 2012. Original Folketing Report; read public astarkivoriginal. SHA256 f0a78a2fd9c36d16321ce2ce539b2db4748b4f47c1b33f7of1791482e562762b. All 180 pages actually read, scanned 105- 116 and tables 59 / 92 / 93 / 95 visually read in memory. Own controlled cells and paraphrases in practice -second actoer2013full -original tables.json. No official original text / PDF / pixels stored.

BPA 2023: full original figures and concrete aid courses

BPA23F - Original report of the Board of Appeal, June 2023. SHA256: 3dd0bffa55dffccf985642bab2461816d287b2aaf577041cdfecc2fc9a622108.

Generation 2023: full original numbers and constructed programmes

HER23F — Ankestyrelsen's main original. SHA256: 51565bc7dca3e3a2fb0dc979bbf660f46b4bdeafbe9be08f3efbaf1bc242b684. HER23BF — Five examples, separate original Annex 2. SHA256: 406d3ac3cf8df97aed26cb4bbe8371f6168c021fb443abd1a20d1a77ab9c2c74.

Equal treatment: outcome, end-of-life and restoration

Original URL and page numbers are listed locally and in the data annex. The overall report shall place these sources in the final literature and source register.

Environmental and planning complaints: amended decisions, waiting time and actual legalisation

NH's original annual-report list; Planning Appeals Board's original annual reports. Original URL, year and locator appear in each row and in JSON. The combined bibliography and source register must appear last in the main report.

Handicap: right of appeal, waiting period and the difference between a law and effective protection

Rasmussen, P. S.; Olsen, M. G.; Røgeskov, M.; Nielsen, E. W.; Jensen, A. N. (2024). *Law prohibiting discrimination on the ground of: disability - Evaluation from a citizens and society perspective*. VIVE, ISBN 9788775823727. Official publication page, original PDF. Controlled pages and tables are listed above; own compact fact recording is available in the accompanying JSON registry.

Ministry of Social Affairs and Housing (20 September 2024). *New evaluation by VIVE on discrimination against people with disabilities*. Official publication;. Only used as public evidence of the Ministry's knowledge and publication received, not as an independent study on the VIVE report.

A three-year child excluded from municipal offers: documented discrimination, 961 days and missing recovery data;

Equal Treatment Board (17. June 2021). *Equal Treatment Board decision on disability - other - constitutes disability - finding in the party's favour*, KEN no. 9536, case no. 19-16769. Original decision. Entire decision read; the locators above distinguish between printed number and physical PDF page.

Rasmussen, P. S. and others (2024). *Non-discrimination Act on the grounds of disability - Evaluation by a citizen and social perspective;*. VIVE, ISBN 9788775823727. Original45. Secondary research of the same case; no additional case or person is added to the complaint register.

Children's barometers 2020-2024: main checked figures

• BB20, original *Children's Day Barometer 2020*: https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732297165855301/B%C3%B8rnesagsbarometeret-2020.pdf

• BB21, original *Children's Day Barometer 2021*:
https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732316862069048/B%C3%B8rnesagsbarometret-20 21.pdf

• BB22 original *Children's Day Barometer 2022*:
https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732228965030943/B%C3%B8rnesagsbarometret-20 22.pdf

• BB23, original *The 2023 Children's Day Barometer*:
https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/639137507362342039/18-30107-2-boernesagsbarometre t-2023-21164119 _ 1024439 _ 0.pdf

• BB24 original *Children's Day Barometer 2024*:
https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/639228074573458091/boernesagsbarometret-2024.pdf

Pilot 2019: documented errors in uncontested child cases

[BBP19] Ankestyrelsen, November 2019, Child Case Barometer. Pilot Study,42 pages, ISBN978-87-7811-375-7. Official original address; public archive copy of the same original. 783.546 bytes; SHA256: 1522f3e0e33d208424a7c131f0dd153cdd94a90ade1e7c116a2cabb07580d3f6. Physical/printed 1-42 read; numbers in raster figures checked visually.

[BBP19M] Ankestyrelsen, November 2019, Annex 1. Method, 6 pages. Official original address; archive copy. 100.285 bytes; SHA256: 4c3bb48166a680cad9a3d7984855157e9e3b0ca72e28b26398b5e955de796d7f. Physical / printed 1-6 read; Table 1.1 on 5 visually controlled.

[BBP19K] Ankestyrelsen, November 2019, Annex 2. Commune results, 20 pages. Official original address; archive copy. 494.647 bytes; SHA256: 1b9f4bb61c08ea8f8fab3aa7fd2f073d213abf2e033a335154b23cf74a43caf6. Physical / printed 1-20 read; all 17 figures physically 4-20 visually read.

Children's barometers 2021: all municipal and case type annexes

[BB21ANNEX] 2021 original of the Appeal Board; PDF54-76; SHA-256
b1bf61bafd453f38151c80e47e0c86704903a44667adb1349c31d87ff95af77 5.

Children's barometer 2022: all municipal and case type annexes

[BB22ANNEX] The 2022-original of the Appeal Board; PDF56-78; SHA-256
a663c7e86b7715of1b482348defc2f2e96b896be3314d898511e74f329a711 43. All attachments checked; the original is not stored locally.

Children's Day Barometer 2023: full annexes and internal deviations

[BB23ANNEX] 2023 original of the Appeal Board,64PDFsider; Annex 2PDF45-57 / Annex 3PDF58-64. SHA-256
5685ef273b0a31b3fceafab94a8e47583102214b83cd4d079a6394ab34bf8c5e. All the annexes actually read text; the essential denominator deviations are visually checked and remain separately marked.

Children's barometer 2024: all municipal and case type annexes

[BB24ANNEX] 2024 original of the Appeal Board,66PDFsider; Annex 2PDF46-58 / Annex 3PDF59-66. SHA-256
b495b778c1c934921b1d5b2f57275507650501b1fe04512e98f20db4b46d938d. Table 2.2 / 2.3 / 3.1 / 3.14 visually controlled; temporary image deleted. The module repeats the same main cases as BB24 and must not be added to as a new population.

Children's barometers 2020-2024: all published municipal annexes

[BB20ANNEX] Original 2020 of the Appeal Board; physical PDF page per row; SHA-256 bced61c357e39a7540a28cf9318f389fe807e1d952077789d4456e0eaf5fb622.

[BB21ANNEX] Original of the Appeal Board 2021; physical PDF page per row; SHA-256 b1bf61bafd453f38151c80e47e0c86704903a44667adb1349c31d87ff95of775.

[BB22ANNEX] Original 2022 of the Appeal Board; physical PDF page per row; SHA-256 a663c7e86b7715of1b482348defc2f2e96b896be3314d898511e74f329a71143.

[BB23ANNEX] Original 2023 of the Appeal Board; physical PDF page per row; SHA-256 5685ef273b0a31b3fceafab94a8e47583102214b83cd4d079a6394ab34bf8c5e.

[BB24ANNEX] Original 2024 of the Appeal Board; physical PDF page per row; SHA-256 b495b778c1c934921b1d5b2f57275507650501b1fe04512e98f20db4b46d938d.

Children's Day Barometer: pilot, break and new populations

[BBPILOTNY20] Appeals Board,2020 official article,third paragraph 228/12. Original 2019 address:https://ast.dk/publikationer/bornesagsbarometret (404 at the current check).

[BBSAM22] Ankestyrelsen, combined main results 2020–22, PDF4,21 PDF pages; SHA-256 ff63f7b5f6f1a5bd70b0ca9da912bde787a824bacd201bd5a9fc9092ce16c64b. Pilot exclusion and three free municipalities checked.

[BBPLAN26] Ankestyrelsen,16.6.2026, How to work Ankestyrelsen with the action of the municipalities in the field of children;, section Studies and Monitoring / Direct support; actually read public plan.

[BBP19 / BBP19M / BBP19K] The three November 2019 originals and precise physical locators are documented in the boernesagsbarometer -pilot 2019 -original control.md and boernesagsbarometer -pilot 2019 -original -tal.json. Main original: public copy of archives;.

The four handicap barometers: actual source control

• HB23: Disability Case Barometer 2023, April 2024.

• HB24B: Disability Case Barometer 2024 – children, March 2025.

• HB24V: The disability barometer 2024 - adults, March 2025.

• HB25: The disability case barometer 2025.

Use of force 2018: the practice review's actual population

• [PTMAGT18] Original practice check of the Appeal Board 2018,85PDFsider, ISBN978-87-7811-353-5; SHA-256 c440304ce7c9071dcfbff1b8c691d54634dbb260a0d0d42371e39b211385409b. Original publication in a public mirror; Minister's official Reference.

• [PILOTV] Appeals Board’s 2020 article with pilot population 228/12.

Task Force 2012- 2024: the central forerunner list and report coverage check

TFKAT24: SOU 2023–24 spm 404, annex 1,7.5.2024, both PDF pages. TFMID24: Same answer, annex 2, grants, PDF1, table 1. TFKAT18: § 71 spm 3, ministerial reply 6.12.2018, both pages:23 partner municipalities, four possible intakes/year, one municipality/process;2018 development/closure is phase-specific.

Task Force: actual content control against 43 key events

TFAFST - official register of deliveries 7.5.2024, PDF1-2 text controlled; individual municipal original sources are in the respective modules.

Task Force: cases, selection and continued errors

• [TFMODELH] Long cycle of disability and sources of analysis;, controlled 7.10.2026.

• [TFMODELB] Task Force - exposed children, controlled 7.10.2026.

• [TFRES25] Ministerial letter 21.5.2025, SOU annex 349, pages 1-2.

• [TFEGEDAL] Egedal Analysis Report 2020,119PDFsider; SHA-256 c875b4ff8b2e47d9071d49302ea1b06efab142f2b5a5e29f17eae6ecdccc 61f5.

• [TFSOROE24] Sorrow Child Analysis 2024,42PDFsider; SHA-256 793c9931823748cae53e43625c4e3cdfcc8a5572dd0d9f85eccafaaa7f8701 c8.

• [TFODSHERRED23] The status report of Odshrøn 2023,44PDFsider; SHA-256 16432b428157f249d346ecc750d59e5995aab74a41e13cb79d9842806efd39db.

• [TFKK20] Copenhagen Task Force Status 2020,48PDFsider; SHA-256 04801ae999015a3a877286648d5869bd46daccde01a25a7e47a7d0b3075baef2.

• [TFSOROE26] Sorose Final Children's Report 2026,27PDFsider; SHA-256 0b83196b911752c684dfdec967f411b6e3a69f0ee6b41dae72485823a2819bd1.

Guldborgsund 2022: fully original-controlled task force accounting

TFGB22: Task Force Analysis Report, Guldborgsund, October 2022PDF1-68. SHA-256 b1a5f1d7d45b71ad92f26c287a374f5c242306cfbd10d16884079ea60a60d15c. Only own compact facts and metadata stored; the original read in memory.

Lyngby-Taarbæk 2015: all original Task Force tables and denominators

TFLTK15: Task Force Analysis Report, Lyngby-Taarbæk, 2.7.2015, printed 1-80 / physically 56-135. Original SHA-256 5b640b2bb29240ff03dd39aea8cd9aede9f3760c90e96c0b78df59bf64a353de. The original only read in memory; temporary visual check deleted.

Solrød and Odense: legal samples, baseline and actual follow-up

• **TFSOL22** Solar Red Task Force Analysis, August 8, 2022. Period: 23.10.2019-22.10.2021. Original 65 pp.; SHA-256 c8d78aabe6f820ff4084d4cf4dd8de3c19f43f7c9b458ebd139988d772118e9e.

• **TFSOLBASE22** Solrød baseline, annex to committee 17. August 2022. Period:baseline before 17.8.2022; exact measurement date not stated. Original 2 pages; SHA-256 8da172147f92545e257972693e5a6a8f5540d89bc233fdf94d692461bf5e80e0.

• **TFSOL24** Solar Red Task Force Status, February 2024. Period: August 2022-November 2023. Original 49 pages; SHA-256 3e1067e66ae2c15d3619279fe3eff661165f73cf5ca26bdb7d18b691f7a86cb8.

• **TFODE22** Odense Children and Family Advice Task Force analysis, June 2022. Period: 3.1.2020- 3.1.2022. Original 67 pages; SHA-256 fd6e29d4b4913456fe02cfe3ec0d4dfd9ed89a32b03eea889b77f06e62ffef9b.

• **TFODE24** Odense Task Force status, January 2024. Period: August 2022-October 2023. Original 39 pages; SHA-256 24b3302dca050fb81b0d47caead065b3dda51829fa45e99d55275edb55c086c3.

• **TFODESAG24** Odense Children's and Youth Committee 27.2.2024, point 7. Period: 27.2.2024.

• **TFSOLHOR24** Task Force: comments on Sunred's consultation response, 20.2.2024. Period: Consultation 29.1.2024; reply 8.2.2024; comment 20.2.2024. Original 19 pp.; SHA-256 7c697caf00dc0d682297986779cd35ca9f0a608e01518f4954c3e360ff891d9c.

Solrød og Odense: full main text control of the analyses 2022

TFSOL22: Solrød Task Force analysis,8. August 2022, 65PDF pages; SHA-256 c8d78aabe6f820ff4084d4cf4dd8de3c19f43f7c9b458ebd139988d772118e9e. Official PDF access requires the parameter redirectDirectlyToPdf=true and a RAM session; no original file saved. TFODE22: Odense Children and Family Counselling Task Force analysis,June 2022, 67PDF pages; SHA-256 fd6e29d4b4913456fe02cfe3ec0d4dfd9ed89a32b03eea889b77f06e62ffef9b. Official PDF access requires the parameter redirectDirectlyToPdf=true and a RAM session; no original file saved.

Solrød and Odense: full original control of the final reports 2024

• **TFSOL24**: Original Final Report, all 49 pages checked; Period August 2022-November 2023; SHA-256 3e1067e66ae2c15d3619279fe3eff661165f73cf5ca26bdb7d18b691f7a86cb8.

• **TFODE24**: Original final report, all 39 pages checked; Period August 2022-October 2023; SHA-256 24b3302dca050fb81b0d47caead065b3dda51829fa45e99d55275edb55c086c3.

Langeland: Task Force -original 2023, warranty error, time and oversight correction 2026

• TFLAN23: Langeland Task Force analysis March 2023; 41 pp.; SHA2564c55c8852936504b27210db4be361a9dab2def229cbf0656b93f32eb8 c3ac960.

• TFLANISM26:Ministry’s opinion 29.5.2026, case no. 2025-11404, document 4556205;16 pages;SHA256659892b04fad5df280187d8e7a230a8dc02eb9bd885a3f87a65309e4b11a8487.

Næstved 2023: original case committee, warranty errors and time denominators

• TFNAE23: Official original; read archive copy,4.12.2023,42 pp., SHA256a29630636d6a47977d7d7055e836b8150470d4ddebate54322ea17fb6 9851d35.

• TFNAENY25: Official closing news 3.10.2025, full news read; qualitative statements, no original final tables.

Stevns 2020: end-of-life measurement, continued warranty errors and concrete placement process

• TFSTE20: Municipal original; actually read official archive copy, June 2020,52PDFsider, SHA256bb59162bfeb0be904a79697f6ea25196c0edde56c80837ab9a72e5e0e632b99.

Frederiksberg 2021: warranty error, delay and source internal deviations

• TFFRE21: Municipal original; actually read official archive copy,69PDFsider, SHA256335e46001147cfad045bb2f5b420901ed80e8cfd9d66d7b6 2c49260583b5c8f.

Nordfyn 2020: assessment backlog, financial management and missing placement follow-up

• TFNOR20: actually read public original, September 2020,58PDFsider, SHA2563df02dabc3c0cea3c0c687ca6973062b5dbd321068d212ee8b1514a6082695b2.

• Initial publication of the municipality; RAMcontrolled archived link page.

Rudersdal: continued guarantee deficiencies after Task Force progress, 2024-2026

• **TFRUD26**: Final report 03.03.2026; all 26 pages read as text; PDF7 visually checked: photograph, no table. SHA-256 5e779e38e249ba74938ce90039247ed23118cc9d5f4af667ded33f6b6625612e.

• **TFRUDH26**: Comment on consultation response 02.03.2026; all 4 pages read. SHA-256 ae7ecb44298ed5f7c9c72479d3dd1c1f249b32fc4a9ea909602432997cf60f80.

• **TFRUDM25**: Mid-term review April 2025; all 4 pages read. SHA-256 ce26a79270a3e974970en98f609329887960f9e70e5995c8477c139557d0c213.

• **TFRUDE25**: Extraordinary status 23.10.2025; whole page read. SHA-256 2042e7b5a25b27e649a410052977e4b59b713a68061ed15d3e6c66eb2324963b.

• **TFREK25**: Local status matrix over 25 recommendations; all 6 pages read; not the original analytical report. SHA-256 5dff6177424bb1d940c549dba1a11bb0c7f7de95bfeb7c71efefbd8b5fd24eb1.

Rudersdal 2024: the initial Task Force original

• TFRUD24: Analysis report Rudersdal June 2024, all 40 pages textual, PDF39 visually controlled; SHA256 44247119ab9cb205460befe180b50f050d812dbca31688d85965195d83df91e7. Officially submitted 21.08.2024 paragraph 12 / Case 24 / 8396.

Slagelse: legal guarantees, waiting time and municipal control 2020- 2021

• TFSL20: Task Force analysis Slagelse October 2020 - All 61 physical pages read as text; PDF37/38/53 visually checked in RAM; SHA256 0690d336e148ecf1dd85159b725e61da41e8dd4d156530656998d56a3cb926bb.

• TFSL21: Municipal status Task Force October 2021 submitted 01.11.2021 - All 15 physical pages text read; PDF6 / 8 / 9 / 10 / 11 / 14 visually controlled in RAM; SHA256 7630a650ba9d6d6ec18786d7bc7d1f97582efda80020274f62800084b07f099c.

Middelfart 2020: original figures, action programmes and development plan

• TFMID20: public original, All 69 pages textual; PDF44 / 46 / 60 visual RAM-controlled; SHA256 6026069ca6222cf58881efbb6bdf5cf022b63d5d8d915ed34b177d2fcd84b2e3.

• TFMIDP20: public original, All 13 pages textual; SHA256 c69240bec7b20b31d031fb0caf8eab1cc6e19804d32eb16c0cbb1a12b542a288.

• TFMIDM22: public original, Meeting point 33 / 14.06.2022 fully read RAM; no annexes to the report under point; SHA256 19df153d9e29259b7978bacb527e7513b60f338dcfe699d462f1f98d55e91a8b.

• TFMIDV19: public original, Official meeting point 103 / 12.11.2019 fully RAM-read; SHA256 f616fdecb37d649fb6e9f2c5a1287e03d168ce5d7941c23fab277f3422fb2f9d.

Frederikssund: adult disability, the entire Task Force original 2022

FSA22 · The municipality's public original, preserved archive version. SHA256 4bad0684fb85622443f2700542d266en5efeaac90395261a89797b28cca9fc6d. All 133 pages, Table 1 physical PDF62 / printed 60.

Sorø: children's analysis 2024 and final report 2026, full originals

TFSOROE24, AllePDF1-42 text read; SHA256 793c9931823748cae53e43625c4e3cdfcc8a5572dd0d9f85eccafaaa7f8701c8. TFSOROE26, AllePDF1-27 text read; SHA256 0b83196b911752c684dfdec967f411b6e3a69f0ee6b41dae72485823a2819bd1.

Replaces: National Audit Report 11 / 2025 and follow-up in 2026

• **RRAN26** Report 11 / 2025 on procedures for the placement of children; original 54 pages, SHA-256 2697158db430b2727c68288f00566200efc74f1f155b7c31ccb73490d5584ece. Decisions 2022-2024; data and ministerial action 2021-2024; original all pages read. Figure 4 / 6, Table C and note annexes visually controlled.

• **RRANSM26** Statement by the Minister for Social Affairs 10 June 2026; original 4 pages, SHA-256 2e6036477ffc70e7a5219e58cf2977290fabc8ba2aff189b670708819d02019a. All four original pages read.

• **RRANC11126** Note C111 / 26, dated 24 June 2026; cover August 2026; original 7 pages, SHA-256 72bdebf1b785e7b3a3c0ebff1a277e254a0664b679772cfcab61b827985a5e20. All seven original pages read; table of meeting visually controlled.

Placement statistics 2010: all annual-original figures, charts and methodology

ASAN10: Ankestyrelsen, *Placement statistics. Annual statistics 2010*, October 2011, ISBN 978-87-7811-157-9, 56 physical PDF pages. Public original mirror hosted by Socialpædagogerne. SHA256 4899a808233d348b4aade6b06bf7aa502f532246827adb7dbf294cd2f8e73809. All pages read as text; our figure checks PDF 10/12/16/17/19/20/21/24/25/29/32/33/34/52 and root check 4/11. No original PDF, complete source text or original pixels stored locally. Earlier person modules' AS 2010 extracts come from the same original and must not be added to these tables. This full numerical delivery replaces their limited coverage status, not the source population. No request has been sent.

Return and duration of placement: reconciliation of public publication

• **DST-PUB26A:** Public table catalogue, active and completed tables, read October 7, 2026. The 44 tableinfos are taken from the statistical bank's public tableinfo- API; direct table references are given in the vote. Compact own metadata register: dst- public- ophors- and -duration catalogue.json.

• **DST-PUB26B:** Current content description of placement statistics, section on mid-year/year-end status and research registers with reasons for cessation and destinations.

• **DST-PUB26C:** Precision and reliability, section on reporting, validation and detail uncertainty.

Youth Crime Board 2019-2025:decisions, errors, time and return home

• [UKN2019] Annual Report 2019, p.9,11 Table 3,15 Table 5,45- 47. https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/gupdxen5/aarsberetning-2019. pdf

• [UKN2020] Annual Report 2020, p.4-10,45-46. p. https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/rgvobagy/aarsberetning-2020.pdf

• [UKN2021] Annual Report 2021, p.4-8,39-42. https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/rtthv4sb/aarsberetning-2021.pdf

• [UKN2022] Annual Report 2022, p. 4-8,32-34. https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/vysh5vaq/aaarsberetning-2022.pdf

• [UKN2023] Annual Report 2023, p.5-9,24-26,32-34. p. https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/0btltavj/ungdomskriminalitetsnaevnets-aars Report-2023.pdf

• [UKN2024] Annual Report 2024, p.5-9,31- 34. https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/oqmhxndt/a-rsberetning-2024.pdf

• [UKN2025] Annual Report 2025, p.5-10,21-24,29-34. p. https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/unjnaam3/ungdomskriminalitetsnaevnet-a- rådsreport-2025.pdf

Children under 15:detention, seclusion and missing redress

• **B15-01** The prosecution service's current statistics page, sections on complaints about operational decisions, under 15 and secrecy of communications; status 7. October 2026. Original public publication status.

• **B15-02** The Attorney General, *Opinion on detention and placement of suspected persons under the age of 15 in 2021*, RA-2022-3200514-2, p.1-5; all 5 pages read. Original 2021.

• **B15-03** Advocate General, Opinion 2022,8 September 2023, R-2023-3200514-3, p.1-5; all 5 pages read. Original 2022.

• **B15-04** Director of Public Prosecutions, corresponding opinion 2023, pp.1-4; all 4 pages read. Original 2023.

• **B15-05** Director of Public Prosecutions, *Graphical presentation of developments 2017-2021*,2 pages, also 2016 totals; both pages read. Original graph annex.

• **B15-06** Director of Public Prosecutions, *Graphical presentation of developments 2018-2022*,2 pages; both pages read, district chart visually checked. Original graph annex.

• **B15-07** Director of Public Prosecutions, *Graphical representation 2019-2023*,2 pages; both figure pages checked visually in memory. Original graph annex.

Accidental events: controlled annual data, demarcation and follow-up

-[UTH2006] Original/source of information 2006. -[UTH2007] Original/source of information 2007. -[UTH2008] Original/source of information 2008. -[UTH2009] Original/source of information 2009. -[UTH2010] Original/source of information 2010. -[UTH2011] Original/source of information 2011. -[UTH2014] Original/source of information 2014. -[UTH2015] Original/source of information 2015. -[UTH2016] Original/source of information 2016. -[UTH2017] Original/source of information 2017. -[UTH2018] Original/source of information 2018. -[UTH2019] Original/source of information 2019. -[UTH2020] Original/source of information 2020. -[UTH2021] Original/source of information 2021. -[UTH2022] Original/source of information 2022. -[UTH2023] Original/source of information 2023. -[UTH2024] Original/source of information 2024. -[UTH2025] Original/source of information 2025.

-[DPSD2007OR] Annual original 2007 in public webarkiv.

-[DPSD2012OR] Annual original 2012 in public webarkiv.

DPSD 2007 and 2012: historical annual originals, table figures and selection

• DPSD2007OR: Danish Health Authority, March 2008; version date XX.March 2008,67 pages; SHA256d6d8b96935601a0afba7fac4b623f209b5dea86e3e934fa64ea84f75d2cf7e1c. Primary original URL:http://www.sst.dk/Publ/Publ2008/EFT/DPSD/DPSDaarsrap2007_saml_ministeriet.pdf.

• DPSD2012OR: Patient Ombudsman, March 2013,18 pp.; SHA2562f894f1779bcec20e19b820c9aaf2a8d1906009ecd18820b5963d10f1330308 c. Primary original URL:http://www.patientombuddet.dk/Publikationer/Aarsberetninger/~/media/POB/Aarsberetninger/2012/2012%20%C3%85rs Report% 20DPSD% 20Share% 201.ashx.

DPSD 2012: Health Service Contribution and Learning Annexes

• [DPSD12D2] Original in public archive; PDF1-389; all material response fields read, contact blocks / repetitive questions omitted from the RAM display from PDF55. PDF384 actually visually controlled in RAM; no original files or images saved; SHA-256 597806804a9318f1255ecbcdfa5bec914be4901e5ba89de4922d73859d3f5b02.

• [DPSD12L] Original in public archive; All 12 pages text read; projecttable PDF11 actually visually controlled in RAM; SHA-256 2399b7f4ca2d3a14f5abaafd25550445fc4c6df1c25401ed7a3f3feb0ce9c44a.

The Patient Complaints Board 2010: original time targets, production and historical version differences

[PKNA10] The Patient Complaints Board, Annual Report 2010,21 physical pages. Official previous address; actually read public archive copy, capture 20160503102330. 587.566 bytes; SHA256cefb06268f4772048b8d201160199c55e9923b5616102755d9179d3e6017fa3c. Visual RAMcontrol of 2,4,5,9,10,11; all reproduced figures originate from these actually read pages. No local original file or original image page.

[PKNS16] The Patient Safety Agency, May 2017, Patient Complaint Statistics 2016 version 1.0. Official originalTable 3 physically 5 / printed 4. Initial check and other denominators in the health year module; this own composition does not change the original population.

Health Disciplinary Board 2011: original outcomes, resumption and lack of evidence

SDN11FT: Annual Report 2011 of the Danish Health Service Disciplinary Board, Official Reproduction of the Danish Parliament. 34 printed pages. The entire HTML text reproduction read October 7, 2026; Critical matrix and retakes p.9, method p.6-12, case-by-case p. 13-24, learning p. 25, Rules of Procedure p. 28-30 Graphics without available text numbers have not been visually verified. The document -ID1131055 identifies this disciplinary report in the complete annex.

Psykiatrics: follow-up to waiting, coercion and change of rights

• **CPsy25:** National Audit Office, RN C121/25, dated 26. November 2025, cover December 2025: Original follow-up memorandum on the right to diagnostic assessment. All 13 pages read; figures 1-2 and table 1 visually checked. Official news entry 28. November 2025. The dates have different functions.

• **CTv 25:** Rigsrevisionen, RN C117 / 25, dated 20 October 2025, cover November 2025: Original concluding note on action against coercive. All six pages read; Table 1 visually controlled. Official News October 22, 2025.

• **PsyL25:** Law 1762 of 29 December 2025, both original pagesParagraph 1 (1) to (6) and (10) to (11) and Section 2. Folketinget's L45-overview controlled for adoption 19 December 2025 and log identification. The final legislative text is used rather than earlier proposals.

Patient insurance 2006-2010: original figures by source version and delimitation

• **PFOR06**: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, Original Domain of Authorities; public archives;. Archive version 20110707050638; 21 physical PDFs pages; 1181726 bytes; SHA256 1d41d72c14f88ce6a2b51a378b14f3dfbd67c8bef0474cbf796d0ad3a62704e9.

• **PFOR07**: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, Original Authority Domain; public archives;. Archive version 20110707050655; 21 physical PDFs pages; 778227 bytes; SHA256 79be97a0938760e376782c8deaa7dff22dd65accece9a6e937901bff65e529ed.

• **PFOR08**: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008, Original Authority Domain; public archives;. Archive version 20110707045849; 15 physical PDFs pages; 1392493 bytes; SHA256 250b149bb55f2461795ac8d5ca193917e4dbc4b63c89ca18de639cb9a31e422d.

• **PFOR09**: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, Original Domain of Authorities; public archives;. Archive version 20110707050307; 36 physical PDFs pages; 2049033 bytes; SHA256 00536600dd41bc2515428c3e72fbc022376d1f15481f6ee7431abe79bd493c15.

• **PFOR10**: Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, Original Authority Domain; public archives;. Archive version 20110707050613; 28 physical PDFs pages; 2809500 bytes; SHA256 b37c2d54769b2f736b47e6fe22cca1c69cb4f8bbd38103668bac8f61df3e7560.

Patient insurance 2006: regional original decision and financial statements

• **PFR06H**: Patient insurance Statistics 2006, Capital Region; the initial link of authority;; archive version 20070703002525; 29734 bytes; SHA256 673830e16335c12b96cc0c9c4a6b3c8f7c11d86ac9fdae14bedd47b482dfd4d0. All four numerical original tables and their column headings read. HTML page; locator section 1-4.

• **PFR06M**: Patient insurance Statistics 2006, Region of Central Jutland; the initial link of authority;; archive version 20080123154118; 29958 bytes; SHA256 6c9724de0eadb07901b95d2b63f9989d13ba98d37ca6d95c84a7d54d336a0212. All four numerical original tables and their column headings read. HTML page; locator section 1-4.

• **PFR06N**: Patient insurance Statistics 2006, Region North Jutland; the initial link of authority;; archive version 20080123154125; 24398 bytes; SHA256 5f328c909cab3eed8e3105bebb2ade6aa7773a29f9db536946880148d79fb419. All four numerical original tables and their column headings read. HTML page; locator section 1-4.

• **PFR06S**: Patient Insurance Statistics 2006, Region Zealand; original authority link; archive version 20080122171756; 28652 bytes; SHA256 eb7836c334edee8f1c3f29749673a20d76244e6e3eb8b0dd61300f97ce90846d. All four original numerical tables and their column headings read. HTML page; locator sections 1-4.

• **PFR06Y**: Patient insurance Statistics 2006, Region South Denmark; the initial link of authority;; archive version 20070905021812; 23657 bytes; SHA256 d99d9750adbb89eb1967c02d71c2e98b42e77d74825e5589898281011fda551e. All four numerical original tables and their column headings read. HTML page; locator section 1-4.

Health: known risk, long review and documented oversight failure

FOB09T: Folketingets Ombudsmand,2009 12-2,*5 ½ years of total handling time at the Health Service's Patient Complaints Board*. Opinion of 22 October 2009, para. 2009- 0031- 400. Official original PDF. All 10 physical pages text read in RAM7 October 2026; printed pages 1-9 plus printed cover page. Official text page.

SSTAM13: Danish Health Authority,7. May 2013, case no.5-441-554/1,*The Danish Health Authority's handling of the case concerning specialist Arne Mejlhede*. SUU 2012-13, annex 290. Official PDF, official HTML text. The entire 8-page text reproduction read; the dates in the table on p.4 read from PDF text with page markers. No graphical or visual check is attested.

FOB10J: Folketingets Ombudsmand,25 October 2010, j.nr. 2008-2276-420,*Hospital doctors' medical records*, FOB 2010- 4-4. Official original PDF. All 13 physical pages of text read in memory on October 7, 2026; printed 1-12 plus printed cover page. Criticism, concrete statements by the authorities and the legal distinction between responsibility and control have been independently verified in the original.

Data Protection Agency 2006-2017: historical public control figures

Data Protection Agency, Annual Reports 2006, 2007, 2008-2009 and 2010-2017. All original statistical tables are read; exact URL and printed pages are in each row. Official publication directory.

National tax law: original knowledge of guarantee breaches and waiting time in 2006-2007

• **LSRFOB07:** FOB 2007.525, Final Report on 40 actions brought by the National Tax Court,176 physical PDFs pages. In this module, PDF1-4,9-10,91-94,97-101,110-118 and 134-139 content is controlled; the total time distribution of PDF98 is visually controlled in memory. No full reading of 176 pages or individual underlying tax acts is claimed. The original and original images are not stored locally.

Taxes 2009-2012: original outages, hidden changes and actual waiting time

• **FXTAX01** EMD, Ferrazzini v. Italy [GC], 44759 / 98,12 July 2001, § 25-31; legal basis before the period, no new Danish incident. Original judgment.

• **FXTAX02** ECtHR, Vegotex International S.A. v. Belgium [GC],49812/09,3. November 2022, introduction and Article 6's criminal review; international legal basis, no Danish event. Original judgment.

• **LSRH11** National Tax Court, Annual Report 2011. 30 physical PDFs pages; actual reading delineation in the module's numerical annex. Archived official original.

• **LSRH12** National Tax Court, Annual Report 2012. 31 physical PDFs pages; actual reading delineation in the module's numerical annex. Archived official original.

National Tax Tribunal 2006: administrative outcomes, hidden findings in parties' favour and actual waiting time

LSR06O. National Tax Court, Annual Report 2006,64 pp. Historical official address: http://www.skm.dk/public/dokumenter/landsskatteretten2006.pdf. Public Archives, capture 20070630025107.589878 bytes; SHA256396a84fdb6177929c5614c1786010f420a1b33dc022a8865820ea2615096e2. Physical and printed pagination are the same. All its own tables, the original rules of the denominators and the locators can be found in the National Tax Court -2006- original -tal.json and the National Tax Court - 2006- original -tables .md.

National Tax Law 2007, 2008 and 2013: actual original access after 2006 - found

Public historical records: CDX with documented hosts / filters in table above; old official annual report page, capture 20070108152045. Folketingets ODA Document Register, title / annual filters specified above. All notices have been made in memory. Only its own compact results and method boundaries are saved, no complete public source extraction.

2013: official annual report, FT SAU 20131 annex 196, all pp.1-16 read as text in this review; pp.5/8/9 contain the existing statistical and target tables. No new visual pixel check; the original is not stored locally. Evaluation of the tax complaints structure, FT SAU 20171 annex 209, only the specific methodology check on 37-38 in this delivery. The Auditor General's follow-up memorandum of 6. May 2010, p. 3. No percentage reproduced secondarily has been back-calculated into an alleged original count of administrative successful claims.

National Tax Law 2007: documented management knowledge, leisure time and process changes

• **LSRLEAN07** National Tax Law, 22 February 2007, *Group project to reduce the duration of proceedings in the National Tax Court (mid-term report)*31 pages. Historical official original. All 31 pages of text read in RAM, PDF9 / 26 / 28 / 29 visually controll.263005 bytes; SHA256 a5b39cfd391001a59c65ca662080117092b48d9b8d5ae4ad3674e6a342ad0968.

• **LSR06O-GEN** 2006 annual report's hashdentical official re-publication.64 pages; new identification pages 1-3 read; other actual reading in the LSR06O module. SHA256 396aa84fdb6177929c5614c1786010f420a1b33dc022aa8865820ea2615096e2. No new statistical population.

• **LSRWRITE07** Writer Guide 2007, Historically official tester.28 pages; only 1-3 actually read for delimitation. HA256 3d8b047b11d5669432fb53f7ff0592e1717c86b5cf3b0b32c0b7f99a5e59df39.

• Public archive metadata, CDX,7. October 2026: domain queries landsskatteretten.dk, lsr.dk, skatteankestyrelsen.dk,status 200 and MIME PDF/Word/spreadsheet/binary, all names, collapseURL.41/1/121URL occurrences; metadata alone without original-content evidence.

Tax appeals:outcomes, hidden remittals for reconsideration and time

Skatteankestyrelsen, original case statistics 2014-2025, individual URLs and PDF pages above; official publication list.

The Refugee Board: decisions, cases concerned and waiting period 2006-2025

The original URL and page number of all annual reports are at the individual row. The compact JSON retains denominators, device, methodical breakage and unbalanced source differences. The document shall be annexed and the data base shall be included in the overall report; its total list of literature and sources shall be placed at the end.

EMD decisions: full public register and person count

ECtHR, HUDOC, original decisions individually identified above. Sources have been read in memory; the data file retains our compact metadata and document identifiers. The register date is the adoption date. Klein explicitly shows why public notification date and adoption year must be retained separately.

EMD: finality, implementation and actual restoration

EMD, HUDOC-EXEC, all Danish document metadata, extracted 7.10.2026; original resolutions, identified in the table. Ministerial Committee, Annual Report 2025, p. 67. Official Committee of the Ministers Denmark-factaark, updated 11.6.2026, p. 4-9.

Greenland 2013: State's full response, lack of control and concrete guarantees

Council of Europe / CPT and Danish Government (2013): *Response of the Danish Government to the report of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) on its visit to Greenland from 25 to 27September 2012*, CPT / Inf (2013) 11, Strasbourg 3July 2013,31 physical pages. Official document reference; public archive copy of official original, 6November 2013. All statistical rows and sections of response have separate sidecomers above. The source section is placed in the final bibliography of the overall report.

UPR 2026: the entire original basis, Denmark's knowledge and compliance

• **UPR26-WG** UN, A / HRC / 63 / 10,10 July 2026,26 pages, all actually RAM text read. FN symbol. Read copy of the UN original.

• **UPR26-NAT** UN, A / HRC / WG.6 / 52 / DNK / 1,20 February 2026,21 pages, all actually RAM text read. SHA256 01d83c4865c0d9c79e8c8ade2a083c22532a307569e6214893c8c249d5307b6a. Final national report.

• **UPR26-UN** OHCHR,A/HRC/WG.6/52/DNK/2,6. February 2026,10 pages, all actually read as text in RAM. SHA256 053247cf58523cdd2bb87e0d1d900f1fd6122a86a9b58ed64023a8fe9bea252b. Treaty compilation.

• **UPR26-CSO** OHCHR,A/HRC/WG.6/52/DNK/3,28. January 2026,10 pages, all actually read as text in RAM. SHA256 316c173caa355c1a72782c27b0a70c2563b286a421539cab76bce38e200f3a1c. Stakeholder summary.

• **UPR26-MOEDE** UN automatic meeting transcript,63rd session,28th meeting,25. September 2026,1:51 segment and 2:27:41;not an official record. Meeting transcript with source limitation.

• **UPR26 ADD ACCESS** The symbol view of the answer document; the embedded API provided error page at the control 7 October 2026. Not read as a reply.

Children cases in Copenhagen: from error figures to actual interventions

• **KK17** Copenhagen Citizens' Adviser,24. May 2017, *The quality of case handling and exercise of authority at the Children and Young People Citizens' Centre*,126 pages. Pp.6-8 overall result;12-14 sampling and verification;21-24 support/accompanying-person rights;66-69 specific matters and follow-up;74-75 previous oversight. Original report. Same original as R03; no new statistical population through the additional source ID.

Remittal for reconsideration, actual return home and interim protection

• **HG01:** Order of the Supreme Court 3 November 2025, BS-28216 / 2025 -HJR, original, 10 pages, the entire order checked; time calculations made from the specified dates. Order for suspension of effect on the placement of a Faroese child.

• **HG02:** Appeals Permission Board, leave granted 8. May 2025, public announcement 9. May 2025, case nos.25/10144 and 25/10519. On suspensive effect in a case concerning placement of a Faroese child in Denmark.

• **HG03:** Decision of the Appeal Board of Appeal C-5-99, KEN No 9414 of 15 July 1999, original, 2 pages, both sides controlled; historical source of rules outside the counting period. C-5 / 99 on the abolition, return and subsequent aid.

• R07-R11 refer to the coded original sources on remittal for reconsideration, the Children's Act, *Strand Lobben*, oversight of return home and liability for damages in the report's final bibliography and source list.

Children's contact, freedom and actual repatriation: three documented steps of government

• **BK-K01:** Folketingets Ombudsmand, FOB 2018- 26,4 July 2018, j.nr.17 / 05145,15 pages. The entire original opinion has been checked. Original.

• **BK-K02:** Folketingets Ombudsmand, *Inspection of the secure institution Egely - follow-up*,12. April 2011, case no. 2007-3697-628/PK3,42 physical pages. The information used about confinement and authorities' assessments is on printed pp.35-40, physical pp.36-41; the institution's activity information is in the section on duration of stays. No new review of all private reports in the case has been carried out. Original.

• **BK-K03:** Folketingets Ombudsmand, FOB 2018- 33, original opinion 7 November 2018, j.nr.17 / 00750,36 pp. The whole of the opinion and its presentation of the case have been checked. The legal rules applied are the historical rules set out in that opinion. Original.

• **BK-K04:** Criminal Code, consolidated Act LBK871 of 4. July 2014,§ 263. Historical statutory text delimiting acts involving communications; a specific criminal case requires checking the version of the law at the time of the act. Original.

Concrete action: separation time, citizens' consequences and responsibility

• **IF01** Court of Impeachment, judgment 13. December 2021, pp.112-118(families, times and reproduced primary documents),138-142(violations and responsibility),145-149(sentence). Original judgment.

• **IF02** The Prime Minister, 23 March 2023, decision to revoke disciplinary warning, 4 pages. Original decision.

• **IF03** The interview management, 10 February 2023, *Report and recommendation on the occasion of an official inquiry against Chief of Police Thorkild Fogde*, published Part 8,16 pages. Original excerpt.

• **IF04** The Ministry of Justice, March 2023, decision to revoke disciplinary reprimand for Johan Legarth. Original decision.

• **IF05** The Ministry of Justice, 24 March 2023, the employment law follow-up, later the CMS update date of 2 October 2025 on the same page, using the decision process 2022-2023. Notification by the Ministry.

• **IF06** Folketing, Report 24,8 July 2022, *Report on the report of the minkkommission*.30 physical pages including cover page. Parliamentary original.

Tibet: illegal censorship, misleading information, lack of material and delayed liability

TB01. Tibetan Commission I, *Report*, 2017, Volume 2, Chapter 4, printed p. 351-375; physical PDFs p. 9-33 are checked in context. Volume 1 is a reference to the first report, not to claim full reading of all annexes.

TB02. Tibetan Commission II, *Report*, 2022, Volume 1, printed pp. 25-47 and 99- 106, and Volume 2, contiguous pp. 1110-1138, Section 9.7 and Chapter 10. Locators are for printed page numbers. Public reporting is also documented in Notification by the Ministry of Justice of 28 March 2022 and Folketingets Annex 209;.

TB04. Eastern High Court, judgment of 29. October 2025, S-3118-23, Judgment Database, case 10805, full original judgment, pp. 1-21, and the register's indication of finality. The displayed ECLI DK:OLR:2026:SS0000000020 has the year 2026, but the judgment's own date is 29. October 2025; the publication identifier's year does not change the judgment date. Underlying District Court judgment: 1. November 2023, SS 3-12715/2022.

TB05. The Danish Parliament, Report No 1 of 17 May 2023 on the treatment of certain aspects of the Tibetan Commission II Report, 2022 / 2 BR 1, entire original, five PDFs pages.

TB06. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Opinion on Tibetan Commission II, 1 April 2022, the Ministry's decision on Martin Bille Hermann. Ritzau is a distribution channel; the sender is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

TB07. The Copenhagen Police Department, compensation to offenders in Tibetan case, 18 April 2018;, initial regulatory notice of eight requirements, offers and three obsolete requirements.

TB08. The Public Prosecutor's Office Police officers continue to be charged with false explanation in court, 28 April 2022, subsequent procedural decision. The final decision is TB04.

The settlement procedure: non-compliance with the Convention, delay and liability until 2026

• [SL01] Stateless Persons Commission (2015), *Report*, volume 9, particularly printed pp. 2736-2747, 2752-2755, 2785-2796, 2809-2813, 2822-2828 and annex 18 pp. 2993-2997. Original volume 9. The decisive case rows, refusal/delay annexes and responsibility sections used have been checked; the entire nine-volume report is not described as fully read.

• [SL02] Stateless Persons Commission (2015), *Report*, volume 8, the commission's case review and table of contents. Original volume 8. The judgment's summary is only a secondary link relative to the commission annexes used.

• [SL03] The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Integration and Housing, 21 December 2015, Closure of the Claes Nilas case.

• [SL04] Same Ministry, 11 January 2016, closure of the Kim Lunding case;.

• [SL05] Højesteret, *Annual Report 2018*, printed p. 15, record of UfR 2018.3230 H. Original annual report. Used as the court's own record, not as a claim to read through the whole of the previous judgment.

• [SL06] Folketinget's Committee on the Rules of Procedure,*Report on the Statelessness Commission's report*, no.4 of 4. March 2016, particularly physical pp.20-24. Original report.

• [SL07] Østre Landsret, judgment of 28 May 2025, BS-4484 / 2012-OLR, in particular pp. 4-9 and 124-129. Original judgment in the judgment database. The key counts, time data and final assumptions are read in the original; all individual explanations in the middle are not described as fully reviewed.

• [SL08] Højesteret, Judgment of 21 August 2026, BS-36329 / 2025 -HJR, p. 1 -7. Original judgment. The entire sentence has been checked.

Mink: legal basis, actual pressure, responsibility and publicity

• **MK01.** Commission of Inquiry into the Mink Culling Case, *Report*, 2022, volume 2, chapter 8, especially pp.632-650,657-717,727-748. The original's public HTML has been checked in the specified sections: https://www.ft.dk/samling/20211/almdel/GRA/bilag/46/2602662/index.htm.

• **MK02.** The State Police, *The National Police revokes two disciplinary warnings issued in September 2022*, 2.6.2023: https://politi.dk/rigspolitiet/nyhedsliste/vedr-advarsler/2023/06/02.

• **MK03.** Folketingets Ombudsmand, *FOB 2024-5*, 6.3.2024, Cases 23 / 03723 and 23 / 04352, original 14 pages: https://cdn2.gopublic.dk/ombudsmanden/Media/638454031628418603/2024-5%20Ikke%20ret%20til%20aktindsigt%20i%20begrundelser....pDf.

• **MK04.** Ministry of the Environment, *Legal follow-up to the Minkkommission's report*, 24.8.2022: https://mim.dk/nyheder/pressemeddelelser/2022/august/ansaettelsesretlig-opfoelgning-paa-minkkommissionens-beretning.

• **MK05.** Esbjerg Municipality, *Green Council, Report 1.3.2023*, information on Henrik Studsgaard's new executive position: https://www.esbjerg.dk/energi-og-miljoe/natur/det-groenne-raad/referater.

• **MK06.** The Ministry of Justice, *Withdrawal of disciplinary warning to Anne-Mette Lyhne Jensen*, 23.3.2023, original 5 pages: https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Afgoerelse-om-tilbagekaldelse.pdf.

• **MK07.** Folketingets Ombudsmand, *FOB 2024-6*, 6.3.2024, Case 23 / 03978; official summary checked: https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/find-viden/udtalelser/2024/2024-6.

IF02-IF05 is indicated with full source references in the complete literature and source list.

Green Desert: assault fund, Danish responsibility and long-term trial

• **GD01.** Højesteret, Decisions 31.5.2022,134 / 2018 and 141 / 2018, public anonymised original, 35 pages, in particular 24-35: https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/joylaspi/134-141-anonymisere.pdf.

• **GD02.** EMD, *Abdulaal Naser and Others v. Denmark*,46571 / 22,21.10.2025, final 21.1.2026, original with complainant's table: https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/html/body?id=001-245259&library=ECHR.

• **GD03.** The United Nations Committee on Torture, *CAT/ C / DNK / CO / 8*,8.12.2023, § 40-41,48-49, original physical p.10-11: https://documents.un.org/api/symbol/access?l=en&s=CAT%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F8&t=pdf.

Samsam: authority information, evidential chain and late review

• **SA01** Højesteret,02.09.2025, BS-58021 / 2023-HJR, 21 pages. Original judgment via the Verified Document Link of the Courts. S.2-3 translation; 9-14 explanation on dialogue and requirements; 16-21 assumptions and result.

• **SA02** PET and FE, 02.09.2025, joint opinion following the judgment. Own recognition of services.

Greenland: body integrity, separation and delayed repair

• [GL01] Jensen, Tenna et al. (2025), *Independent investigation of contraceptive practices in Kalaallit Nunaat during the period 1960-1991*, Ilisimatusarfik and National Institute of Public Health, SDU. Co-authors: Bonnie Jensen, Ellen Bang Bourup, Gitte Adler Reimer, Ingelise Olesen, Janne Rothmar Herrmann, Maja Christiansen and Mette Seidelin. ISBN 978-87-7899-707-4. Original investigation, 347 physical pages. The methodology, rights, statistics, consent, consequences and concluding sections used have been checked against the original. No full reading of all historical archival references or every subtable in the annexes is claimed.

• [GL02] Law No 722 of 1 September 2026, *Law on compensation for women subject to the contraceptive procedure (spiral case) Greenland from 1960 to 1991*, full text, three physical pages.

• [GL03] The Patienterstatningen, Women's compensation for contraception in Greenlandin Section on the case status and date of update, entered on 7 October 2026. Danish update date 30th September, Greenlandic 23rd September; same table showed. Status is a dated snapshot.

• [GL04] Lund Jensen, Einar, Sniff Andersen Nexø and Daniel Thorleifsen (2020), *Historical investigation into the 22 Greenlandic children who were sent to Denmark in 1951*, submitted 15. November. Original investigation, 96 physical pages, particularly chapters 1 and 9. The investigation's distinction between contemporary sources and recollections is retained.

• [GL05] Ministry of Social Affairs and the Elderly, 25 February 2022, Reimbursement on the way to six living Greenlanders. The Ministry's notice documents the published terms of the agreement; independent bank documents have not been provided.

Investigation commissions: knowledge, time and actual responsibility

• **KO01** Ministry of Justice committee, *Commissions of inquiry and parliamentary forms of investigation*, report 1571,2018. Delimited original sections pp.90-118 and 128-132. Original report. The upload year 2021 is not the publication year.

• **KO02** Instrukskommissionen, final report April 2021, volume 6, corrigendum; pp.3492-3509,3526-3528,3568-3580. The physical page number is the printed page number minus 3475. Original volume.

• **KO03** The Danish Parliament, *Ministerial responsibility*, overview of commissions and legal / political accountability, controlled 07.10.2026. Official overview.

• **KO04** FE- Commission II, own mandate and status, including letters 13.12.2024 and 25.06.2026, verified 07.10.2026. Original status.

• **KO05** Ministry of Justice, 09.07.2026, transmission of FEII's letter 25.06.2026. The Ministry's message and document links.

• **KO06** Danish Parliament, B27,2025-2026(1. session), official case status and consideration. Course of the proposal.

• **KO07** The Folketing, L118,2025-2026 (1st Session), submitted 25.02.2026, status "Discontinued." Official case status.

Cassation of social complaints: documented loss of evidence

• [ARK-FOB08] FOB 2008.399, Cassation of Social Appeals Acts: https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/fob/2008/399/dan/pdf. The relevant original sections are read in memory; not all 35 pages are fully reviewed. SHA256 at latest PDF generation 7 October 2026: 6c5c2921bb7e2ab648602a15467332c9bdfda1of30c9871eddea4bc707b39a4c. The dynamic PDF of court information can get a different filhash on a later download.

State administration 2025: control, continued errors and actual follow-up

[RRAAR25] Rigsrevisionen,20/2025,17.8.2026,61 PDF pages. Original report. SHA-256 ee9e4197d46e99cb7b2e1917cbb4b9d5ab6473bbe4f0d66e44d1ef419e064722.2025 activities and relevant information through June 2026, and dated July 2026 exemption information in the text. Review status:the entire original actually reviewed; tables 2/3 read visually; no original file permanently retained.

Legal analysis, consequences and responsibilities

• **R01** The Act of Administration, LBK433 of 22 April 2014, § 19,22-25. Legal text.

• **R02** Folketingets Ombudsmand, Authority Guide, *Parties' consultations*, updated 24 March 2025, paragraph on nullity. Instructions.

• **R03** Copenhagen Citizens' Adviser, *The quality of case handling and exercise of authority at the Children and Young People Citizens' Centre*,24. May 2017, pp.6-8,12-14,25-27. Original report. Social Services Committee's consideration 7. June 2017.

• **R04** Council of Europe, *European Convention on Human Rights*, art.1,2,3,5,6,8,13,14,41,46. Convention text.

• **R05** Criminal Code, LBK1294 of 7. November 2025, §§ 19,81, nr.8,150-157,215,261. Statutory text. Historical comparison version: LBK1000 of 5. October 2006.

• **R06** The Attorney General, *Child abduction*, CIR1H9048 of 2025, in particular printed p.7-9,12-14; summary of practices, non-originals. Practical overview.

• **R07** Ankestyrelsen, decision of principle 108-15, legal effect of remittal for reconsideration back. Decision.

• **R08** Law of the child, LBK282 of 17 March 2025, § 46- 47,100,102- 103,146- 148,209- 210. Legal text. Historical period before 2024 requires separate application of the then service law.

• **R09** EMD, *Strand Lobben and Others v.Norway* [GC], 37283 / 13,10 September 2019, § 8,202-213, in particular 205,208; physical PDF p.68-69. Original judgment.

• **R10** Parliamentary Ombudsman, FOB 2018-33, case 17/00750, four return-home cases; the publication page's date and news entry differ and are not used for a day-exact time calculation. Opinion, original PDF.

• **R11** Liability for Damages Act, consolidated Act LBK1080 of 30. August 2025, §§ 19-20,23,26. Statutory text.

• **R12** Police of East Jutland, 28 March 2023, *Father sentenced to two years in prison for child abduction of daughters*. Notification of judgment by the Authority.

• **R13** The Public Prosecutor's Office, the Oestjyllands Police, 30 June 2026, *Known guilty of child abduction and sentenced to prison*. Authority press release,.

• **R14** Tibet Commission II, March 2022, volume 2, chapter9 introduction p.987 and § 9.7 pp.1110-1130. Original report.

• **R15** Court of Impeachment, judgment of 13. December 2021, especially the sections on guilt and sentence. Original judgment, the court's announcement.

• **R16** The Danish Parliament, Minkkommission's report, GRAALM.Part 2021-22, Annex 46,30 June 2022. Binding Register, Description of the Folketing the mandate;.

• **R17** Folketinget, Report on the Mink Commission's report,2021-22, report 24. Parliamentary follow-up. This is the subsequent proceedings' account and assessment, not independent verification of all commission material.

• **R18** Folketingets Ombudsmand, Egely, follow-up to supervision 12 December 2007,2011, section on lockdown. Original follow-up.

• **R19** United Nations Commission on People's Rights, 2001, *Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, with commentaries*, art.2,4,7,30-37. Original with comments.

• **R20** United Nations, *2005 World Summit Outcome*, A / RES / 60 / 1, § 138-139. UN document portal. The UN Secretary-General, 2009, *Implementing the responsibility to protect*, A / 63 / 677. Report.

• **R21** FN, *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*,1998, art.6-8. Originaltraktat.

• **R22** Law 1674 of 30 December 2024, *Certain international crimes*, new Chap. 13a and entry into force. Amending Law.

Specific protection against sanctions in healthcare incident reporting: scope, time and the citizen's accountability track

[UTHP03] Law 429 of 10.6.2003 on patient safety§ 4-7. Primary public text, the paragraphs listed checked in the web source; historical PDFaddress gave 404 and is not used as a reading certificate.

[UTHP08] Health Act consolidation 95/2008,§§201-202 and 277. Primary provision text checked; the transitional wording is also in the official PDF edition. No attestation of the consolidation Act's other content as a whole.

[UTHP11] Guidance 1 of 3.1.2011 on reporting,8 physical pages. Sections 2/3/4/5/6/7/8/9/11 on the relevant physical pages 1,3-7 read in RAM, particularly the sanction boundary and information duty at PDF6. Historical guidance, not automatically current reporting requirements.

[UTHP20] Act 1855 of 9.12.2020,all 4 pages read as RAM text;section 1 nos. 4-5 and section 5. Enacted legislation; the earlier bill L129 is not equated with enactment.

[UTHP25] Health Act, consolidated Act 275 of 12.3.2025,58 physical pages;checked§§ 200-202 at PDF43, not the entire Act. Later amending Act 406 checked separately.

[UTHP25A] Act 406 of 29.4.2025, all 2 pages read as text in RAM;§ 1 and§ 4. Transfer and entry into force 1.5.2025; the sanction rule in§201 is not repealed by this Act.

Private child abduction: original judgment, criminal claim and legal basis

• **PB01:** Original judgment of the City of Copenhagen 16 January 2017, SS1 -23445 / 2016, all 3PDF pages read; penalty order 1, message deficiency 2, justification and acquittal 3. The court database's registered case number SS-2345 / 2016-KBH is not the original number; the original number is used in the text.

• **PB02:** Original additional note 30 January 2017, all 6PDFs pages read. Explains reconstructed on the basis of sound recordings; in particular 2-5.

• **PB03:** Østre Landsret's original judgment 7. June 2017, S-218-17, all 5PDFs pages read; legal qualification 3-5 and acquittal 5. Public Case metadata indicates finally and connects the city / country law; metadata is not independent proof of the facts of the explanations. The year of publication 2022 is not the year of judgment 2017.

Private evasion 2022: actual punishment, time and the Authority's created situation

• **PU22:** Original combined judgment document AM 2022.06.16V, Prosecution Service knowledge base, all six pages read in memory. District Court judgment 31. March 2022,13-11239/2020, physical PDF1-4; High Court judgment 16. June 2022, S-0833-22, physical PDF5-6. The family-law decision of 10. July 2020 is reproduced at physical PDF2; obtaining the complete separate original is a specified investigative step.

Judicial review: revision, declaration of judgment and effective action

• **DSK01** The Special Board of Appeal, *On the Special Complaint Court*, official statistics 2020-2025, updated 19 June 2026, section "Statistics." Original public table,. The usual court address gave 403; the same content of the official publishing host has been checked.

• **DSK02** Nielsen, Gorm Toftegaard (2021). *Resumption of criminal proceedings in Denmark*. In Swedish Juristtidning, p.538-559. Statistics s.552, Physical PDF page 15, footnotes 16-19. Original research article. The 2020 row of the source overlaps with DSK01.

• **DSK03** The Act of Law, LBK No 1835 of 15 September 2021, Paragraphs 48-50 and the chapter on reopening; source of period. Original historical text. A recent case must be tested against its simultaneous version of the law.

Storage: actual time of liberty, acquittal, isolation and data limits

• **VA01** The Attorney General, *Use of long-term pre-trial imprisonment in 2024*, prepared March 2026,13 pages; all pages read, tabular -G checked, graphs historical overlap aligned against previous annual originals. Original 2024.

• **VA02** Director of Public Prosecutions, *Use of pre-trial solitary confinement in 2024*,5 pages; the entire original and all three tables checked. Original solitary confinement 2024.

• **VA03** The Attorney General, *Analysis of the use of detention facilities*.2025,61 physical PDFs pages; method p.4-5, statistics p.21-44 and Annex 2-3-57-60 as well as conclusion / follow-up p.45-54 controlled. All 22 statistical tables, over 300 own compact rows in the register; legal history / Norwegian-Swedish comparison is not used as verified foreign practice. Original analysis.

• **VA04** The Ministry of Justice's Research Office, *Statistics on isolation imprisonment 2018*, p.3, Note 2; the material historical series shall be checked in separate annexes. Original 2018.

• **VA05** The Attorney General, *Use of long-term pre-trial imprisonment 2022*, corrected by December 2024 and April 2026, p.2 on the amended reporting of the supervisory authority; all historical version cells shall be aligned separately. Original 2022 revision.

Historical care and isolation: original numbers, time and selection

• **LV06:** Ministry of Justice Research Unit, Long-term detention in custody 2006, December 2007. All 21 pages read; Tables 1-19 reproduced and numerically checked, each with locator. The metadata year and publication index 2008 shall be separated from the data year 2006.

• **ISO18:** Ministry of Justice Research Office, Statistics on Isolation Prison 2018, May 2019. All 10 pages read; Table 1-4, s 3 / 5 / 7 / 8; duration / delimitation, s 2 / 5 / 6 / 9. Table 4 visually read from the original in memory.

Historical custody versions 2007-2010 and correction of children's whereabouts

• **LV07:** Original custody report / audit by the Ministry of Justice. The entire original read; tables and methods with locator above.

• **LV08:** Original custody report / audit by the Ministry of Justice. The entire original read; tables and methods with locator above.

• **LV08R:** Original custody report / audit by the Ministry of Justice. The entire original read; tables and methods with locator above.

• **UC0810:** Ministry of Justice Research Office, Remand detention of young people under 18 years: correction 2008–2010, April 2012. All 8 pages read; all 14 tables reproduced, specific denominators and assumptions delimited.

Long-term care 2009- 2010: excluded course, timelimits and evidence fund

• **LV09:** Ministry of Justice Research Office, Long-term detention in custody 2009, November 2010. All 16 pages read; 14 tables; selection and shredded reports especially s 2 / 7 / 11 / 13 -15.

• **LV10:** Ministry of Justice Research Office, Long-term detention in custody 2010, November 2011. All 16 pages read; 14 tables; main denominator 896, broken 67, continuous 829 and cell exclusions in particular s 2 / 7 / 11-15. Legal rules shall be tested against original orders in the individual chain of responsibility.

Isolation: original annual reports, children, time volumes and versions 2006-2023

• **ISO 2006:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2006. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2007:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2007. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2008:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2008. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2009:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2009. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2010:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2010. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2011:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2011. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2012:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2012. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2013:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2013. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2014:** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Prison 2014. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2015:** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Prison 2015. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2016:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2016. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2017** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2017. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2019:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2019. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2020:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2020. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2021:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2021. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2022:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2022. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISO 2023:** Original annual statistics on isolation imprisonment 2023. Methodology, tables, children and longest periods actually reviewed; table / sidecomers above. 2021 is the original DOCX with 2 numerical tables. 2020 version corrected August 2023.

• **ISOLOV06:** Act 1561 of 20. December 2006 on pre-trial solitary confinement,§1 no.3/6/7. The amending provisions' requirements concerning children and time limits; compared with the Director of Public Prosecutions' Notice 4/2008, section on persons under 18.

Long-term care 2019: original control findings and separate annex reproduction

• **LV19:** Original statement by the Advocate General of 30 November 2020, all four pages read in the official HTML reproduction; in particular, definition p. 1, definition p. 2 and omitted references / method p. 3-4. Original PDF address.

• **LV19B-G:** Public transcription of REU Annex 244, document 901387, section "Annex 1. Statistics on the use of long-term detention in 2019," all 16 pages reproduced; identified original supporting documents;. The figure of the Annex is secondary checked, not materially controlled in the original.

• **LV19-register:** Folketinget's original document register, document 901387 with file relations, forwarding date 12. March 2021, statement file 1523121 and annex file 1523116. Register identification is not reading of content.

• **LV18 register:** Original Folketing Document Register, Document 789586, transfer 25. September 2019; reattachments in original Answer to REU question 655, document 853609. Statement, 8 pages and Annex, 15 pages identified; material image reading missing.

LV 2018: full original, children, outcomes and internal number differences

Rigsadvokaten (2019): *Use of long-term pre-trial detention 2018*,17. September 2019, RA-2019-2100105-2,8 pages, and statistical annex 15 pages. Folketinget, originally REU 2018-19(2nd session) annex 113, resubmitted REU 2019-20 question 655. Original report, original annex, public archive copies from 28. June 2024 with links above. The specific outstanding source for 2019 is original annex 2353614; the actual reproduction is PolSpy 901387. The source section is moved to the full report's final literature/source chapter.

Criminal services: intervention, amended decisions and health errors without national registration

• **KF15:** Statistics 2015, revised edition, PDF32 -38,48 -51; tables 5.1 -5.10,7.6,8.1 -8.2. Magtabel 5.10 indicates revision 7 September 2016.

• **KF23:** Statistics 2023, original, PDF4-5,37-46,53-56. Table 8.2 PDF56 also visually controlled; superwriting footnotes are kept separately.

• **KF24:** Statistics 2024, web-accessible original, PDF4-5,36-46,53-56. Another public original version, PDF4,54-56: the same checked methodology/court figures. Both originals' methodology on page 4 gives early April 2024 as the data-basis date for the 2024 statistics; this has not been silently corrected to 2025 and requires clarification by the authority.

• **KFA:** Current statistical table of the Authority, actual links read in memory October 7, 2026. The controlled inventory has statistical reports 2015- 2024; its demarcation is not evidence of a lack of older registrations.

• **KFL24:** Law 661 of 11 June 2024, § 3 and § 10, paragraph 1 / 6, § 11, original PDF5-7 actually read.

• **KFUTH25:** Original reply of the Minister of Justice to REU1157,23 June 2025, all 4 pages read through public PDF view; in particular 2-3. ODA document 1173975 identifies the same original file 3044774; 2025-06696, dok.3742259.

• **KFUTHREG25:** Executive Order 420 of 29. April 2025,§ 2, nr.3,§ 3-5; content checked in the original public display.

• **KFDT25:** Original decision of the Data Protection Agency 10 July 2025,2024- 432- 0030, the decision's 1-4 actually read; not an independent new victim register on top of the Data Protection Agency's year.

The original action and trial tables of the Department of Investigation

• **KF 2015** Original 2015; the tables shown above.

• **KF 2023** Original 2023; the tables shown above.

• **KF 2024** Original 2024; the tables shown above.

Proprietary custody: all controlled years, durations and consequences of Justitia/ The 2025 Study of the Lawyer Society

Schultz-Knudsen, Mikele and Eiriksson, Birgitte Arent / Justitia and the Danish Bar and Law Society(2025). *Remand detention - Legal safeguards before judgment*. Contributions by Rabia Kubra Güler, Lukas Garly and Anna Hebo Torp Henriksen. ISBN9788797248942. Published 28.10.2025.
Originalhttps://justitia-int.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Rapport_varetaegtsfaengsling-retssikkerhed-foer-dom_web.pdf. Main locators:pp.16-17,48-49,67-99,101-104,158-169,180-185,198,209-211. Actor:authors/organisations; statistics supplied by the Director of Public Prosecutions, DST and the Prison and Probation Service. Document ID:Rapport_varetaegtsfaengsling-retssikkerhed-foer-dom_web. Follow-up:implementation not documented; three specific official judgment chains subsequently checked in a separate module; other original judgments and most actual payment dates remain missing.

Remains: unique persons across the years; full publication of the underlying selected 2024 material; 2024 non-indictment; phase cessation and actual payment in the individual claims; precise numerical questionnaire values and question specific denominators. None of these shortcomings renders the tables already checked unread; they must be indicated locally in the question concerned.

Maintenance, work and family life: primary research and controlled source chain

• Wakefield, Sara and Andersen, Lars Højsgaard (2020). *Pretrial Detention and the Costs of System Overreach for Employment and Family Life*. Sociological Science 7:342-366. DOI 10.15195/v7.a14. Original pp. 346-352, tables 1-3 pp. 354-358 and discussion pp. 361-363. Original article: https://sociologicalscience.com/download/vol-7/august/SocSci_v7_342to366.pdf. Document ID: SocSci_v7_342to366. Actor: researchers using Danish register data. Knowledge point: publication 17. August 2020. Population: 75.187 cases, 50.446 men, 1995-2010. Follow-up: three years after release/judgment; no verification of individual compensation.

• ROCKWOOL Foundation (2020). *Innocent people lose their job after custody.*, June 2020, p. 1-3. https://rockwoolfonden.s3.eu-central-1.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/RFF-NYT-Uskyldige-mister-jobbet-efter-varetaegtsfaengsling.pdf? download = true. Research dissemination of the same survey, not an extra cohort. The chapter's used page 1-4 has been read; other research references in the booklet are not included as verified findings here.

• Schultz-Knudsen, Mikele and Eiriksson, Birgitte Arent / Justitia and the Bar Society (2025). *Preservation of custody - Legal certainty before judgment*, printed p. 12. https://justitia-int.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Rapport_varetaegtsfaengsling-retssikkerhed-foer-dom_web.pdf. The reproduction is checked against the original above; the comparison group should be corrected.

Weight: three original decision chains and time to restore

• **ERVA01** AM 2020.10.15V2. Vestre Landsret, 15.10.2020, S-0338-20; Hjørring 29.01.2020KTN-3496/2019; RA29.05.2019RA-2019-3100206-105; SAV21.03.2019SAV-2018-3100101-1068. Official compilation 21 pages, document ID57 cb 5635-11 ed-4 edb-9 ac 0-d 6 a 767 ef 674 d, URL above. Actors: police, District Court, High Court, Regional Public Prosecutor, Director of Public Prosecutions. Knowledge/follow-up dates appear in the timeline. Person deduplication: one E, several decisions. Actual payment unknown.

• **ERVA02** AM 2010.02.25V2. Vestre Landsret 25.02.2010S-1566-09; Aalborg 25.06.2009 nr.12-5016 / 2008; RA24.06.2008RA-2008-521-2206; SA27.02 / 06.03.2008SA4-2007-521-0998. Official composition 37 pages, document -ID170 e 8 ca 2 -b 063-4 ad 0-85 b 5-2 a 9 de 4 c 05 fbe, URL above. Actors: police, criminal / compensation courts, SA, RA. Scope: one mother, two children, the estate represents the same person's claim for compensation. Follow-up: early partial payment and reunification described; last payment, health / job and cause of death not documented.

• **ERVA03** AM 2022.10.17E. Østre Landsret 17.10.2022S-2621-21; Glostrup 01.09.2021A2-15318 / 2020; RA19.08.2019RA-2019-3100206-189; SAK20.06.2019SAK-2019-3100101-325. Official composition 9 pages, document -IDf 0 f 12061-d 096-4 c 8 a -a 2 f 8-3 ca 5 cc 95 ca 25, URL above. Scope: one citizen, one child mentioned in the reproduced interview. Follow-up: administrative and legal retention; not documented further review.

Denmark's knowledge, positive commitments and actual responsibility

• **PFK01** The European Convention on Human Rights, in particular Articles 1, 2, 3, 8 and 13 thereof. The application and historical scope of the provision shall be tested in concrete terms. Original Convention.

• **PFK02** The United Nations Committee on Torture, CAT/ C / DNK / CO / 8, adopted 22 November 2023, published 8 December 2023. Points 40 to 41: complaints against the police, few charges, clarification of ill-treatment and scope of the mandate. Official document number. Checked original text.

• **PFK03** The Secretariat of the EMD, *Guide on Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights*, updated on 31 August 2026. Points 123- 140 and 150- 155. Guide to practice, not an independent binding judgment. Original Guide.

• **PFK04** EMD, *Gäfgen v. Germany*, Grand Chamber, 1 June 2010, No 22978 / 05. Paragraphs 88-89 and 123-125. Original judgment.

• **PFK05** Ministry of the Interior and Health, letter to the Municipality of Langeland of 29 May 2026, j.nr. 2025-11404, in particular pp. 14-16. Original letter.

• **PFK06** Folketingets Ombudsmand, 2010-4-4, *Hospital doctors' medical records*, 25 October 2010, in particular p. 1-2. Original opinion.

• **PFK07** Criminal Code, consolidated Act no. 1294 of 7. November 2025, §§ 81, no. 8, and 155-157. Historical acts are examined under the rules in force at the time and transitional criminal-law rules. Statutory text.

• **PFK08** Liability for Damages Act, Consolidation Act no.266 of 21. March 2014, particularly §§19-20 and 23. Historical primary version; the applicable version must be tied to the harm. Original statutory text.

• **PFK09** The Health Act, Legislative Decree No 248 of 8 March 2023, § 201- 202. Compare with the historical UTH sources of the report and the enlargement with effect from 1 January 2021. Legal text.

• **PFK10** Act no. 722 of 1. September 2026 on the compensation scheme concerning the contraception case in Greenland, sections 4 and 16. Supplement after the main period. Original statutory text.

• **PFK11** EMD, *Strand Lobben and Others v. Norway*, Grand Chamber, 10 September 2019, No 37283 / 13, paragraphs 205, 208 and 212. Original judgment.

• **PFK12** UN International Law Commission, *Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts*, 2001, Articles 2, 4, 7 and 30-31. Source for the structure of State responsibility rules; status and application are examined according to the relevant rule. Original collection of articles.

Cross-cutting evidence and documented consequences

• **L01** Mølholt,Anne-Kirstine; Søegaard,Emma Hoff; Andreasen,Asger Graa (2025). *Placement without consent - A collection of knowledge*. VIVE. e-ISBN978-87-7582-406-9. Main findings pp.6-10; methodology pp.20-22,87-94. Original report.

• **L02** Lausten, Mette; Kloppenborg, Hans Skov; Engbo, Amanda; Iversen, Katrine (2023). *Targeted support for parents with children in care. Final evaluation*. VIVE. ISBN978-87-7582-143-3;133 PDF pages. Sections on population, before/after results and interview sample checked against the original, pp.80-87,110-115. Original report.

• **L03** Lausten,Mette; Iversen,Katrine; Andreasen,Asger Graa (2023). *Well-being among children and young people in vulnerable positions 2023*. VIVE. ISBN978-87-7582-237-9. Sections on contact, involvement and methodology checked against the original, pp.101-108,135,141-143,163,168-169. Original report.

• **L04** Folketingets Ombudsmand, FOB 2018- 26, case for verification of 14- to 15-year-old communications. The entire 15 pages of the original are checked; the specific chain of time and evidence is in BK01. Original opinion.

• **L05** Datatilsynet,30. January 2024, *Datatilsynet issues an order in the Chromebook case*,case no. 2023-431-0001, decision and statement of the case. Original decision.

• **L06** Data Protection Agency, September 2022, *Hørsholm Municipality fined 50.000 DKK.*, reported break 2019. Notice of the supervisory authority.

• **L07** Government,2024, note on submissions in ECtHR application 46571/22,*Abdulaal Naser and Others v. Denmark*, REU 2023-24, annex 174, pp.1-5. Original government note. The note is a litigation position. The expanded Green Desert analysis also uses the Supreme Court's complete original judgment and the ECtHR's later decision, with separate locators.

• **L08** Wakefield, Sara; Andersen, Lars Højsgaard (2020). *Pretrial Detention and the Costs of System Overreach for Employment and Family Life*. Sociological Science 7: 342-366. DOI10.15195 / v7.a14. Population / method p.346-350; social outcomes p.352-358, Table 2-3. Original Article.

• **L09** Schultz-Knudsen, Mikele; Eiriksson, Birgitte Arent (2025). *Pre-trial detention - Legal safeguards before judgment*. Justitia/Advokatsamfundet. ISBN9788797248942. Methodology pp.16-17,68,101-104; all checked statistical tables pp.67-99. Original report.

• **ERVA01-ERVA03** Official Chambers of the Public Prosecutor's Office AM 2020.10.15V2, AM 2010.02.25V2, AM 2022.10.17E. All 21,37 and 9PDFs pages read. Original administrative decisions and judgments, URL and grounds can be found in the module *Product weight: primary the course of compensation and actual restoration;*.

• **KEN9536/2021** Board of Equal Treatment,17.6.2021, case no.19-16769. The original's 15 PDF pages read; proportionality and favourable finding on printed pp.12-14. Original decision.

• **LV11-LV23** The Director of Public Prosecutions' original reports on prolonged remand detention and corrected annual statistics. Original URLs, dates, precise tables and reading scope appear in the module *Prolonged remand detention 2011-2023: originals, annual versions, children and actual end date*.
• **ISO 2006-ISO 2023** Original isolation reports and annual statistics; source and page references, children's programmes, day numbers and version changes are provided in the module *Isolation: original annual reports, children, time volumes and versions*.

• **SL16H** Law on Services, LBK1270 of 24.10.2016. Historical original. PDF9-11 actual text read in RAM; § 48,50,52-54. No full reading of all 50 pages is claimed.

• **SL17H** Law on Services, LBK988 of 17.8.2017. Historical original. PDF9-11 / 16 actual text read in RAM; § 48,50,52-54,68. No full reading of all 47 pages is claimed. The actual decision dates shall be linked to the version in force on that date.

• **SL18H** Law on Services, LBK1114 of 30.8.2018. Historical original. PDF11 / 16 actual text read in RAM; § 52- 54 / 68, paragraphs 1 to 10, with separate verification of seven-day position and a maximum six-month period of repatriation. No full reading of all 52 pages is claimed.

Control source reference key

FN-CRC17 = CRC/C/DNK/CO/5 (2017); FN-CRPD24 = CRPD/C/DNK/CO/2-3 (2024); FN-CAT23 = CAT/C/DNK/CO/8 (2023). Originals and paragraphs are in chapter15. RR18/2024 = Rigsrevisionen's report on Ankestyrelsen's supervision; RR10/2023 = report on the right to diagnostic assessment in child psychiatry. PPKN25 = Det Psykiatriske Patientklagenævn's annual review2025 (chapter9). ECtHR annual tables and ECtHR complaint tables = the individual original annual tables in chapter13. V19 = Legal Safeguards Guidance2019,no.9330. Personbilag2011 = Ankestyrelsen's practice study on relocation and return home,2011, addressed in chapters4 and8.

Total register of all links used

• **K001** Annual archives - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/find-viden/beretninger-og-andre-publikationer/folketingets-ombudsmands-beretninger

• **K002** 2006 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638381538383030415/FOB2006.pdf

• **K003** 2007 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638381538755697387/FOB2007.pdf

• **K004** 2008 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911799538515/FOB2008.pdf

• **K005** 2009 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911635168716/FOB2009.pdf

• **K006** 2010 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911560552229/FOB2010.pdf

• **K007** 2011 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911485810594/FOB2011.pdf

• **K008** 2012 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911424578316/FOB2012.pdf

• **K009** 2013 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911368047812/FOB2013.pdf

• **K010** 2014 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911315977071/FOB2014.pdf

• **K011** 2015 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911264582417/FOB2015.pdf

• **K012** 2016 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911218705483/FOB2016.pdf

• **K013** 2017 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911182788860/FOB2017.pdf

• **K014** 2018 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911148433638/FOB2018.pdf

• **K015** 2019 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911714553396/FOB2019.pdf

• **K016** 2020 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911118028606/FOB2020.pdf

• **K017** 2021 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911093663574/FOB2021.pdf

• **K018** 2022 - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/638339911006674048/FOB2022.pdf

• **K019** 2023 webtable - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/om-ombudsmanden/tal-og-statistik/afsluttede-sager-fordelt-paa-myndigheder-mv/afsluttede-sager-i-2023-fordelt-paa-myndigheder-mv

• **K020** 2024 web table - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/om-ombudsmanden/tal-og-statistik/afsluttede-sager-fordelt-paa-myndigheder-mv/afsl non-executive cases -in -2024 -distribution -to -authorities - etc.

• **K021** 2025 web table - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/om-ombudsmanden/tal-og-statistik/afsluttede-sager-fordelt-paa-myndigheder-mv/afsl - in -2025 - distribution - by authorities - etc.

• **K022** 2025 annual report - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/Media/639111390641827689/Folketingets%20Ombudsmands%20beretning%202 025.pdf

• **K023** State Advocate General's 2011 Report - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Documents/rigsadvokatens-bertening-2011.pdf

• **K024** 2023 annual report - https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Aarsrapport-2023.pdf

• **K025** 2025 annual report - https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Aarsrapport-2025-for-Politiklagemyndigheden-og-Be vismiddelsevistroset.pdf

• **K026** 2024 annual report - https://politiklagemyndigheden.dk/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/Politiklagemyndigheden-aarsberetning-2024.pdf

• **K027** 2006–2011 analysis - https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/637810534607166501/Stigningen%20i%20anmeldelser%20til%20og%20erstatningstilkendegivelser%20fra%20Patienterstatningen%202006-2011%20-%20analyse%20af%20baggrunden%20og%20prognose%20for%202012-2015.pdf

• **K028** Administrative 2017 annual report - https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/637811297663901902/aarsrapport-administrativ-2017.pdf

• **K029** 2020 annual report - https://cdn.patienterstatningen.dk/patienterstatningen/Media/637811278972224787/2020-Aarsrapport-tilgaengelig.p df

• **K030** Treatment Damage 2025,27 / 5 / 2026 version - https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/639160013922933960/behandlingsskader-2025-hel e-country -27-05-26.pdf

• **K031** Pharmaceutical Damage 2025,27 / 5 / 2026 version - https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/639160017661448385/laegemiddelskader-2025-27- 05-26.pdf

• **K032** Treatment-injury annual report 2017 - https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/637811297745313048/Aarsrapport2017-Behandlingsskader.pdf

• **K033** 2025 annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/639105380237831502/Datatilsynets%20%C3%A5rsberetning%2020 25.pdf

• **K034** 2025 annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/639098498457632708/%C3%85rsrapport%202025%20for%20Datatilsynet%20og%20Tilsynet%20med%20Efterretningstjenesterne.pdf

• **K035** Annual archives - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/om-datatilsynet/aarsberetninger-og-aarsrapporter

• **K036** AULA Decisions 2024 - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2024/jan/orientering-om-datatilsynets-afgoerelser-vedroerende-aula

• **K037** Board of Appeal supervision, 18 / 2024,2 / 6 / 2025 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638844561254182646/SR1824.pdf

• **K038** Child psychiatry, 10 / 2023,19 / 2 / 2024 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638439378115271204/SR1023.pdf

• **K039** Specialised palliation, 17 / 2024,12 / 5 / 2025 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638826416432697549/SR1724.pdf

• **K040** audit file - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/revisionssager

• **K041** 2025 annual report - https://cdn.rigsrevisionen.dk/rigsrevisionen/Media/639128878936444916/aarsrapport-2025.pdf

• **K042** STPki-number 2023 PDF - https://www.stpk.dk/media/gdpnn3nn/stpk-i-tal-opdateret-2023.pdf

• **K043** Current Number Panel - https://www.stpk.dk/viden/stpk-i-tal/

• **K044** Danish Patient Safety Database 2024 - https://stps.dk/Media/638814438533715726/Dansk%20Patientsikkerhedsdatabase%20%C3%85rsberetning%202024.pdf

• **K045** Figures from the Danish Tax Appeals Authority 2025 - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/wvzb4rzh/tal-fra-skatteankestyrelsen-2025.pdf

• **K046** Annual Archives 2014- 2025 - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/om-os/maal-og-resultater

• **K047** Annual statistics of the Aliens' Board - https://udln.dk/da/statistik-og-maaltal/aarsstatistik-2025/

• **K048** Annual archive 2013- 2025 - https://udln.dk/da/aarsberetninger/

• **K049** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2008 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2008.pdf

• **K050** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2009 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2009.pdf

• **K051** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2010 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2010.pdf

• **K052** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2011 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2011.pdf

• **K053** Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2012 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2012.pdf

• **K054** Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2013 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2013.pdf

• **K055** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2014 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2014.pdf

• **K056** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2015 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2015.pdf

• **K057** Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2016 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2016.pdf

• **K058** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2017 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2017.pdf

• **K059** Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2018 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2018.pdf

• **K060** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2019 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2019.pdf

• **K061** Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2020 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2020.pdf

• **K062** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2021 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2021.pdf

• **K063** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2022 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2022.pdf

• **K064** Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2023 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2023.pdf

• **K065** National Police disciplinary-case summary 2024 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2024.pdf

• **K066** Rigspolitiet's disciplinary case summary 2025 - https://politi.dk/-/media/mediefiler/landsdaekkende-dokumenter/aktuelt/statistik-og-udgivels er/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersagsresume-2025.pdf

• **K067** V19 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/retsinfo/2019/9330/dan/html

• **K068** Primary report in publicly available copy - https://viden.sl.dk/media/6425/ankestatistik_2011.pdf

• **K069** Original Annex - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/806230d9a819cd47ba7749283886369 41f0a7393/5-bilag-1.pdf

• **K070** KL Agenda Annex 19 June 2018 - https://www.kl.dk/media/ylcnncx3/dagsordensbilag-moede-190618-kkr-syddanmark.pdf

• **K071** Primary portal - https://talportal.ast.dk/tal-og-statistik-app/

• **K072** Ankestyrelsen, Kommuner's compliance with Board Decisions, November 2013 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20131/almdel/sou/bilag/61/1308614.pdf

• **K073** Law No 493 / 2013, entry into force and transition § 25-26, reproduced in the historical legal notes of the Law on Legal Security - https://retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2015/1052

• **K074** 2006 original archive copy - https://web.archive.org/web/20160516202046id_/https://ast.dk/publikationer/ankestatistik-for-de-sociale-naevn-2006 / @ @ download / publication

• **K075** The archive copy of the original of the 2012 - https://web.archive.org/web/20160516202547id_/https://ast.dk/publikationer/ankestatistik-for-2012/@@do wgad / publication

• **K076** Official original - https://ast.dk/publikationer/ankestatistik-for-de-sociale-naevn-2006/@@download/publication

• **K077** Official original - https://ast.dk/publikationer/ankestatistik-for-2012/@@download/publication

• **K078** Original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/A/F/sagsbehandlingstider-ved-omstruktureringen-af-statsforvaltningerne.pdf

• **K079** Original - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732306913517095/Ankestyrelsens-%C3%A5rsopg%C3%B8relsen-for-sagsbehandlingen-i-2020.pdf

• **K080** Original - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732217522819424/Ankestyrelsens-%C3%A5rsopg%C3%B8relse-for-sagsbehandlingen-i-2021.pdf

• **K081** Original - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638731492506945855/Ankestyrelsens-%C3%A5rsopg%C3%B8relse-for-sagsbehandling-2022.pdf

• **K082** Original - https://www.ast.dk/tal-og-statistik

• **K083** Read the original - https://viden.sl.dk/media/4811/flytning_og_hjemgivelse_2011.pdf

• **K084** PUD09, physical and printed page 11 - https://web.archive.org/web/20211130155339id_/https://ast.dk/publikationer/praksisundersogelse-om-placing of -born-and-young-2009 / @ download / publication

• **K085** Original, 20 pages - https://viden.sl.dk/media/5320/kommunernes_anvendelse_af_foraeldrekompetenceundersoegelser.pdf

• **K086** Source tracks - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/almdel/sou/bilag/9/1163104.pdf

• **K087** Source tracks - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/almdel/SOU/bilag/9/index.htm

• **K088** Source tracks - https://ast.dk/publikationer/kommunernes-anvendelse-af-foraeldrekompetenceundersogelser

• **K089** Source tracks - https://web.archive.org/cdx/search/cdx?url=ast.dk%2Fpublikationer%2Fkommunernes-anvendelse-af-foraeldrekompetence Studies&output = json&filter = status code% 3A200&collapse = digest&fl = timestamp% 2Coriginal% 2Cmimetype% 2Cdigest% 2Clength

• **K090** Source tracks - https://web.archive.org/cdx/search/cdx?url=www.ast.dk%2Fpublikationer%2Fkommunernes-anvendelse-af-foraeldrekompe studies on the subject;&output = json&filter = status code% 3A200&collapse = digest&fl = timestamp% 2Coriginal% 2Cmimetype% 2Cdigest% 2Clength

• **K091** Public report copy of social educators - https://viden.sl.dk/media/6005/hvordan-familie-og-netvaerk-bliver-inddraget-i-boernesage r.pdf

• **K092** Original report - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/87cdddb1f80ec10726da526c6245661e9cfcdfed/6-bilag-1.pdf

• **K093** Original report - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/7bdfff17-46d0-4691-b948-de594e28932f/59e12234-4a69-4b80-bcc1-35759c3c2960 -Annex -1.pdf

• **K094** The original of the Appeal Board at the Social Teachers' Association - https://viden.sl.dk/media/4567/ankestyrelsens-praksisundersoegelse-om-samvaerss ager.pdf

• **K095** report - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20151/almdel/beu/bilag/40/1565744.pdf

• **K096** report - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20151/almdel/beu/spm/371/svar/1328632/1639498.pdf

• **K097** report - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20151/almdel/beu/spm/371/svar/1328632/1639494.pdf

• **K098** report - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20151/almdel/beu/spm/371/svar/1328632/1639496.pdf

• **K099** report - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20181/almdel/BEU/bilag/295/2037319.pdf

• **K100** Original 2015 - https://viden.sl.dk/media/7031/kommunernes-anvendelse-af-sanktioner.pdf

• **K101** Original 2016 - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/60d9fd4d-608f-4cd1-a39f-43f45cc37ab2/174bc27e-3a23-49db-b46a-8301c5294ed7 - Annex -1.pdf

• **K102** Original 2017 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20161/almdel/beu/bilag/161/1736458.pdf

• **K103** main report - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732241780767167/Sanktioner-1-Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-om-sanktion -at -no-win-from-offer-or-interview .pdf

• **K104** Annexes - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732368783964879/Bilagsrapport-til-ankestyrelsens-praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-o m-sancties.pdf

• **K105** main report - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638731542165184672/Sanktioner-2-Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-om-sk%C3 % A6rpet-r% C3% A5tyssanction -n% C3% A5r -citizen -expands -a -lacking -will -to -st% C3% A5til-r% C3% A5tid.pdf

• **K106** Annexes - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638731543375879547/Bilagsrapport-praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-om-sanktioner-2.pdf

• **K107** main report - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/639222101259073370/sanktioner-3-praksisundersoegelse.pdf

• **K108** Annexes - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/639137497254620221/18-30107-2-bilagsrapport-sanktioner-3-handicaptilgaengelig-211 63602 _ 1024439 _ 0.pdf

• **K109** main report - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638845375795402201/praksisundersoegelse-om-kommunernes-tilkendelser-af-early retirement; pdf

• **K110** Annexes - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638845375848768020/bilagsrapport-til-praksisundersoegelse-om-kommunernes-tilkend units--of -early sion.pdf

• **K111** Section 7 of the Sickness Benefits Act on incapacity for work, April 2016 - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/44ffd761-6cc6-4bba-896d-05 de22c6667a/a734c6f3-8c94-451c-9040-5df2d25bbc92-bilag-1.pdf

• **K112** Note 3 June 2016 - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/44ffd761-6cc6-4bba-896d-05de22c6667a/a734c6f3-8c94-451c-9040-5d f2d25bbc92- Annex -2.pdf

• **K113** Original, 38 pages - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638736692749888794/Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-om-udm%C3%A5ling- off-lost-work benefits.pdf

• **K114** Original, 17 pages - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638736693735172187/Bilagsrapport-Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-om-udm % C3% A5ling-off-loss-work benefits.pdf

• **K115** Original, 50 pages - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/639137473063156316/18-30107-2-kommunernes-brug-af-virksomhedspraktik-handicap available -20841318 _ 1024439 _ 0.pdf

• **K116** Original, 13 pages - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732367128461073/Bilagsrapport-til-prakssiunders%C3%B8gelse-om-vir ksomhedspraktik.pdf

• **K117** Additional expenses 2014, original copy - https://viden.sl.dk/media/7223/anketyrelsens-praksisundersoegelse.pdf

• **K118** SOU Annex 246 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20131/almdel/sou/bilag/246/1376726.pdf

• **K119** Anchors' Demense Survey 2015 - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/68f01f0d-7282-4233-9625-849e77f0ca06/b6 c71b37-68ec-40e7-afeb-e7c45f3a6f5b-Annex -1 _ 0.pdf

• **K120** Review by the Board of Appeal, November 2015 - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/a72b4d38-79b7-4b7a-a07d-6fa6d86360c 2 / 606f6151-5d5d-4a92-981f -9373f42c8bce -Annex -1.pdf

• **K121** Release date 2.5.2022 - https://www.ast.dk/for-myndigheder/publikationer/2022/maj/praksisundersoegelse-om-udmaaling-af-tabt-ar labour productivity,

• **K122** Main report - https://www.ast.dk/Media/639137473063156316/18-30107-2-kommunernes-brug-af-virksomhedspraktik-handicaptilga engelig-20841318 _ 1024439 _ 0.pdf

• **K123** Original report - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638733157417386135/Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-af-Udbetaling-Danmark s -assessment -of -% C3% A6gtektidende -relation -i-b% C3% B8ngrant and pension cases .PDF

• **K124** Original report - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638943075118596665/praksisundersoegelse-om-kommunernes-brug-af-saer equal-day-and-club offer.pdf

• **K125** 2025-original - https://www.ast.dk/Media/639138351242606992/ligebehandlingsnaevnet-aarsberetning-2025.pdf

• **K126** Annual original - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638761596906128148/Ligebehandlingsn%C3%A6vnets-%C3%A5rsberetning-2020-original.pdf

• **K127** Annual original - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638761596367711808/Ligebehandlingsn%C3%A6vnets-%C3%A5rsberetning-2021-original.pdf

• **K128** Annual original - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638761594277027053/Ligebehandlingsn%C3%A6vnets-%C3%A5rsberetning-2022-original.pdf

• **K129** Annual original - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638761592639930270/Ligebehandlingsn%C3%A6vnets-%C3%A5rsberetning-2023-original.pdf

• **K130** Annual original - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638784942896255250/Ligebehandlingsnvnets-rsberetning-2024-original.pdf

• **K131** 2019 -original, physical PDF page 35 - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638761597657782710/Ligebehandlingsn%C3%A6vnets-%C3%A5rsbere tn-2019-original.pdf

• **K132** Original opinion - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2F97%2FD% 2F58% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K133** the Committee's original follow-up report; - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=wC84SY5OwTA7pRQfjHZjN E2DqhlCDg89K3R% 2FPxD65Vl1y56T2cT9bIU7wpnjbuteMrVK% 2FWqUwViORrWY4YMDOA% 3D% 3D

• **K134** Original legislative proposal - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/ft/200722L00041/pdf

• **K135** Plan report 2022 - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/5mcpnia3/aarsberetning-planklagenaevnet-2022.pdf

• **K136** Plan report 2023 - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/xbdfrkv2/aarsberetning-2023-2.pdf

• **K137** Plan report 2024 - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/i0hoeynd/25_01207-3-aarsberetning-planklagenaevnet-2024-4985897_39_0-4.p df

• **K138** NH Annual Report - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/okwbvopi/aarsrapport-for-naevnenes-hus-2022.pdf

• **K139** NH Annual Report - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/d1ij0ila/aarsrapport-for-naevnenes-hus-2023.pdf

• **K140** NH Annual Report - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/enmpfq1l/aarsrapport-for-2024.pdf

• **K141** NH Annual Report - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/cxslyv2p/aarsrapport-for-naevnenes-hus-2025docx.pdf

• **K142** Original, p.6,8-9 - https://fvm.dk/Media/638484367761436684/NMKN_aarsrapport_2016.pdf

• **K143** Annual report - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/yjbbb5rp/aarsrapport-2017-naevnenes-hus.pdf

• **K144** Annual report - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/owiiqlgz/aarsrapport-for-naevnenes-hus-2018-underskrevet.pdf

• **K145** Annual report - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/ouihtugx/aarsrapport-2019-naevnenes-hus.pdf

• **K146** Annual report - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/k3qmdj4e/nh-aarsrapport-2020.pdf

• **K147** Annual report - https://naevneneshus.dk/media/zieju0zu/naevnenes-hus-aarsrapport-2021.pdf

• **K148** Original note - https://cdn.rigsrevisionen.dk/rigsrevisionen/Media/639155560077978613/c109-26.pdf

• **K149** the official control history of the case; - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/revisionssager-arkiv/2022/mar/beretning-om-forvaltningen-af-handicapo mradet

• **K150** original report - https://www.vive.dk/media/pure/qz55dkrz/25783388

• **K151** Original Decision - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/retsinfo/2021/9536/dan/pdf

• **K152** Annual statistics 2006, Aid for the purchase of cars etc., SEL § 99 - https://web.archive.org/web/20130525041216id_/http://www.ast.dk/Page_Pic/pdf/ Car statistics 06 _ 19 _ 12 _ 2007 _ 10 _ 14.pdf

• **K153** Annual statistics 2007, Aid to disabled cars, SEL § 114 - https://web.archive.org/web/20220630073654id_/https://ast.dk/publikationer/stotte-til-kop-af-handicapcar-arsstatistik-2007 / @ download / publication

• **K154** Annual statistics 2008, Aid to disabled cars, SEL § 114 - https://web.archive.org/web/20201126102229id_/https://ast.dk/publikationer/korre-case-handling time-by-application-om-disabled car / @ download / publication

• **K155** Annual statistics 2009, Support for disabled cars, SEL § 114 - https://web.archive.org/web/20220630065657id_/https://ast.dk/publikationer/faerre-fix-support-to-kop-af-handicap car -i-2009 / @ download / publication

• **K156** Annual statistics 2010, Aid to disabled cars, SEL § 114 - https://web.archive.org/web/20130525042556id_/http://www.ast.dk/Page_Pic/pdf / St% C3% B8tte _ to _ disabled cars _ 2010 _ 02 _ 12 _ 2011 _ 15 _ 04.pdf

• **K157** National Archives 12705,2005- 06, BIL _ AMT / STAT - https://digidata.rigsarkivet.dk/aflevering/12705

• **K158** 12706,2007- 09, BIL _ COM / STAT - https://digidata.rigsarkivet.dk/aflevering/12706

• **K159** BBP19M, Physical 5 - https://web.archive.org/web/20200921031344id_/https://ast.dk/filer/bilag-til-publikationer/bornesagsbarometret_bil ag-1 method _ final.pdf

• **K160** BBP19, Physically 15 - https://web.archive.org/web/20221203084155id_/https://ast.dk/publikationer/bornesagsbarometret/@@download/p ublisation

• **K161** BBP19K, Physically 4 - https://web.archive.org/web/20220121122447id_/https://ast.dk/filer/bilag-til-publikationer/bornesagsbarometret_bilag-2-kommunedistributeresults _ final.pdf

• **K162** MAG18F — Ankestyrelsen March 2018, main report and annex - https://viden.sl.dk/media/9786/ankestyrelsens-undersoegelse-om-mag tanvendelse.pdf

• **K163** Original report, public copy - https://velfaerdslisten.dk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/bilag-4.pdf

• **K164** Municipal original in public archive - https://web.archive.org/web/20160914234342if_/http://www.ikast-brande.dk/media/9238218/task-force -analyst report -ikast -brande-final -22-June-2015.pdf

• **K165** Source - https://ringsted.dk/sites/default/files/kommunen_-_presse_foto_design/2014_12_15_pressemeddelelse_task_force_mandag_e ndelig.pdf

• **K166** Source - https://selvbetjening.nb-medier.dk/storage/media-library/2023/12/notat-om-administrationens-orienteringer-til-politiske-udvalg-om-case handling -pa-children-and-family -1702632137-unlkd.pdf

• **K167** original - https://ballerup.dk/sites/default/files/2022-11/%C3%85rsregnskab%202017%20for%20Ballerup%20Kommune.pdf

• **K168** Original - https://bvb.vejle.dk/media/21141/11-boerne-og-familieudvalget-b2019.pdf

• **K169** Original - https://csv.vejle.dk/media/9188/aarsberetning-2016.pdf

• **K170** tracks - https://rebild.dk/sites/default/files/centre/hr_og_udvikling/statusrapport_rebild_kommune_endelig_2014_0.pdf

• **K171** tracks - https://abcdocz.com/doc/3330681/morten-frydenberg-version-dato--04-02-2014-statistik

• **K172** tracks - https://hjoerring.dk/

• **K173** tracks - https://abcdocz.com/doc/3182382/masterplan---halsn%C3%A6s-kommune

• **K174** tracks - https://aabenraa.dk/

• **K175** tracks - https://norddjurs.dk/

• **K176** tracks - https://toender.kommune-tv.dk/watch/1384

• **K177** Task Force analysis report, February 2019 - https://dagsordener.sonderborgkommune.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/ae2248d8-2174-431e-a2f8-fa6f4c66b3da/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K178** Task Force status report, October 2020 - https://dagsordener.sonderborgkommune.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/f2ad53b7-bc12-4e32-bd34-e9e2bd089aa8/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K179** Development plan, January 2020 - https://dagsordener.skive.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/fe35d58a-fdea-457a-a616-3663b7ff48c8/?redirectDirectlyToPd f = true

• **K180** Municipal presentation 15.1.2020 - https://dagsordener.skive.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/25d2d008-cdc0-4d21-9361-a92d6f2bc2e8/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K181** Presentation of the final report 12.5.2021 - https://dagsordener.skive.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/c47a482f-30ab-458c-8a5c-561ce38228d8/?redirect DirectlyToPdf = true

• **K182** Orientation point 14.8.2019 - https://dagsordener.skive.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/0df7df48-34c7-4e44-8616-ab5c205fc7d1/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K183** Implementation status 21.9.2021 - https://dagsordener.vardekommune.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/5957ca7f-0536-4ff4-9f3d-ebb93b620e66/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K184** Half-year status 21.10.2020 - https://dagsordener.mors.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/24c40add-bd5f-4ff2-ab7b-752e14030951/?redirectDirectlyToPdf =true

• **K185** Estimation 21.4.2021 - https://dagsordener.mors.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/41af47c9-949b-49e7-8319-2d0b8bc08372/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K186** Task Force analysis report, 12. April 2019 - https://dagsordener.vardekommune.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/90808af1-cdee-42fa-8324-e11227972561/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K187** Task Force status report, September 2020 - https://dagsordener.vardekommune.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/ed80df8f-c964-4834-bac3-9d48841ad947/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K188** Task Force Analysis Report, November 2018 - https://dagsordener.mors.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/f20c95d7-58ef-485e-bf5c-f564b3eeabcd/?redir ectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K189** TFVAR20S, additional public address - https://dagsordener.vardekommune.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/65ae3412-941b-4caa-ac1e-ca515cba9b13/? redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K190** TFMOR18A, additional public address - https://dagsordener.mors.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/157b51df-e4d4-42e3-aa8c-96f084a31eea/?redirectDir ectlyToPdf = true

• **K191** Public Task Force analysis, Sorø adult disability 2024 - https://dagsordener.soroe.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/d5755057-7afd-49b1-ad97-08c1fbd53372/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K192** Ankestyrelsen/ Social and Housing Agency Nordfynanalyse 2025 - https://presscloud.com/file/86/863291341045722/TFH_Nordfyn_Analyserapport.pdf

• **K193** Official publication page - https://www.nordfynskommune.dk/nyheder/taskforce-rapport-er-landet-18-anbefalinger-skal-styrke-voksenhandicapareadet-i -northfyns-kommune -499740125874991 /

• **K194** Original Task Force analysis, Faxe September 2025 - https://dagsordener.faxekommune.dk/Vis/Pdf/bilag/7d791905-f209-41bc-be4b-eeb7 562b6e7d?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K195** Otter Analysis Report, March 10, 2017 - https://dagsordener.odder.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/9bbfc597-021b-4361-9c65-9c09a096af04/?redirectD irectlyToPdf = true

• **K196** Otter Status Report, October 2019 - https://dagsordener.odder.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/b1c2b225-8333-418e-bfe3-bf5ef223802c/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K197** Glostrup status report, April 2019 (front page), May 2019 (kolofon) - https://dagsorden.glostrup.dk/meeting/attachment/229801

• **K198** Faaborg-Midtfyn Analyst Report 31.8.2017 - https://dagsordener.fmk.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/fccfe148-c8bf-43e7-a443-5be062d8e066/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K199** Faaborg-Midtfyn Status Report, March 2020 - https://dagsordener.fmk.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/8634e929-ee66-41e3-9f79-b5e8697ae88a/?redir ectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K200** Faaborg-Midtfyn consultation response 20.3.2020 - https://dagsordener.fmk.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/2f88e41a-acc9-4fef-a497-c0efb4b19cbb/?redirectDir ectlyToPdf = true

• **K201** Svendborg Analysis Report 6.2.2018 - https://dagsordener.svendborg.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/8298c42e-6e69-40cc-93e3-ab5af491d842/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K202** Svendborg progress report September 2019 - https://dagsordener.svendborg.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/1bdd3e59-9115-4912-a421-bb93fd5072f2/? redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K203** Fredericia Final Report October 2023 - https://dagsordner.fredericia.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/96d89a6f-a450-42db-befa-5e55a9b24b94/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K204** Fredericia presentation 26.1.2022 - https://dagsordner.fredericia.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/75558c5a-69ed-4bbc-8ffc-41aa67d936d4/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K205** Fredericia presentation 12.10.2023 - https://dagsordner.fredericia.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/633c8014-f964-4cb6-8bd7-bdd70e4f2224/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K206** Fredericia follow-up 22.8.2024 - https://dagsordner.fredericia.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/21039867-4690-4d91-b62b-44983eb6fe2a/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K207** The road analysis report 10 March 2023 - https://dagsordener.vejen.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/80a2303c-5fab-4513-875e-b1e023f7a47d/?redirectDi rectlyToPdf = true

• **K208** Road final status November 2024, colofon December 2024 - https://dagsordener.vejen.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/05270f3f-c9f9-4276-ada4-e916be00bd28/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K209** Vejen midterm status January 2024, presented 20.2.2024 - https://dagsordener.vejen.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/095f64fd-0243-404c-a105-a4b501c3f 776/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K210** The road overall management supervision summer 2023 - https://dagsordener.vejen.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/48c85364-e901-49c1-8ae9-d1759f7f7e64/?r edirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K211** The road thematic management supervision summer 2023 - https://dagsordener.vejen.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/6a894a56-e50e-4f2b-ab9b-0ca781c4f456/?r edirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K212** Tårnby mid-road status, submitted 13.11.2024 - https://dagsordener.taarnby.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/f52a9c65-7ba9-4563-991e-684f642d3843/?re directDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K213** Tårnby final report April 2025, submitted 10.9.2025 - https://dagsordener.taarnby.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/65327a80-63c3-40af-af5e-9bbf493a1498/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K214** Tårnby follow-up note May 2026, presented 10.9.2026 - https://dagsordener.taarnby.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/0eac32f7-c7bd-451e-be82-c7e30786bbbf/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K215** Herning analysis report September 2024, presented 23.10.2024 - https://dagsordener.herning.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/a0fd4b71-49d6-4c63-97ad -659d3057c6f6/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K216** Herning midterm status June 2025, submitted 13.8.2025 - https://dagsordener.herning.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/3d6e2e40-9d00-44c7-b0ad-e13961 7635cf/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K217** Herning final report May 2026, presented 11.8.2026 - https://dagsordener.herning.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/9109b2cf-2c5f-4ed4-ae1f-f772f18be2c8/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K218** Egedal Analysis Report April 2020 - https://egedalkommune.dk/p/Mit-liv/Omsorg-stoette-tilbud/Hj%C3%A6lp%20til%20fysisk%20og%20mental% 20handicap / b% C3% B8rn% 20and% 20adolescent% 20with% 20handicap / tfh -analytic report -egedal -kommune-april-2020.pdf

• **K219** TFKK20F - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/4844f4aa-92d8-45c2-8e83-ff947dba68e5/0c4f4107-3af8-46d3-9ee8-b0d27ce71ec2 Annex -3.pdf

• **K220** TFODS23F - https://www.odsherred.dk/media/nutjdliv/afsluttende-statusrapport-odsherred-kommune.pdf

• **K221** Original exposition - https://cdn.rigsrevisionen.dk/rigsrevisionen/Media/8/A/21-2015-sim.pdf

• **K222** Original STAR note - https://star.dk/media/21854/vejledning-om-kategorisering-af-fejl.pdf

• **K223** Annex link of the municipality - https://dagsordener.frederiksberg.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/834130f7-3232-4273-9e9a-159a2bbfc67d/?redirectDirectlyT oPdf = false

• **K224** Copied case presentation with direct attachment link - https://www.monrad.app/agenda_items/188818

• **K225** The Minister's original answer - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20252/spoergsmaal/s70/svar/2215841/3157519.pdf

• **K226** BU04 - https://www.statistikbanken.dk/BU04

• **K227** ANB6 - https://www.statistikbanken.dk/ANB6

• **K228** ANB7 - https://www.statistikbanken.dk/ANB7

• **K229** ANBILS1 - https://www.statistikbanken.dk/ANBIVS1

• **K230** API - https://api.statbank.dk/v1/

• **K231** PGF, quality comments - https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/dokumentation/Times/boern-og-unge/pgf

• **K232** DST: Contents, population / classification - https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/dokumentation/statistikdokumentation/anbringelser-af-boern-og -adolescents / contents

• **K233** NEW 51309, Table - https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/udgivelser/NytHtml?cid=51309

• **K234** BUAH: power date and termination information - https://www.dst.dk/extranet/ForskningVariabellister/BUAH%20-%20B%C3%B8rn%20og%20 young% 20planted% 20h% C3% A6ningsregister.html

• **K235** VIVE, Annex B1.7 - https://www.vive.dk/media/pure/yzekd3zk/394130

• **K236** Ankestyrelsen 2011, printed pp. 2,8-12 and Annex 1 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20111/almdel/sou/bilag/86/1045840.pdf

• **K237** HANDBU01 - https://www.statistikbanken.dk/HANDBU01

• **K238** DST: Accessibility, table definitions - https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/dokumentation/statistikdokumentation/handicapkompenserende-interventions -to -children and -young / accessible

• **K239** NEW 54493,28 May 2026 - https://www.dst.dk/Site/Dst/Udgivelser/nyt/GetPdf.aspx?cid=54493

• **K240** NEW 51369, delimitation - https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/udgivelser/NytHtml?cid=51369

• **K241** DST reporting page, NYT 27 August 2026 - https://www.dst.dk/da/Indberet/oplysningssider/handicap-og-udsatte-voksne

• **K242** HAND02A - https://www.statistikbanken.dk/HAND02A

• **K243** HAND07 - https://www.statistikbanken.dk/HAND07

• **K244** DST Subject Page - https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/emner/sociale-forhold/social-stoette/handicapomraadet

• **K245** HANDBIL1 - https://www.statbank.dk/HANDBIL1

• **K246** HANDBIL2 - https://www.statbank.dk/HANDBIL2

• **K247** HANDBIL3 - https://www.statbank.dk/HANDBIL3

• **K248** Content, Concepts and definitions - https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/dokumentation/statistikdokumentation/stoette-til-handicapbil/indhold

• **K249** Precision, Other Uncertainty - https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/dokumentation/statistikdokumentation/stoette-til-handicapbil/praecision-and -reliability

• **K250** HAND02A - https://www.statbank.dk/HAND02A

• **K251** BU20 - https://www.statbank.dk/BU20

• **K252** BU21 - https://www.statbank.dk/BU21

• **K253** original - https://viden.sl.dk/media/4547/anbringelsesstatistik_aarsstatistik_2010.pdf

• **K254** original - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20151/almdel/sou/bilag/84/1574102.pdf

• **K255** original - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20161/almdel/sou/bilag/76/1700020.pdf

• **K256** Original of the Minister - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20081/almdel/sou/spm/120/svar/591816/629626/index.htm

• **K257** BU03A - https://www.statbank.dk/BU03A

• **K258** ANB6 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANB6

• **K259** Time of public proceedings of the Board of Appeal - https://www.ast.dk/tal-og-statistik/sagsbehandlingstider

• **K260** Original - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732268836982459/Ankestyrelsens-%C3%A5rsopg%C3%B8relse-for-sagsbehandlingen-i-2019.pdf

• **K261** DST Precision and reliability - https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/dokumentation/statistikdokumentation/anbringelser-af-boern-og-unge/precision and reliability;

• **K262** DST NEW 30567 - https://www.dst.dk/da/Statistik/udgivelser/NytHtml?cid=30567

• **K263** BIS66 - https://www.statbank.dk/BIS66

• **K264** BU25 - https://www.statbank.dk/BU25

• **K265** BU32 - https://www.statbank.dk/BU32

• **K266** Reference time _ RR2008 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/4/4/a511-08.pdf

• **K267** Reference time _ RR2010 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/B/3/a503-10.pdf

• **K268** Reference time _ RR2011 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/7/8/a509-11.pdf

• **K269** ANB5 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANB5

• **K270** ANB7 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANB7

• **K271** ANB8 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANB8

• **K272** ANB9 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANB9

• **K273** ANB10 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANB10

• **K274** ANBAAR2 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR2

• **K275** ANBAAR15 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR15

• **K276** ANBAAR5 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR5

• **K277** ANBAAR16 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR16

• **K278** ANBAAR6 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR6

• **K279** ANBAAR12 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR12

• **K280** ANBAAR13 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR13

• **K281** ANBAAR9 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR9

• **K282** ANBAAR7 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR7

• **K283** ANBILS1 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBIVS1

• **K284** ANBIVS2 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBIVS2

• **K285** ANBIVS3 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBIVS3

• **K286** ANBILS4 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBIVS4

• **K287** ANBAAR10 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR10

• **K288** ANBAAR8 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR8

• **K289** ANBAAR17 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR17

• **K290** ANBAAR14 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR14

• **K291** ANBAAR1 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR1

• **K292** ANBAAR3 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR3

• **K293** ANBAAR4 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANBAAR4

• **K294** BU02A - https://www.statbank.dk/BU02A

• **K295** BU02B - https://www.statbank.dk/BU02B

• **K296** BU03B - https://www.statbank.dk/BU03B

• **K297** ANB1 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANB1

• **K298** ANB2 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANB2

• **K299** ANB3 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANB3

• **K300** ANB4 - https://www.statbank.dk/ANB4

• **K301** BIS99 - https://www.statbank.dk/BIS99

• **K302** BIS2 - https://www.statbank.dk/BIS2

• **K303** BIS9 - https://www.statbank.dk/BIS9

• **K304** BIS6 - https://www.statbank.dk/BIS6

• **K305** BIS7 - https://www.statbank.dk/BIS7

• **K306** Original report - https://www.vive.dk/media/pure/rv747lov/26621995

• **K307** Original report - https://www.vive.dk/media/pure/2z1o2lvj/16231336

• **K308** Official release page, 19 January 2023 - https://www.vive.dk/da/udgivelser/maalrettet-stoette-til-foraeldre-med-anbragte-boern-2z1o2lvj /

• **K309** Original report - https://www.vive.dk/media/pure/4vl88dox/23947692

• **K310** Annual report 2025 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/qo0nutay/aarsberetning-for-sundhedsvaesenets-disciplinaernaevn-2025.pdf

• **K311** Annual report 2025 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/fpcdeauo/ppkn-aarsberetning-2025.pdf

• **K312** Annual report 2025 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/ablnyytx/det-psykiatriske-ankenaevns-aarsberetning-2025.pdf

• **K313** 2017-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/ymkfowgl/aarsberetning-ppkn-2017.pdf

• **K314** 2018-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/abih431s/ppkn-aarsberetning-2018.pdf

• **K315** 2019-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/yzvfrxzv/ppkn-aarsberetning-2019.pdf

• **K316** 2022-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/drygj104/aarsberetning-2022.pdf

• **K317** 2023-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/voad30tc/ppkn-aarsberetning-2023.pdf

• **K318** 2024-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/mlkjduws/det-psykiatriske-patientklagenaevns-aarsberetning-for-2024.pdf

• **K319** 2013-original - https://krim.dk/undersider/straffesager/straffeproces/kap-43-a/psykiatriske-patientklagenaen-aarsberetning-2013.pdf

• **K320** 2014-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/mddnisle/aarsberetning-2014.pdf

• **K321** 2020 -original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/4x2d0brm/ppkn-aarsberetning-2020.pdf

• **K322** 2021 -original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/dllfomcq/aarsberetning-2021.pdf

• **K323** 2014-original - https://krim.dk/kommenteret-lovsamling/straffesager/straffeproces/kap-43-a/psykiatriske-ankenaevn-aarsberetning-2014.pdf

• **K324** 2015-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/ojtkagfp/%C3%A5rsberetning-2015_det-psykiatriske-anken%C3%A6vn_final.pdf

• **K325** 2016-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/fh5dbmvk/det_psykiatriske_ankenvns_rsberetning_2016.pdf

• **K326** 2017-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/jy4ptdoh/det-psykiatriske-ankenaevns-aarsberetning-2017.pdf

• **K327** 2018-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/q4lb5up2/%C3%A5rsberetning-for-det-psykiatriske-anken%C3%A6vn-2018.pdf

• **K328** 2019-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/ckkfsgxd/det-psykiatriske-anken%C3%A6vn-2019.pdf

• **K329** 2020 -original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/ggcbkif5/%C3%A5rsberetning-2020-det-psykiatriske-anken%C3%A6vn.pdf

• **K330** 2021 -original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/vachop0w/det-psykiatriske-anken%C3%A6vn-%C3%A5rsberetning-for-2021-v2-januar-2023. pdf

• **K331** 2022-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/lkjdkfau/det-psykiatriske-anken%C3%A6vn-%C3%A5rsberetning-for-2022.pdf

• **K332** 2023-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/yojfodo1/%C3%A5rsberetning-2023-det-psykiatriske-anken%C3%A6vn.pdf

• **K333** 2024-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/1hghhbwu/aarsberetning-for-det-psykiatriske-ankenaevn-2024.pdf

• **K334** 2010- original - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20101/almdel/%C2%A771/bilag/101/996647/index.htm

• **K335** 2011-original - https://krim.dk/kommenteret-lovsamling/straffesager/straffeproces/468-aarsberetning-psyk-naevn-region-midtjylland-2011.pdf

• **K336** 2012-original - https://krim.dk/undersider/straffesager/straffeproces/469-aarsberetning-midtjylland-psykiatriske-patientklagenaevn-2012.pdf

• **K337** 2012-original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/tt0d2pon/aarsberetning-2012.pdf

• **K338** DPSD2007OR - https://web.archive.org/web/20110108223518id_/http://www.sst.dk/Publ/Publ2008/EFT/DPSD/DPSDaarsrap2007_saml _ ministeriet.pdf

• **K339** DPSD2012OR - https://web.archive.org/web/20130909031452id_/http://www.patientombuddet.dk:80/Publikationer/Aarsberetninger/~/media / POB / Years reports / 2012 / 2012% 20% C3% 85r report% 20DPSD% 20Part% 201.ashx

• **K340** archived primary portal from 6 June 2013 - https://web.archive.org/web/20130606005234id_/http://www.dpsd.dk/Publikationer%20mv/a Annual reports / Years report _ 2009.aspx

• **K341** Original DPSD- Annual Report 2009 of the Danish Health Board - http://www.sst.dk/publ/publ2010/Tilsyn/DPSD/DPSD_Aarsrapport_2009.pdf

• **K342** SUU general part 2009- 10, answer to question 583 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20091/almdel/SUU/spm/583/svar/726182/864436/index.ht m

• **K343** Previous file address of the patient pass - http://www.patientombuddet.dk/Publikationer/Aarsberetninger/~/media/L%C3%A6ring/Aarsbere% 20DPSD / DPSD% 20% C3% 85th Report% 202013% 20% 20DEL% 201.ashx

• **K344** DPSD's previous file address - http://www.dpsd.dk/~/media/Foundry/Sites/DPSD/Files/Aarsrapporter/DPSD%20aarsberetning%202013 % 20% 20DEL% 201.ashx

• **K345** Hospital pharmacy, Nordjylland Region, research report 2016 - https://sygehusapoteket.rn.dk/-/media/Hospitaler/Sygehusapoteket/Forskningsprojekt- / 2016-Creation-of-ordination---REPORT _ Final -% 28002% 29.pdf

• **K346** Patient Information / Ministry, Service Oversight July 2014 - https://web.archive.org/web/20220423102043id_/http://stps.dk/da/udgivelser/2014 / ~ / media / 92DBC2DC8B1249D88DAFFD2B431FDBB4.ashx

• **K347** STPS, Annual Report page - https://stps.dk/om-os/grundlag-beretning-og-aarsrapport/aarsberetninger-dpsd

• **K348** 2013-index, capture 20160704154345 - https://web.archive.org/web/20160704154345id_/http://stps.dk:80/da/udgivelser/2013

• **K349** 2014-index, capture 20160710050650 - https://web.archive.org/web/20160710050650id_/http://stps.dk:80/da/udgivelser/2014

• **K350** Statistical information on patient complaints 2014 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/pxqdfylg/statistiske-oplysninger-om-patientklager-for-2014.p df

• **K351** 2018 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/v0lhxraa/%C3%A5rsberetning-anken%C3%A6vnet-for-patienterstatningen-2018.pdf

• **K352** 2019 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/ye0i151e/%C3%A5rsberetning-anken%C3%A6vnet-for-patienterstatning-2019.pdf

• **K353** 2020 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/50fpwi3d/%C3%A5rsberetning-2020-anken%C3%A6vnet-for-patienterstatningen-final-merged.pdf

• **K354** 2021 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/arbh41wt/%C3%A5rsberetning-2021-anken%C3%A6vnet-for-patienterstatningen.pdf

• **K355** 2022 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/wf5llect/aarsberetning-for-afp-2022.pdf

• **K356** 2023 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/04dhdvb0/aarsberetning-for-afp-2023.pdf

• **K357** 2024 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/jcmpzlc5/aarsberetning-for-afp-2024.pdf

• **K358** 2025 - https://www.stpk.dk/media/r3ijpkbu/aarsberetning-ankenaevnet-for-patienterstatningen-2025.pdf

• **K359** Public original, archive capture 20070606212828 - https://web.archive.org/web/20070606212828id_/http://www.pkn.dk/public/dokumenter / stat _ 06.pdf

• **K360** STPKs publication page, capture 20190923130030 - https://web.archive.org/web/20190923130030id_/https://stpk.dk/da/publikationer/f-2017 / Annual statistics -for -patient complaints - for-2010 /

• **K361** STPKs publication page, capture 20190923130539 - https://web.archive.org/web/20190923130539id_/https://stpk.dk/da/publikationer/foer-2017 / annual statistics-for-patient complaints -i-2011 /

• **K362** STPK publication page, capture 20190923125856 - https://web.archive.org/web/20190923125856id_/https://stpk.dk/da/publikationer/foer -2017 / statisticialinformation -om -patient complaints -for-2012 /

• **K363** Annual Report 2020, Disciplinary Board of the Health Service - https://www.stpk.dk/media/z41lc1wx/sundhedsv%C3%A6senets-disciplin% C3% A6rn% C3% A6vn-2020.pdf

• **K364** Internet Archives CDX interface - https://web.archive.org/cdx/search/cdx

• **K365** register analysis dated 9. March 2012 - https://cdn.patienterstatningen.dk/patienterstatningen/Media/637810534607166501/Stigningen%20i%20anmeldelser%20til%20og%20erstatningstilkendegivelser%20fra%20Patienterstatningen%202006-2011%20-%20analyse%20af%20baggrunden%20og%20prognose%20for%202012-2015.pdf

• **K366** ODA lookup - https://oda.ft.dk/api/Dokument%2859754%29?$format=json&$expand=Fil,SagDokument

• **K367** Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006 - https://web.archive.org/web/20110707050638id_/http://www.patientforsikringen.dk/da/Udgivelser-and -numerals / ~ / media / Files / Years reports / PF-2006 _ net.ashx

• **K368** Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007 - https://web.archive.org/web/20110707050655id_/http://www.patientforsikringen.dk/da/Udgivelser- and -numerals / ~ / media / Files / Annual Reports / Annual Report07.ashx

• **K369** Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008 - https://web.archive.org/web/20110707045849id_/http://www.patientforsikringen.dk/da/Udgivelser-and -numerals / ~ / media / Files / Years reports / 2008.ashx

• **K370** Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009 - https://web.archive.org/web/20110707050307id_/http://www.patientforsikringen.dk/da/Udgivelser-and -numerals / ~ / media / Files / Years reports / Annual report2009.ashx

• **K371** Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010 - https://web.archive.org/web/20110707050613id_/http://www.patientforsikringen.dk/da/Udgivelser-and -numerals / ~ / media / Files / Years reports / report2010.ashx

• **K372** Patient insurance Statistics 2006, Capital Region - https://web.archive.org/web/20070703002525id_/http://www.patientforsikring en.dk: 80 / statisticial2006 / regioncapital.html

• **K373** Patient insurance Statistics 2006, Region of Central Jutland - https://web.archive.org/web/20080123154118id_/http://www.patientforsikringen. dk: 80 / statistisk 2006 / regionmidtjylland.html

• **K374** Patient insurance Statistics 2006, Region North Jutland - https://web.archive.org/web/20080123154125id_/http://www.patientforsikringen. dk: 80 / statistisk 2006 / regionnordjylland.html

• **K375** Patient insurance Statistics 2006, Region of Zealand - https://web.archive.org/web/20080122171756id_/http://www.patientforsikringen.d k: 80 / statistik 2006 / regionsjaelland.html

• **K376** Patient insurance Statistics 2006, Region South Denmark - https://web.archive.org/web/20070905021812id_/http://www.patientforsikring en.dk: 80 / statisticial2006 / regionsydansmark.html

• **K377** Original legal observations - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/ft/201312L00126/dan/pdf

• **K378** Act No 519 of 26 May 2014 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2014/519/dan/pdf

• **K379** Højesteret, BS-1564 / 2020-HJR, 4 December 2020 - https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/2ccj45oy/bs-1564-dom-anonymiseret.pdf

• **K380** Annual Report 2021 - https://cdn.patienterstatningen.dk/patienterstatningen/Media/638035257139153289/%C3%85rsrapport%202021_tilg % C3% A6ngelik.pdf

• **K381** Annual Report 2022 - https://cdn.patienterstatningen.dk/patienterstatningen/Media/638237091744479602/%C3%85rsrapport_2022.pdf

• **K382** Annual Report 2025 - https://patienterstatningen.dk/Media/639268050936165809/aarsrapport_2025_patienterstatningen.pdf

• **K383** Law No 909 of 21 June 2022 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2022/909

• **K384** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7710/aarsberetning_2006.pdf

• **K385** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7709/aarsberetning_2007.pdf

• **K386** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7708/aarsberetning_20082009.pdf

• **K387** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7707/aarsberetning_2010.pdf

• **K388** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7706/aarsberetning_2011.pdf

• **K389** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7705/aarsberetning_2012.pdf

• **K390** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7704/aarsberetning_2013.pdf

• **K391** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7703/aarsberetning_2014.pdf

• **K392** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7702/aarsberetning_2015.pdf

• **K393** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7701/datatilsynets_aarsberetning_2016_web.pdf

• **K394** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7632/aarsberetning_2017.pdf

• **K395** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7700/aarsberetning_2018.pdf

• **K396** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7699/aarsberetning_2019.pdf

• **K397** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/637559694498947201/%C3%85rsberetning_2020_Datatilsynet.pdf

• **K398** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/637822563591117421/Datatilsynets%20%C3%A5rsberetning%202021.pd f

• **K399** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/638191430509289037/Datatilsynets%20%C3%A5rsberetning%202022.pd f

• **K400** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/638611155770709695/Datatilsynets%20%C3%A5rsberetning%202023.pd f

• **K401** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/638865212229879094/Datatilsynets%20%C3%A5rsberetning%202024.pd f

• **K402** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7695/aarsrapport_2018.pdf

• **K403** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/media/7717/aarsrapport_2019.pdf

• **K404** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/637532964846931481/Datatilsynet%20%C3%A5rsrapport%202020.pdf

• **K405** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/637841776634047237/aarsrapport_2021.pdf

• **K406** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/638197576212036701/aarsrapport_2022.pdf

• **K407** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/638481580493890913/aarsrapport_2023.pdf

• **K408** Annual report - https://cdn.datatilsynet.dk/datatilsynet/Media/638784214676320017/%C3%85rsrapport%202024%20for%20Datatilsynet.p df

• **K409** primary selection - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/boedesager

• **K410** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2020/mar/to-kommuner-indstillet-til-boede

• **K411** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/2257/2688

• **K412** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2020/jun/lejre-kommune-indstilles-til-boede

• **K413** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/2256/2687

• **K414** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2020/dec/kommune-indstillet-til-boede

• **K415** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/2467/2944

• **K416** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2021/jun/vejle-kommune-indstilles-til-boede

• **K417** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/5802/6928

• **K418** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2021/jul/region-syddanmark-indstilles-til-boede

• **K419** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/6995/8393

• **K420** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2021/sep/region-syddanmark-indstillet-til-boede

• **K421** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2021/aug/udlaendingestyrelsen-indstilles-til-boede

• **K422** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2021/sep/region-midtjylland-indstillet-til-boede

• **K423** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/9789/11442

• **K424** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2021/sep/favrskov-kommune-indstilles-til-boede-

• **K425** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/4822/5809

• **K426** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2021/dec/frederiksberg-kommune-indstilles-til-boede

• **K427** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/4813/5798

• **K428** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2022/mar/nationalt-genom-center-indstilles-til-boede

• **K429** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2022/maj/civilstyrelsen-indstilles-til-boede

• **K430** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2022/aug/lolland-kommune-indstilles-til-boede

• **K431** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2024/jan/odsherred-kommune-indstilles-til-boede

• **K432** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2024/jan/hvidovre-kommune-indstilles-til-boede

• **K433** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2024/aug/endnu-en-kommune-indstillet-til-boede-for-manglende-kryp port

• **K434** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2024/jan/det-kongelige-teater-indstilles-til-boede

• **K435** Data Protection Agency - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2024/nov/datatilsynet-anmelder-lyngby-taarbaek-kommune-til-politiet

• **K436** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/9568/11151

• **K437** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/7244/8738

• **K438** Judgment - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/10573/12480

• **K439** s 12 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET2022_web.pdf#page=12

• **K440** s 19 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET_2023.pdf#page=19

• **K441** s 21 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/PET_2024.pdf#page=21

• **K442** s 10 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/PET_2025_redegoerelse.pdf#page=10

• **K443** s 11 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE2022_web.pdf#page=11

• **K444** s 19 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE_2023.pdf#page=19

• **K445** s 20 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/FE_2024.pdf#page=20

• **K446** s 9 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/FE_2025.pdf#page=9

• **K447** s 11 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS2022_web.pdf#page=11

• **K448** s 17 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS_2023.pdf#page=17

• **K449** s 18 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/CFCS_2024.pdf#page=18

• **K450** s 23 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Aarsredegoerelse-om-kontrol-af-PET-i-2014.pdf#page=23

• **K451** s 23 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET_2016.pdf#page=23

• **K452** s 32 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET2016.pdf#page=32

• **K453** s 31 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Redegoerelse-om-PET-for-2017-web-version.pdf#page=31

• **K454** s 25 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET_2018.pdf#page=25

• **K455** s 25 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET_2019.pdf#page=25

• **K456** s 29 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_PET_2020.pdf#page=29

• **K457** s 30 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_PET_2021.pdf#page=30

• **K458** s 31 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET2022_web.pdf#page=31

• **K459** s 32 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET_2023.pdf#page=32

• **K460** s 34 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/PET_2024.pdf#page=34

- **K461** sfys 7,9,27-31 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/PET_2025_redegoerelse.pdf#page=fys7,9,27%E2%80%9331
- **K462** s 21 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Aarsredegoerelse-om-kontrol-af-FE-i-2014.pdf#page=21
- **K463** s 16 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE_2016.pdf#page=16
- **K464** s 29 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE2017_web2.pdf#page=29
- **K465** s 25 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Redegoerelse-om-FE-for-2017-web-version.pdf#page=25
- **K466** s 21 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE_2018.pdf#page=21
- **K467** s 21 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE_2019.pdf#page=21
- **K468** s 17 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_FE_2020.pdf#page=17
- **K469** s 24 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_FE_2021.pdf#page=24
- **K470** s 26 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE2022_web.pdf#page=26
- **K471** s 31 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE_2023.pdf#page=31
- **K472** s 32 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/FE_2024.pdf#page=32
- **K473** s 22 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/FE_2025.pdf#page=22
- **K474** s 20 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CfC_2014-2015.pdf#page=20
- **K475** s 24 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS2016.pdf#page=24
- **K476** s 24 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Redegoerelse-om-CFCS-for-2017.pdf#page=24
- **K477** s 16 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS_2018.pdf#page=16
- **K478** s 18 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS_2019.pdf#page=18
- **K479** s 22 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_CFCS_2020.pdf#page=22
- **K480** s 23 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_CFCS_2021.pdf#page=23
- **K481** s 21 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS2022_web.pdf#page=21
- **K482** s 27 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS_2023.pdf#page=27
- **K483** s 27 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/CFCS_2024.pdf#page=27
- **K484** s 29 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/FE_2025.pdf#page=29
- **K485** PET 2024 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/PET_2024.pdf
- **K486** PET 2023 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET_2023.pdf
- **K487** PET 2022 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET2022_web.pdf
- **K488** PET 2021 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_PET_2021.pdf
- **K489** PET 2020 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_PET_2020.pdf
- **K490** PET 2019 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET_2019.pdf
- **K491** PET 2018 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET_2018.pdf
- **K492** PET 2017 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Redegoerelse-om-PET-for-2017-web-version.pdf
- **K493** PET 2016 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET2016.pdf
- **K494** PET 2015 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/PET_2016.pdf
- **K495** PET 2014 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Aarsredegoerelse-om-kontrol-af-PET-i-2014.pdf
- **K496** FE 2024 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/FE_2024.pdf
- **K497** FE 2023 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE_2023.pdf
- **K498** FE 2022 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE2022_web.pdf
- **K499** FE 2021 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_FE_2021.pdf
- **K500** FE 2020 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_FE_2020.pdf
- **K501** FE 2019 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE_2019.pdf
- **K502** FE 2018 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE_2018.pdf

• **K503** FE 2017 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Redegoerelse-om-FE-for-2017-web-version.pdf

• **K504** FE 2016 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE2017_web2.pdf

• **K505** FE 2015 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/FE_2016.pdf

• **K506** FE 2014 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Aarsredegoerelse-om-kontrol-af-FE-i-2014.pdf

• **K507** CFCS 2024 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/CFCS_2024.pdf

• **K508** CFCS 2023 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS_2023.pdf

• **K509** CFCS 2022 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS2022_web.pdf

• **K510** CFCS 2021 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_CFCS_2021.pdf

• **K511** CFCS 2020 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/TET_CFCS_2020.pdf

• **K512** CFCS 2019 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS_2019.pdf

• **K513** CFCS 2018 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS_2018.pdf

• **K514** CFCS 2017 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Redegoerelse-om-CFCS-for-2017.pdf

• **K515** CFCS 2016 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CFCS2016.pdf

• **K516** CFCS 2014 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CfC_2014-2015.pdf

• **K517** PET 2025 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/PET_2025_redegoerelse.pdf

• **K518** FE 2025 - https://tet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/FE_2025.pdf

• **K519** Official original - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20131/almdel/sau/bilag/196/1372167.pdf

• **K520** Original - https://www.ft.dk/statsrevisor/20051/beretning/sb11/bilag/2/965647.pdf

• **K521** Original - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/dpdgq4ld/supplerende-oplysninger-om-sagsbehandlingen-i-2014-1.pdf

• **K522** Original - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20101/almdel/SAU/bilag/243/1014056.pdf

• **K523** Original - https://skm.dk/media/Skatteministeriet/Dokumenter/PDF%27er/redegoerelse-2014-bilag.pdf

• **K524** ODA document 488209 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20061/almdel/SAU/bilag/138/index.htm

• **K525** ODA document 249337 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20091/almdel/SAU/bilag/192/index.htm

• **K526** ODA document 201843 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20101/almdel/SAU/bilag/220/index.htm

• **K527** ODA document 142923 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20111/almdel/SAU/bilag/250/index.htm

• **K528** ODA document 53631 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/almdel/SAU/bilag/181/index.htm

• **K529** ODA document 54511 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/almdel/SAU/bilag/186/index.htm

• **K530** aarsrap2010.pdf - https://www.landsskatteretten.dk/public/dokumenter/aarsrap2010.pdf

• **K531** LSR aarsrapp 2011 til web.pdf - https://www.landsskatteretten.dk/public/dokumenter/LSR%20aarsrapp%202011%20til%20web.pdf

• **K532** LSR06O, p. 35-37 - https://web.archive.org/web/20070630025107id_/http://www.skm.dk/public/dokumenter/landsskatteretten2006.pdf

• **K533** Evaluation, method p 37 -38 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20171/almdel/SAU/bilag/209/1904358.pdf

• **K534** Case statistics - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/Skatteankestyrelsen/Om_styrelsen/M%C3%A5l_og_resultater/sagsstatistikker_20 15.pdf

• **K535** Case statistics - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/Skatteankestyrelsen/Om_styrelsen/M%C3%A5l_og_resultater/sagsstatistikker-20 16.pdf

• **K536** Case statistics - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/Skatteankestyrelsen/Om_styrelsen/M%C3%A5l_og_resultater/sagsstatistikker-20 17.pdf

• **K537** Case statistics - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/Skatteankestyrelsen/Om_styrelsen/M%C3%A5l_og_resultater/sagsstatistikker-20 18.pdf

• **K538** Case statistics - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/553piuu2/sagsstatistikker-2019.pdf

• **K539** Case statistics - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/Skatteankestyrelsen/Om_styrelsen/M%C3%A5l_og_resultater/sagsstatistikker-20 20.pdf

• **K540** Case statistics - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/Skatteankestyrelsen/Om_styrelsen/M%C3%A5l_og_resultater/tal-fra-skatteankest yrelsen -2021.pdf

• **K541** Case statistics - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/Skatteankestyrelsen/Om_styrelsen/M%C3%A5l_og_resultater/tal-fra-skatteankest yrelsen -2022.pdf

• **K542** Case statistics - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/akqdtbg3/sagsstatistikker-2023-tal-fra-skatteankestyrelsen.pdf

• **K543** Case statistics - https://skatteankestyrelsen.dk/media/p4qfbbzp/tal-fra-skatteankestyrelsen-2024.pdf

• **K544** Original 2025 - https://udln.dk/media/fa4icktn/aarsberetning-2025.pdf

• **K545** Report - https://udln.dk/media/kzwhp15r/aarsberetning_2013.pdf

• **K546** Report - https://udln.dk/media/lxyp24fg/aarsberetning_2014_1_udkast_2.pdf

• **K547** Report - https://udln.dk/media/wv2n2yik/aarsberetning-2015.pdf

• **K548** Report - https://udln.dk/media/w4nigmd1/aarsberetning-2016.pdf

• **K549** Report - https://udln.dk/media/vrhf0zdy/aarsberetning-2017.pdf

• **K550** Report - https://udln.dk/media/t0xbpcjl/aarsberetning-2018.pdf

• **K551** Report - https://udln.dk/media/1m5nxb4r/udlaendingenaevnets-7-beretning-2019.pdf

• **K552** Report - https://udln.dk/media/qp2pkd4p/aarsberetning2020.pdf

• **K553** Report - https://udln.dk/media/rfce41ss/aarsberetning2021.pdf

• **K554** Report - https://udln.dk/media/zijbkels/udln-aarsberetning-2022-1.pdf

• **K555** Report - https://udln.dk/media/kvajfu41/beretning-2023.pdf

• **K556** Report - https://udln.dk/media/kw0lninv/aarsberetning-2024.pdf

• **K557** Original - https://udln.dk/da/statistik-og-maaltal/aarsstatistik-2022/

• **K558** KEN9715 of 28 May 2024 / ERH 2024 / 35 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/api/pdf/244985

• **K559** Reply - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20241/almdel/uui/spm/421/svar/2155318/3055462.pdf

• **K560** Annual report 2006 - https://fln.dk/media/01un3i4u/beretning2006340.pdf

• **K561** Annual report 2007 - https://fln.dk/media/44ofhh5j/flygtningenaevnets-beretning-2007.pdf

• **K562** Annual Report 2008 - https://fln.dk/media/sgcnj5va/flygtningenaevnets-beretning-2008.pdf

• **K563** Annual Report 2009 - https://fln.dk/media/hyhlheun/beretning-2009.pdf

• **K564** Annual report 2010 - https://fln.dk/media/yevhy0gf/beretning-2010.pdf

• **K565** Annual Report 2011 - https://fln.dk/media/lfdk2x3o/formandskabets-2011-beretning.pdf

• **K566** Annual Report 2012 - https://fln.dk/media/trrhf3bm/formandskabet-21-beretning-2012-web.pdf

• **K567** Annual Report 2013 - https://fln.dk/media/opknfimd/formandensbetning2013_web.pdf

• **K568** Annual Report 2014 - https://fln.dk/media/zx5oqn41/formandens-beretning-2014-web.pdf

• **K569** Annual Report 2015 - https://fln.dk/media/m45m3edn/beretning-2015-web.pdf

• **K570** Annual report 2016 - https://fln.dk/media/qahdpdbj/beretning-2016-web.pdf

• **K571** Annual report 2017 - https://fln.dk/media/pvkgbd0g/291964-beretning-2017_low.pdf

• **K572** Annual Report 2018 - https://fln.dk/media/kkwnszif/301535-beretning-2018-web-version.pdf

• **K573** Annual Report 2019 - https://fln.dk/media/h32nkzfq/317951-beretning-2019.pdf

• **K574** Annual report 2020 - https://fln.dk/media/nqbnsekf/1005647-beretning-2020_low.pdf

• **K575** Annual report 2021 - https://fln.dk/media/ihch2dbu/flygtningnvnet-formandskabs-beretning-2021.pdf

• **K576** Annual report 2022 - https://fln.dk/media/rtldbdgg/1060074-beretning-2022.pdf

• **K577** Annual report 2023 - https://fln.dk/media/4ydeiris/beretning-2023.pdf

• **K578** Annual report 2024 - https://fln.dk/media/4wufu5pa/beretning-2024.pdf

• **K579** Annual report 2025 - https://fln.dk/media/x4unnlej/beretning-2025.pdf

• **K580** Annual Report 2006 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/annual_report_2006_eng

• **K581** Annual Report 2007 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/annual_report_2007_eng

• **K582** Annual Table 2008 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2008_ENG

- **K583** Annual Table 2009 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2009_ENG
- **K584** Annual Table 2010 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2010_ENG
- **K585** Annual Table 2011 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2011_ENG
- **K586** Annual Table 2012 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2012_ENG
- **K587** Annual Table 2013 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2013_ENG
- **K588** Annual Table 2014 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2014_ENG
- **K589** Annual Table 2015 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2015_ENG
- **K590** Annual Table 2016 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2016_ENG
- **K591** Annual Table 2017 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2017_ENG
- **K592** Annual Table 2018 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2018_ENG
- **K593** Annual Table 2019 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2019_ENG
- **K594** Annual Table 2020 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2020_ENG
- **K595** Annual Table 2021 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2021_ENG
- **K596** Annual Table 2022 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_violation_2022_ENG
- **K597** Annual Table 2023 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/stats-violation-2023-eng
- **K598** Annual Table 2024 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/stats-violation-2024-eng
- **K599** Annual Table 2025 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/stats-violation-2025-eng
- **K600** EMD, Understanding the Court's statistics - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_understanding_ENG
- **K601** Annual analysis 2008 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_analysis_2008_ENG
- **K602** Annual analysis 2011 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_analysis_2011_ENG
- **K603** Annual analysis 2014 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_analysis_2014_ENG
- **K604** Annual analysis 2015 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_analysis_2015_ENG
- **K605** Annual analysis 2016 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_analysis_2016_ENG
- **K606** Annual analysis 2017 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_analysis_2017_ENG
- **K607** Annual analysis 2020 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_analysis_2020_ENG
- **K608** Annual analysis 2022 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_analysis_2022_ENG
- **K609** Annual analysis 2023 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/stats-analysis-2023-eng
- **K610** Annual analysis 2024 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/stats-analysis-2024-eng
- **K611** Annual analysis 2025 - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/stats-analysis-2025-eng
- **K612** Previous source - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/Stats_analysis_2013_ENG
- **K613** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-72015
- **K614** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-77064
- **K615** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-79808
- **K616** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-80460
- **K617** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-90194
- **K618** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-90200
- **K619** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-90820
- **K620** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-91899
- **K621** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-93358
- **K622** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-102955
- **K623** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-102949
- **K624** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-102953

- **K625** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-102947
- **K626** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-102957
- **K627** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-105129
- **K628** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-114485
- **K629** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-141941
- **K630** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-145341
- **K631** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-163115
- **K632** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-168934
- **K633** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-169481
- **K634** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-171776
- **K635** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-179218
- **K636** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-187391
- **K637** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-187203
- **K638** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-187202
- **K639** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-194318
- **K640** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-196152
- **K641** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-204602
- **K642** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-207134
- **K643** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-207136
- **K644** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-207667
- **K645** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-211178
- **K646** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-211795
- **K647** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-213522
- **K648** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-214330
- **K649** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-217039
- **K650** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-219943
- **K651** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-221261
- **K652** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-221506
- **K653** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-226192
- **K654** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-226193
- **K655** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-226195
- **K656** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-226194
- **K657** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-227719
- **K658** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-231959
- **K659** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-231958
- **K660** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-231957
- **K661** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-237294
- **K662** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-237795
- **K663** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-237958
- **K664** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-237959
- **K665** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-237954
- **K666** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-237957

• **K667** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-243258

• **K668** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-244099

• **K669** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-245259

• **K670** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-245386

• **K671** Original - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/?i=001-246128

• **K672** Original Resolution - https://search.coe.int/cm?i=0900001680b172fa

• **K673** HUDOC 001-72219 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-72219&filename=001-72219.pdf

• **K674** HUDOC 001-72789 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-72789&filename=001-72789.pdf

• **K675** HUDOC 001-75419 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-75419&filename=001-75419.pdf

• **K676** HUDOC 001-75548 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-75548&filename=001-75548.pdf

• **K677** HUDOC 001-75655 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-75655&filename=001-75655.pdf

• **K678** HUDOC 001-75939 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-75939&filename=001-75939.pdf

• **K679** HUDOC 001-76660 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-76660&filename=001-76660.pdf

• **K680** HUDOC 001-76591 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-76591&filename=001-76591.pdf

• **K681** HUDOC 001-76777 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-76777&filename=001-76777.pdf

• **K682** HUDOC 001-76900 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-76900&filename=001-76900.pdf

• **K683** HUDOC 001-76921 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-76921&filename=001-76921.pdf

• **K684** HUDOC 001-76979 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-76979&filename=001-76979.pdf

• **K685** HUDOC 001-76985 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-76985&filename=001-76985.pdf

• **K686** HUDOC 001-77707 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-77707&filename=001-77707.pdf

• **K687** HUDOC 001-77874 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-77874&filename=001-77874.pdf

• **K688** HUDOC 001-78692 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-78692&filename=001-78692.pdf

• **K689** HUDOC 001-79612 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-79612&filename=001-79612.pdf

• **K690** HUDOC 001-79613 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-79613&filename=001-79613.pdf

• **K691** HUDOC 001-79614 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-79614&filename=001-79614.pdf

• **K692** HUDOC 001-80347 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-80347&filename=001-80347.pdf

• **K693** HUDOC 001-83095 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-83095&filename=001-83095.pdf

• **K694** HUDOC 001-84941 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-84941&filename=001-84941.pdf

• **K695** HUDOC 001-87267 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-87267&filename=001-87267.pdf

• **K696** HUDOC 001-88498 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-88498&filename=001-88498.pdf

• **K697** HUDOC 001-91461 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-91461&filename=001-91461.pdf

• **K698** HUDOC 001-88767 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-88767&filename=001-88767.pdf

• **K699** HUDOC 001-91816 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-91816&filename=001-91816.pdf

• **K700** HUDOC 001-95239 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-95239&filename=001-95239.pdf

• **K701** HUDOC 001-95460 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-95460&filename=001-95460.pdf

• **K702** HUDOC 001-97938 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-97938&filename=001-97938.pdf

• **K703** HUDOC 001-97940 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-97940&filename=001-97940.pdf

• **K704** HUDOC 001-101378 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-101378&filename=001-101378.pdf

• **K705** HUDOC 001-103074 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-103074&filename=001-103074.pdf

• **K706** HUDOC 001-103497 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-103497&filename=001-103497.pdf

• **K707** HUDOC 001-105086 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-105086&filename=001-105086.pdf

• **K708** HUDOC 001-106254 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-106254&filename=001-106254.pdf

• **K709** HUDOC 001-106255 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-106255&filename=001-106255.pdf

• **K710** HUDOC 001-106261 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-106261&filename=001-106261.pdf

• **K711** HUDOC 001-106253 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-106253&filename=001-106253.pdf

• **K712** HUDOC 001-111358 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-111358&filename=001-111358.pdf

• **K713** HUDOC 001-111359 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-111359&filename=001-111359.pdf

• **K714** HUDOC 001-111363 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-111363&filename=001-111363.pdf

• **K715** HUDOC 001-111365 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-111365&filename=001-111365.pdf

• **K716** HUDOC 001-111367 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-111367&filename=001-111367.pdf

• **K717** HUDOC 001-111711 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-111711&filename=001-111711.pdf

• **K718** HUDOC 001-114470 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-114470&filename=001-114470.pdf

• **K719** HUDOC 001-114493 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-114493&filename=001-114493.pdf

• **K720** HUDOC 001-114500 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-114500&filename=001-114500.pdf

• **K721** HUDOC 001-114504 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-114504&filename=001-114504.pdf

• **K722** HUDOC 001-114507 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-114507&filename=001-114507.pdf

• **K723** HUDOC 001-114528 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-114528&filename=001-114528.pdf

• **K724** HUDOC 001-114537 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-114537&filename=001-114537.pdf

• **K725** HUDOC 001-115695 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-115695&filename=001-115695.pdf

• **K726** HUDOC 001-119823 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-119823&filename=001-119823.pdf

• **K727** HUDOC 001-138920 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-138920&filename=001-138920.pdf

• **K728** HUDOC 001-145773 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-145773&filename=001-145773.pdf

• **K729** HUDOC 001-154210 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-154210&filename=001-154210.pdf

• **K730** HUDOC 001-158733 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-158733&filename=001-158733.pdf

• **K731** HUDOC 001-159830 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-159830&filename=001-159830.pdf

• **K732** HUDOC 001-159832 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-159832&filename=001-159832.pdf

• **K733** HUDOC 001-159837 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-159837&filename=001-159837.pdf

• **K734** HUDOC 001-159840 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-159840&filename=001-159840.pdf

• **K735** HUDOC 001-159928 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-159928&filename=001-159928.pdf

• **K736** HUDOC 001-159838 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-159838&filename=001-159838.pdf

• **K737** HUDOC 001-163311 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-163311&filename=001-163311.pdf

• **K738** HUDOC 001-163312 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-163312&filename=001-163312.pdf

• **K739** HUDOC 001-163313 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-163313&filename=001-163313.pdf

• **K740** HUDOC 001-163320 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-163320&filename=001-163320.pdf

• **K741** HUDOC 001-165469 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-165469&filename=001-165469.pdf

• **K742** HUDOC 001-166578 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-166578&filename=001-166578.pdf

• **K743** HUDOC 001-167813 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-167813&filename=001-167813.pdf

• **K744** HUDOC 001-167323 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-167323&filename=001-167323.pdf

• **K745** HUDOC 001-170625 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-170625&filename=001-170625.pdf

• **K746** HUDOC 001-174547 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-174547&filename=001-174547.pdf

• **K747** HUDOC 001-175216 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-175216&filename=001-175216.pdf

• **K748** HUDOC 001-183289 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-183289&filename=001-183289.pdf

• **K749** HUDOC 001-184343 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-184343&filename=001-184343.pdf

• **K750** HUDOC 001-188708 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-188708&filename=001-188708.pdf

• **K751** HUDOC 001-188709 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-188709&filename=001-188709.pdf

• **K752** HUDOC 001-191222 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-191222&filename=001-191222.pdf

• **K753** HUDOC 001-203914 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-203914&filename=001-203914.pdf

• **K754** HUDOC 001-211317 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-211317&filename=001-211317.pdf

• **K755** HUDOC 001-214157 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-214157&filename=001-214157.pdf

• **K756** HUDOC 001-216317 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-216317&filename=001-216317.pdf

• **K757** HUDOC 001-216316 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-216316&filename=001-216316.pdf

• **K758** HUDOC 001-216583 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-216583&filename=001-216583.pdf

• **K759** HUDOC 001-216585 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-216585&filename=001-216585.pdf

• **K760** HUDOC 001-216586 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-216586&filename=001-216586.pdf

• **K761** HUDOC 001-217052 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-217052&filename=001-217052.pdf

• **K762** HUDOC 001-217311 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-217311&filename=001-217311.pdf

• **K763** HUDOC 001-223630 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-223630&filename=001-223630.pdf

• **K764** HUDOC 001-223836 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-223836&filename=001-223836.pdf

• **K765** HUDOC 001-226141 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-226141&filename=001-226141.pdf

• **K766** HUDOC 001-226143 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-226143&filename=001-226143.pdf

• **K767** HUDOC 001-226144 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-226144&filename=001-226144.pdf

• **K768** HUDOC 001-227647 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-227647&filename=001-227647.pdf

• **K769** HUDOC 001-229798 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-229798&filename=001-229798.pdf

• **K770** HUDOC 001-231272 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-231272&filename=001-231272.pdf

• **K771** HUDOC 001-231265 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-231265&filename=001-231265.pdf

• **K772** HUDOC 001-231266 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-231266&filename=001-231266.pdf

• **K773** HUDOC 001-231267 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-231267&filename=001-231267.pdf

• **K774** HUDOC 001-231269 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-231269&filename=001-231269.pdf

• **K775** HUDOC 001-231270 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-231270&filename=001-231270.pdf

• **K776** HUDOC 001-233533 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-233533&filename=001-233533.pdf

• **K777** HUDOC 001-233534 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-233534&filename=001-233534.pdf

• **K778** HUDOC 001-234499 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-234499&filename=001-234499.pdf

• **K779** HUDOC 001-235811 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-235811&filename=001-235811.pdf

• **K780** HUDOC 001-237904 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-237904&filename=001-237904.pdf

• **K781** HUDOC 001-244833 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-244833&filename=001-244833.pdf

• **K782** HUDOC 001-248072 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-248072&filename=001-248072.pdf

• **K783** CM / ResDH (2007) 6 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-79816&filename=001-79816.pdf

• **K784** CM / ResDH (2011) 199 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-108095&filename=001-108095.pdf

• **K785** CM / ResDH (2012) 73 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-111904&filename=001-111904.pdf

• **K786** CM / ResDH (2012) 117 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-114014&filename=001-114014.pdf

• **K787** CM / ResDH (2018) 155 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-182502&filename=001-182502.pdf

• **K788** CM / ResDH (2020) 312 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-207196&filename=001-207196.pdf

• **K789** status cards, - https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=004-56537

• **K790** CM / ResDH (2023) 119 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-225472&filename=001-225472.pdf

• **K791** CM / ResDH (2024) 182 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-237475&filename=001-237475.pdf

• **K792** CM / ResDH (2025) 140 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-244121&filename=001-244121.pdf

• **K793** status cards, - https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=004-64727

• **K794** status cards, - https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=004-64729

• **K795** status cards, - https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=004-64793

• **K796** status cards, - https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=004-66547

• **K797** CM / ResDH (2025) 329 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-247227&filename=001-247227.pdf

• **K798** CM / ResDH (2026) 73 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-250359&filename=001-250359.pdf

• **K799** status cards, - https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=004-67935

• **K800** status cards, - https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=004-69051

• **K801** status cards, - https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?i=004-69935

• **K802** HUDOC-EXEC, full Danish extract and individual status cards - https://hudoc.exec.coe.int/eng?StateCode=DNK

• **K803** Annual Report 2025, Danish Country Field, p. 67 - https://rm.coe.int/2025-annual-report/48802b1633

• **K804** Original - https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/702346/files/CRC_C_DNK_CO_4-EN.pdf

• **K805** Original - https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1311756/files/CRC_C_DNK_CO_5-EN.pdf

• **K806** Original - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=YtIJ7js0ceByHq2O7PYIERLkFWgFneTkdSFOKdXWLJLJzgMAh4W% 2Belmbyfnf% 2FPqzHDPcv34YSJIt7nGx623Q% 3D% 3D

• **K807** Original - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=OKiZ%2BFzLH1owmUqe4cPLYtFoL14PNoLyy808sbAAPfIAQWxN6VDjPy4e246wy4Cf4nR% 2FBZ6t% 2F6VgeyJUGYmpTQ% 3D% 3D

• **K808** Original - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=uRujvz%2FCGAhh0JhJrXdK%2FITsxYV8TyQSFj%2BhTJRjEQsFZT3gHFRxEqA% 2FblZUDR605RomgCU% 2BW3VH% 2BVRc4N62gQ% 3D% 3D

• **K809** Original Country Page - https://www.coe.int/en/web/cpt/denmark

• **K810** CPT / Inf (2024) 38 - https://rm.coe.int/1680b2bb49

• **K811** Government response, CPT / Inf (2025) 19 - https://rm.coe.int/1680b66eb4

• **K812** Original dom - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/docx/pdf?library=ECHR&id=001-195909&filename=CASE%20OF%20STRAND%20LOBBEN%20AND%20OTHERS%20v.%20NORWAY.pdf

• **K813** Original - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=UXCKrCdlTRktN5%2FweRVcFUjoxQmCOYxbG4R9OITtOleAYTdXMKiAvkJie51sFqiv3IPy4lLHJ3UJssGeg0xNGg% 3D% 3D

• **K814** Original - https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/791463/files/CRPD_C_DNK_CO_1-EN.pdf

• **K815** Original - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=ifsEu72ewhrK9txbZdt1W8YpDfjF1xgeFGo998c6tLwxAxY6us9L4% 2FgM6GeuagdKAY% 2BdjNtL2ngXnpZcpT% 2BUCg% 3D% 3D

• **K816** original follow-up letter - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=3MnSeeYYgXGDFN1GLm67iE861J2fcumDtNg3jBHV7vwrhteS% 2BtEK9vBncwUNPiaKIwIjJ8JVAKxyH23XS9kbXUFTBDVkdG4v% 2B8jJC0SMCoo% 3D

• **K817** Original - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=iEVjjn6acTdduYr%2B5ArjbRL1l96O%2BILSj69nQFvTxOPVizeqbumhMynB0sCb4I7dyR4IScwsVnf33dwA04FWyQ% 3D% 3D

• **K818** official Danish register - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/countries.aspx?CountryCode=DNK&Lang=EN

• **K819** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2FDEN%2FCO%2F6&Lang = one

• **K820** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2FDEN%2FCO%2F17&Lang = one

• **K821** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2FOPSC%2FDNK%2FCO% 2F1&Lang = one

• **K822** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F5&Lang = one

• **K823** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F5&Lang = one

• **K824** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2FDEN%2FCO%2F7&Lang = one

• **K825** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F18-19&Lang = one

• **K826** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F4&Lang = one

• **K827** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=E%2FC.12%2FDNK%2FCO%2F5&Lang = one

• **K828** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F1&Lang = one

• **K829** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F8&Lang = one

• **K830** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F20-21&Lang = one

• **K831** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F6-7&Lang = one

• **K832** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F6&Lang = one

• **K833** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F5&Lang = one

• **K834** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=E%2FC.12%2FDNK%2FCO%2F6&Lang = one

• **K835** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F9&Lang = one

• **K836** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F22-24&Lang = one

• **K837** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F8&Lang = one

• **K838** Original - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2FDNK%2FCO%2F2-3&Lang = one

• **K839** Original first-time report - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CED%2FC%2FD N% 2F1&Lang = one

• **K840** OHCHR land register - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/TBSearch.aspx?Lang=en&CountryID=49&DocType ID = 17

• **K841** Denmark's Treaty Profile - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Treaty.aspx?CountryID=49&Lang=en

• **K842** CRPD / C / 32 / 3 - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=bb569JTsUIC2UIUGUxTmT34OgAyp%2BTE22eUZAz50N62nREAUD1ZTRdu5j% 2FOdUEq2njNPh2RRf8z9uQrCJTjrw% 3D% 3D

• **K843** CRC / C / 98 / 2 - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=XotUMU0yhGhp%2F9zak1yoNfKKX%2BSAP6lxkDlCFH7eabdSzhphqI% 2FADlAZh9ycBIbyF0ppdfQzj8dCY7oRFCznew% 3D% 3D

• **K844** CCPR / C / 118 / 3 - https://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=sqxfuWOke8wtydnjkyyM6M7l0yrAUcEQwXNsB3LI%2BtqfAEUFbRGF8dDeSWegk3TeYWCVIY2NkcSiUNLqFZyQDg% 3D% 3D

• **K845** CAT/ C / 45 / D / 339 / 2008 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F45%2F D% 2F339% 2F2008&Lang = one

• **K846** CAT/ C / 49 / D / 412 / 2010 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F49%2F D% 2F412% 2F2010&Lang = one

• **K847** CAT/ C / 49 / D / 464 / 2011 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F49%2F D% 2F464% 2F2011&Lang = one

• **K848** CAT/ C / 51 / D / 429 / 2010 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F51%2F D% 2F429% 2F2010&Lang = one

• **K849** CAT/ C / 52 / D / 466 / 2011 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F52%2F D% 2F466% 2F2011&Lang = one

• **K850** CAT/ C / 55 / D / 555 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F55%2F D% 2F555% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K851** CAT/ C / 55 / D / 571 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F55%2F D% 2F571% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K852** CAT/ C / 56 / D / 580 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F56%2F D% 2F580% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K853** CAT/ C / 57 / D / 709 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F57%2F D% 2F709% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K854** CAT/ C / 57 / D / 593 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F57%2F D% 2F593% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K855** CAT/ C / 57 / D / 628 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F57%2F D% 2F628% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K856** CAT/ C / 58 / D / 607 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F58%2F D% 2F607% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K857** CAT/ C / 59 / D / 634 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F59%2F D% 2F634% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K858** CAT/ C / 60 / D / 602 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F60%2F D% 2F602% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K859** CAT/ C / 60 / D / 653 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F60%2F D% 2F653% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K860** CAT/ C / 61 / D / 625 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F61%2F D% 2F625% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K861** CAT/ C / 63 / D / 647 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F63%2F D% 2F647% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K862** CAT/ C / 63 / D / 703 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F63%2F D% 2F703% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K863** CAT/ C / 64 / D / 693 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F64%2F D% 2F693% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K864** CAT/ C / 64 / D / 733 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F64%2F D% 2F733% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K865** CAT/ C / 66 / D / 735 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F66%2F D% 2F735% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K866** CAT/ C / 70 / D / 743 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F70%2F D% 2F743% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K867** CAT/ C / 71 / D / 792 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F71%2F D% 2F792% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K868** CAT/ C / 80 / D / 1068 / 2021 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F80%2F D% 2F1068% 2F2021&Lang = one

• **K869** CAT/ C / 80 / D / 985 / 2020 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F80%2F D% 2F985% 2F2020&Lang = one

• **K870** CAT/ C / 81 / D / 1113 / 2021 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F81%2F D% 2F1113% 2F2021&Lang = one

• **K871** CCPR / C / 92 / D / 1487 / 2006 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F92% 2FD% 2F1487% 2F2006&Lang = one

• **K872** CCPR / C / 99 / D / 1554 / 2007 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F99% 2FD% 2F1554% 2F2007&Lang = one

• **K873** CCPR / C / 99 / D / 1868 / 2009 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F99% 2FD% 2F1868% 2F2009&Lang = one

• **K874** CCPR / C / 109 / D / 1879 / 2009 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F109% 2FD% 2F1879% 2F2009&Lang = one

• **K875** CCPR / C / 110 / D / 2007 / 2010 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F110% 2FD% 2F2007% 2F2010&Lang = one

• **K876** CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2001 / 2010 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F113% 2FD% 2F2001% 2F2010&Lang = one

• **K877** CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2272 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F113% 2FD% 2F2272% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K878** CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2369 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F1 13% 2FD% 2F2369% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K879** CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2497 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F113% 2FD% 2F2497% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K880** CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2515 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F113% 2FD% 2F2515% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K881** CCPR / C / 113 / D / 2523 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F113% 2FD% 2F2523% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K882** CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2329 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F114% 2FD% 2F2329% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K883** CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2370 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F114% 2FD% 2F2370% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K884** CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2393 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F114% 2FD% 2F2393% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K885** CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2360 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F114% 2FD% 2F2360% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K886** CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2389 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F114% 2FD% 2F2389% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K887** CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2288 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F114% 2FD% 2F2288% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K888** CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2343 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F114% 2FD% 2F2343% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K889** CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2363 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F114% 2FD% 2F2363% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K890** CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2426 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F114% 2FD% 2F2426% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K891** CCPR / C / 114 / D / 2428 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F114% 2FD% 2F2428% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K892** CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2320 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F115% 2FD% 2F2320% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K893** CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2344 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F115% 2FD% 2F2344% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K894** CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2351 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F115% 2FD% 2F2351% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K895** CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2492 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F115% 2FD% 2F2492% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K896** CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2514 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F115% 2FD% 2F2514% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K897** CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2553 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F115% 2FD% 2F2553% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K898** CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2605 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F115% 2FD% 2F2605% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K899** CCPR / C / 115 / D / 2258 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F115% 2FD% 2F2258% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K900** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2422 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2422% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K901** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2347 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2347% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K902** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2402 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2402% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K903** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2409 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2409% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K904** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2039 / 2011 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F1 16% 2FD% 2F2039% 2F2011&Lang = one

• **K905** CCPR/C/116/D/2357/2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116%2FD%2F2357%2F2014& Lang=en

• **K906** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2447 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2447% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K907** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2488 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2488% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K908** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2506 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2506% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K909** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2513 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2513% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K910** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2516 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2516% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K911** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2571 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2571% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K912** CCPR / C / 116 / D / 2646 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F116% 2FD% 2F2646% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K913** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2469 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2469% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K914** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2464 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2464% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K915** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2378 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2378% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K916** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2379 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2379% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K917** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2493 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2493% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K918** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2462 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2462% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K919** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2291 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2291% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K920** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2443 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2443% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K921** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2350 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2350% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K922** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2376 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2376% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K923** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2415 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2415% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K924** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2559 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2559% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K925** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2611 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2611% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K926** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2633 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2633% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K927** CCPR / C / 117 / D / 2745 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F117% 2FD% 2F2745% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K928** CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2204 / 2012 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F118% 2FD% 2F2204% 2F2012&Lang = one

• **K929** CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2569 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F118% 2FD% 2F2569% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K930** CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2608 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F1 18% 2FD% 2F2608% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K931** CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2115 / 2011 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F118% 2FD% 2F2115% 2F2011&Lang = one

• **K932** CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2282 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F118% 2FD% 2F2282% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K933** CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2440 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F118% 2FD% 2F2440% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K934** CCPR / C / 118 / D / 2468 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F118% 2FD% 2F2468% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K935** CCPR / C / 120 / D / 2625 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F120% 2FD% 2F2625% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K936** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2512 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2512% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K937** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2681 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2681% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K938** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2253 / 2013 paras. 119 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR% 2FC% 2F119% 2FD% 2F2253% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K939** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2530 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2530% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K940** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2240 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2240% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K941** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2593 / 2015 paras. 119 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR% 2FC% 2F119% 2FD% 2F2593% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K942** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2602 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2602% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K943** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2293 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2293% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K944** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2336 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2336% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K945** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2338 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2338% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K946** CCPR/C/119/D/2352/2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119%2FD%2F2352%2F2014&Lang=en

• **K947** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2473 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2473% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K948** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2738 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2738% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K949** CCPR / C / 119 / D / 2763 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F119% 2FD% 2F2763% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K950** CCPR / C / 120 / D / 2640 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F120% 2FD% 2F2640% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K951** CCPR / C / 120 / D / 2601 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F120% 2FD% 2F2601% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K952** CCPR / C / 120 / D / 2470 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F120% 2FD% 2F2470% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K953** CCPR / C / 120 / D / 2784 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F120% 2FD% 2F2784% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K954** CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2594 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F121% 2FD% 2F2594% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K955** CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2770 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F121% 2FD% 2F2770% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K956** CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2419 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F1 21% 2FD% 2F2419% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K957** CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2467 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F121% 2FD% 2F2467% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K958** CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2585 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F121% 2FD% 2F2585% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K959** CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2600 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F121% 2FD% 2F2600% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K960** CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2624 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F121% 2FD% 2F2624% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K961** CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2612 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F121% 2FD% 2F2612% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K962** CCPR / C / 121 / D / 2643 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F121% 2FD% 2F2643% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K963** CCPR / C / 122 / D / 2595 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F122% 2FD% 2F2595% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K964** CCPR / C / 122 / D / 2642 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F122% 2FD% 2F2642% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K965** CCPR / C / 122 / D / 2753 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F122% 2FD% 2F2753% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K966** CCPR / C / 122 / D / 2485 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F122% 2FD% 2F2485% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K967** CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2328 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F123% 2FD% 2F2328% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K968** CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2575 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F123% 2FD% 2F2575% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K969** CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2423 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F123% 2FD% 2F2423% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K970** CCPR/C/123/D/2353/2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F123%2FD%2F2353%2F2014&Lang=en

• **K971** CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2408 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F123% 2FD% 2F2408% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K972** CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2812 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F123% 2FD% 2F2812% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K973** CCPR / C / 123 / D / 2949 / 2017 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F123% 2FD% 2F2949% 2F2017&Lang = one

• **K974** CCPR / C / 124 / D / 2734 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F124% 2FD% 2F2734% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K975** CCPR / C / 124 / D / 2449 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F124% 2FD% 2F2449% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K976** CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2345 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F125% 2FD% 2F2345% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K977** CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2494 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F125% 2FD% 2F2494% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K978** CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2373 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F125% 2FD% 2F2373% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K979** CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2439 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F125% 2FD% 2F2439% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K980** CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2475 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F125% 2FD% 2F2475% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K981** CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2672 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F125% 2FD% 2F2672% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K982** CCPR / C / 125 / D / 2791 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F1 25% 2FD% 2F2791% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K983** CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2603 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F126% 2FD% 2F2603% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K984** CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2346 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F126% 2FD% 2F2346% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K985** CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2685 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F126% 2FD% 2F2685% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K986** CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2421 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F126% 2FD% 2F2421% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K987** CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2472 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F126% 2FD% 2F2472% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K988** CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2531 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F126% 2FD% 2F2531% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K989** CCPR / C / 126 / D / 2786 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F126% 2FD% 2F2786% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K990** CCPR / C / 126 / D / 3620 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F126% 2FD% 2F3620% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K991** CCPR / C / 127 / D / 2654 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F127% 2FD% 2F2654% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K992** CCPR / C / 127 / D / 3224 / 2018 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F127% 2FD% 2F3224% 2F2018&Lang = one

• **K993** CCPR / C / 128 / D / 2255 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F128% 2FD% 2F2255% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K994** CCPR / C / 129 / D / 2562 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F129% 2FD% 2F2562% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K995** CCPR / C / 129 / D / 2596 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F129% 2FD% 2F2596% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K996** CCPR / C / 129 / D / 2597 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F129% 2FD% 2F2597% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K997** CCPR / C / 130 / D / 2671 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F130% 2FD% 2F2671% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K998** CCPR / C / 130 / D / 2752 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F130% 2FD% 2F2752% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K999** CCPR / C / 130 / D / 2946 / 2017 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F130% 2FD% 2F2946% 2F2017&Lang = one

• **K1000** CCPR / C / 131 / D / 3781 / 2020 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F131% 2FD% 2F3781% 2F2020&Lang = one

• **K1001** CCPR / C / 131 / D / 2475 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F131% 2FD% 2F2475% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1002** CCPR / C / 131 / D / 2781 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F131% 2FD% 2F2781% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1003** CCPR / C / 132 / D / 2651 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F132% 2FD% 2F2651% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1004** CCPR / C / 132 / D / 2787 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F132% 2FD% 2F2787% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1005** CCPR / C / 132 / D / 3188 / 2018 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F132% 2FD% 2F3188% 2F2018&Lang = one

• **K1006** CCPR / C / 132 / D / 2591 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F132% 2FD% 2F2591% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1007** CCPR / C / 132 / D / 2649 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F132% 2FD% 2F2649% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1008** CCPR / C / 132 / D / 3711 / 2020 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F 132% 2FD% 2F3711% 2F2020&Lang = one

• **K1009** CCPR / C / 133 / D / 2510 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F133% 2FD% 2F2510% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1010** CCPR / C / 133 / D / 3325 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F133% 2FD% 2F3325% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1011** CCPR / C / 133 / D / 2458 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F133% 2FD% 2F2458% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1012** CCPR / C / 133 / D / 2722 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F133% 2FD% 2F2722% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1013** CCPR / C / 133 / D / 2816 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F133% 2FD% 2F2816% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1014** CCPR / C / 134 / D / 2475 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F134% 2FD% 2F2475% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1015** CCPR / C / 134 / D / 2557 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F134% 2FD% 2F2557% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1016** CCPR / C / 134 / D / 2563 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F134% 2FD% 2F2563% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1017** CCPR / C / 134 / D / 2788 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F134% 2FD% 2F2788% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1018** CCPR / C / 135 / D / 2460 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F135% 2FD% 2F2460% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1019** CCPR / C / 135 / D / 2889 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F135% 2FD% 2F2889% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1020** CCPR / C / 135 / D / 3046 / 2017 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F135% 2FD% 2F3046% 2F2017&Lang = one

• **K1021** CCPR / C / 136 / D / 2754 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F136% 2FD% 2F2754% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1022** CCPR / C / 136 / D / 2459 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F136% 2FD% 2F2459% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1023** CCPR / C / 136 / D / 2527 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F136% 2FD% 2F2527% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1024** CCPR/C/136/D/2774/2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F136%2FD%2F2774%2F2016&Lang=en

• **K1025** CCPR / C / 136 / D / 3048 / 2017 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F136% 2FD% 2F3048% 2F2017&Lang = one

• **K1026** CCPR / C / 136 / D / 3707 / 2020 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F136% 2FD% 2F3707% 2F2020&Lang = one

• **K1027** CCPR / C / 137 / D / 3187 / 2018 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F137% 2FD% 2F3187% 2F2018&Lang = one

• **K1028** CCPR / C / 137 / D / 2858 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F137% 2FD% 2F2858% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1029** CCPR / C / 137 / D / 2748 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F137% 2FD% 2F2748% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1030** CCPR / C / 137 / D / 2795 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F137% 2FD% 2F2795% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1031** CCPR / C / 137 / D / 2852 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F137% 2FD% 2F2852% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1032** CCPR / C / 137 / D / 3710 / 2020 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F137% 2FD% 2F3710% 2F2020&Lang = one

• **K1033** CCPR/C/137/D/4125/2022 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F137%2FD%2F4125%2F2022&Lang=en

• **K1034** CCPR / C / 138 / D / 2342 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F 138% 2FD% 2F2342% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1035** CCPR / C / 138 / D / 3282 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F138% 2FD% 2F3282% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1036** CCPR / C / 138 / D / 4144 / 2022 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F138% 2FD% 2F4144% 2F2022&Lang = one

• **K1037** CCPR / C / 139 / D / 2592 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F139% 2FD% 2F2592% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1038** CCPR / C / 140 / D / 3316 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F140% 2FD% 2F3316% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1039** CCPR / C / 143 / D / 4255 / 2022 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F143% 2FD% 2F4255% 2F2022&Lang = one

• **K1040** CCPR / C / 144 / D / 4713 / 2024 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F144% 2FD% 2F4713% 2F2024&Lang = one

• **K1041** CEDAW / C / 55 / D / 33 / 2011 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 55% 2FD% 2F33% 2F2011&Lang = one

• **K1042** CEDAW / C / 55 / D / 40 / 2012 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 55% 2FD% 2F40% 2F2012&Lang = one

• **K1043** CEDAW / C / 55 / D / 35 / 2011 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 55% 2FD% 2F35% 2F2011&Lang = one

• **K1044** CEDAW / C / 56 / D / 44 / 2012 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 56% 2FD% 2F44% 2F2012&Lang = one

• **K1045** CEDAW / C / 59 / D / 59 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 59% 2FD% 2F59% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K1046** CEDAW / C / 59 / D / 37 / 2012 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 59% 2FD% 2F37% 2F2012&Lang = one

• **K1047** CEDAW / C / 60 / D / 51 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 60% 2FD% 2F51% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K1048** CEDAW / C / 61 / D / 50 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 61% 2FD% 2F50% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K1049** CEDAW / C / 62 / D / 56 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 62% 2FD% 2F56% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K1050** CEDAW / C / 62 / D / 53 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 62% 2FD% 2F53% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K1051** CEDAW / C / 63 / D / 46 / 2012 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 63% 2FD% 2F46% 2F2012&Lang = one

• **K1052** CEDAW / C / 64 / D / 57 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 64% 2FD% 2F57% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K1053** CEDAW / C / 64 / D / 64 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 64% 2FD% 2F64% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K1054** CEDAW / C / 65 / D / 61 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 65% 2FD% 2F61% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K1055** CEDAW / C / 65 / D / 71 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 65% 2FD% 2F71% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1056** CEDAW / C / 66 / D / 54 / 2013 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 66% 2FD% 2F54% 2F2013&Lang = one

• **K1057** CEDAW / C / 67 / D / 70 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 67% 2FD% 2F70% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1058** CEDAW / C / 67 / D / 77 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 67% 2FD% 2F77% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1059** CEDAW / C / 67 / D / 78 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 67% 2FD% 2F78% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1060** CEDAW / C / 68 / D / 79 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 68% 2FD% 2F79% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1061** CEDAW / C / 68 / D / 93 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 68% 2FD% 2F93% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1062** CEDAW / C / 69 / D / 80 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 69% 2FD% 2F80% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1063** CEDAW / C / 69 / D / 85 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 69% 2FD% 2F85% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1064** CEDAW / C / 70 / D / 113 / 2017 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F70% 2FD% 2F113% 2F2017&Lang = one

• **K1065** CEDAW / C / 70 / D / 76 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 70% 2FD% 2F76% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1066** CEDAW / C / 71 / D / 101 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F71% 2FD% 2F101% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1067** CEDAW / C / 71 / D / 73 / 2014 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 71% 2FD% 2F73% 2F2014&Lang = one

• **K1068** CEDAW / C / 71 / D / 81 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 71% 2FD% 2F81% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1069** CEDAW / C / 72 / D / 96 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 72% 2FD% 2F96% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1070** CEDAW / C / 73 / D / 109 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F73% 2FD% 2F109% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1071** CEDAW / C / 73 / D / 84 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 73% 2FD% 2F84% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1072** CEDAW / C / 73 / D / 86 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 73% 2FD% 2F86% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1073** CEDAW / C / 73 / D / 94 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 73% 2FD% 2F94% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1074** CEDAW / C / 74 / D / 82 / 2015 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F 74% 2FD% 2F82% 2F2015&Lang = one

• **K1075** CEDAW / C / 75 / D / 108 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F75% 2FD% 2F108% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1076** CEDAW / C / 81 / D / 144 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F81% 2FD% 2F144% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1077** CEDAW / C / 81 / D / 163 / 2020 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F81% 2FD% 2F163% 2F2020&Lang = one

• **K1078** CEDAW / C / 84 / D / 151 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F84% 2FD% 2F151% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1079** CEDAW/C/88/D/161/2020 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F88%2FD%2F161%2F2020&Lang=en

• **K1080** CEDAW / C / 89 / D / 147 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F89% 2FD% 2F147% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1081** CERD / C / 68 / D / 34 / 2004 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2F68% 2FD% 2F34% 2F2004&Lang = one

• **K1082** CERD / C / 71 / D / 36 / 2006 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2F71% 2FD% 2F36% 2F2006&Lang = one

• **K1083** CERD / C / 71 / D / 37 / 2006 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2F71% 2FD% 2F37% 2F2006&Lang = one

• **K1084** CERD / C / 71 / D / 40 / 2007 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2F71% 2FD% 2F40% 2F2007&Lang = one

• **K1085** CERD / C / 75 / D / 41 / 2008 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2F75% 2FD% 2F41% 2F2008&Lang = one

• **K1086** CERD / C / 77 / D / 43 / 2008 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2F77% 2FD% 2F43% 2F2008&Lang = one

• **K1087** CERD / C / 77 / D / 44 / 2009 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2F77% 2FD% 2F44% 2F2009&Lang = one

• **K1088** CERD / C / 80 / D / 46 / 2009 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2F80% 2FD% 2F46% 2F2009&Lang = one

• **K1089** CERD / C / 108 / D / 62 / 2018 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2F10 8% 2FD% 2F62% 2F2018&Lang = one

• **K1090** CRC / C / 77 / D / 3 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F77%2FD % 2F3% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1091** CRC / C / 78 / D / 7 / 2016 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F78%2FD % 2F7% 2F2016&Lang = one

• **K1092** CRC / C / 82 / D / 32 / 2017 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F82%2F D% 2F32% 2F2017&Lang = one

• **K1093** CRC / C / 82 / D / 33 / 2017 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F82%2F D% 2F33% 2F2017&Lang = one

• **K1094** CRC / C / 82 / D / 36 / 2017 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F82%2F D% 2F36% 2F2017&Lang = one

• **K1095** CRC / C / 82 / D / 43 / 2018 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F82%2F D% 2F43% 2F2018&Lang = one

• **K1096** CRC / C / 83 / D / 52 / 2018 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F83%2F D% 2F52% 2F2018&Lang = one

• **K1097** CRC / C / 85 / D / 31 / 2017 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F85%2F D% 2F31% 2F2017&Lang = one

• **K1098** CRC / C / 85 / D / 49 / 2018 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F85%2F D% 2F49% 2F2018&Lang = one

• **K1099** CRC / C / 86 / D / 83 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F86%2F D% 2F83% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1100** CRC / C / 90 / D / 96 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F90%2F D% 2F96% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1101** CRC / C / 90 / D / 99 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F90%2F D% 2F99% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1102** CRC / C / 91 / D / 85 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F91%2F D% 2F85% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1103** CRC / C / 93 / D / 140 / 2021 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F93%2 FD% 2F140% 2F2021&Lang = one

• **K1104** CRC / C / 94 / D / 145 / 2021 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F94%2 FD% 2F145% 2F2021&Lang = one

• **K1105** CRC / C / 96 / D / 169 / 2021 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F96%2 FD% 2F169% 2F2021&Lang = one

• **K1106** CRC / C / 97 / D / 103 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F97%2 FD% 2F103% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1107** CRPD / C / 20 / D / 39 / 2017 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2F20% 2FD% 2F39% 2F2017&Lang = one

• **K1108** CRPD / C / 29 / D / 61 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2FC%2F29% 2FD% 2F61% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1109** CRC / C / 100 / D / 97 / 2019 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2FC%2F100% 2FD% 2F97% 2F2019&Lang = one

• **K1110** CEDAW / C / 92 / D / 227 / 2024 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CEDAW%2FC%2F92% 2FD% 2F227% 2F2024&Lang = one

• **K1111** CCPR / C / 145 / D / 3726 / 2020 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F145% 2FD% 2F3726% 2F2020&Lang = one

• **K1112** CCPR / C / 145 / D / 4440 / 2023 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2F 145% 2FD% 2F4440% 2F2023&Lang = one

• **K1113** CAT/ C / 84 / D / 1150 / 2022 - https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CAT%2FC%2F84%2 FD% 2F1150% 2F2022&Lang = one

• **K1114** CPT / Inf (2008) 26 - https://rm.coe.int/168069570a

• **K1115** CPT / Inf (2009) 12 - https://rm.coe.int/168069570b

• **K1116** CPT / Inf (2013) 3 - https://rm.coe.int/168069570c

• **K1117** CPT / Inf (2013) 11 - https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168069570d

• **K1118** CPT / Inf (2014) 25 - https://rm.coe.int/168069570e

• **K1119** CPT / Inf (2015) 16 - https://rm.coe.int/168069570f

• **K1120** CPT / Inf (2019) 35 - https://rm.coe.int/1680996859

• **K1121** CPT / Inf (2020) 26 - https://rm.coe.int/16809f65d6

• **K1122** CPT / Inf (2025) 14 - https://rm.coe.int/1680b5cbb7

• **K1123** CPT / Inf (2025) 28 - https://rm.coe.int/488027d962

• **K1124** CPT / Inf (2007) 46 - https://rm.coe.int/1680695709

• **K1125** document copy; - https://www.ecoi.net/en/file/local/2026207/2020-10-inf-eng.pdf.pdf

• **K1126** archive copy of CPT's official file from 6 November 2013 - https://web.archive.org/web/20131106020002id_/http://www.cpt.coe.int/docume nts / dnk / 2013-11-inf-eng.pdf

• **K1127** FN original - https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/710720/files/A_HRC_18_4_Add.1-EN.pdf

• **K1128** read copy of document, - https://upr-info.org/sites/default/files/documents/2013-08/ahrc184add1denmarke-1.pdf

• **K1129** FN original - https://digitallibrary.un.org/nanna/record/846189/files/A_HRC_32_10_Add.1-EN.pdf?registerDownload=1&version=1&withMetadata = 0&withWatermark = 0

• **K1130** read advanceversion - https://upr-info.org/sites/default/files/documents/2016-06/a_hrc_32_10_add.1_denmark_e-advanceversion.pdf

• **K1131** UN Session Report A / HRC / 32 / 2 - https://documents.un.org/api/symbol/access?l=en&s=A%2FHRC%2F32%2F2&t=pdf

• **K1132** FN original - https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3936038/files/A_HRC_48_10_Add.1-EN.pdf

• **K1133** read copy of document, - https://www.ecoi.net/en/file/local/2058943/A_HRC_48_10_Add.1_E.pdf

• **K1134** mid-term report 2014 - https://upr-info.org/sites/default/files/documents/2014-06/denmark_midterm_report_2014.pdf

• **K1135** mid-term report June 2018 - https://upr-info.org/sites/default/files/documents/2018-08/denmark_mid-termreport2018.pdf

• **K1136** cover letter to mid-term report December 2023, - https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/hrbodies/upr/sessions/session24/d k / Cover-letter-Denmark-Mid- term-report-2023.pdf

• **K1137** M.A., 6697 / 18 - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-211178

• **K1138** A / HRC / WG. 6 / 52 / DNK / 1 - https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/g26/022/93/pdf/g2602293.pdf

• **K1139** Report - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/B/9/16-06.pdf

• **K1140** Report - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/D/4/19-2007.pdf

• **K1141** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/2/6/19-2008.pdf

• **K1142** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/6/B/18-2009.pdf

• **K1143** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/B/1/16-2010.pdf

• **K1144** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/E/D/22-2011.pdf

• **K1145** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/7/5/rs-2012.pdf

• **K1146** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/E/7/rs-2013.pdf

• **K1147** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/5/A/rs-2014.pdf

• **K1148** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/C/1/sr2515.pdf

• **K1149** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/1/3/sr2116.pdf

• **K1150** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/E/4/sr2017.pdf

• **K1151** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/637967621489833199/SR1921.pdf

• **K1152** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638276013276370917/SR2122.pdf

• **K1153** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638590537676031552/SR1923.pdf

• **K1154** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/637830358226795577/SR2118.pdf

• **K1155** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/637830384571417379/SR2019.pdf

• **K1156** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/637654869694552819/SR1920.pdf

• **K1157** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/637967621879264507/SR2021.pdf

• **K1158** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638276013426841036/SR2222.pdf

• **K1159** original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638590537454921270/SR1823.pdf

• **K1160** Original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/637830357149746085/SR2018.pdf

• **K1161** Original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/637830384287708001/SR1919.pdf

• **K1162** Original - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/637654869362408036/SR1820.pdf

• **K1163** Report 21 / 2024,18.8.2025, Review of the State Administration 2024 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638911098344528699/SR2124.pdf

• **K1164** Report page with ministerial statements and follow-up 20.11.2025 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/revisionssager-arkiv/2025/aug/beretning-om-revisionen-af-statens-forvaltning-i-2024

• **K1165** RN902 / 25,20.11.2025 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638997378101710146/902-25.pdf

• **K1166** The use of long-term detention in 2011 and 2012 - https://vidensbasen.anklagemyndigheden.dk/api/Portals%286e302527-f0b3-4a5e-889a-668aa67e5491%29/Print/h/6dfa19d8-18cc-47d6-b4c4-3bd07bc15ec0 / VB / 9d9dd721-a660-4acc-98e7-b99684564aed

• **K1167** The use of long-term detention in 2013 - https://vidensbasen.anklagemyndigheden.dk/api/Portals%286e302527-f0b 3-4a5e-889a-668a67e5491% 29 / Print / h / 6dfa19d8-18cc-47d6-b4c4-3bd07b15ec0 / VB / e78015c2-3d7c-4087-8b8a-514dbbf36972

• **K1168** Use of prolonged pre-trial detention in 2014 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Documents/anvendelsen-af-langvarige-varetaegtsfaengslinger-i-2014.pdf

• **K1169** Annex to the 2014 statement - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Documents/bilag-til-Rigsadvokatens-redegoerelse-om-anvendelse-af-langvarige-varetaegtsfaengslinger-i-2014.pdf

• **K1170** The use of long-term pre-trial imprisonment in 2015 - https://vidensbasen.anklagemyndigheden.dk/api/Portals%286e302527-f0b 3-4a5e-889a-668a67e5491% 29 / Print / h / 6dfa19d8-18cc-47d6-b4c4-3bd07b15ec0 / VB / 87433318-6f81-4b95-9e7-bf863dc1b7b

• **K1171** Use of long-term pre-trial detention in 2016 - https://vidensbasen.anklagemyndigheden.dk/api/Portals%286e302527-f0b 3-4a5e-889a-668aa67e5491%29/Print/h/6dfa19d8-18cc-47d6-b4c4-3bd07bc15ec0/VB/f79ee7fe-7399-4be0-bcbe-fbccd3af8b3d

• **K1172** The use of long-term detention in 2017 - https://vidensbasen.anklagemyndigheden.dk/api/Portals%286e302527-f0b 3-4a5e-889a-668a67e5491% 29 / Print / h / 6dfa19d8-18cc-47d6-b4c4-3bd07b15ec0 / VB / 73608a57-fd6c-4a51-83c0-b237b6fa836c

• **K1173** Statistics on long-term detention in custody 2020 - https://vidensbasen.anklagemyndigheden.dk/api/Portals%286e302527-f0b3-4a5 e -889a -668aa67e5491% 29 / Print / h / 6dfa19d8-18cc-47d6-b4c4-3bd07b15ec0 / VB / f6776cdc-b736-4818-a16b-a7d240dc81f7

• **K1174** Statistics 2021, corrected October 2023 (corrigendum indicates September 2023) - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Varet%C3%A6gtsf%C3%A6ngslinger/Statistik%20%28berigtiget%29%20om%20langvarige% 20aget% C3% A6gt% C3% A6ngslinger% 202021 _ .pdf

• **K1175** Statistics 2022, corrected December 2024 and April 2026 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/2026-02/Anvendelsen%20af%20langvarige%20varet%C3%A6gtsf%C3%A6ngslinger%202022%20%28berigtiget%20december%202024%20og%20april%202026%29.pdf

• **K1176** Statistics 2023, corrected April 2026 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/2026-02/Anvendelsen%20af%20langvarige%20varet%C3%A6gtsf%C3%A6ngslinger%20i%202023%20%28berigtiget%20april%202026%29.pdf

• **K1177** Report 2237670 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20191/almdel/REU/spm/655/svar/1685657/2237670.pdf

• **K1178** Annex 2237671 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20191/almdel/REU/spm/655/svar/1685657/2237671.pdf

• **K1179** copies of the report; - https://web.archive.org/web/20240628181513id_/https://www.ft.dk/samling/20191/almdel/reu/spm/655/svar/1685657 / 2237670.pdf

• **K1180** Annex - https://web.archive.org/web/20240628141816id_/https://www.ft.dk/samling/20191/almdel/reu/spm/655/svar/1685657/2237671.pdf

• **K1181** Annex file 2353614 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20201/almdel/REU/bilag/244/2353614.pdf

• **K1182** Original 214-page report - https://justitia-int.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Rapport_varetaegtsfaengsling-retssikkerhed-foer-dom _ web.pdf

• **K1183** Original Article - https://sociologicalscience.com/download/vol-7/august/SocSci_v7_342to366.pdf

• **K1184** ROCKWOOL Foundation's original research dissemination, p. 1-2 - https://rockwoolfonden.s3.eu-central-1.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads / 2022 / 08 / RFF-NYT -Innocent -miser-jobbet-after-product-target-sling.pdf? download = true

• **K1185** AM 2020.10.15V2, Vestre Landsret S-0338-20, 15 October 2020, with decision chain - https://vidensbasen.anklagemyndigheden.dk/api/Portals%286e302527-f0b3-4a5e-889a-668aa67e5491%29/Print/h/6dfa19d8-18cc-47d6-b4c4-3bd07bc15ec0 / VB / 57cb5635-11ed-4edb-9ac0-d6a767ef674d

• **K1186** AM 2010.02.25V2, Vestre Landsret S-1566-09, 25 February 2010, with urban judgment and administrative originals - https://vidensbasen.anklagemyndigheden.dk/api/Portals%286e302527-f0b3-4a5e-889a-668aa67e5491%29/Print/h/6dfa19d8-18cc-47d6-b4c4-3bd07bc15ec0 / VB / 170e8ca2-b063-4ad0-85b5-2a9de4c05fbe

• **K1187** AM 2022.10.17E, Østre Landsret S-2621-21, with administrative decisions and Glostrup judgment - https://vidensbasen.anklagemyndigheden.dk/api/Portals%286e302527-f0b3-4a5e-889a-668aa67e5491%29/Print/h/6dfa19d8-18cc-47d6-b4c4-3bd07bc15ec0 / VB / f0f12061-d096-4c8a-a2f8-3ca5c95ca25

• **K1188** Document copy - https://www.krim.dk/undersider/politi/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersager-2006.pdf

• **K1189** Document copy - https://www.krim.dk/undersider/politi/disciplinaersager/disciplinaersager-2007.pdf

• **K1190** Public original of the Folketing - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20081/almdel/REU/bilag/471/670685.pdf

• **K1191** Original 2018 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/inline-files/Overblik%20over%20dispositionsklager%20F%C3%86RD IG _ 0.pdf

• **K1192** Original 2019 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/inline-files/Overblik%20over%20dispositionsklager%202019%20FD.pdf

• **K1193** Original 2020 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/inline-files/Overblik%20over%20dispositionsklager%202020%20-%2013.04.21.pdf

• **K1194** Release Status - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/da/Statistik

• **K1195** PDF - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732327378275946/Ankestyrelsens-%C3%A5rsredeg%C3%B8relse-til-det-r%C3%A5given -practice committee -for-2020.pdf

• **K1196** PDF - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732364740555553/Ankestyrelsens-%C3%A5rsredeg%C3%B8relse-til-Det-R%C3%A5give-Praxis Committee -2021.pdf

• **K1197** PDF - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638917875859340782/ankestyrelsens-arsredegorelse-til-det-radgivende-praksisudvalg-2024.pdf

• **K1198** PDF - https://www.ast.dk/Media/639210067838706043/ankestyrelsens-aarsrapport-2025.pdf

• **K1199** Social area 2025 and comparison 2024 - https://www.sm.dk/danmarkskort/2026/jun/omgoerelsesprocenter-paa-socialomraadet-i-2025

• **K1200** Children's disability area 2025 and comparison 2024 - https://www.sm.dk/danmarkskort/2026/jun/omgoerelsesprocenter-paa-boerneDisability area -i -2025

• **K1201** Adult disability services 2025 and comparison 2024 - https://www.sm.dk/danmarkskort/2026/jun/omgoerelsesprocenter-paa-voksenhandicapomraadet-i-2025

• **K1202** Read guide 23 June 2026 - https://www.sm.dk/Media/639177368610865315/Lsevejledning%20til%20danmarkskort%202026.pdf

• **K1203** Practical examination of penalties in case of non-appearance from offers or interviews - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638751433806161949/Sanktioner-3-Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-om-sanktion-ved-udblivelse-fra-tilbud-or-intertale.pdf

• **K1204** Section 7 of the Health and Safety Act concerning incapacity for work, April 2016; - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20151/almdel/beu/bilag/164/1620173/index.ht m

• **K1205** Senior Pension Unit’s appeal cases 2024 - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638911925387165305/ankestyrelsens-redegorelse-om-behandling-af-klagesager-fra-seniorpensionsenheden-2024.pdf

• **K1206** Case-processing times in adult disability services,2022 - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638736640905767415/Sagsbehandlingstider-p%C3%A5-voksenhandicapomr%C3%A5det.pdf

• **K1207** Official publication address - https://ast.dk/publikationer/ankestatistik-for-de-sociale-naevn-2006

• **K1208** Official publication address - https://ast.dk/publikationer/ankestatistik-for-2012

• **K1209** Original publication - https://web.archive.org/web/20171020142320id_/http://www.statsforvaltningen.dk/sfdocs/Publikationer/Statsforvaltningerns%20%C3%A5rsrapporter/2013%20-%20Statsforvaltningernes%20halv%C3%A5rsrapport%202013%20-%201%20halv%C3%A5r%2013.PDF

• **K1210** Original publication - https://web.archive.org/web/20230323172950id_/https://ast.dk/publikationer/arsrapport-2013/@@download/publication

• **K1211** Original publication - https://familieretshuset.dk/media/t4jp0td1/2013_statsforvaltningens_aarsrapport.pdf

• **K1212** Committee Minutes 10 January 2008, paragraph 5 - https://www.kk.dk/dagsordener-og-referater/Besk%C3%A6ftigelses-%20og%20Integrationsu doptionen / m% C3% B8de-10012008 / record / point -5

• **K1213** 2006Annex 2, breakdown of benefits - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/806230d9a819cd47ba774928388636941f0a7393/5-bilag- 2.pdf

• **K1214** The Ombudsman's inspection of the City of Copenhagen 9, 14 and 27 November 2006 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/fob/2010/0518/dan/pdf

• **K1215** The whole original Annex - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/d95150a3-1dd7-4149-99ff-7e8aeaf8b585/50a90070-7c96-470e-834 6-b8c2170035ab -Annex -1.pdf

• **K1216** Political presentation - https://www.kk.dk/dagsordener-og-referater/Socialudvalget/m%C3%B8de-22042015/referat/punkt-10

• **K1217** Follow-up Note 303 / 17 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/4/4/303-17.pdf

• **K1218** Follow-up note 302 / 19 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/C/3/302-19.pdf

• **K1219** Report16 / 2018: Duration and productivity of the Board of Appeal - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/A/4/sr1618.pdf

• **K1220** Follow-up note 305 / 22 - https://cdn.rigsrevisionen.dk/rigsrevisionen/Media/637840671733417708/305-22.pdf

• **K1221** Final NotatC108 / 25 - https://cdn.rigsrevisionen.dk/rigsrevisionen/Media/638829739170624098/C108-25.pdf

• **K1222** Annual Report 2019 of the Board of Appeal - https://www.ast.dk/Media/637832230088818901/Ankestyrelsens-%C3%A5rsrapport-2019.pdf

• **K1223** Annual Report 2021 of the Board of Appeal - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/637832246814279295/Ankestyrelsens-%C3%A5rsrapport-2 021.pdf

• **K1224** Annual Report 2022 - https://www.ast.dk/Media/637831537362311560/Ankestyrelsens-%C3%A5rsrapport-2022.pdf

• **K1225** Annual Report of the Appeal Board 2023 - https://www.ast.dk/Media/637837462311759831/Ankestyrelsens-%C3%A5rsrapport-2023.pdf

• **K1226** Annual Report 2024 of the Appeal Board - https://www.ast.dk/Media/639089994279478701/ankestyrelsens-aarsrapport-2024.pdf

• **K1227** PUD-I11F - https://viden.sl.dk/media/4551/inddragelse_af_boern_og_foraeldre_i_sager_om_frivillige_foranstaltninger.pdf

• **K1228** Public original - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20061/almdel/sou/bilag/125/333666.pdf

• **K1229** Official original annex of the municipality - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/bb368c96e4e1260e084332b32c01cbf574f6bbe2/12 -Annex -2.pdf

• **K1230** Original political presentation - https://www.kk.dk/dagsordener-og-referater/Socialudvalget/m%C3%B8de-12032008/dagsorden/punkt -12

• **K1231** Public Original at the Danish Parliament - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20091/almdel/SOU/bilag/129/791241.pdf

• **K1232** PF14K - original sub-report - https://viden.sl.dk/media/4633/kommunernes-vurdering-af-samarbejdet-med-plejefamilier.pdf

• **K1233** PF14P - original sub-report - https://viden.sl.dk/media/4642/plejefamiliers-vurdering-af-samarbejdet-med-kommuner-2.pdf

• **K1234** PF14N - original sub-report - https://viden.sl.dk/media/4644/kortlaegning-af-antallet-af-plejefamilier.pdf

• **K1235** PF14S - original sub-report - https://viden.sl.dk/media/4593/sammenfatning-af-hovedresultater.pdf

• **K1236** Main report39pp - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732391690173418/Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-af-sager-om-tab-af-erhvervsevne-der-hjemvises-grundet-oplysningsgrundlaget.pdf

• **K1237** Annex 28s, august2022 - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732390377664441/Bilag-hjemviste-sager-om-tab-af-erhvervsevne-grundet-oplys gamebase.pdf

• **K1238** Main Report 49s - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732233286942377/Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse-af-udbetaling-danmarksrevaluation-afg% C3% B8ederings-om -tempts-p% C3% A5-maternity benefit for% C3% A5det.pdf

• **K1239** Annex 27s - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638736685835992667/Udbetaling-Danmarks-genvurdering-af-afg%C3%B8relser-om-frister-p%C3% A5- maternity benefit for% C3% A5det -Bilagsrapport.pdf

• **K1240** Official originals 55pages - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732272956796950/Ankestyrelsens-unders%C3%B8gelse-af-afbrydelse-af-sa etc.% C3% A6r-and-or-contact.pdf

• **K1241** Ankestyrelsen, Early retirement, April 2015, all 65physical pages - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/4229ba02-96f9-46e3-8644- e035c8ed919a / 4ca1497b-0bf5-4236-af0e-3dc034764339-Annex -1.pdf

• **K1242** Copenhagen, political presentation and decision 17September 2015 - https://www.kk.dk/dagsordener-og-referater/Borgerrepr%C3%A6sentationen/m%C3%B8de-17092015/referat/punkt-9

• **K1243** fully readable municipal annex original - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/d718071028998bf7297d85ecfc078b761079d339/9 -attachment -10.PDF

• **K1244** Full municipal annex original - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/75305e21a0a10b6223416f17caf6ba6638ba9410/12-bilag-2.PDF

• **K1245** Ankestyrelsen, The application of sanctions by the municipalities, 2015, all116pages - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/691c3a65-b242-4f6f-b4a8-c3a706f4ad8a/41517e90-b819-443e-8701-284addf52aee-bilag-1.pdf

• **K1246** Copenhagen, political presentation and decision12November 2015 - https://www.kk.dk/dagsordener-og-referater/Borgerrepr%C3%A6sentationen/m%C3%B8de-12112015/referat/punkt-40

• **K1247** Ribbed 29October2015, one page - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/691c3a65-b242-4f6f-b4a8-c3a706f4ad8a/41517e90-b819-443e-8701-284addf52aee -Annex -2.pdf

• **K1248** Ankestyrelsen, kommunersens2017, full98-pages original - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/cbe4cf15-b43a-42bd-a981-ed14c1ec1edf/caae4850-a106-47aa-a611-6a7731024284-bilag-1.pdf

• **K1249** City Council 22 June 2017, item 48 - https://www.kk.dk/dagsordener-og-referater/Borgerrepr%C3%A6sentationen/m%C3%B8de-22062017/referat/punkt-48

• **K1250** PFLEX10B · The flekjob / unemployment benefit of the Board of Appeal 2010 - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/543fe3eddee6c626b2c3dbd2 acf24a4a3541f435 / 13-Annex -2.PDF

• **K1251** FF16F - Original report of the Appeal Board, public document copy - https://viden.sl.dk/media/7018/fleksjob-til-borgere-med-aktuelt-begraenset-arbejdsevne.pdf

• **K1252** PEN19F - original report, municipal document copy - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/5b424109-b519-49bf-8ffc-43af80b08b1f / a5db60ab -3979-4a1f-bdc2-9a1b939526f9-Annex -1.pdf

• **K1253** PEN19BF - original report, municipal document copy - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/5b424109-b519-49bf-8ffc-43af80b08b1f / a5db60ab -3979-4a1f -bdc2-9a1b939526f9-Annex -3.pdf

• **K1254** State administration of Midtjyllands original2012survey, public municipality copia - https://www.holstebro.dk/Filarkiv/BY/2013/19022013/14%20-%20Praksisunders%C3%B8gelse%20sanktioner%202012.PDF

• **K1255** PFORM14B · Anchorship's cash / assets 2014original - https://viden.sl.dk/media/6876/ankestyrelsens-praksisundersgelse-kontanthjlp.pdf

• **K1256** Ankestyrelsen,Municipalities' use of rehabilitation teams,October2014;official KK meeting-case copy - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/a9c0cb4f-2fdc-41f3-b83e-09880a5e4ea9/b91d566a-db66-456d-8f2e-cfadfbf1ac11-bilag-1.pdf

• **K1257** Original Folketing Report - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/almdel/beu/bilag/224/1268502.pdf

• **K1258** read public astarkivoriginal - https://web.archive.org/web/20250814140759id_/https://ast.dk/publikationer/praksisundersogelse-om-the municipalities' -use -of -second -actor-i-sickness benefit cases / @ download / publication

• **K1259** BPA23F — Ankestyrelsen's original report, June 2023 - https://www.ast.dk/Media/639137551265142991/18-30107-2-kommunernes-udmaalings-og-visitationspraksis-i-sager-om-%C3%82%C2%A7%C3%82%C2%A7-95-og-96-21875350_1024439_0.pdf

• **K1260** HER23F - The main original of the Appeal Board - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732199378231181/Kommunal-praksis-i-sager-om-udsatte-b% C3% B8rn- and -young-with-not-western-background. pdf

• **K1261** HER23BF - Five examples, separate original Annex 2 - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638726163294646978/Fem%20eksempler% 20p% C3% A5% 20cases% 20with% 20exposed% 20b% C3% B8rn% 20and% 20young% 20with% 20non-western% 20backward.pdf

• **K1262** NH's original annual report list - https://naevneneshus.dk/om-os/aarsrapporter-og-maal-og-resultatplan/

• **K1263** The original annual reports of the Board of Appeal - https://naevneneshus.dk/naevnsoversigt/planklagenaevnet/aarsberetninger/

• **K1264** Official publication page - https://www.vive.dk/da/udgivelser/lov-om-forbud-mod-forskelsbehandling-paa-grund-af-handicap-qz55dkrz/

• **K1265** Official publication - https://www.sm.dk/nyheder/nyhedsarkiv/2024/sep/ny-evaluering-fra-vive-om-forskelsbehandling-mod-mennesker-with-disability

• **K1266** Official original address - https://ast.dk/publikationer/bornesagsbarometret/@@download/publication

• **K1267** Official original address - https://ast.dk/filer/bilag-til-publikationer/bornesagsbarometret_bilag-1-metode_final.pdf

• **K1268** Official original address - https://ast.dk/filer/bilag-til-publikationer/bornesagsbarometret_bilag-2-kommunefordelte-resultater_final.pdf

• **K1269** 2021 original of the Appeal Board - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732316862069048/B%C3%B8rnesagsbarometret-2021.pdf

• **K1270** The 2022-original of the Appeal Board - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732228965030943/B%C3%B8rnesagsbarometret-2022.pdf

• **K1271** Appeal Board 2023original - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/639137507362342039/18-30107-2-boernesagsbarometret-2023-21164119 _ 1024439 _ 0.pdf

• **K1272** Anchor management 2024original - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/639228074573458091/boernesagsbarometret-2024.pdf

• **K1273** Original 2020 of the Appeal Board - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638732297165855301/B%C3%B8rnesagsbarometeret-2020.pdf

• **K1274** Appeals Board,2020 official article - https://www.ast.dk/for-myndigheder/artikler/2020/aug/boernesagsbarometret-2020-et-indblik-i-kommunernes-sagsbehandling-paa-boerneomraadet-med-underretninger-som-tema

• **K1275** Ankestyrelsen, total main results2020-22 - https://cdn.ast.dk/ankestyrelsen/Media/638732228428707760/B%C3%B8rnesagsbarometer -aggregate -main results% 202020-2022.pdf

• **K1276** Ankestyrelsen,16.6.2026, How to work Ankestyrelsen with the action of the municipalities in the field of children; - https://www.ast.dk/for-myndigheder/artikler/2026/jun/saadan-arbejder-ankestyrelsen-med-kommunernes-indsats-paa-boerneomraadet

• **K1277** The disability case barometer 2023 - https://www.ast.dk/Media/638733137802028851/Handicapsagsbarometret-2023.pdf

• **K1278** Disability Case Barometer 2024 – children - https://www.ast.dk/Media/639141895725758947/18-30107-2-handicapsagsbarometret-boern-2024-handicaptilgaengelig-22010157_1024439_0.pdf

• **K1279** Disability Case Barometer 2024 – adults - https://www.ast.dk/Media/639137532094267199/18-30107-2-handicapsagsbarometret-2025-voksne-21166328_1024439_0.pdf

• **K1280** The disability case barometer 2025 - https://www.ast.dk/Media/639008651650812189/handicapsagsbarometret-2025.PDF

• **K1281** official reference; - https://www.sm.dk/nyheder/nyhedsarkiv/2018/mar/ministre-serviceeftersyn-viser-behov-for-bedre-regler-for-mause

• **K1282** SOU2023–24spm404, annex1,7.5.2024 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20231/almdel/sou/bilag/0/2863309.pdf

• **K1283** The same answer, Annex 2, appropriations - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20231/almdel/sou/bilag/0/2863310.pdf

• **K1284** § 71spm3, Minister's reply 6.12.2018 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20181/almdel/%C2%A771/spm/3/svar/1537752/1982752/index.htm

• **K1285** Long cycle of disability - https://www.sbst.dk/tvaergaende-omrader/sagsbehandling/taskforce-handicap/lange-forloeb

• **K1286** sources of analysis; - https://www.sbst.dk/tvaergaende-omrader/sagsbehandling/taskforce-handicap/lange-forloeb/analysens-kilder

• **K1287** Task Force - exposed children - https://www.sbst.dk/tvaergaende-omrader/sagsbehandling-boern-og-unge/task-force

• **K1288** Ministerial letter 21.5.2025, SOUAnnex 349 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20241/almdel/SOU/bilag/349/3025801/index.htm

• **K1289** Sorbent child analysis 2024 - https://soroe.dk/Media/638682918557656638/Analyserapport%20Task%20Force%20-%20Sor%C3%B8 % 20Kommunere.pdf

• **K1290** Sorrous final children's report 2026 - https://cdn.soroe.dk/soroekommune/Media/639240316037758130/task-force-boern-og-unge-i- ################

• **K1291** Task Force analysis report, Guldborgsund, October2022 - https://dagsordener.guldborgsund.dk/Vis/Pdf/bilag/21d80cd1-2662-499f-a07b-3ec5b923badb?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K1292** Task Force Analysis Report, Lyngby-Taarbæk, 2.7.2015 - https://www.ltk.dk/media/ceyf1nwy/social-og-sundhedsudvalget-23-09-2015- reportat.pdf

• **K1293** Solar Red Task Force Analysis, 8.august2022 - https://dagsordener.solrod.dk/Vis/Pdf/bilag/571a277c-f987-4834-8c57-88d410115f2d

• **K1294** Sunred baseline, annex to committee 17.august2022 - https://dagsordener.solrod.dk/Vis/Pdf/bilag/698a76c9-72c0-47b3-ad3d-c756bc54e8a a

• **K1295** Solar Red Task Force Status, February 2024 - https://dagsordener.solrod.dk/Vis/Pdf/bilag/6b4d50a1-6c02-4072-9d85-e5a5d4ce6cf7

• **K1296** Odense Children and Family Advice Task Force analysis, June 2022 - https://dagsordener.odense.dk/Vis/Pdf/bilag/ca9fcc5d-5256-4e15-8660-0fb69dc3490a

• **K1297** Odense Task Force status, January 2024 - https://dagsordener.odense.dk/Vis/Pdf/bilag/5e8035d9-d376-46cc-bfd3-abf40aeb601e

• **K1298** Odense Children and Youth Committee 27.2.2024, paragraph 7 - https://dagsordener.odense.dk/vis?id=923b158f-fb4e-40fe-a31d-a586621cf6ac

• **K1299** Task Force: comments on Sunred's consultation response, 20.2.2024 - https://dagsordener.solrod.dk/Vis/Pdf/bilag/e666405c-2903-4e43-a4b8- b7789357beca

• **K1300** Original Final Report, all 49 pages checked - https://dagsordener.solrod.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/6b4d50a1-6c02-4072-9d85-e5a5d4ce6cf7/?redirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K1301** Original final report, all39 pages checked - https://dagsordener.odense.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/5e8035d9-d376-46cc-bfd3-abf40aeb601e/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K1302** TFLAN23 - https://langelandkommune.dk/p/Task-Force-analyserapport-Langeland-Kommune.pdf

• **K1303** TFLANISM26 - https://www.resumedatabase.im.dk/Media/639156603084307457/Indenrigs-%20og%20Sundhedsministeriets%20skrisize% 20of% 2029.% 20May% 202026% 20til% 20Langeland% 20Municipality% 2C% 20j.n.% 202025-11404.pdf

• **K1304** TFNAE23: Official original - https://www.naestved.dk/media/053dwmo0/task-force-udsatte-boern-og-unge-naestved-kommune-analyserreport -December -2023.pdf

• **K1305** read archive copy - https://web.archive.org/web/20240718151516id_/https://www.naestved.dk/media/053dwmo0/task-force-udsatte-boer n-and -young -naestved -kommune -analysisreport -December -2023.pdf

• **K1306** TFNAENY25: Official closing news 3.10.2025 - https://www.naestved.dk/nyheder/nyheder-2025/task-force-fremlaegger-resultater

• **K1307** TFSTE20: Municipal original - https://stevns.dk/sites/default/files/sbsys/Dagsordener/Boern_Unge_og_Laering%282020%29/31-08-2020 / Agenda% 28ID1497% 29 / Annex / stevns _ kommune _ - _ status report _ for _ task _ force _ forloeb _ 0.pdf

• **K1308** actually read official archive copy - https://web.archive.org/web/20201031034757id_/https://stevns.dk/sites/default/files/sbsys/Dagsordener / Boern _ Young _ and _ Laering% 282020% 29 / 31-08-2020 / Agenda% 28ID1497% 29 / Annex / stevns _ municipality _ - _ status report _ for _ task _ force _ forl øb _ 0.pdf

• **K1309** TFFRE21: Municipal original - https://www.frederiksberg.dk/sites/default/files/meetings-appendices/3274/Punkt_56_Bilag_1_Bilag_1 _ Task _ Force _ analysis report _ Fredriksberg _ kommune.pdf

• **K1310** actually read official archive copy - https://web.archive.org/web/20210529060436id_/https://www.frederiksberg.dk/sites/default/files/meetings- appendices / 3274 / Point _ 56 _ Annex _ 1 _ Annex _ 1 _ Task _ Force _ analysis report _ Fredriksberg _ Kommune.pdf

• **K1311** TFNOR20: actually read public original - https://presscloud.com/file/74/746822242389248/Analyserapport_-_Nordfyns_Kommune_S Socialstyrelsen _ Task _ Force _ oktober _ 2020.pdf

• **K1312** Initial publication of the municipality - https://www.nordfynskommune.dk/Toolbar/Nyheder/2020/Oktober/Task-Force-rapport-er-ti Vertical

• **K1313** RAMcontrolled archived link page - https://web.archive.org/web/20201022180246id_/https://www.nordfynskommune.dk/Toolbar/Nyheder / 2020 / October / Task-Force-report-available

• **K1314** Final report 03.03.2026; all26 pages read as text; PDF7 visually checked: photograph, no table - https://dagsordener.rudersdal.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/5986cae1-fcea-4d96-8e99-4a89b4261af1/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K1315** Comment on consultation response 02.03.2026; all 4 pages read - https://dagsordener.rudersdal.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/7e5117f1-9bf9-412b-b8f5-2cc 9c49ce8a0/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K1316** Midway status April2025; all 4 pages read - https://dagsordener.rudersdal.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/4f5867aa-aaea-4b8e-b62d-f9c0cb991ae5/?r edirectDirectlyToPdf = true

• **K1317** Extraordinary status 23.10.2025; entire page read - https://dagsordener.rudersdal.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/02dd2cca-6523-4c5c-a71a-8b4fe08 b7645/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K1318** Local status matrix over 25 recommendations; all 6 pages read; not the original analytical report - https://dagsordener.rudersdal.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/8126e85a-b888-44ec-90c2-e6aa42e59509/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K1319** TFRUD24: analysis report Rudersdal June 2024 - https://dagsordener.rudersdal.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/0a788ee7-027a-470a-b50f-e18d03344 4e3/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K1320** TFSL20: Task Force analysis Slagelse October2020 - https://dagsordener.slagelse.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/5ed02c4a-a79a-4c4a-a90e-3b01c 41d3572/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K1321** TFSL21: Municipal status Task Force October 2021, provisional 01.11.2021 - https://dagsordener.slagelse.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/93907e4d-fcac-4cd8-b92f-343678359061/?redirectDirectlyToPdf=true

• **K1322** TFMID20: public original - https://dagsordener.middelfart.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/66c1e06a-4240-47ec-a9a6-0da42133f50e/?redirectDirectl yToPdf = true

• **K1323** TFMIDP20: public original - https://dagsordener.middelfart.dk/vis/pdf/bilag/5a53c4f2-935d-4438-a91f-69fa41e484e3/?redirectDirect lyToPdf = true

• **K1324** TFMIDM22: public original - https://dagsordener.middelfart.dk/api/agenda/dagsorden/02f2f9a7-816e-4738-b0ff-3f6eb6524461

• **K1325** TFMIDV19: public original - https://dagsordener.middelfart.dk/api/agenda/dagsorden/3ff40a7b-a641-4f9d-8e4e-1c7ca2f2f456

• **K1326** FSA22 · The municipality's public original, preserved archive version - https://web.archive.org/web/20220701013931id_/https://www.frederikssund.dk/api/agendaitem/df1231ff-1bfa-49bd-90d5-3b968b537025/document / dd504a75-ca58-47e7-98bb -8c7d8fa1f4c3 / taskforce analysis report -frederisk sund report _ final

• **K1327** Report 11 / 2025 on procedures for the placement of children - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/639113279124445164/sr1125.pdf

• **K1328** Statement by the Minister for Social Affairs 10 June 2026 - https://cdn.rigsrevisionen.dk/rigsrevisionen/Media/639171867010765837/11-2025-sm. pdf

• **K1329** Note C111 / 26, dated 24 June 2026; cover August 2026 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/639179720524960815/c111-26.pdf

• **K1330** Public table catalogue, active and completed tables - https://api.statbank.dk/v1/tables?lang=da&includeinactive=true

• **K1331** Original 2021 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/inline-files/RAs%20udtalelse%20om%20tilbageholdelse%20og%20e% 20of% 20mist% C3% A6nkte% 20under% 2015% 20% C3% A5r.pdf

• **K1332** Original 2022 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/inline-files/Udtalelse%20om%20tilbageholdelse%20og%20enerumsanling% 20of% 20mist% C3% A6nkte% 20people% 20under% 2015% 20% C3% A5r _ 2022 _ final.pdf

• **K1333** Original 2023 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Rigsadvokatens%20udtalelse%20om%20tilbageholdelse%20og%20enerumsanbringelse%20af%20mist%C3%A6nkte%20personer%20under%2015%20%C3%A5r%20i%202023.pdf

• **K1334** Original graph annex - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/inline-files/Grafisk%20fremstilling%20af%20udviklingen_2017-2 021.pdf

• **K1335** Original graph annex - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/inline-files/Grafisk%20fremstilling%20af%20udviklingen%20201 8-2022 _ final.pdf

• **K1336** Original graph annex - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Grafisk%20fremstilling%202019-2023%20%28PowerPoint%20- % 20PDF% 29.pdf

• **K1337** Original / source of information 2006 - https://www.yumpu.com/da/document/view/18094191/arsrapport-2006-dpsd

• **K1338** Original / source of information 2007 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/api/pdf/122265

• **K1339** Original / source of information 2008 - https://www.yumpu.com/da/document/view/17967014/arsrapport-2008-dpsd-sundhedsstyrelsen

• **K1340** Original / source of information 2010 - https://www.yumpu.com/da/document/view/8383897/arsrapport-2010-dpsd-dansk-patientsikkerhedsda tabase

• **K1341** Original / source of information 2011 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20111/almdel/suu/bilag/344/1131054.pdf

• **K1342** Original/information source2014 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/media/9200/E85DE920722E4580B134DF2ADCEB4974.pdf

• **K1343** Original / source of information 2015 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/media/9198/3E68AD018AB34FED943A5104864B6273.pdf

• **K1344** Original / source of information 2016 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/media/9177/CB4E49D2B27A4A70B183D1574C00179F.pdf

• **K1345** Original / source of information 2017 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/media/9131/5574018D8E6C40BF86DBCFC67232923E.pdf

• **K1346** Original / source of information 2018 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/media/9117/F7436C7BBEF0486690D30D392840F279.pdf

• **K1347** Original / source of information 2019 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/media/9090/01707469F7F9446FB3D3FD4EAB99CD6E.pdf

• **K1348** Original / source of information 2020 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/media/9055/34B5512CA00544F1B69B22918D2249DB.pdf

• **K1349** Original / source of information 2021 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/media/9029/6D59BD12616A466998E04BAD2A7E2FCE.pdf

• **K1350** Original / source of information 2022 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/Media/638548934922745431/Dansk%20Patientsikkerhedsdatabase%20%C3 % 85rsreport% 202022.pdf

• **K1351** Original / source of information 2023 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/Media/638549842110615643/Dansk%20Patientsikkerhedsdatabase%20%C3 % 85rsreport% 202023.pdf

• **K1352** Original / source of information 2024 - https://cdn.stps.dk/stps/Media/638814438533715726/Dansk%20Patientsikkerhedsdatabase%20%C3 % 85rsreport% 202024.pdf

• **K1353** Original / source of information 2025 - https://www.sundk.dk/media/vpnkhjyi/dansk-patientsikkerhedsdatabase-aarsrapport-2025.pdf

• **K1354** Original in public archive - https://web.archive.org/web/20130909034843id_/http://www.patientombuddet.dk/Publikationer/Aarsberetninger/~/media/POB/Aarsberetninger/2012/2012%20%C3%85rsberetning%20Del%202%20Bidrag%20fra%20sundhedsv%C3%A6senet.ashx

• **K1355** Original in public archive - https://web.archive.org/web/20130909032520id_/http://www.patientombuddet.dk/Publikationer/Aarsberetning / ~ / media / POB / Years reports / 2012 / 2012% 20% C3% 85th report% 20L% C3% A6ring activities.ashx

• **K1356** Official previous address - https://www.patientombuddet.dk/da/Publikationer/~/media/POB/Aarsrapporter/Aarsrapport_PKN_2010.ashx

• **K1357** actually read public archive copy - https://web.archive.org/web/20160503102330id_/https://www.patientombuddet.dk/da/Publikationer/~/media / POB / Years reports / Years report _ PKN _ 2010.ashx

• **K1358** Official original - https://www.stpk.dk/media/piqepcvt/statistiske-oplysninger-om-patientklager-2016.pdf

• **K1359** Annual Report 2011 of the Danish Health Service Disciplinary Board, Official Reproduction of the Danish Parliament - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20111/almdel/SUU/bilag/344/1131055/index.htm

• **K1360** Original follow-up memorandum on the right to diagnostic assessment - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638999089624655411/C121-25.pdf

• **K1361** Official News Registration 28 November 2025 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/nyheder/2025/nov/notat-til-statsrevisorerne-14

• **K1362** Original concluding note on action against coercion - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/638967109120148819/C117-25.pdf

• **K1363** Official News October 22, 2025 - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/nyheder/2025/okt/notat-til-statsrevisorerne-3

• **K1364** Law 1762 of 29 December 2025, both original pages - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2025/1762/dan/pdf

• **K1365** Folketinget's L45- overview - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20251/lovforslag/l45/index.htm

• **K1366** Patient Insurance Annual Report 2006, Original Domain of Authorities - http://www.patientforsikringen.dk/da/Udgivelser-og-tal/~/media/Files/Aarsberetninger/PF-2006_net.ashx

• **K1367** Patient Insurance Annual Report 2007, Original Authority Domain - http://www.patientforsikringen.dk/da/Udgivelser-og-tal/~/media/Files/Aarsberetninger/aarsberetning07.ashx

• **K1368** Patient Insurance Annual Report 2008, Original Authority Domain - http://www.patientforsikringen.dk/da/Udgivelser-og-tal/~/media/Files/Aarsberetninger/2008.ashx

• **K1369** Patient Insurance Annual Report 2009, Original Domain of Authorities - http://www.patientforsikringen.dk/da/Udgivelser-og-tal/~/media/Files/Aarsberetninger/aarsberetning2009.ashx

• **K1370** Patient Insurance Annual Report 2010, Original Authority Domain - http://www.patientforsikringen.dk/da/Udgivelser-og-tal/~/media/Files/Aarsberetninger/beretning2010.ashx

• **K1371** the initial link of authority; - http://www.patientforsikringen.dk:80/statistik2006/regionhovedstaden.html

• **K1372** the initial link of authority; - http://www.patientforsikringen.dk:80/statistik2006/regionmidtjylland.html

• **K1373** the initial link of authority; - http://www.patientforsikringen.dk:80/statistik2006/regionnordjylland.html

• **K1374** the initial link of authority; - http://www.patientforsikringen.dk:80/statistik2006/regionsjaelland.html

• **K1375** the initial link of authority; - http://www.patientforsikringen.dk:80/statistik2006/regionsyddanmark.html

• **K1376** Official original PDF - https://www.retsinformation.dk/api/pdf/133539

• **K1377** Official text page - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/fob/2009/1202

• **K1378** Official PDF - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/almdel/suu/bilag/290/1247903.pdf

• **K1379** official HTML text - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20121/almdel/suu/bilag/290/1247903/index.htm

• **K1380** Official original PDF - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/fob/2010/0404/dan/pdf

• **K1381** FOB2007.525, Final Report on 40Cases brought by the National Tax Court - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/fob/2007/525/pdf

• **K1382** Original judgment - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-59589

• **K1383** Original judgment - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/tur?i=001-220415

• **K1384** Archived official original - https://web.archive.org/web/20120607120306id_/http://www.landsskatteretten.dk/public/dokumenter/LSR%20aarsrapp%202011%20til%20web.pdf

• **K1385** Archived official original - https://web.archive.org/web/20130823093036id_/http://www.landsskatteretten.dk/public/dokumenter/aarsrap2012.pdf

• **K1386** old official annual report page, capture 20070108152045 - https://web.archive.org/web/20070108152045id_/http://www.landsskatteretten.dk: 80 / maal _ and _ results / rsreportre.html

• **K1387** ODA Document Register - https://oda.ft.dk/api/Dokument

• **K1388** Historical official original - https://web.archive.org/web/20070923175518id_/http://www.landsskatteretten.dk/public/dokumenter/Midtve jsrapport.PDF

• **K1389** 2006 Annual Report Hashitentic Official Republication - https://web.archive.org/web/20070923175756id_/http://www.landsskatteretten.dk / public / documents / 5705 -2006% 20materie.pdf

• **K1390** WriteGuide2007, Historically official tester - https://web.archive.org/web/20070729095424id_/http://test.www.landsskatteretten.dk/public / documents / 5707% 20samkump.pdf

• **K1391** Denmark-factaark, updated 11.6.2026, p. 4-9 - https://rm.coe.int/denmark-eng/488029925f

• **K1392** FN symbol - https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/63/10

• **K1393** Read copy of the UN original - https://www.ecoi.net/en/file/local/2143999/g2608751.pdf

• **K1394** Final national report - https://documents.un.org/api/symbol/access?l=en&s=A%2FHRC%2FWG.6%2F52%2FDNK%2F1&t=pdf

• **K1395** Compilation of Convention material - https://documents.un.org/api/symbol/access?l=en&s=A%2FHRC%2FWG.6%2F52%2FDNK%2F2&t=pd f

• **K1396** Stakeholder compilation - https://documents.un.org/api/symbol/access?l=en&s=A%2FHRC%2FWG.6%2F52%2FDNK%2F3&t=pdf

• **K1397** Meeting printout with source limitation - https://transcripts.un.org/en/hrc/63/28

• **K1398** The symbol view of the answer document - https://docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/63/10/Add.1

• **K1399** Original report - https://www.kk.dk/sites/default/files/agenda/e5358b31-4009-4e3a-9b8c-ef3472840895/8032522b-56ed-46fb-a1c6-bfab069f6b77 -Annex -1.pdf

• **K1400** Order for suspension of effect on the placement of a Faroese child - https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/expbbsax/28216-2025.pdf

• **K1401** Subject suspensive effect in the case of the placement of a Faroese child in Denmark - https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/procesbevillingsnaevnet/aktuelt/2025/5/om-opsaettende-virkning-i-sag-om-anbringelse-af-faeroesk-barn-i-Denmark /

• **K1402** C-5 / 99 on the abolition, return and subsequent aid - https://www.retsinformation.dk/api/pdf/154168

• **K1403** Original - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/media/52933/pdf.pdf

• **K1404** Original - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/media/17934/pdfegelyopflgning.pdf

• **K1405** Original - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/media/53151/pdf2.pdf

• **K1406** Original - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2014/871/pdf

• **K1407** Original judgment - https://rigsretten.dk/media/of4lp4dn/rigsrettens-dom-af-13-december-2021.pdf

• **K1408** Original decision - https://stm.dk/media/onqfxt5a/afgoerelse-om-tilbagekaldelse-af-disciplinaer-advarsel.pdf

• **K1409** Original excerpt - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Del-8-af-forhoersledelsens-beretning-af-10.-februar-20 23.pdf

• **K1410** Original decision - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Afgoerelse-om-tilbagekaldelse-af-disciplinaer-irettes aettele.pdf

• **K1411** Notification by the Ministry - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/pressemeddelelse/ansaettelsesretlig-opfoelgning-paa-minkkommissionens- Report-2 /

• **K1412** Parliamentary original - https://www.retsinformation.dk/api/pdf/232334

• **K1413** Volume 2 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Pressemeddelelser/pdf/2017/tibet_kommission_bind2.pdf

• **K1414** Volume 1 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/tibet_kommission_bind1.pdf

• **K1415** Volume 1 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Tibetkommissionens-beretning-Bind-1.pdf

• **K1416** Volume 2 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Tibetkommissionens-beretning-Bind-2.pdf

• **K1417** Notification by the Ministry of Justice of 28 March 2022 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/pressemeddelelse/tibetkommissionen-ii-har-afgive t-its-report /

• **K1418** Annex 209 of the Folketing - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20211/almdel/REU/bilag/209/index.htm

• **K1419** Case 10805 - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#sag/10805

• **K1420** Report No 1 of 17 May 2023 on the treatment of certain aspects of the Tibetan Commission II Report - https://www.retsinformation.dk/api/pdf/237524

• **K1421** Opinion on Tibetan Commission II, 1 April 2022 - https://via.ritzau.dk/pressemeddelelse/13648023/udtalelse-fra-udenrigsministeriet-o m-tibet commission -ii? publicsherId = 2012662

• **K1422** compensation to offenders in Tibetan case, 18 April 2018; - https://politi.dk/koebenhavns-politi/nyhedsliste/erstatning-til-kraenkede-i-tibetsag/2 018/04/18

• **K1423** Police officers continue to be charged with false explanation in court, 28 April 2022 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/da/tibetsag-politiledere-fortsat-tiltalt-falsk-forklaring-i-retten

• **K1424** Original Volume 9 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Pressemeddelelser/pdf/2015/statsloesekommission_bind_9. pdf

• **K1425** Original Volume 8 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Pressemeddelelser/pdf/2015/statsloesekommission_bind_8. pdf

• **K1426** Closure of the Claes Nilas case - https://uim.dk/nyhedsarkiv/2015/december/udlaendinge-integrations-og-boligministeriet- the -statsloesesesagen -as -completed -previously -departmentschef-clays -nilas /

• **K1427** closure of the Kim Lunding case; - https://uim.dk/nyhedsarkiv/2016/januar/udlaendinge-integrations-og-boligministeriet-be The Court of Justice of the European Communities, the Court of Justice of the European Communities

• **K1428** Original annual report - https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/csjjhspb/aarsberetning-2018.pdf

• **K1429** Original report - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/ft/20151SS00004/dan/pdf

• **K1430** Original judgment in the judgment database - https://domsdatabasen.dk/#/sag/9757/11395

• **K1431** Original judgment - https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/43qlm1zh/36329-2025.pdf

• **K1432** Original judgment via the Verified Document Link of the Courts - https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/media/ohpp5hze/58021-anonymise rt-dom.pdf

• **K1433** Own recognition of services - https://pet.dk/pet/nyhedsliste/faelles-udtalelse-fra-fe-og-pet-i-forbindelse-med-hoejesterets-dom-d a -2-September -2025 / 2025 / 09 / 02

• **K1434** Original investigation,347 physical pages - https://www.ism.dk/Media/638930184996168937/Antikonceptionspraksis-i-Kalaallit-Nunaat-da nsk.pdf

• **K1435** Law No 722 of 1 September 2026 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2026/722/pdf

• **K1436** Women's compensation for contraception in Greenland - https://patienterstatningen.dk/presse-og-nyheder/fokusomraader/godtgoerelse- to the -women -for -contraceptive -in -green -spiral case

• **K1437** Original investigation - https://www.sm.dk/media/8409/historisk_udredning_groenlandske_boern_nov2020_t.pdf

• **K1438** Reimbursement on the way to six living Greenlanders - https://www.sm.dk/nyheder/nyhedsarkiv/2022/feb/godtgoerelse-paa-vej-til-seks- the present-growing countries - which were -sent -to -Denmark -in -1951

• **K1439** Original report - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Undersoegelseskommissioner-og-parlamentar ISK survey forms.pdf

• **K1440** Original volumes - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/1004492-Instrukskom-bind-6-FINAL-a.pdf

• **K1441** Official overview - https://www.ft.dk/folkestyret/regeringen/ministeransvar

• **K1442** Original status - https://feuk2.dk/

• **K1443** The Ministry's message and document links - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/pressemeddelelse/vedroerende-fe-kommission-ii/

• **K1444** Progress of the proposal - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20251/beslutningsforslag/b27/index.htm

• **K1445** Official case status - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20251/lovforslag/l118/index.htm

• **K1446** Original Report - https://www.rigsrevisionen.dk/Media/639225602093624025/sr2025.pdf

• **K1447** Legal text - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2014/433/pdf

• **K1448** Instructions - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/find-viden/myndighedsguiden/generel-forvaltningsret/9-partshoering

• **K1449** Social Committee treatment7.June 2017 - https://www.kk.dk/dagsordener-og-referater/Socialudvalget/m%C3%B8de-07062017-130000 / Minutes / Point -2

• **K1450** Convention text - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/convention_ENG

• **K1451** Legal text - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2025/1294/pdf

• **K1452** LBK1000of5.October2006 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2006/1000

• **K1453** Practical overview - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/retsinfo/2025/9048/pdf

• **K1454** Decision - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/retsinfo/2015/11331/dan/pdf

• **K1455** Legal text - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2025/282/pdf

• **K1456** Opinion - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/find-viden/udtalelser/2018/2018-33

• **K1457** original PDF - https://admin.ombudsmanden.dk/media/53151/pdf2.pdf

• **K1458** Legal text - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2025/1080/pdf

• **K1459** Notification of judgment by the Authority - https://politi.dk/oestjyllands-politi/nyhedsliste/far-idoemt-to-aars-faengsel-for-boernebortfoerelse-af- Doetre / 2023 / 03 / 28

• **K1460** Press release of the Authority - https://via.ritzau.dk/pressemeddelelse/15022746/kendt-skyldig-i-bornebortforelse-og-idomt-faeng sel?lang = da&publicherId = 13563085

• **K1461** the notification of the court; - https://www.rigsretten.dk/aktuelt/2021/12/rigsretten-har-afsagt-dom-i-sagen-mod-fhv-minister-inger-stoejberg/

• **K1462** Binding Register - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20211/almdel/GRA/bilag/46/index.htm

• **K1463** Description of the mandate of the Parliament - https://www.ft.dk/aktuelt/nyheder/2022/06/minkkommissionens-beretning

• **K1464** Parliamentary aftercare - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/ft/20211SS00024

• **K1465** Original with comments - https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/commentaries/9_6_2001.pdf

• **K1466** UN document portal - https://www.un.org/en/conferences/environment/newyork2005

• **K1467** Report - https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n09/206/10/pdf/n0920610.pdf?OpenElement

• **K1468** Original Treaty - https://legal.un.org/icc/statute/99_corr/cstatute.htm

• **K1469** Amending Law - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2024/1674/pdf

• **K1470** Law 429 of 10.6.2003on patient safety - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2003/429

• **K1471** Health Act consolidation 95/2008 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2008/95

• **K1472** official PDFversion - https://www.retsinformation.dk/api/pdf/114054

• **K1473** Guide 1 of 3.1.2011on reporting - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/mt/2011/1/pdf

• **K1474** Law 1855 of 9.12.2020 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2020/1855/pdf

• **K1475** Health Act, consolidated Act 275 of 12.3.2025 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2025/275/pdf

• **K1476** Law 406 of 29.4.2025 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2025/406/pdf

• **K1477** Copenhagen Byret's original dom16 January 2017, SS1 -23445 / 2016 - https://domsdatabasen.dk/webapi/api/Case/document/download/content/1275

• **K1478** Complementary Original Code 30 January 2017 - https://domsdatabasen.dk/webapi/api/Case/document/download/content/1274

• **K1479** Østre Landsret originaldom7.juni 2017, S-218-17 - https://domsdatabasen.dk/webapi/api/Case/document/download/content/1273

• **K1480** Public case metadata - https://domsdatabasen.dk/webapi/api/Case/get/1056

• **K1481** Original overall act of judgment AM2022.06.16V, Public Prosecutor's Base - https://vidensbasen.anklagemyndigheden.dk/api/Portals%286e302527-f0b3-4a5e-889a-668aa67e5491%29/Print/h/6dfa19d8-18cc-47d6-b4c4-3bd07bc15ec0 / VB / d569411d-4cac-4746-bb92-c97f30296bee

• **K1482** Original public table - https://domstoldk.euwest01.umbraco.io/densaerligeklageret/om-den-saerlige-klageret/

• **K1483** Original research article - https://svjt.se/sites/default/files/pdf/2021/hft7/svjt2021hft7s538toftegaardnielsen.pdf

• **K1484** Original historical text - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2021/1835

• **K1485** Original 2024 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Anvendelsen%20af%20langvarige%20varet%C3%A6gtsf%C3%A6ngslinger% 20i% 202024.pdf

• **K1486** Original Isolation2024 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Anvendelsen%20af%20varet%C3%A6gtsf%C3%A6ngsling% 20i% 20isolation% 20i% 202024.pdf

• **K1487** Original analysis - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Rigsadvokatens%20analyse%20af%20anvendelsen%20af%20varight% C3% A6gt% C3% A6ngslinger.PDF

• **K1488** Original 2018 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Statistik-om-isolationsfaengsling-2018.pdf

• **K1489** Ministry of Justice Research Unit, Long-term detention in custody 2006, December 2007 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forskning/Forskningsrapporter/2008/Langvarige_varetaegtsfaengslinger _ 2006.pdf

• **K1490** Ministry of Justice's original pre-trial detention report/revision - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forskning/Forskningsrapporter/2009/Langvarige_varetaegtsfaengslinger2007.pdf

• **K1491** The Ministry of Justice's original pre-trial detention report/revision - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forskning/Forskningsrapporter/2010/Langvarige%20varetaegtsfaengslinger%202008.pdf

• **K1492** Ministry of Justice's original remand-detention report/revision - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forskning/Forskningsrapporter/2010/Tillaeg_Langvarige%20varetaegtsfaengslinger%202008.pdf

• **K1493** The Ministry of Justice's Research Office, The custody of young people under the age of 18: correction 2008-2010, April 2012 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forskning/Forskningsrapporter/varetaegt_2008-2010.pdf

• **K1494** Ministry of Justice Research Office, Long-term detention in custody 2009, November 2010 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forskning/Forskningsrapporter/2011/Varetaegtsfaengslinger_2009.pdf

• **K1495** Ministry of Justice Research Office, Long-term detention in custody 2010, November 2011 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forskning/Forskningsrapporter/Varetaegtsfaengslinger_2010.pdf

• **K1496** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Prison 2006 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forsknin g / Research reports / 2007 / Isolation faengsling.pdf

• **K1497** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2007 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forsknin g / Research reports / 2008 / Isolation report _ 2007.pdf

• **K1498** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2008 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forsknin g / Research reports / 2010 / Isolation report% 202008.pdf

• **K1499** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2009 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forsknin g / Research reports / 2011 / Isolation report _ 2009.pdf

• **K1500** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2010 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forsknin g / Research reports / Isolation report _ 2010.pdf

• **K1501** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2011 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forsknin g / Research reports / 2013 / Isolation report% 202011.pdf

• **K1502** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2012 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forsknin g / Research reports / 2014 / Isolation report% 202012.pdf

• **K1503** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2013 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forskning / Research reports / 2015 / Isolation report% 202013.pdf

• **K1504** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2014 - https://justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Pressemeddelelser/pdf/2015/Isolation% 20annex% 20A.pdf

• **K1505** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2015 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Arbejdsomraader/Forskning / Research reports / 2016 / Isolation report _ 2015.pdf

• **K1506** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2016 - https://justitsministeriet.dk/sites/default/files/media/Billeder/Forskning/isolationsrapport _ 2016.pdf

• **K1507** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2017 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/isolationsrapport_2017.pdf

• **K1508** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2019 - https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Statistik-om-isolationsfaengsling -2019.pdf

• **K1509** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2020 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/inline-files/Statistik%20om%20vara% C3% A6gt% C3% A6ngslinger% 20i% 20isolation% 202020 _ 0.pdf

• **K1510** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2021 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/inline-files/Statistik%20om%20vara% C3% A6gt% C3% A6ngslinger% 20i% 20isolation% 202021.docx

• **K1511** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2022 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Varet%C3%A6gtsf%C3%A6ngslinger / Statistics% 20om% 20var% C3% A6gt% C3% A6ngslinger% 20i% 20isolation% 202022 _ .pdf

• **K1512** Original Annual Statistics on Isolation Jail 2023 - https://anklagemyndigheden.dk/sites/default/files/Anvendelsen%20af%20varet%C3% A6gt% C3% A6ngsing% 20i% 20isolation% 20i% 202023.pdf

• **K1513** Law 1561 of 20 December 2006 on detention in solitary confinement - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2006/1561

• **K1514** Notice of the Attorney General 4 / 2008 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/retsinfo/2008/11054

• **K1515** Original statement by the Advocate General of 30 November 2020 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20201/almdel/REU/bilag/244/2353611/index. htm

• **K1516** Original PDF address - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20201/almdel/REU/bilag/244/2353611.pdf

• **K1517** Public transcription of REU Annex 244, document 901387 - https://polspy.org/dk/dokumenter/901387

• **K1518** Original Folketing Document Register, document 901387 with file relationships - https://oda.ft.dk/api/Dokument%28901387%29?$expand=Fil&$format=json

• **K1519** Original Folketing Document Register, Document 789586 - https://oda.ft.dk/api/Dokument%28789586%29?$format=json

• **K1520** original answer to REU question 655, document 853609 - https://oda.ft.dk/api/Dokument%28853609%29?$expand=Fil&$format=json

• **K1521** Statistics 2015, revised version - https://xn--danmarksfngsler-5lb.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/kriminalforsorge nsstatistik 2015-4.pdf

• **K1522** Statistik2023, original - https://kriminalforsorgen.dk/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/kriminalforsorgens-statistik-2023-hjemmesiden.pdf

• **K1523** Statistics 2024, web-accessible original - https://xn--danmarksfngsler-5lb.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/kriminalforsorgens-statistik-20 24-webtilgaengeligversion.pdf

• **K1524** Other public original version - https://xn--danmarksfngsler-5lb.dk/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/kriminalforsorgens-statistik-2024.pdf

• **K1525** Current statistical table of the Authority - https://xn--danmarksfngsler-5lb.dk/om-os/tal-og-fakta/statistik/

• **K1526** Act 661 of 11 June 2024 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2024/661/pdf

• **K1527** The Minister of Justice's original reply to REU1157,23.June2025 - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20241/almdel/reu/spm/1157/svar/2150408/304 4774.pdf

• **K1528** Order 420 of 29.April2025 - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2025/420/pdf

• **K1529** The original decision of the Data Protection Regulation10.juli2025,2024-432-0030 - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2025/jul/datatilsynet-u Dutchman Critical of Criminal Services

• **K1530** Original Convention - https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr/convention_eng

• **K1531** Official document number - https://docs.un.org/CAT/C/DNK/CO/8

• **K1532** Original Guide - https://ks.echr.coe.int/documents/d/echr-ks/guide_art_3_eng

• **K1533** Original judgment - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/pdf/?filename=001-99015.pdf&id=001-99015&library=ECHR

• **K1534** Original opinion - https://www.ombudsmanden.dk/media/52455/20104-4.pdf

• **K1535** Legal text - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2025/1294

• **K1536** Original legal text - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2014/266/pdf

• **K1537** Legal text - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2023/248

• **K1538** Original judgment - https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/pdf/?filename=001-195909.pdf&id=001-195909&library=ECHR

• **K1539** Original article collection - https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/draft_articles/9_6_2001.pdf

• **K1540** Original decision - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/afgoerelser/afgoerelser/2024/jan/datatilsynet-giver-paabud-i-chromebook-sag

• **K1541** Notice of the supervisory authority - https://www.datatilsynet.dk/presse-og-nyheder/nyhedsarkiv/2022/sep/hoersholm-kommune-idoemt-boed e-pa-50000-kr

• **K1542** Original Government Note - https://www.ft.dk/samling/20231/almdel/REU/bilag/174/2844180.pdf

• **K1543** Historical original - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2016/1270/pdf

• **K1544** Historical original - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2017/988/pdf

• **K1545** Historical original - https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2018/1114/pdf

• **K1546** 10.1093 / icon / moaf046 - https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moaf046

• **K1547** Original article § 3, 5-6.3, Figure 1, Note 137 - https://academic.oup.com/icon/article/23/3/800/8324586