

# more

Motivations, experiences and consequences of returns and readmissions policy: revealing and developing effective alternatives



## National Summary Report

Experiences, expectations and views of migrants and professionals in the field around RR and alternative policies

### Case Study: Sweden

*Authors: Aida Ibricevic and Zoran Slavnic*

Funded by



Funded by  
the European Union

Co-funded by



UK Research  
and Innovation

*Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.*

*Project Number: 101094107*



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by



UK Research and Innovation

**Disclaimer:**

This document provides a concise summary of the key findings of **MORE Project WP5 in Sweden**. For detailed analysis, evidence, and comprehensive insights, please refer to the full report. The information in this summary should not be considered complete or fully representative of the entire study.

**DOI:** 10.5281/zenodo.18223483

**Publication date:**

September 2025

PROJECT COORDINATOR



PARTNERS





When discussing « people at risk of return » in Sweden, it is important to note that their experiences often **stretch over many years**, in some cases decades. This is due to long processing times and the possibility of appeal of a rejected asylum claim and re-application. During this long and arduous time, the persons at risk of return could have been asylum seekers for part of that time, rejected asylum seekers who are in some stage of the appeals process for another couple of years, or completely undocumented migrants for some other time. Therefore, all aspects of experiences of “people at risk of return” are considered along the full spectrum of asylum seeker to rejected asylum seeker to undocumented migrant-to residence permit holder.

Housing for people at risk of return in Sweden is an area of **considerable policy changes**. For example, if an asylum application was filed with the Migration Agency prior to March 1, 2025, the applicant, previously housed in private accommodation, needs to move into the Migration Agency provided housing by August 31, 2025. Otherwise, the asylum seeker loses their financial assistance. Migrant perceptions of living conditions depend on the **length of time** spent in a state of precarity. People are impacted differently depending on **their country of origin**. The main point of distinction is whether the migrant **can be returned by force or not**. The greatest obstacle for migrants at risk of return is their **lack of a personal number** in Sweden. Because they do not have a personal number, migrants (including asylum seekers, failed asylum seekers and undocumented migrants) cannot get a « first-hand » contract for an apartment in Sweden and cannot register their address. Without a personal number it is also not possible to open a **bank account** or access a wide range of **services in Sweden, including education**. Living in accommodation/return centers comes with extra risks for particularly vulnerable groups, such as **LGBTQI people**, who could be exposed to **violence and threats**.

In principle, asylum seekers have had the **right to work** in Sweden, only under the condition that they have **valid identification documents**, such as a passport. Once they receive a final return decision, they no longer have permission to work. The **nation-wide** proscribed **minimum of healthcare provision** for asylum seekers, rejected asylum seekers, and undocumented migrants is **limited to emergency healthcare**. However, there are **regional differences** and some Swedish regions are providing free or highly subsidized healthcare. People at risk of return maintain the strongest social connections either with **people that are in a similar life situation** or with **co-ethnic diaspora groups in Sweden**. Civil society organizations have a host of different **social inclusion projects** aimed at people at risk of return. Some of the most frequently observed effects of immobility, were high blood pressure and overall deteriorating physical health, however the effects on mental health were more pronounced with many instances of **depression, anxiety, trauma, PTSD** and more **severe psychiatric disorders**, including **suicidal ideation**. Detention has the worst effect on overall



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Funded by  
the European Union

Co-funded by



UK Research  
and Innovation

migrant wellbeing. Migrants turn to their own **networks** within the country or transnational, in-person or digitally for support, information transfer and solidarity.

PROJECT COORDINATOR



PARTNERS

