



Before filling in this form, please read ‘How to submit a complaint to the European Commission’:  
[https://ec.europa.eu/assets/sg/report-a-breach/complaints\\_en/](https://ec.europa.eu/assets/sg/report-a-breach/complaints_en/)  
 All fields with \* are mandatory. Please be concise and if necessary continue on a separate page.

1. Identity & contact details

	Complainant*	Your representative (if applicable)
Title* Mr/Ms/Mrs	Mrs	
First name*	Bernadette	
Surname*	Feuerstein	
Organisation:	Independent Living Austria (SLIÖ – Selbstbestimmt Leben Österreich)	
Address*	Laxenburger Strasse 28/1/1/15	
Town/City *	Wien	
Postcode*	1100	
Country*	Austria	
Telephone		
E-mail	bernadette@selbstbestimmtleben.at	
Language*	English / German	
Should we send correspondence to you or your representative*:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Complainant*	Your representative (if applicable)
Title* Mr/Ms/Mrs	Ms	
First name*	Ines	
Surname*	Bulic Cojocariu	
Organisation:	ENIL – European Network on Independent Living	
Address*	Rue de l’Industrie 10	
Town/City *	Brussels	
Postcode*	1000	
Country*	Belgium	
Telephone	32 (0)2 893 25 83	
E-mail	ines.bulic@enil.eu	
Language*	English	
Should we send correspondence to you or your representative*:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 2. How has EU law been infringed?\*

	Authority or body you are complaining about:
Name*	State Government of Carinthia
Address	Arnulfplatz 1
Town/City	Klagenfurt
Postcode	A-9021
EU Country*	Austria
Telephone	050 536
Mobile	
E-mail	No general e-mail contact provided at <a href="https://www.ktn.gv.at/">https://www.ktn.gv.at/</a>

## 2.1 Which **national measure(s)** do you think are in breach of EU law and why?\*

The complaint relates to the **segregation and social exclusion of children with disabilities in a new residential facility co-financed by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)**. The building of the long-stay institution was publicised in the following news report: [https://www.meinbezirk.at/klagenfurt-land/c-lokales/erfolgreicher-spatenstich-fuer-neues-comenius-heim\\_a5294827](https://www.meinbezirk.at/klagenfurt-land/c-lokales/erfolgreicher-spatenstich-fuer-neues-comenius-heim_a5294827) and in a press release of the State Government of Carinthia: <https://www.ktn.gv.at/Service/News?nid=32230>.

Specifically, the complaint concerns the building of the “**Comeniusheim**”, a residential facility for children with disabilities, currently under construction in Carinthia. The facility is run by AVS, a large provider for different types of social services, operating all over Carinthia (see <https://www.avs-sozial.at/>). The new facility is replacing the old “Comeniusheim”, which is said to be run down and no longer up-to-date. This facility is closely connected to a private special school with three classes for children with severe disabilities. Some basic information on the residential facility, as well as the special school, is provided on the AVS website (see <https://www.avs-sozial.at/comenius-heim-und-schule>). However, no information on the construction of the new “Comeniusheim” can be found there. Only a short report on the brick laying ceremony was published in a regional paper which gives some basic information on the new residential facility: 16 children with disabilities at the age between 5 and 16 years are supposed to live there all year round, and they will attend the aforementioned private special school for children with severe disabilities.

The project described constitutes a violation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN-CRPD), as well as the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), as it **reinforces the segregation, isolation and discrimination of children with disabilities in Carinthia. Instead of supporting inclusive education in the children’s community of origin and developing services to ensure these children can grow up with their families, the EAFRD co-funded project reinforces the social exclusion of children with disabilities in a segregating institution. This violates the children’s right to live in a family.**

The facility for children is in breach of Austria’s and the European Union’s obligations under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the EU Charter on Fundamental Rights and the European Structural Funds Regulations 2014 – 2020.

## 2.2 Which is the **EU law** in question?

Article 26 of the **EU Charter on Fundamental Rights** states that “[t]he Union recognises and respects the right of persons with disabilities to benefit from measures designed to ensure their independence, social and occupational integration and participation in the life of the community.” Article 21 of the Charter prohibits discrimination on any ground, including disability. Article 24 of the Charter states that, in all actions relating to children, “the child’s best interest must be a primary consideration”.

The European Union’s **Strategy for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 2021 – 2030** identifies “developing independent living and reinforcing community-based services” as one of the three priorities for the EU. It states that the “Commission will support national, regional and local authorities in their efforts for deinstitutionalisation and independent living, including through the 2021 – 2027 shared management funds ...”.

The **European Union’s Strategy on the Rights of the Child and the Child Guarantee** focus, among other, on children in institutional care, and aim to facilitate the development of community-based and family-based care in the Member States. Among other, they stress the importance of prevention services for vulnerable children and families, with the aim of preventing the placement of children in institutional care. There is a recognition that these objectives must be sufficiently funded by a range of EU funds.

Austria is a State party to the **United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)**, which it ratified in 2008. As a regional integration organisation, the EU also became a party to the treaty by way of confirmation in 2010. Ratification or confirmation of the treaty

creates binding obligations under international law on parties to promote, protect and fulfil the human rights of all persons with disabilities, including the right to independent living and inclusion in the community (Article 19), the full enjoyment of children with disabilities of all human rights (Article 7), the right to inclusive education (Article 24), and the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination (Article 5) .

Pursuant to **Article 19 CRPD**, persons with disabilities have the right to live independently and be included in the community, with choices equal to others. States must ensure that persons with disabilities can “choose their place of residence and where and with whom they live” and that they are “not obliged to live in a particular living arrangement”. This requires “access to a range or in-home, residential and other community support services, including personal assistance necessary to support living and inclusion in the community, and to prevent isolation or segregation from the community.” It also requires access to mainstream services and facilities, which should be available and “responsive to their needs”. To ensure that services are responsive to individual needs, a thorough individual needs assessment is required, with the goal of facilitating disabled people’s social inclusion and participation in society. As part of this process, it is important to map out individual wishes and requirements of all those in institutional settings and in the community, and invest into different community-based alternatives to meet everyone’s needs and requirements. This also applies to children with disabilities, and their families.

According to the **General Comment 5 (GC 5)**, the authoritative guidance on the implementation of Article 19 CRPD, published by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, defining characteristics of institutions, or institutionalisation, include: “[...] obligatory sharing of assistants with others and no or limited influence over whom one has to accept assistance from; isolation and segregation from independent life within the community; lack of control over day-to-day decisions; lack of choice over whom to live with; rigidity of routine irrespective of personal will and preferences; identical activities in the same place for a group of persons under a certain authority; a paternalistic approach in service provision; supervision of living arrangements; and usually also a disproportion in the number of persons with disabilities living in the same environment.” With regard to children with disabilities, GC5 explains that for children “**the core of the right to be included in the community entails a right to grow up in a family**” (para. 37), adding that: “Large or small group homes are especially dangerous for children, for whom there is no substitute for the need to grow up with a family. ‘Family-like’ institutions are still institutions and are no substitute for care by a family”. (General Comment 5, on living independently and being included in the community, para 16(c)).

GC 5 explains that investments should not support institutions or institutionalisation of persons with disabilities, by stating in para 51 that: “States parties should ensure that public or private funds are not spent on maintaining, renovating, establishing building or creating any form of institution or institutionalization. Furthermore, States parties must ensure that private institutions are not established under the guise of “community living”.

The **Guidelines on deinstitutionalisation, including in emergencies**, adopted by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2022, further clarify that for children with disabilities “deinstitutionalisation should be directed towards protection of the right to family life, in accordance with their best interests” (paras 43 – 51).

In line with **Article 24 CRPD**, on the right of persons with disabilities to education, States are required to put in place an inclusive education system at all levels and must not exclude children from the general education system on the basis of disability.

General Comment 4 (GC 4) clarifies that, although this right is subject to progressive realisation, States must move away from maintaining a special/segregated education system in parallel with mainstream education. Specifically: “Article 4 (2) requires that States parties take measures to the maximum of their available resources regarding economic, social and cultural rights and, where needed, within a framework of international cooperation, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of those rights. Progressive realization means that States parties have a specific and continuing obligation to move as expeditiously and effectively as possible towards the full realization of article 24. **This is not compatible with sustaining two systems of education: a mainstream**

**education system and a special/segregated education system.** Progressive realization must be read in conjunction with the overall objective of the Convention to establish clear obligations for States parties in respect of the full realization of the rights in question.” (General Comment 4, on the right to inclusive education, para 40).

Austria is a party to the **UN Convention on the Rights of the Child**, which in Article 2 prohibits discrimination based on disability. According to Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, “School segregation is one of the worst forms of discrimination and a serious violation of the rights of the children concerned, as their learning opportunities are seriously harmed by isolation and lack of inclusion in mainstream schools.” (Council of Europe, 2017: Fighting school segregation in Europe through inclusive education, p. 5)

Pursuant to Article 216(2) of the **Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)**, “[a]greements concluded by the Union are binding upon the institutions of the Union and on its Member States.” Thus, Article 19 of the CRPD, as interpreted by General Comment 5, Article 27 and Article 5, as interpreted by General Comment 6, create legal obligations for the Union and the Member States, including the European Commission.

Pursuant to Articles 4 and 6 of **Regulation 1303/2013 on the common provisions for the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds**, operations supported by ESI Funds shall comply with EU law, including its obligations under the CRPD. Moreover, Article 7 of the Regulation states that “the Commission shall take appropriate steps to prevent discrimination”, including that based on disability, during the preparation and the implementation of an ESI Funds programme.

There is **mounting jurisprudence** in support of the prohibition of investing ESI Funds into segregating services, under the CRPD. In April 2020, the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities published the results of an inquiry into implementation of Article 19 CRPD in Hungary<sup>1</sup> and made a number of recommendations that should be taken into account when interpreting EU’s and Austria’s obligations under the CRPD. It called on the State party to:

- Reorient the investment of public funds, including the way in which European Structural and Investment Funds are allocated, from institutions to support in the community by accelerating the development of a full range of in-home and other community services offering support in daily life, including personal assistance, and other forms of supported decision-making (para 112/2e);
- Revise its understanding of community-based services to exclude from this concept any form of refurbishment of institutions or group homes and construction of “supported housing” (para 112/3b);
- With the participation of organizations of persons with disabilities, expeditiously adopt a comprehensive strategy to ensure employment and income-generation opportunities for persons with disabilities without discrimination in the open labour market, and move away from sheltered employment (para 112/3d).

<sup>1</sup> United Nations, Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Inquiry concerning Hungary carried out by the Committee under article 6 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention, 13 September 2019, CRPD/C/HUN/IR/1, available at: [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2fC%2fHUN%2fIR%2f1&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD%2fC%2fHUN%2fIR%2f1&Lang=en)

2.3 Describe the problem, providing facts and reasons for your complaint\* (max. 7000 characters):

This complaint relates to the reconstruction of an existing 'special institution' for children with disabilities. The main source of evidence are a press release of the State Government of Carinthia (December 2020, see <https://www.ktn.gv.at/Service/News?nid=32230>) and a newspaper article (April 2022, see [https://www.meinbezirk.at/klagenfurt-land/c-lokales/erfolgreicher-spatenstich-fuer-neues-comenius-heim\\_a5294827](https://www.meinbezirk.at/klagenfurt-land/c-lokales/erfolgreicher-spatenstich-fuer-neues-comenius-heim_a5294827)). This institution will accommodate 16 children with disabilities at the age between 5 and 16 years, who are going to live there all year round. In addition to being placed at this institution, the children will attend a private special school for children with severe disabilities affiliated to the residential facility.

Systems of 'special institutions' for children with disabilities are well established and generously funded in Austria, where there is a severe shortage of family and community-based services. Institutional care services are, due to the lack of alternatives, supported by a majority of the Austrian population and make the transition to inclusive support services in the field of family life, leisure activities and education extremely difficult. These findings are supported by the Austrian Ombudsman Board (AOB), which has a mandate to protect and promote human rights, functions as an independent authority under Article 16, Paragraph 3 CRPD, and is the National Preventive Mechanism, in accordance with the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture (OPCAT). In a report to the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the AOB stated in 2018:

"The AOB has been confronted with numerous complaints of families whose children with disabilities are discriminated against. Although equality among children is prescribed by the Austrian constitution, children with disabilities still face, in many instances, rejection in nurseries, schools, sports associations, youth groups and the like. Parents are often referred to special institutions for children with disabilities. The lack of a barrier-free environment, liability issues, shortage of individual support and lack of knowledge result in separation and hinder inclusion. (...)

To promote equality, special institutional structures for children with disabilities should be reduced and inclusive education structures further promoted. (...) many parents also wish their kids to be educated or looked after in special institutions. Nevertheless, existing discriminatory structures and separation of children are consolidated through the promotion of those institutions."<sup>2</sup>

Already in 2012, the UN Committee for the Right of the Child was "seriously concerned about the high number of children with disabilities in institutional care in the State party", and urged Austria to "take measures to de-institutionalize children with disabilities and further strengthen support to families to enable them to live with their parents."<sup>3</sup> Early in 2020, the UN Committee was seriously concerned that "the State party still lacks a comprehensive plan in all Länder for de-institutionalisation of children with disabilities" and urged Austria to elaborate "a coherent strategy on de-institutionalization and prevention of separation of children with disabilities from their families with a clear time frame and a mechanism for its effective implementation and monitoring."<sup>4</sup>

**A growing body of scientific research** shows that all children need families for their healthy emotional, cognitive and physical development. In a comprehensive review of the research literature, an international consensus statement adopted by researchers on child welfare concluded that "[g]roup

<sup>2</sup> Austrian Ombudsman Board (2018): Written Contribution, p. 6, [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2fCRPD%2fIFR%2fAUT%2f32189&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2fCRPD%2fIFR%2fAUT%2f32189&Lang=en)

<sup>3</sup> Committee on the Rights of the Child (2012). Concluding observations: Austria. [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2fC%2fAUT%2fCO%2f3-4&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2fC%2fAUT%2fCO%2f3-4&Lang=en)

<sup>4</sup> Committee on the Rights of the Child (2020). Concluding observations on the combined fifth and sixth periodic reports of Austria. [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/\\_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2fC%2fAUT%2fCO%2f5-6&Lang=en](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRC%2fC%2fAUT%2fCO%2f5-6&Lang=en)

settings should not be used as living arrangements, because of their inherently detrimental effects on the healthy development of children, regardless of age.”<sup>5</sup> Similarly, there is conclusive scientific evidence of the harm of residential care on the development of a child, and their prospects of living independently and be included in the community as adults.<sup>6</sup> This position has been adopted by UNICEF, according to which even small scale residential care is not a suitable permanent placement for a child.<sup>7</sup> A key recommendation, therefore, of the international scientific and child rights community is that **“global actors should work jointly to support the progressive elimination of institutions and promote family-based care”** and that **“donors and volunteers should redirect their funding and efforts to community-based and family-based programmes”**.<sup>8</sup>

Furthermore, in a recent landmark case *G.L. v. Italy*, the European Court of Human Rights established denial of education in a mainstream setting to be discriminatory. The Court stated: The Government had failed to show that the authorities had acted with the requisite diligence to guarantee the applicant the enjoyment of her right to education on an equal footing with the other pupils such as to strike a fair balance between the competing interests at stake.”<sup>9</sup>

When it comes to provision of community-based support services, in October 2022, the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities published a decision in *M.S.B. v Italy* (CRPD/C/27/D/51/2018). It found that Italy’s failure to provide individualised support services to a family of persons with disabilities was discriminatory and violated their rights to family life, to live independently and to an adequate living standard.<sup>10</sup>

All the factors and elements are evidence of the harm and the rights abuses committed by isolation and segregation from their families and independent life within the community of children with disabilities in the facility co-funded by the European Union.

<sup>5</sup> Mary Dozier, Joan Kaufman, Roger Kobak, Thomas G. O’Connor, Abraham Sagi-Schwartz, Stephen Scott, Carole Shauffer, Judith Smetana, Marinus H. van IJzendoorn, and Charles Zeanah, *Consensus Statement on Group Care for Children and Adolescents: A Statement of Policy of the American Orthopsychiatric Association*, 84 *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 219-225 (2014). See further discussion in Section III *infra*.

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, Van IJzendoorn et al, *Institutionalisation and deinstitutionalisation of children 1: a systematic and integrative review of evidence regarding effects on development*, 23 June 2020, the *Lancet*, Volume 7, Issue 8, p703-320, August 01, 2020, available at: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpsy/article/PIIS2215-0366\(19\)30399-2/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpsy/article/PIIS2215-0366(19)30399-2/fulltext)

<sup>7</sup> See UNICEF White paper, 1st July 2020, available at: <https://www.unicef.org/eca/media/13261/file>

<sup>8</sup> Phillip S Goldman et al, *Institutionalisation and deinstitutionalisation of children 2: policy and practice recommendations for global, national and local actors*, 23 June 2020, the *Lancet*, Volume 7, Issue 8, p611 – 633, August 01, 2020, available at: [https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lanchi/PIIS2352-4642\(20\)30060-2.pdf](https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lanchi/PIIS2352-4642(20)30060-2.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> *G.L. v. Italy* – 59751/15, see: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#%7B%22itemid%22%3A%22002-12926%22%7D>;

<sup>10</sup> Views adopted by the Committee under article 5 of the Optional Protocol, concerning communication No. Communication N. 51/2018, see: [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CRPD/Shared%20Documents/ITA/CRPD\\_C\\_27\\_D\\_51\\_2018\\_34385\\_E.pdf](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CRPD/Shared%20Documents/ITA/CRPD_C_27_D_51_2018_34385_E.pdf)

2.4 Does the Country concerned receive (or could it receive in future) EU funding relating to the subject of your complaint?

Yes, please specify below       No       I don't know

Yes, the complaint relates to a project co-funded by the European Structural and Investment Funds, more precisely the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD). No exact numbers on the invested amount is publicly available, but according to the information provided in a newspaper article, € 1 Mio of EAFRD is being used to built the new residential facility for children with disabilities.

2.5 Does your complaint relate to a breach of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights?

The Commission can only investigate such cases if the breach is due to national implementation of EU law.

Yes, please specify below       No       I don't know

Article 26 of the EU Charter on Fundamental Rights states that “[t]he Union recognises and respects the right of persons with disabilities to benefit from measures designed to ensure their independence, social and occupational integration and participation in the life of the community.” Article 21 of the Charter prohibits discrimination on any ground, including disability. Article 24 of the Charter states that, in all actions relating to children, “the child’s best interest must be a primary consideration”.

The manner in which EU law – as explained in question 2.2 – is implemented in Austria leads to the breach of these two provisions of the Charter.

The European Commission Guidance on ensuring respect for the Charter<sup>11</sup> suggests, among other, the following key questions (in Annex III) when establishing whether the Charter has been breached:

- How does the action entail any different treatment of groups or individuals directly on grounds of sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, and sexual orientation? Or could it lead to indirect discrimination?
- Does the action ensure respect for the rights of people with disabilities in conformity with the UN Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities? How? (see <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32010D0048>)

Using these two questions as a guide, we can conclude that the facility co-funded by EAFRD in Carinthia breaches Articles 26, 21 and 24 of the EU Charter on Fundamental Rights.

Namely, the action discriminates against children with disabilities by placing them in separate facilities, rather than providing support to their families. It does not have the child’s best interest as its primary consideration, having in mind the scientifically proven inherently detrimental effects of group living arrangements on the healthy development of children. It also denies children with disabilities the right to education alongside peers, in mainstream educational settings. The segregating nature of special schools is highlighted in the General Comment 4, para 11, which states: “Exclusion occurs when students are directly or indirectly prevented from or denied access to education in any form. Segregation occurs when the education of students with disabilities is provided in separate environments designed or used to respond to a particular or various impairments, in isolation from students without disabilities. [...]”<sup>12</sup> Para 50 further emphasizes that the place of inclusion should be the local community, respectively the neighbourhood school in the child’s community of origin: “The introduction of inclusive education in the local community must take place alongside a strategic commitment to the ending of institutions for persons with disabilities.”<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Guidance on ensuring the respect for the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union when implementing the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESI Funds) available at: [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52016XC0723\(01\)&from=EN](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52016XC0723(01)&from=EN)

<sup>12</sup> General Comment 4 on Article 24 Right to inclusive education

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.



### 3. Previous action taken to solve the problem\*

Have you already taken any action in the Country in question to solve the problem?\*

In March 2019, ENIL first raised concerns about the use of EAFRD for segregating institutions in Austria at DG AGRI. In August 2019, ILA filed a complaint about the misuse of EAFRD for institutions at the Austrian Disability Council, which is the official representative of persons with disabilities in the development and implementation of ESIF programmes in Austria. According to the information we have, and which was provided in confidence, meetings took place with representatives of different Federal Ministries, as well as with the EAFRD advisory body, in autumn 2019. Concerns about the investments and their misalignment with the UNCRPD were raised and alternative approaches to residential facilities and sheltered workshops were presented. The Austrian Disability Council handed over an information letter which shows how a UNCRPD-compliant use of funds would work. This document was then brought to the attention of the EAFRD Managing Authorities and the Laender by the Ministry of Social Affairs.

The first complaint (reference: AT CHAP(2020)01883) was submitted to the European Commission in July 2020. The complaint was submitted by the European Network on Independent Living and Independent Living Austria. It relates to the segregation and social exclusion of women and men with disabilities in facilities co-financed by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD).

The second complaint (reference: CHAP(2021)01440) was submitted to the European Commission in April 2021. The complaint was submitted by the European Network on Independent Living and Independent Living Austria. It relates to the segregation and social exclusion of women and men with disabilities in facilities co-financed by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), including one large facility for children with disabilities.

**IF NOT** please specify below as appropriate

- Another case on the same issue is pending before a national or EU Court
- No remedy is available for the problem
- A remedy exists, but is too costly
- Time limit for action has expired
- No legal standing (not legally entitled to bring an action before the Court) please indicate why:

- No legal aid/no lawyer
- I do not know which remedies are available for the problem
- Other – specify

4. If you have already contacted any of the EU institutions dealing with problems of this type, please give the reference for your file/correspondence:

- Petition to the European Parliament – Ref:.....
- European Commission – Ref: AT CHAP(2020)01883, CHAP(2021)01440
- European Ombudsman – Ref:.....
- Other – name the institution or body you contacted and the reference for your complaint (e.g. SOLVIT, FIN-Net, European Consumer Centres)


5. List any supporting documents/evidence which you could – if requested – send to the Commission.

 Don't enclose any documents at this stage.

## 6. Personal data\*

Do you authorise the Commission to disclose your identity in its contacts with the authorities you are lodging a complaint against?

Yes       No

 *In some cases, disclosing your identity may make it easier for us to deal with your complaint.*