



National Summary Report

Case study: Germany



National Summary Report

Exploration and analysis of further public and civic alternatives to RR: case studies at multiple levels

Case study: **Germany**

Authors: Svenja Schurade, Peer Yousif Diercks, Sabine Hess, Institute for Cultural Anthropology / European Ethnology, Georg August University Göttingen, Germany

With support of Selmar Krug, Azadeh Allahyari, Ahmet Hilmi Güler, Rojhat Rafo, Simón Lobos, and Fiona Dubois.

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



The MORE Consortium

Coordinator

UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA, SPAIN

Partners

UNIVERSITA CA' FOSCARI VENEZIA, ITALY

UNIVERSITÉ LIBRE DE BRUXELLES, BELGIUM

PLATFORM FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ON UNDOCUMENTED MIGRANTS ASBL,
BELGIUM

MIROVNI INSTITUT, SLOVENIA

KMOP – KENTRO MERIMNAS OIKOGENEIAS KAI PAIDIOU, GREECE

RED BARNET, DENMARK

LINKOPINGS UNIVERSITET, SWEDEN

GEORG-AUGUST-UNIVERSITÄT GÖTTINGEN STIFTUNG OFFENTLICHEN RECHTS, GERMANY

CENTRE FOR EUROPEAN POLICY STUDIES, BELGIUM

Associated Partner

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD'S CENTRE ON MIGRATION, POLICY AND SOCIETY,
UNITED KINGDOM

To cite:

Schurade, S., Diercks P., Y., Sabine Hess, S. (2026) WP7. Country Report on alternatives. Germany. Executive Summary. MORE Project. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20843444

Publication date

May 2026

Disclaimer

This document provides a concise summary of the key findings of the WP7 national report in Germany. 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.





Table of contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Legal status: Regularization in Germany	4
3. Civil society-based alternatives.....	6
4. Church asylum under attack.....	8
5. Conclusion	11
6. References / Further Reading	12

1. Introduction

Internationally, research has shown for years that return policies remain highly inefficient, costly, and complex, with many attempts at deportation continuing to fail (Lindberg, 2023). This is the case in Germany as well, where half to two-thirds of such endeavors have been unsuccessful for years now (BT-Drs. 20/890, 2021; BT-Drs. 20/5795, 2022, 2023; Schurade, Hess, and Krug, 2025). Instead of further enforcing returns by all means, research has emphasized how regularization can provide a more “effective response” to the problematized enforcement deficits (Chauvin, Garcés-Mascareñas, and Kraler, 2013; Jonitz and Leerkes, 2022). Also in Germany, in fact, residency rights have been expanded since the 1990s in parallel to the constant political emphasis on return. Against this backdrop, our research highlights several initiatives and regularization procedures that exist in Germany and offer alternative approaches to return policies.

2. Legal status: Regularization in Germany

Several regularization mechanisms and programs have existed in Germany since the 1990s, ones mainly based on humanitarian principles. Due to ongoing protests, a political church asylum movement, and the fact that many migrants cannot be returned, programs started in the 1990s as “old case” regulations (§ 104a and b (§ 104a and b Aufenthaltsgesetz (AufenthG), n.d.) for specific groups—as defined by key dates by which migrants must have lived in Germany for a defined pre-tolerance period.¹ Additionally, hardship commissions (§ 23a AufenthG) were established on the federal level as a means of **regularizing exceptional cases** of hardship from 2008 onward. These commissions have been implemented at the federal state (Bundesländer) level, with differing criteria and processes.

Regularization mechanisms **based on the paradigm of “integration”** have been in place since 2011. Against the backdrop of ongoing debates on skilled-labor shortages and political pressure from economic actors, as well as a public discussion on rewarding “integration efforts” on the part of migrants, two laws have been implemented: § 25a AufenthG for “well-integrated” young people, and § 25b AufenthG for all migrants who meet certain integration criteria. As our research shows, the obstacles enshrined in these criteria (such as to earn one’s own living, no criminal record, fulfilling the “obligation to cooperate” with the immigration

¹ Germany has the non-status of tolerated stay (Duldung) for people who cannot be deported but also are not get eligible for a residence permit.

authorities in terms of securing identity documents, language skills, pre-toleration times) are high. They systematically exclude asylum seekers from safe countries of origin and introduce a performance-based approach (Schurade, 2025; Schurade et al., 2025a).

To address the shortcomings of the existing right-to-stay regulations, the Law of Residence Opportunities (§ 104c AufenthG) was introduced in 2022 as a special regularization program. This law offers a 18-month probationary residence period with reduced passport- and integration requirements. During this probationary period, migrants have the chance to fulfill the requirements of the general right to stay mechanisms—namely the passport requirements and to earn one's own living. However, this law only applies migrants who have resided legally in Germany for at least five years as of October 31, 2022.

Our research demonstrates as well that recent legal reforms to migration and return laws also lead to further social and economic exclusion, making it ever more difficult to achieve the criteria set out by these regularization programs (Riedner & Hess, 2024; Schurade, 2025; Schurade et al., 2025a).

Additionally, **humanitarian regularizations** based on §§ 25(5), 60(5) and 60(7) AufenthG were introduced in 2005, offering access based on family ties and de facto non-returnability. However, also those pathways have become restricted due to several legislative changes in recent years. For example, the requirements for humanitarian residence based on medical obstacles to deportation increased with the Law on the Introduction of Accelerated Asylum Procedures (Gesetz zur Einführung beschleunigter Asylverfahren, BMI, 2016). Since then, it has been stipulated that deportation can only be suspended if there is a significant, concrete danger to health, such as life-threatening or serious illnesses being significantly aggravated by repatriation. This does not presuppose that the standard of medical care in the destination country is equivalent to that in the Federal Republic of Germany. Furthermore, it is essential that medical health obstacles are supported by a certificate from a qualified doctor, with the exception of therapists.

Even though the existing mechanisms and programs present significant challenges, research nevertheless shows that **options for regularization are still more effective** than deportations in reducing the high number of non-returnable migrants (Ghelli, 2025; Peitz & Carwehl, 2025).²

² By the end of May 2025, 84,106 out of 137,100 migrants living in Germany with Duldung status for five years or more at the key date of October 31, 2022, had been granted a residence permit based on § 104c; around 16,600 of these had been granted a further residence permit by April 30, 2025 (ibid). By contrast, 12,945 (2022), 16,430 (2023) and 20,084 people (2024) were deported during that time (49,459 total) (Statista, 2025). Several of these individuals were denied the right to reside due to the stipulation of the key cutoff date.

Our research highlights that immigration authorities are overwhelmed with work, causing a feeling of deep frustration. Against this backdrop, some implementing agents emphasized that the workload and frustration could easily be reduced by offering regularization mechanisms for migrants (Schurade et al. 2025b), 2025).

3. Civil society-based alternatives

Civil society actors play an important role in providing the necessary support for migrants to meet these criteria, and hence immensely help with securing the implementation of these programs and mechanisms. Civil society in Germany is engaged in multiple ways, supporting migrants in precarious legal situations. In the following, we offer a typology of civil society practices that aim to create alternative approaches to return policies, many of them going beyond the question of residence permits. We categorize the various practices of civil society actors and municipalities into three types: (1) legal protection—opening access to rights; (2) preventing deportation; and (3) facilitating access to society.

1) Legal protection—opening access to rights:

In terms of **legal protection**, our research reveals that many migrants actively seek access to legal pathways, even if the hurdles are high. Throughout the project, our research has shown that counseling services such as Refugee Law Clinics, the project “Wege ins Bleiberecht” (“Pathways to Stay”) as a cross-sector approach implemented by the federal state of Lower Saxony and through distinct municipal immigration authorities in cooperation with civil society institution, and local “contact points” for undocumented migrants aim to improve access to legal-regularization mechanisms. They provide counseling, and support individuals in dealing with the authorities to help them access and enforce their rights.

2) Preventing deportation

Countless initiatives directly aim at preventing deportations, such as church asylum or “soli-” or “citizens asylum” as a sanctuary movement organized by citizens and in private homes. The actions taken to this end range from offering sanctuaries, over direct actions such as blockades, to monitoring and public awareness-raising campaigns. Some of these practices simply aim to prevent a particular instance of enforcement, granting those affected more time to find a way back into the legal process, file a lawsuit, or raise awareness and support for the individual case (mostly by addressing the specific hardship).

3) Facilitating access to socioeconomic rights to meet regularization requirements

Many of those already named projects and an additional number aim to **improve access to socioeconomic rights**, such as contact points for people without papers. In the last few decades, projects have particularly emerged that offer assistance with health-related problems and seek to ensure those concerned enjoy improved access to medical services. In numerous bigger German cities contact points for people without papers as well as health-specific initiatives (such as groups called Medinetz or the “anonymous health insurance card”) were set up, with a strong nationwide network.

As our research shows, return policies strongly influence the living conditions and can lead to downward social spirals (Krug et al., 2025). Institutions and initiatives like social services for homeless people and drug addicts, as well as several grassroots initiatives, such as local Asyl- or Anti-Deportation Cafés, play a vital role in providing low-threshold assistance for those affected to find orientation, obtain information, and enjoy support in a variety of aspects of daily life such as housing, work, schooling, and similar. Accordingly, community-based initiatives such as the local Global Citizens’ Meeting Place and the Anti-Deportation Café in a medium-sized city in Germany are essential for establishing social contact in that country.

As can be seen from these practices, they cover a wide range of activities and address basic living conditions, (mental) health issues, social connections, and access to society, as well as legal residence permits. These aspects are all interrelated and are therefore often addressed together by the mentioned grassroots actors. Our research demonstrates again the relevance of those projects not only to inform migrants in the first place of their rights, legal-regularization options, and how to achieve them. As such, they are often a decisive factor in being able to navigate the administrative hurdles and turning de jure rights into accessible de facto rights. In this sense, civil society is key not only to addressing the shortcomings of the existing right-to-stay regulations but also in making them accessible to those affected in the first place. However these projects find themselves under increasing attack due to the political return-orientated approach, as is the case with the practice of church asylum.

4. Church asylum under attack

Church asylum (Catholic and Protestant) is a long-established practice that aims to **prevent deportation**. It is based on the historically established authority of the two main Christian churches to provide temporary protection against deportation. Under church asylum, migrants move into “sanctuary” rooms that should not be violated by the state. The moral authority of the Church plays a central role here, as its sanctuary practice is directly derived from “Christian values.” This gives Church authority particular weight. In the past, politicians, immigration authorities, and police forces have been mostly reluctant to act against the Church’s moral authority.

The practice of church asylum dates back to a long Christian tradition of providing sanctuary for persecuted individuals. In Germany, the modern concept of church asylum emerged following the death of Cemal Kemal Altun, an asylum seeker, in 1983, who committed suicide in reaction to the return order. His death became a national scandal. Altun had fled Turkey’s military dictatorship and come to Germany as a student in 1981. However, West Germany wanted to expel him to Turkey in order to maintain amicable relations with the latter. His suicide led to the establishment of the church asylum movement (Asyl in der Kirche e. V., 2003).

In recent years, in view of the considerable pressure coming with the enforcement of the Dublin Regulation, churches have primarily been **dealing with “Dublin cases”**—that is, with migrants who got a return order in line with the main clause of the Dublin regulation, stipulating that the first EU country of entry is in charge of the asylum procedure. However, this entails an administrative procedure by which Germany has to ask the concerned country to take back the respective person, limited by a given “transfer period” within which this return needs to be finalized. If it expires, Germany has to take over the asylum procedure. The Dublin III Regulation (Verordnung (EU) Nr. 604/2013) stipulates that Germany has six months to deport a migrant to the deemed first EU country. This period can be extended (up to a maximum of 18 months) if the respective person moves away without letting the immigration authorities know where he/she is living. As long as the place of residence is known to the BAMF, as is the case with registered church asylum, it does not affect the original transfer deadline of six months (BAMF, 2023). In this regard, church asylum primarily helps to bridge the Dublin Regulation period until Germany becomes responsible for the asylum case. This means church asylum mainly offers temporary protection from Dublin-related deportations, thereby giving asylum seekers access to rights, social services, and medical services once the transfer period has expired.

Church asylum has become **increasingly institutionalized**. Although it still does not have recognized legal status, in 2015 an agreement was reached with the main national asylum and migration authority on how to proceed: the so-called dossier procedure (Dossierverfahren). This stipulates that the parish writes a dossier on the individual case. The dossier contains basic personal data and a description of the impending hardship, which can be substantiated further with medical reports or personal accounts from those affected or their supporters. This file is sent to the BAMF, which may decide to take over the asylum procedure voluntarily (self-entry), contrary to the Dublin responsibility of another country (BT Drs. 21/67, 2025). In the beginning the number of dossier procedures and self-entries was high, but in 2016 the responsible department changed to the “Dublin Regulation Department” (Jrs Germany, n.d.). The quota then decreased, and many parishes are not handing over such a dossier anymore.³

In practice, many churches continue to offer sanctuary even if the application is rejected. Several related networks have emerged over the years, such as the Ecumenical Network for Asylum in the Church in North Rhine-Westphalia (Ökumenisches Netzwerk Asyl in Der Kirche in NRW e.V., n.d.) or the Federal Working Group on Asylum in the Church (Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft Asyl in der Kirche, Kirchenasyl.de, 2025). They facilitate exchange between parishes granting church asylum and provide information and support to those needing it.

Every year, **hundreds of migrants** can access regular asylum procedures after their Dublin deadlines have expired while they are in church asylum. In 2022, 1,763 people were in church asylum and in 1,734 cases further asylum proceedings were conducted in Germany (BT Drs. 21/67, 2025). In 2023, 2,703 people were in church asylum, and 2,690 asylum cases were taken over by the BAMF. In 2024, 2,866 out of 2,966 church asylum cases were transferred to the jurisdiction of Germany (BT Drs. 21/67, 2025).

Despite church asylum being a readily acknowledged and tolerated practice for years now, it has come **under attack** in the wake of the current political climate aimed at increasing deportation numbers. Alexander Dobrindt, the current Federal Minister of the Interior and member of the center-right Christian Social Union, for example framed activities like church asylum as part an “aggressive anti-deportation industry” in the summer of 2018. In his eyes, they sabotage the constitutional state and endanger public safety (Forschung-und-Lehre.de,

³ In 2017, just half of the involved churches handed over such a dossier (Jrs Germany, n.d.). In 2022, 2.3 percent of the dossier procedures ended with the self-entry of the BAMF (BT Drs. 20/12757, 2024, p. 3). In 2024, the BAMF took over one case, but rejected the self-entry in 49 cases; additionally, there were 1,596 “other completions” (BT Drs. 21/1668, 2025, p. 4).

2019; for an analysis of these narratives, see: Hänsel et al., 2020; Schurade et al., 2025b).

The AG Rück (2011, p. 4), a federal state working group analyzing the enforcement deficits around deportations in Germany, concluded over a decade ago already that instances of deportation mainly fail because of civil society mobilizing against this practice, which often leads to political pressure not to expel the individual in question. Yet, church asylum has been violated more frequently in recent years. Examples of migrants being apprehended from church asylum include cases in the city of Nettetal in July 2023 (pro Asyl, 2023) and of Bienenbüttel in May 2024 (Niedersächsischer Flüchtlingsrat, 2024). A study conducted by the human rights organization netzpolitik.org (Dachwitz, 2024) found that, between July 2023 and May 2024, evictions from church buildings increased compared to the previous ten years.⁴ Also, nuns and priests have increasingly faced legal proceedings for providing support to migrants as part of church asylum, such as the case of Sister Juliana Seelmann in Würzburg in 2021 and Abbess Mechthild Thürmer of the Benedictine Convent in Kirchsletten, Upper Franconia, in 2023 (domradio.de, 2023). However, most of these trials have resulted in acquittals (Auer, 2022; Oberzeller Franziskanerinnen, 2022).

As can be seen, supporting migrants with a Dublin decision has become more challenging in recent years. The introduction of the so-called security package in 2024 put in place a number of restrictions and sanctions vis-à-vis “Dublin cases.” Since then, those in question have no access to social benefits and/or medical care during the period before Germany becomes responsible for the asylum procedure. Consequently, projects such as church or citizen asylum, which support migrants in overcoming the Dublin deportation period, are forced to allocate more resources to securing access to basic rights while offering sanctuary.

⁴ Six attempted or completed evictions from church asylum between the summer of 2023 and 2024—that is more evictions in ten months than in the entire previous decade.

5. Conclusion

As this report shows, there are **several regularization programs and mechanisms** in Germany. Many of these programs and mechanisms were implemented in the wake of protest movements, as well as a reaction to securing Germany's own economic interests. However, they only regularize certain migrants with Duldung status, and that per specific performance-related criteria or on specific humanitarian grounds—both of which are endangered by current enforced return policies.

Civil society initiatives and organizations continue to provide necessary basic support against exclusion. These efforts range from facilitating access to existing regularization programs and mechanisms, to preventing deportations, through enabling access to society and basic socioeconomic rights. Our research shows that these civil society practices are under increasing pressure due to the political will to deport more efficiently, as well as due to direct attacks and legal proceedings against key actors, further to severe financial cuts in this sector.

Our research demonstrates as well that the current return policy of fostering a more **restrictive approach to migration and return endangers existing regularization mechanisms** on several levels (Krug et al., 2025; Schurade, et al., 2025a, 2025b, 2025c. Based on the in-depth analysis of church asylum, we have shown how this firm stance on migration and return since 2018 increasingly also entails the criminalizing of civil society actors supporting migrants, as pertaining not just to grassroots activists but also institutionally well-established actors such as the church. Our research further highlights how return policies in Germany predominantly produce social exclusion and destitution (Krug et al., 2025; Schurade et al., 2025a, 2025b; Schurade et al., 2025). In line with these findings, Germany's return policies can be said to endanger basic living conditions to such an extent that it has become challenging for those seeking to offer alternative pathways to meaningful counteract this politically intended destitution.

Nevertheless, analysis of the history of anti-deportation protests in Germany makes clear how migrants and civil society actors have continued to be involved in challenging exclusion and opening up pathways into society. Even though increasingly coming under attack, church asylum has enabled hundreds of migrants to access the German asylum procedure, as the figures above make evident. Accordingly, church asylum can be seen as a fairly successful alternative practice to strict return policies—enabling access to rights for those previously threatened by a return order. It is a practice that arises not only from small, marginal solidarity networks, but from a relevant social actor with roots in large segments of society and even the conservative spectrum. Church asylum is specifically successful in making available to migrants sufficient time to access enshrined legal procedures.

6. References / Further Reading

- AG Rück. (2011). Vollzugsdefizite Ein Bericht über die Probleme bei der praktischen Umsetzung von ausländerbehördlichen Ausreisepflichtungen.
https://www.einwanderer.net/fileadmin/downloads/Berichte/2011-04_Bericht_AG_Rueck-1.pdf
- ‘Anti-Abschiebe-Industrie’ ist Unwort des Jahres 2018. (2019). <https://www.forschung-und-lehre.de/zeitfragen/anti-abschiebe-industrie-ist-unwort-des-jahres-2018-1414>
- Asyl in der Kirche – Ökumenische Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft. (2025, August 25).
<https://kirchenasyl.de/>
- Asyl in der Kirche e. V. (2003). Zuflucht gesucht Tod gefunden. <https://fluechtlingsrat-berlin.de/wp-content/uploads/altun.pdf>
- Auer, K. (2022, February 25). Prozess in Bamberg: Mönch gewährt Kirchenasyl - Freispruch bestätigt. Süddeutsche.de. <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/bayern/bamberg-prozess-kirchenasyl-moench-freispruch-muensterschwarzach-1.5537007>
- Aufenthaltsgesetz (AufenthG). (n.d.). Retrieved 30 October 2025, from
<https://dejure.org/gesetze/AufenthG>
- BAMF. (2023). Merkblatt Kirchenasyl.
https://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/AsylFluechtlingsschutz/merkblatt-kirchenasyl.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&
- BMI. (2016). Gesetz zur Einführung beschleunigter Asylverfahren. Bundesministerium des Innern.
<https://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/gesetzgebungsverfahren/DE/gesetz-zur-einfuehrung-beschleunigter-asylverfahren-asylpaket-2.html?nn=9919714>
- BT Drs. 21/67. (2025). Kirchenasyl in Deutschland – Stand: 31. März 2025.
<https://dserver.bundestag.de/btd/21/000/2100067.pdf>
- Dachwitz, I. (2024, May 17). Abschiebungen: Behörden und Polizei brechen immer häufiger Kirchenasyl. netzpolitik.org. <https://netzpolitik.org/2024/abschiebungen-behoerden-und-polizei-brechen-immer-haeufiger-kirchenasyl/>
- Das Dossierverfahren. (n.d.). Retrieved 10 December 2025, from <https://www.jrs-germany.org/was-wir-tun/kirchenasyl/das-dossierverfahren>
- Gericht verhandelt Kirchenasyl-Klage gegen Äbtissin. (2023, February 7). domradio.de.
<https://www.domradio.de/artikel/gericht-verhandelt-kirchenasyl-klage-gegen-aebtissin>
- Ghelli, F. (2025). Chancenaufenthaltsrecht—Der Hauptweg aus der Ausreisepflicht. Mediendienst Integration. <https://mediendienst-integration.de/artikel/der-hauptweg-aus-der-ausreisepflicht.html>
- Hänsel, V., Hess, S., & Schurade, S. (2020). Refugee Protection: Germany Country Report (Version v.1). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.3600613>
- Kirchenasyl: Freispruch für Schwester Juliana Seelmann—Kloster Oberzell. (2022, July 15).
<https://www.oberzell.de/allgemein/kirchenasyl-freispruch-fuer-schwester-juliana-seelmann/>
- Krug, S., Schurade, S., & Hess, S. (2025). Experiences, expectations and views of migrants and

professionals in the field around RR and alternative policies. https://www.moreproject-horizon.eu/sdc_download/1438/?key=tx606kb76kfr3zuftsb8xn271gqp48

Niedersächsischer Flüchtlingsrat. (2024, May 21). Rot-grüne Landesregierung bricht Kirchenasyl in Bienenbüttel (Kreis Uelzen) – Flüchtlingsrat Niedersachsen. <https://www.nds-fluerat.org/59366/aktuelles/rot-gruene-landesregierung-bricht-kirchenasyl-in-bienenbuettel-kirchenkreis-uelzen/>

Ökumenisches Netzwerk Asyl in der Kirche in NRW e.V. (n.d.). Retrieved 1 December 2025, from <https://www.kirchenasyl-nrw.de/>

Peitz, L., & Carwehl, A.-K. (2025). Zwischen Duldung und Bleiberecht: Wie und für wen wirkt das Chancen-Aufenthaltsrecht? (BAMF-Kurzanalyse 03/2025) (Version 1.0) [Application/pdf]. Federal Office for Migration and Refugees. <https://doi.org/10.48570/BAMF.FZ.KA.03/2025.D.2025.CHAUFR.1.0>

pro Asyl. (2023). Erst Bruch des Kirchenasyls, jetzt droht die Abschiebung: Ehepaar darf nicht nach Polen abgeschoben werden! <https://www.proasyl.de/pressemitteilung/erst-bruch-des-kirchenasyls-jetzt-droht-die-abschiebung-ehepaar-darf-nicht-nach-polen-abgeschoben-werden/>

Riedner, L., & Hess, S. (2024). Mapping new colour lines – border studies within a workfare state. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 50(11), 2707–2728

Schurade, S. (2025). Bleiberechte zwischen Rückkehr- und Workfare-Politiken. *Zeitschrift Für Flüchtlingsforschung*, 9(1), 64–97. <https://doi.org/10.5771/2509-9485-2025-1-64>

Schurade, S., Hess, S., & Krug, S. (2025a, February 7). Alternative policy approaches to returns and readmissions. Case study: Germany [Executive Summary]. Zenodo. <https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.14832974>

Schurade, S., Hess, S., & Krug, S. (2025b, February 7). Development of the Return and Readmissions policy across Europe: Multilevel analysis. Case study: Germany [Executive Summary]. Zenodo. <https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.14832948>

Schurade, S., Krug, S., Hess, S., & Diercks, P. Y. (2025,c). WP4 executive summary Germany. Zenodo. <https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.15174784>

www.moreproject-horizon.eu

Funded by



Funded by
the European Union

Co-funded by



UK Research
and Innovation

PROJECT COORDINATOR



PARTNERS



PICUM



The Peace Institute



UNIONING
UNIVERSITY

