



Annual Report on Migration and International Protection Statistics 2009

Produced by the
European Migration Network

June 2012

This EMN Synthesis Report summarises the main findings of National Reports analysing migration and international protection statistics for the year 2009. It is based on contributions from twenty one EMN NCPs, in **Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden** and **United Kingdom** plus Norway.

Topics covered are Indicators of the Effect of the Economic Crisis; Legal Immigration and Emigration; Irregular Migration: Refusals, Apprehensions and Return; and International Protection, including Asylum.

This Report continues a series of Annual Reports from 2001. Since 2008, the analysis has been of data produced in accordance with the Migratory Statistics Regulation 862/2007.

This EMN Synthesis Report, as well as the National Reports and Data upon which the synthesis is based, is available from: www.emn.europa.eu, under "Migration and International Protection Statistics."

CONTENTS

DISCLAIMER.....	5
EXPLANATORY NOTE	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	6
1. INTRODUCTION.....	12
2. METHODOLOGY.....	12
3. INDICATIONS OF THE EFFECT OF THE ECONOMIC CRISIS.....	14
3.1 Impact on legal migration	14
3.2 Impact on irregular migration	16
3.3 Impact on international protection, including asylum	16
4. LEGAL MIGRATION	17
4.1 International Migration Flows	18
4.1.1 <i>Immigration</i>	18
4.1.2 <i>Emigration</i>	22
4.1.3 <i>Net Migration</i>	23
4.2 Usual Residence.....	24
4.3 Acquisition of citizenship	28
4.4 Residence permits and residence of third-country nationals	29
5. IRREGULAR MIGRATION: REFUSALS, APPREHENSIONS AND RETURN	34
5.1 Refusals.....	36
5.1.1 <i>Type of border</i>	38
5.1.2 <i>Reason for refusal</i>	39
5.1.3 <i>Refusals by country of citizenship</i>	40
5.2 Apprehensions	42
5.3 Returns	45
5.4 Relationship between Refusals, Apprehensions and Returns.....	48
6. INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION, INCLUDING ASYLUM	51
6.1 Applications for International Protection	53
6.1.1 <i>Total asylum applications</i>	53
6.1.2 <i>New applications for international protection</i>	56
6.1.3 <i>Unaccompanied Minors</i>	59
6.1.4 <i>Asylum applications under consideration</i>	60
6.1.5 <i>Withdrawn asylum applications</i>	61
6.2 Decisions on International Protection.....	62
6.2.1 <i>First instance decisions</i>	62
6.2.2 <i>Final decisions</i>	65
6.2.3 <i>The proportion of positive and negative decisions by Member States</i>	65
6.2.4 <i>Positive and negative decisions by country of citizenship</i>	68
6.3 Resettled Persons	70
6.4 Dublin Transfers	70
ANNEX 1: HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX 2009	73
ANNEX 2: TABLES OF DATA	74

TABLE OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1:	Third-country nationals apprehended/found to be illegally staying, by Member State, 2009.....	9
Figure 2:	Positive First Instance Decisions on Asylum Applications, by status granted and by Member State, ordered by number of decisions, 2009.....	11
Figure 3:	Overall Immigration by Member State in 2008 and 2009 (in 1 000), ordered by decreasing 2009-figures.	19
Figure 4:	Immigration by Member State and by main group of citizenship, as a percentage of total immigration, ordered by nationals immigrating, 2009	20
Figure 5:	Immigration by Member State and by main group of citizenship, as a percentage of total immigration of citizens of countries outside the EU-27, ordered by relative share of immigration of nationals from highly developed non-EU countries, 2009	21
Figure 6:	Immigration of citizens from countries outside the EU-27 into the EU and Norway, top 20 country of citizenship, in 1 000's and in 2009.....	22
Figure 7:	Overall Emigration by Member State in 2008 and 2009 (in 1 000), ordered by decreasing 2009 emigration figures	23
Figure 8:	Net migration by Member State in 2009 (in 1 000), ordered by decreasing numbers	24
Figure 9:	Number of residents who are citizens of countries outside the EU-27 and Norway, by Member State, in 1 000, 1st January 2010, ordered by decreasing numbers	25
Figure 10:	Usual residence by Member State and by main group of citizenship, as a percentage of total residents, ordered by percentage, 1 st January 2010	26
Figure 11:	Usual residence of non-EU nationals by Member State and by main group of citizenship, as a percentage of resident citizens of countries outside the EU-27, 1 st January 2010	27
Figure 12:	Acquisition of citizenship by Member State including Norway in 2009, in 1 000's ordered by decreasing numbers of acquisitions	28
Figure 13:	First residence permits, by reason, for EU-27* as a whole, 2009.....	30
Figure 14:	First residence permits, by type of reason and Member State, 2009, ordered by number of first residence permits.....	31
Figure 15:	First residence permits for remunerated activities, by reason and Member State, 2009, ordered by total number of first residence permits	34
Figure 16:	Third-country nationals refused entry, by Member State, 2009. Ordered by number of nationals.....	37
Figure 17:	Third-country nationals refused entry, by Member State and by external border, 2009.....	38
Figure 18:	Third-country nationals refused entry, by reason and EU level 2009.....	39
Figure 19:	Third-country nationals apprehended/found to be illegally staying, by Member State, 2009, ordered by number of persons apprehended	42
Figure 20:	Third-country nationals found to be illegally staying, top 20 countries of citizenship, EU level, 2009. Ordered by number of nationals.	43
Figure 21:	Third-country nationals (a) ordered to leave and (b) returned following an order to leave, by Member State, 2009. Ordered by number of nationals.....	46
Figure 22:	Third-country nationals returned to a third country following an order to leave, by country of citizenship, EU level, 2009, ordered by number of nationals.....	48
Figure 23:	Total number of asylum applications by Member State, ordered by number of applications, 2009	54
Figure 24:	Total Asylum Applications at the EU level, top 20 countries of citizenship 2009	55
Figure 25:	Number of new asylum applications by Member State, ordered by number of applications, 2009	57
Figure 26:	New Asylum Applications at EU level, top 20 countries of citizenship, 2009.....	58

Figure 27:	Asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors, by Member State and Norway, 2009.....	59
Figure 28:	Asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors, by country of citizenship, 2009	60
Figure 29:	Asylum Applications under Consideration per Member State, 2009.....	61
Figure 30:	Withdrawn Asylum Applications per Member State, 2009	61
Figure 31:	First instance Decisions on Asylum Applications, by type/status, EU level*, 2009	63
Figure 32:	Positive First Instance Decisions on Asylum Applications, by status granted and by Member State, ordered by number of decisions, 2009.....	64
Figure 33:	Share of Positive and Negative Decisions on Asylum Applications by Member State, ordered by (a) number of first instance and (b) final decisions, 2009	66
Figure 34:	Top 20 Countries of Citizenship, by positive and negative first instance decisions, EU level, 2009	68
Figure 35:	Top 20 Countries of Citizenship, by positive and negative final decisions, EU level, 2009.....	69

TABLES

<u>Table 1:</u>	Third-country nationals refused entry, EU level, Top 20 countries of citizenship, 2009.....	40
<u>Table 2:</u>	Dublin Transfers: Incoming and outgoing requests by type and by Member State, 2009.....	71

Disclaimer

This report has been produced by the European Migration Network (EMN), collectively comprising of the European Commission, its EMN Service Provider (GHK-COWI) and EMN National Contact Points (EMN NCPs). This report does not necessarily reflect the opinions and views of the European Commission, GHK-COWI or of the EMN NCPs, nor are they bound by its conclusions. Similarly, the European Commission, GHK-COWI and the EMN NCPs are in no way responsible for any use made of the data provided.

Explanatory Note

This Synthesis Report was prepared on the basis of the data provided in each EMN NCP's National Report on Migration and International Protection Statistics 2009, their 2009 tables of data and/or the Eurostat database.

Twenty one EMN NCPs from **Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden and United Kingdom** plus **Norway**¹ each submitted a National Annual Report on Migration and International Protection Statistics 2009.²

The EMN Service Provider (GHK-COWI) produced statistical tables of data from 2009 by extracting data from the Eurostat database, using standardised template tables, which were subsequently validated and / or revised by EMN NCPs.³

The Member States⁴ mentioned above are given in **bold** when referenced in this Report and when reference to "Member States" is made this is specifically for those Member States. References to those Member States not listed in bold, are on the basis of Eurostat data only.

Additional National Reports, for EMN NCPs from Member States that could not, for various reasons, be included in this Synthesis Report, may become available on the EMN website.

¹ Commission Decision C(2010)6171 of 13th September 2010 established the basis for administrative cooperation between the European Commission and the Ministry of Justice and the Police of the Kingdom of Norway for the participation of **Norway** in the EMN. This was the culmination of a process, foreseen in Article 10 of Council Decision 2008/381/EC, following an initial approach by the Mission of Norway to the European Union in 2009. The Working Arrangement entered into force on 15th November 2010, and places emphasis on the gradual development of co-operation with Norway, working towards a sustainable partnership of mutual benefit.

² Available from <http://emn.europa.eu> under "Annual Report on Migration and International Protection Statistics 2009."

³ Available from <http://emn.europa.eu> under "Tables of Migration and International Protection Statistics 2008 onwards."

⁴ Whilst **Norway** is also included in this Synthesis Report, statistics for **Norway** are not included in any of the EU averages and EU totals.

Executive Summary

This Synthesis Report summarises the main findings for the year 2009 of the analysis of migration and international protection statistics undertaken by 21 EMN NCPs (**Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden and United Kingdom**). References to those Member States in the Report who did not submit a National Report (not listed in 'bold') are on the basis of Eurostat data only.

Indications of the effect of the economic crisis

There are indications in 2009 that the impact of the economic crisis has been consolidated in 2009, and 2009 was the first full year where the various effects of the current downturn became apparent.

The effects of the economic crisis are evidenced best in relation to legal migration (Section 3.1), where nine of the 12 Member States that experienced a decrease in the number of immigrants in 2009, explicitly cited the economic crisis, and the Member State's specific economic situation, as an important reason for the decrease in immigration (**Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, Slovenia and Slovakia**). This suggests that the reduction in employment opportunities resulting from the crisis has had an impact on the numbers of immigrants arriving in some Member States.

The picture on emigration in 2009 in relation to the economic downturn is rather more mixed, and overall whilst net-migration for the EU remained positive in 2009, i.e. there was a larger inflow than outflow of migrants, the downward trend overall in positive net migration from 2007 to 2008 has continued into 2009 with a further decrease of some 20%.

The perception of reduced opportunities relating to the crisis may have influenced individual decisions in relation to irregular migrants coming to the EU for the purpose of employment (Section 3.2), contributing to the decrease in the number of persons refused at the borders, by -21%, and the number of persons apprehended for illegal stay, by -7%. There is evidence that the economic crisis may have influenced increases in the numbers of apprehensions and returns. Many illegally staying third country nationals who were apprehended (and subsequently returned) in 2009, initially entered the Member States legally, and then overstayed their visas or residence permits. This was observed in **Austria, Belgium, Estonia and Poland**.

The precise reasons behind the numbers of applications for international protection (Section 3.3) to a particular Member State are complex, and impact of the global economic downturn is but one of many factors. The concentration of asylum applicants in 2009 were from countries showing conditions of political unrest (for example, Afghanistan, Somalia, Iraq and Kosovo), suggests that this factor remains dominant.

Overall, it should be noted that, whilst a number of indicators are apparent in the statistics for 2009, the full effects of the economic crisis on migration flows are not yet fully evident, and trends would need to be studied further in the light of developments in 2010 and 2011.

Legal migration⁵

Regarding international migration flows (Section 4.1), similar trends from 2008 continued in 2009. A total of 2.7 million people immigrated to EU Member States and Norway and 1.6 million people

⁵ Data on immigration and/or emigration is missing for Bulgaria, **France**, Greece, and Romania. Eurostat furthermore indicates breaks in series in 2009 for **Austria, Germany** and the **Netherlands**. These seven Member States are not included in the summary.

emigrated from a Member State and Norway, either to another Member State or a third country.⁶ A valid comparison of aggregate migration data with previous years is not feasible in 2009 as Eurostat reports a break in data series for **Austria**, **Germany** and the **Netherlands** in 2009 and for the Czech Republic, Denmark, **Estonia**, **Hungary**, **Norway**, **Poland**, **Slovenia** and the **United Kingdom** in 2008.

On immigration (Section 4.1.1), the decrease in immigration to Member States and **Norway** registered in 2008 continued through 2009. This decrease, however, follows an upward trend in immigration over the last decade, and can be observed at Member State-level among the 20 Member States with valid data for both 2008 and 2009, and Norway. Of these, 15 Member States and Norway observed a decrease in immigration in 2009, whereas only five Member States reported an increase. Compared to 2008, the highest decreases in absolute terms of immigrants in 2009 were registered by **Italy** (-92 000), the Czech Republic (-33 000) and **Ireland** (-27 000). In relative terms the largest decreases were recorded by **Ireland** (-42%), Spain (-31%), the Czech Republic and **Lithuania** (both -30%).

On emigration (Section 4.1.2) no clear trend can be observed at Member State-level regarding emigration. As in 2008, the number of Member States in 2009 that reported an increase in emigration figures (12 Member States) was higher than the number of Member States which saw a decrease in emigration figures (9 Member States). The largest decrease was recorded in the **United Kingdom** (59 000, 14%), whereas the largest relative decrease was reported by **Poland** (-44%).

Net-migration (immigration minus emigration) (Section 4.1.3) for the EU and Norway was positive in 2009, by about 1.1 million people⁷, thus continuing the downward trend in positive net migration from 2007 to 2008 by a further decrease of approximately 20%. Two Member States, **Ireland** and **Malta**, changed from having a positive net-migration in 2008 to a negative net-migration in 2009, primarily because of huge drops in immigration figures.

Regarding usual residence (Section 4.2), 20 252 000 citizens of non EU-27 countries have their usual residence in the EU and Norway.⁸ The largest number of third country nationals live in **Germany** (4 585 000). Approximately 767 000 persons acquired citizenship (Section 4.3) in a Member State in 2009. Most acquisitions of citizenship were recorded in the largest Member States: **United Kingdom** (203 630), **France** (135 842) and **Germany** (96 122).

Approximately 767 000 persons acquired citizenship (Section 4.3) in a Member State in 2009.⁹ This represents an increase of some 16% on the previous year. The largest numbers of acquisitions of citizenships were recorded by (in decreasing order): **United Kingdom** (204 000), **France** (136 000), **Germany** (96 000), Spain (80 000) and **Italy** (59 000).¹⁰

Family reasons and remunerated activities constituted the two primary reasons for obtaining first residence permits (Section 4.4) in the EU (approximately 28% of the total each). Educational reasons constituted a further 21%. These relative percentages roughly correspond to those of 2008,

⁶ Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables and Eurostat data. The numbers include 21 EU Member States which have available data plus **Norway**, Bulgaria, **France**, Greece, **Malta** and Romania are not included because of incomplete or missing data.

⁷ Note that this number does not include Bulgaria, **France**, Greece and Romania.

⁸ Data not available for Bulgaria and Romania.

⁹ Data do not include Bulgaria and the **United Kingdom**

¹⁰ According to Eurostat Metadata, a number of different concepts, definitions and data sources are used in different Member States, which can make comparisons difficult and occasionally misleading. Member States also differ in terms of the conditions that must be fulfilled to acquire or lose a citizenship.

although the number of residents permits granted by all Member States for educational reasons increased by some 13%

Irregular migration: refusals, apprehensions and returns


The overall picture at EU level points to the continuation of a tendency of decreasing numbers of refusals (Section 5.1) at the external borders. A total of 499 645 third-country nationals were refused entry into an EU Member State in 2009, which represents a notable decrease of 21% compared to 2008. The refusals of entry were distributed very unevenly among the Member States. In particular, Spain stands out with 387 015 refusals, of which 97% were issued to nationals of Morocco. A large proportion of the overall decrease in the EU between 2009 and 2008 can be ascribed to a reduced number of persons refused entry at the Spanish borders. The Member State with the second highest number of refusals was **Poland** (26 890), followed by **United Kingdom** (20 460). At the other end of the scale was **Luxembourg** with no recorded refusals and **Sweden** with 35.

Regarding type of border (Section 5.1.1), refusals of entry into the Member States with external borders to the Schengen Area (especially eastern borders) mostly occur at land borders (87% of the total number), whereas refusals of entry into other Member States are more likely to take place at air borders (12% of total).

The most frequently used ground for refusal of entry (Section 5.1.2), throughout the Member States, was related to the lack of a valid visa or residence permit (39% of the total number of refusals). Other frequently reported reasons were unjustified purpose and conditions of stay (24%), insufficient means of subsistence (13%) and lack of valid travel documents (9%). By decreasing order, Morocco, Ukraine, Brazil, the Russian Federation, Georgia, Belarus, Croatia, Turkey, Serbia and China were the most frequent countries of citizenship of persons being refused entry (Section 5.1.3).

A total of 567 427 third-country nationals illegally staying in the Member States were apprehended in 2009 (Section 5.2). This represents a 7% decrease compared to 2008, where 611 840 were apprehended. The highest number of apprehensions in the EU took place in Greece (108 317) followed by Spain (90 500), **France** (76 355), **United Kingdom** (69 745) and **Italy** (53 440).

As in previous years, different reasons for developments regarding irregular stay and the number of apprehensions of third-country nationals staying illegally were observed, for example, related to changes in irregular migration routes and entry points of third-country nationals, as well as the enlargement of the Schengen Area, increased surveillance and focus on countering irregular migration of several Member States, including cooperation with third countries, and developments with regard to international protection (apprehended third-country nationals may apply for international protection, and some of the persons apprehended may be rejected asylum applicants).

Figure 1: Third-country nationals apprehended/found to be illegally staying, by Member State, 2009

Source: EMN NCP National. Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. This figure is included in [Section 5.2](#)

The most frequent country of citizenship of the persons apprehended for illegal stay was Albania (68 985), Afghanistan, (49 670), Morocco (32 555), Iraq (23 425) and Brazil (18 565), which also comprised the top five in 2008.

The most frequent countries of citizenship of those returned ([Section 5.3](#)) were: Albania (63 190), Morocco (15 380), Brazil (11 710), India (8 710) and Ukraine (8 340). For the EU-27 as a whole, a total of 595 553 third-country nationals were ordered to leave a Member State in 2009 with Greece, Spain and **France** and being the Member States issuing most orders (respectively 126 140, 103 010 and 88 565). In total, 252 779 third-country nationals were returned following an order to leave. Both the numbers of orders to leave and returns were generally highest amongst the EU-15, with **United Kingdom** returning the most persons (64 945), followed by Greece (62 850) and Spain (28 865). As in previous years, the bulk of apprehensions and returns of third-country nationals relate primarily to citizens of third countries neighbouring, or within the geographical proximity of, the relevant Member State, or citizens of third-countries with historical, cultural or linguistic ties to the Member State.

When looking at the possible links between apprehensions, refusals and returns ([Section 5.4](#)), there is a clear convergence of nationalities in some Member States, but the statistics do not show a clear correlation at EU level. The only countries of citizenship in the top five of all three categories - refused, apprehended and returned - were Brazil and Morocco. A direct link between the number of persons refused and apprehended is limited by the fact that some migrants who are apprehended initially entered the Member States legally and then overstayed their visas or residence permits.

International protection, including asylum

After a downward trend in the number of applications for international protection ([Section 6](#)) in the period 2004-2006 and slight increase in 2009, the total number of applications remained largely stable in 2009. In total, 266 400 applications were lodged in the EU Member States in 2009.

As in 2008, most applicants per capita were received in **Malta** (5 800 applicants per 1 000 000 inhabitants, Cyprus (3 300) and **Sweden** (2 600). **Norway** recorded 3 570 applicants per 1 000 000 inhabitants. The fewest numbers per capita were recorded in **Portugal**, **Latvia** and **Estonia** (15, 25 and 30 applicants per 1 000 000 inhabitants, respectively). Of the total asylum applications, ([Section 6.1.1](#)) most were received by **France** (47 686), **Germany** (33 035) and **United Kingdom** (31 695). The largest total numbers of applications were, in decreasing order, lodged by nationals of

Afghanistan, the Russian Federation, Somalia, Iraq and Kosovo¹¹. Compared to 2008, applications from nationals of Afghanistan, Georgia and Kosovo increased significantly. Applications from nationals of Serbia continued the decline also observed in 2008. The largest groups of new asylum applicants (Section 6.1.2) in 2009 were nationals of Somalia, Iraq, the Russian Federation, Afghanistan and Kosovo.


The applications received in the Member States depended on various factors, other than the situation in the countries of origin, such as “accessible” migration routes; existing migration chains, social networks and diaspora, as well as the perception of the living conditions and possibility to remain in the Member State. The focus on apprehending illegally staying third-country nationals by authorities in some Member States may also influence the number of applications as some third-country nationals, when apprehended, apply for asylum.

In 2009, 14 738 asylum applications were lodged by unaccompanied minors (Section 6.1.3) - a 26% increase compared to 2008. The five Member States receiving the most applicants from unaccompanied minors (**Austria** 1 040, **Germany** 1 305, **Netherlands** 1 040, **Sweden** 2 250, and **United Kingdom** 2 990) together recorded 59% of the total number of unaccompanied minors. **Norway** recorded 2 500 unaccompanied minors, the second highest number. As in 2008, the **United Kingdom** received the highest number of unaccompanied minors applying for international protection, but the numbers are somewhat more evenly distributed among some Member States in 2009, which to an extent reflects the more even distribution of applicants from Afghanistan, from which the largest share of unaccompanied minors originated.

A total of 175 398 asylum applications were under consideration (Section 6.1.4) in the 25 Member States from which data are available. Of these Member States, **Austria, Belgium, France** and **Germany** had the highest number of applications being processed, all exceeding 20 000 cases. In total, 20 710 asylum applications were withdrawn (Section 6.1.5) in the Member States in 2009 - a 42% increase compared to 2008. Of these, most were withdrawn in **Austria** (4 075), **United Kingdom** (3 720) and **Sweden** (2 915).

In 44% of the positive first instance decisions on applications for international protection (Section 6.2.1) Geneva Convention refugee status was granted; subsidiary protection was granted in 42% of positive decisions; and humanitarian status in 13%. A total of 93 575 final decisions, i.e. appeals of cases rejected in the first instance, were made in the Member States (Section 6.2.2). Of these, 21% were positive. Regarding the proportion of positive/negative first instance decisions (Section 6.2.3) the lowest proportion of positive decisions were made in Greece (0.01%) followed by **Ireland** (4%) and Spain (8%). At the other end of the scale were **Malta** (66%), **Portugal** (63%) and **Slovak Republic** (48%). Most positive decisions on applications for international protection (Section 6.2.4) were granted to citizens of Somalia, Iraq, Afghanistan, the Russian Federation and Zimbabwe. The number of positive decisions granted to citizens of Somalia and Zimbabwe increased significantly.

¹¹ This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence. All subsequent mentions of Kosovo are also understood to be within the context of this statement.

Figure 2: Positive First Instance Decisions on Asylum Applications, by status granted and by Member State, ordered by number of decisions, 2009

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. * Eurostat data used.

Notes: No Member State has reported having granted the temporary protection status.

Grants of authorisations to stay for humanitarian reasons at first instance are not applicable in Belgium, Bulgaria, Estonia, Ireland, France, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Austria, Portugal, and Slovenia (http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/Annexes/migr_asydec_esms_an1.pdf).

The outcome of an asylum procedure can be the granting of a residence permit for humanitarian reasons

(http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/Annexes/migr_res_esms_an6.pdf). These cases are reflected in the data under art. 6 of Reg. 862/2007, i.e. residence permits.

Data do not add up due to rounding.

In relation to resettled persons (Section 6.3), **Germany** (2 070), **Sweden** (1 890) and **Norway** (1 390) accepted the highest number of refugees, followed by **United Kingdom** (945), **Finland** (725), **France** (493), **Denmark** (450), **Netherlands** (370), **Ireland** (190), **Italy** (160), **Belgium** (45) and **Luxemburg** (30). **Austria**, the **Czech Republic**, **Estonia**, **Latvia**, **Hungary**, **Malta**, **Portugal**, **Romania**, **Slovenia** and the **Slovak Republic** did not resettle any persons in 2009.

Regarding Dublin Transfers (Section 6.4), Member States made a total of 39 133 requests to other Member States, to either take back or take charge of an asylum applicant in accordance with Council Regulation 343/2003 (the Dublin Regulation) - an increase of 34% compared to 2008. Of these, 69% (27 026) were requests to take back an applicant and 31% (12 107) to take charge.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the tasks of the European Migration Network (EMN), following Council Decision 2008/381/EC of 14th May 2008 establishing its legal base, was to produce the Annual Reports on Migration and International Protection Statistics. It is not; however, the purpose of the EMN to collect and collate the statistics, as this is done by the Commission's Eurostat in co-operation with the relevant official national data providers, which are often from the same entity as the EMN NCPs. Instead, the purpose of the EMN contribution is to analyse the statistical trends on asylum, migration, illegal entry, stays and removals in the Member States. This facilitates comparisons and interpretations pertaining to migratory trends at the European level, as well as in an international context.

This Synthesis Report summarises the main findings for the year 2009 of the analysis of asylum and migration statistics undertaken by 21 EMN NCPs from **Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden and United Kingdom**, and is the latest addition to a series of Annual Reports from 2001.¹² As in the 2008 Statistical Synthesis Report, data was produced in accordance with the [Migratory Statistics Regulation 862/2007](#).¹³ This report thus follows the categories of data of the [Migratory Statistics Regulation 862/2007](#), but with some broader thematic restructuring into four main headings, namely

1. Legal immigration and Integration;
2. Illegal immigration and Return;
3. Border Control;
4. Asylum: International protection.

Terms and definitions used in the main follow those applied by Eurostat, in accordance with the [Migratory Statistics Regulation 862/2007](#).

2. METHODOLOGY

The first step was for the participating EMN NCPs¹⁴ to validate that the data, as extracted from the European Commission's Eurostat,¹⁵ were consistent with their most up-to-date national data, and, if necessary, to revise / add missing data. Where data was revised or added, it is referred to in this report as coming from EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. For those EMN NCPs that did not participate in the study, or participated but did not validate the extracted data, it is referred to as

¹² All of these reports, Synthesis and National, are available from <http://emn.europa.eu> under "Migration and International Protection Statistics".

¹³ Available in all Member State languages from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32007R0862:EN:NOT>.

¹⁴ EMN NCPs are often from the same (or have very close links with the) entity that acts as the source of the data eventually provided to Eurostat. Their details may be found in the respective National Reports or from http://emn.intrasoft-intl.com/html/about/country_profiles/profiles.html

¹⁵ See Eurostat Population Section, at <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/introduction>

coming from Eurostat. Subsequently, any necessary additions or revisions made by the EMN NCPs to the Eurostat data in their National Statistical Tables will have been passed on to Eurostat via the official national data providers in the participating Member States so that in time both data from EMN NCP National Statistical Tables and from Eurostat will be the same. The input used to prepare the 2009 Synthesis Report includes 21 National Reports,¹⁶ produced according to common specifications and the statistical tables, following a common standardised format.

The following migration and asylum data were provided for each Member State:

Legal migration

- International migration flows
- Usual residence
- Acquisition of citizenship.
- Residence permits and residence of third-country nationals

Irregular immigration and return

- Apprehensions
- Returns

Border control

- Refusals

International protection

- Applications for international protection, including unaccompanied minors
- Decisions on international protection
- Dublin transfers

Statistics and relevant developments in **Norway**, following their participation in the EMN since 2011 and their contribution to the 2009 Statistical Report exercise, are also included. It is noted, however, that statistics for **Norway** are not included in any EU totals and EU averages presented in this report. The figures and tables in the following sections have been designed to reflect these developments. To the extent possible, the figures and tables show data of nationals from EU-10 and/or EU-2 either as a component of the total number of third-country nationals or, following their accession to the EU, as a component of the total number of EU nationals. Any differences from this approach are indicated in the footnotes to each table.

For each of the following sections, a general overview of the data and main trends, observed at the aggregated EU level, is provided first. This is followed by a summary of the key findings from the Member States. The key findings are divided into analysis and interpretation of statistics and contextual interpretations. It is noted that, given the purpose of an EMN Synthesis Report, not all Member States are represented in each of the following sections. Instead, only developments which

¹⁶ Available from <http://emn.europa.eu> under “Annual Report on Migration and International Protection Statistics 2009”.

occurred in 2009, which are different from those reported in 2008, and are considered to be of relevance to giving an EU perspective have been highlighted. More details on the situation in a particular Member State(s) are given in the available National Reports, as well as in the corresponding Statistical Tables¹⁷ and the 2008 Synthesis Report.¹⁸ Similarly, more information on the political and legislative developments may be found in the EMN Annual Policy Report 2009.¹⁹

Due to the implementation of the [Migratory Statistics Regulation 862/2007](#) for the collection of statistics in 2008 and 2009, there has been a break of series in many of the concepts now defined by the Regulation. Prior to the implementation of the Regulation, common definitions and methodologies to obtain the data that Member States sent to Eurostat were lacking. Consequently, data for 2008 and 2009 is not in all cases comparable with data from previous years. Also, there were still several methodological constraints regarding the Eurostat data for 2009, in the sense that not all data were collected in all Member States and the methods and definitions used in the Member States were not (yet) fully harmonised. More information can be found in the [Eurostat Metadata](#)²⁰ by types of data.

Finally, in some sections, third countries are classified as highly, medium or less developed. This categorization is based on the Human Development Index (HDI) calculated by the United Nations (UN) under the UN Development Programme. It is a composite index incorporating statistical measures of life expectancy, literacy, educational attainment and GDP per capita. The Eurostat list of countries by level of development, based on the UN's 2009 classification, was used in order to reflect this structure - the list of countries is presented in [Annex 1](#).²¹

3. INDICATIONS OF THE EFFECT OF THE ECONOMIC CRISIS

In the EMN Statistical Synthesis Report for 2008, some indications of the impacts of the current 'economic crisis' could be observed from analysis of the statistics in that reference year. There are indications that the impact of the economic crisis has been consolidated in 2009, and as this was the first full year where the various effects of the current downturn became apparent, some statistics pointing to its effect on migration in the EU have been identified.

3.1 Impact on legal migration

In relation to legal migration, nine of the 12 Member States that experienced a decrease in the number of immigrants in 2009 (and submitted an Annual National Statistical Report²²) explicitly pointed to the economic crisis, and the Member State's specific economic situation, as an important reason for the decrease in immigration in their Annual National Statistical Reports (**Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, Slovenia and Slovakia**). This suggests that the reduction in employment opportunities resulting from the crisis has had an impact on the numbers of immigrants arriving in some Member States.

¹⁷ Available from <http://emn.europa.eu> under "Tables of Migration and International Protection Statistics 2008 onwards".

¹⁸ Available from <http://emn.europa.eu> under "Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics 2007".

¹⁹ Available from <http://emn.europa.eu> under "Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics 2008".

²⁰ See: <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/metadata>

²¹ Since the countries are evolving, each year they are reclassified, based on the new values for the statistical indicators included in the development index (for details see the UN site at: <http://hdr.undp.org>).

²² Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark and Spain also reported a decrease in the number of immigrants in 2009, but have not submitted a Annual National Statistical Report.

Other, more specific, indicators support this perspective. In nine Member States in 2009, the primary reason for issuing a first residence permit was on the grounds of remunerated activities. These were: **Slovenia** (76%, 11 910), **Cyprus** (54%, 13 762), **Lithuania** (51%, 1 358), Italy (47%, 235 966), the **Slovak Republic** (43%, 2 302), Denmark (42%, 11 113), Czech Republic (41%, 11 312), **Hungary** (37%, 5 326) and **Poland**²³ (33%, 11 123). Of these nine, only two (EU-15) Member States, **Italy** and Denmark, reported an increase in the number of first residence permits for the purpose of remunerated activities, of 65% and 50%, respectively. For the other seven Member States, all reported a decrease in the number of first residence permits issued for work reasons, of some 40% or more, compared to 2008,²⁴ suggesting that the economic crisis has had an effect on labour migration. This same general trend could be observed at EU-level where 19 out of 26 Member States reported a decline in the number of residence permits issued for remunerated activities reasons. Further, in spite of policy initiatives in 2008 in several Member States to attract labour migrants, there are several examples in the Member States in 2009 of a decline in labour-related immigration from third countries, especially the US, India and Japan).

Compared to 2008, immigration by EU citizens from other Member States has also decreased by 4 percentage points, whereas the return of nationals to their home Member State has increased by 3 percentage points, which may also be most likely attributed to the economic crisis. **Poland** recorded the largest share (77% of the total number of immigrants) of nationals returning to their home country of all Member States in 2009, followed by **Lithuania** (74%), **Portugal** (56%) and **Estonia** (43%).

The picture on emigration in 2009 in relation to the economic downturn is rather more mixed. Whilst the largest number of people emigrating from the EU Member States and Norway (a total of 1 644 000 people) was recorded in the **United Kingdom** (368 000), this constituted a decrease in emigration compared to 2008 by 14% (-59 000). The second largest number of emigrants in 2009 was reported by Spain which, however, registered an increase compared to the previous year of 21% (57 200), in both Spanish and third country nationals, which may well be related to the employment situation. In relative terms, the largest increase compared to 2008 was recorded by **Slovenia** (55%, 6 700), where 80% of those emigrating were third-country nationals (double the number in 2008 in absolute terms). Relative increases in emigration, compared to 2008, were also registered by **Norway** (32%, 4 100), **Lithuania** (29%, 5 000), **Latvia** (23%, 1 400), the Czech Republic (20%, 10 300), **Malta** (12%, 800), **Hungary** (9%, 900), **Ireland** (8%, 5 100), **Estonia** (6%, 300), Denmark (4%, 1 500) and **Belgium** (3%, 3 400).

Whilst overall net-migration for the EU remained positive in 2009, by about 1.04 million people²⁵, and for **Norway** (i.e. in total there was a larger inflow than outflow of migrants) the downward trend overall in positive net migration from 2007 to 2008 has continued into 2009 with a further decrease of some 20%. This can be attributed to many factors, although it is reasonable to assume that the impact on labour migration resulting from the economic crisis will have played a significant role.

²³ Data on first residence permits issued for remunerated reasons does not include long-term visas issued for this purpose.

²⁴ Except in **Poland**, where a simplified system for employing foreign workers has been implemented allowing entry to and work in Poland on the basis of a visa only, and extending the period of legal employment without an obligation to apply for a work permit from three to six months. This has created a lower demand for work and residence permits for nationals of Ukraine, Belarus, Russia and Moldova.

²⁵ Note that this number does not include Bulgaria, **France**, Greece and Romania.

3.2 Impact on irregular migration

Regarding indicators relating to illegal immigration, at EU-level it was recorded that the number of persons refused at the borders decreased by 21%²⁶ and the number of persons apprehended for illegal stay decreased by 7%, while the number of orders to leave and actual returns remained largely stable. Whilst other factors in relation to efforts by Member States and Third Countries to decrease the numbers of irregular migrants at the borders, the perception of reduced opportunities relating to the crisis may also have influenced individual decisions in relation to irregular labour migrants.

It could be expected that the economic crisis would influence the number of apprehensions and returns as the legal reason for stay for some third country nationals might expire *inter alia* due to layoffs. Many illegally staying third country nationals, who were apprehended (and subsequently returned) in 2009, initially entered the Member States legally and then overstayed their visas or residence permit. This was observed in **Belgium, Estonia and Poland**. In **Estonia**, there are about 100 000 'non-citizens' with undetermined citizenship, and some did not prolong their residence permits in time.

Lithuania, for example, witnessed the largest increase in the number of illegally staying third-country nationals being apprehended in 2009, and has attributed this development mainly to the impacts of the economic crisis. On the one hand, the crisis has resulted in job losses for third-country nationals, and thus the loss of their legal ground for stay, and on the other, third-country nationals have used the Member State as a transit country in their quest for employment elsewhere in the EU. The economic crisis has also been attributed as a cause of increased irregular immigration to **Slovenia** by citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina (while irregular immigration from other Balkan countries decreased due to the upcoming visa liberalisations).

3.3 Impact on international protection, including asylum

The number of applications for international protection including asylum in the EU Member States essentially depends on the situation in the respective countries of origin, although specific factors may draw asylum applicants to specific Member States, for example, geographical proximity, migration chains and diaspora, perceived success rates for asylum applications, and perceived work opportunities. Indeed, in 2009, significant variation was apparent across the Member States: **France** (47 686 applications), **Germany** (33 035), **United Kingdom** (31 695), **Sweden** (24 260) and **Belgium** (22 955) all received more than 20 000 applications, whilst **Estonia** (40), **Latvia** (60), Portugal (140), **Slovenia** (200) and **Lithuania** (450) received less than 500, against an overall total number of applications for international protection lodged in the EU Member States of some 266 400, showing little change from 2008 (an increase of some 1% only).

In such circumstances, it is difficult to determine the precise reasons behind the influx to a particular Member State, and thus any assessment of the impact of the global economic downturn, which is impacting both in Member States and in countries of origin, becomes problematic. The largest groups of asylum applicants, considering the total number of applications, in 2009 were nationals of Afghanistan, the Russian Federation, Somalia, Iraq and Kosovo. The number of applications from nationals of Afghanistan and Georgia doubled compared to 2008 and the number of applicants from Kosovo also increased significantly. These increases relate to the conditions of unrest in the above mentioned countries, suggesting that other factors are impacting to influence the statistics for international protection over and above those of the economic crisis.

²⁶ It should be noted that a large part of the decrease is attributed to a significant decline in the number of nationals of Morocco being refused at the Spanish border.

Overall, it should be noted that, whilst a number of indicators are apparent in the statistics for 2009, the full effects of the economic crisis on migration flows are not yet fully evident, and trends would need to be studied further in the light of developments in 2010 and 2011. It should also be noted that flows of migrants to and from Europe are shaped by many interconnecting factors – which are shaped by specific political, social as well as economic circumstances in both countries of origin and destination for migrants to the EU Member States and Norway, which account for the significant variations across (Member) States making overall impact at EU level challenging to interpret effectively.

4. LEGAL MIGRATION

In general, the following main developments and trends have been observed:

- In 2009, only five Member States registered an increase in immigration from the previous year. In 2008, increases were noted in fifteen Member States.
- At EU level, immigration by third-country nationals constitutes 51%, immigration by EU citizens from other Member States 32%, and re-immigration by nationals 17%.
- Immigration by EU citizens from other Member States has decreased by 4 percentage points, whereas return of nationals to their home Member State has increased by 3 percentage points, which is most likely due to the global economic crisis.
- The composition of third-country nationals immigrating to the EU was in 2009: 29% from highly-developed countries, 57% from medium-developed countries and 9% from less-developed countries.
- Net-migration (immigration minus emigration) for the EU (and Norway) was positive in 2009, by about 1.1 million people, thus continuing the downward trend in positive net migration from 2007 to 2008 by a further decrease of approximately 20%.
- The number of third-country nationals residing within the EU in 2009 is 20.3 million. At the same time, 12.5 million citizens of the EU-27 have their usual residence in another Member State or in Norway.
- Approximately 767 000 persons acquired citizenship in a Member State in 2009.
- Family reasons and remunerated activities constituted the two primary reasons for obtaining first residence permits in the EU (approximately 28% of the total each).
- The number of residents permits granted for educational reasons in 2009 increased by 13% (56 000) and permits granted for "other reasons" by 15% (67 000).

4.1 International Migration Flows

In 2009, 2.7 million people immigrated to EU Member States and **Norway** and 1.6 million people emigrated from a Member State and **Norway**, either to another Member State or a third country.²⁷

A valid comparison of aggregate migration data with previous years is not feasible in 2009 as Eurostat reports a break in data series for **Austria, Germany** and the **Netherlands** in 2009 and for the Czech Republic, Denmark, **Estonia, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Slovenia** and the **United Kingdom** in 2008.

4.1.1 Immigration


Figure 3 shows the overall immigration by Member State and **Norway** for 2009, in descending order. **United Kingdom** received the largest immigration flow in 2009 (566 000), followed by Spain (499 000), **Italy** (443 000) and **Germany** (346 000). Overall, Figure 3 shows that all Member States except four (**Belgium, Estonia, Portugal** and **Sweden**) saw a drop in immigration from 2008 to 2009. In the **United Kingdom**, the decrease was relatively small (-4%) underpinning a stable long-term immigration trend since 2002 according to the Member State's Long-Term International Migration (LTIM) estimates.²⁸ Spain, which had the largest number of immigrants in 2008, saw a drop of 227 000 immigrants (-31%) compared to 2008, whereas **Italy** noted a less dramatic decline of 92 000 persons (-17%). In the case of **Germany**, the dramatic decline shown in Figure 5 is in fact due to a break in Eurostat data series, which means that the data for 2008 and 2009 are not comparable.²⁹

Contrary to the general trend, a small group of Member States reported an increase in the number of immigrants from 2008 to 2009, including **Poland** (15%), **Portugal** (9%), **Estonia** (6%), **Belgium** and **Sweden** (both 1%). In the latter three Member States, this increase follows an overall upward trend since 2002, whereas **Portugal** generally has experienced a downward trend since 2002 (-59%). In **Poland, Estonia** and **Sweden** the increase is attributed to the fact that nationals who had emigrated, began returning to their home Member State.

²⁷ Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables and Eurostat data. The numbers include 21 EU Member States which have available data plus **Norway**. Bulgaria, **France**, Greece, **Malta** and Romania are not included because of incomplete or missing data.

²⁸ Prior to 2009, the International Passenger Survey (IPS) was the primary source of estimates for international migration flows for Article 3 of Regulation EC No 862/2007. From 2009 onward Long-Term International Migration (LTIM) estimates are used as the primary source. Eurostat data based on IPS estimates until 2008 show an upward trend in migration to the United Kingdom, however the LTIM data (showing a stable trend) provides for a more reliable diachronic analysis.

²⁹ In line with the requirements of the EU Statistics Regulation, Germany has for the first time delivered to Eurostat data on immigration and emigration while considering the criterion of a minimum time of stay (or absence) for the year 2009. The figures, which are much lower than the plain case data on entries and exits delivered through 2008, have been calculated using estimates and taking into account data from the Central Register of Foreign Nationals.

Figure 3: Overall Immigration by Member State in 2008 and 2009 (in 1 000), ordered by decreasing 2009-figures.


Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. Missing data for BG, GR, FR, CY, RO.

Note: Eurostat indicates breaks in series, in 2009, for DE, NL and AT

The highest number of immigrants, relative to the size of population in 2009 (measured in number of immigrants per 1 000 inhabitants³⁰) was recorded by **Luxembourg** (32), **Malta** (17), **Belgium** (15), **Cyprus** (15), **Slovenia** (15), **Norway** (12), **Sweden** (11) and Spain (11). This list of Member States thus resembles that of 2008, although **Belgium** has moved up from having the seventh largest number of immigrants relative to the size of population in 2008 to the third largest number in 2009, which is due to the fact that the Member State reported a small increase in the number of immigrants contrary to the general downward trend for the EU as a whole.

Figure 4 provides a breakdown of immigrants into main groups of citizenship. At the aggregated EU level, immigration by third-country nationals constitute 51%, whereas immigration by EU citizens from other Member States accounts for 32%, and return by nationals to their home Member State for 17%. Compared to 2008, this means that the share of immigration by EU citizens from other Member States has decreased by 4 percentage points, whereas return of nationals to their home Member State has increased by 3 percentage points, which can most likely be attributed to the global economic crisis.

³⁰ The ratio between the number of immigrants in the calendar year and the mid-year population of the receiving country, for a given year, multiplied by 1000.

Figure 4: Immigration by Member State and by main group of citizenship, as a percentage of total immigration, ordered by nationals immigrating, 2009

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. Missing data for BG, GR, FR, CY, RO.

Poland recorded the largest share (77% of the total number of immigrants) of nationals returning to their home country of all Member States in 2009, followed by **Lithuania (74%)**, **Portugal (56%)** and **Estonia (43%)**. Bulgaria, who topped this list in 2008, has missing data for 2009.

In **Luxembourg**, which has the highest immigration rate relative to the size of its population, the majority of immigrants are citizens of other Member States (76%), mainly from **Portugal, Italy** or one of the three neighbouring Member States: **Belgium, France and Germany**.

Nationals of other Member States also constituted the largest share of immigrants to Malta (55%), Austria (53%), Hungary (51%), Norway (48%), Ireland (43%), Belgium (40%) and the Netherlands (37%). In these (Member States)31, the number of immigrants from other Member States decreased from 2008. In Ireland, the number of immigrants from other Member States decreased by as much as 50% compared to the year before (15 978 in 2009 compared to 32 142 in 2008).


The largest shares of third-country nationals, among all immigrants coming to a Member State in 2009, were recorded by **Slovenia (84% or 25 000)**, **Spain (65% or 324 000)** and **Italy (61% or 271 000)**. Almost half (43%) of all immigrants entering **Slovenia** in 2009 were from Bosnia and Herzegovina (13 000), whereas nationals of Morocco constituted the main share of third-country nationals immigrating to both **Spain (19%)** and **Italy (12%)**.

Figure 5 provides a further breakdown of immigrants from third countries. It shows that, overall, 29% of the third-country nationals immigrating into the EU in 2009 came from highly-developed countries, 57% from medium-developed countries, 9% from less-developed countries, 3% from candidate countries from 2007 and 1% from EFTA-countries.³²

³¹ 2008 data are not available for **Belgium** and **Norway**.

³² European Free Trade Association (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland). The Human Development Index is a composite index incorporating statistical measures of life expectancy, literacy, educational attainment and GDP per capita, for details see the UN site at: <http://hdr.undp.org>. See **Annex 1** for list of countries.

Figure 5: Immigration by Member State and by main group of citizenship, as a percentage of total immigration of citizens of countries outside the EU-27, ordered by relative share of immigration of nationals from highly developed non-EU countries, 2009



Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. **Missing data for BE, BG, FR, CY, RO

In nine Member States, immigration from highly-developed third countries made up the largest share of the total immigration from third countries in 2009: **Slovenia** (78% or 19 900), **Latvia** 78% (900), **Portugal** 62% (6 300), **Lithuania** 62% (900), **Estonia** 60% (700), Greece 59% (32 000), **Ireland** 46% (3 000), **Luxembourg** 46% (1 200), **Austria** 36% (8 800). The dominating groups of third-country nationals in these Member States resembled those of 2008: Nationals of Bosnia and Herzegovina made up the majority of immigrants from highly-developed third countries in **Slovenia** (63%), nationals of the Russian Federation made up the vast majority in the Baltic Member States of **Estonia** (71%) and **Latvia** (83%). The dominating groups of third-country nationals from highly-developed countries in **Luxembourg** were, like in 2008, nationals of the United States (22%) and Brazil (21%).


Eleven Member States received most third-country nationals from medium-developed countries in 2009: Czech Republic (74%), Spain (69%), **Italy** (68%), **Poland** (65%), **United Kingdom** (61%), Denmark (54%), **Netherlands** (53%), **Slovak Republic** (49%), **Hungary** (47%), **Finland** (41%) and **Germany** (39%). As mentioned, nationals of Morocco constituted the largest group of third-country nationals in Spain and **Italy**. In Denmark, nationals of the United States constituted the major countries of origin of third-country nationals, followed by third-country nationals of the medium-developed countries, Philippines and Ukraine. Like in 2008, the **Netherlands** received most third-country nationals from China, followed by Turkey (the latter being a highly developed country). The Member State also observed a decline in the immigration flow from third-countries where labour migrants typically originated from (the United States, India and Japan) compared to 2008, which was explained by the economic crisis. **Finland** also received its main share of third-country nationals from medium-developed countries; however the main country of origin of third-country nationals in 2009, like in 2008, were from the Russian Federation, a highly-developed country. In **Poland**, the largest share of third-country nationals was from Ukraine, a medium-developed country.

Malta and **Sweden** received most of their third-country national immigrants from less-developed countries (82% and 39%). In **Sweden**, the largest group of third-country nationals came from Iraq (17%) and Somalia (13%). However, whereas the number of immigrants from Iraq decreased by

42% (to 8 500), thus following the trend from the previous year, the number of nationals of Somalia immigrating to the Member State increased by 41% (to 6 900).

Figure 6 shows the top 20 of immigration of third-country nationals into the EU in 2009. Nationals of Morocco constitute by far the largest share (97 100) of third-country immigrants moving to the EU in 2009. However, this marked a significant decrease from 2008 by 29%. As in 2008, most of the immigrants from Morocco went to Spain and Italy, who received 64% and 34%, respectively, of all nationals of Morocco immigrating to the EU in 2009. Nationals of Ukraine made up the second largest group of third-country nationals migrating to the EU in 2009, though this entailed a decrease by 33% from the previous year. Nationals from other dominant third-countries of origin in the figure (China, Colombia, Albania, Peru, Brazil and India) followed the same downward trend in 2009.

Figure 6: Immigration of citizens from countries outside the EU-27 into the EU and Norway, top 20 country of citizenship, in 1 000's and in 2009




Source: Eurostat data

4.1.2 Emigration

A total of 1 644 000 people emigrated from an EU Member State and Norway in 2009. The largest number of people emigrating were recorded in the **United Kingdom** (368 000), **Spain** (324 000) and **Germany** (287 000) as shown in Figure 7. In the **United Kingdom**, this constituted a decrease in emigration compared to 2008 by 14% (-59 000). Nearly two-thirds of the emigrants from the Member State left for a third country in 2009 and estimates from the British national Office for National Statistics (ONS) indicate that Australia and the United States were the most common third-country destinations for emigration by its nationals, whereas **Poland** was the most common destination for emigration from **United Kingdom** within the EU (76 000 in 2009), primarily due to the return of nationals of Poland. The second largest number of emigrants in 2009 was reported by Spain which, however, registered an increase compared to the previous year of 21% (57 200). One-third of the persons emigrating were either Spanish nationals or nationals of another Member State, whereas two-thirds were nationals of a third-country. In the case of **Germany**, the apparent decrease in the number of emigrants from 2008 to 2009 is primarily due to a break in data series. Data is thus not comparable for the two years, however, it is worth noticing the largest number of

emigrants in 2009 (118 200) were German nationals, closely followed by nationals of **Poland** (111 400).

Figure 7: Overall Emigration by Member State in 2008 and 2009 (in 1 000), ordered by decreasing 2009 emigration figures



Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. **Missing data for BG, GR, FR, RO


In relative terms, the largest increase compared to 2008 was recorded by **Slovenia** (55%, 6 700), where 80% of the people emigrating were third-country nationals (in absolute terms twice as many as in 2008) of whom most were nationals of countries of Former Yugoslavia returning to their countries of origin. A relative increase in emigration, compared to 2008, was also registered by **Norway** (32%, 4 100), **Lithuania** (29%, 5 000), **Latvia** (23%, 1 400), the Czech Republic (20%, 10 300), **Malta** (12%, 800), **Hungary** (9%, 900), **Ireland** (8%, 5 100), **Estonia** (6%, 300), Denmark (4%, 1 500) and **Belgium** (3%, 3 400). The largest decrease in relative terms in 2009 was recorded by **Poland** (-44%, 32 405) followed by **Austria** (-25%, 19 200), **Portugal** (-17%, 3 500), **Sweden** (-13%, 6 100), **Finland** (-11%, 1 500), **Luxembourg** (-9%, 900), Cyprus (-6%, 700), the **Netherlands** (-5%, 4 700) and the **Slovak Republic** (-2%, 100). In addition, **Italy** reported a decrease in emigration of less than a half percent (400).

4.1.3 Net Migration

Net-migration (immigration minus emigration) for the EU was positive in 2009, by about 1.04 million people³³, and for **Norway**, was positive by about 40.000), meaning that in total there was a larger inflow than outflow of migrants. The downward trend in positive net migration from 2007 to 2008 was thus continued in 2009 by a further decrease of approximately 20%.

As shown in [Figure 8](#), **Italy** (362 000), **United Kingdom** (198 000) and Spain (175 000) recorded the largest positive net migration in 2009. However, in both **Italy** and Spain the positive net migration decreased by large numbers: 91 000 and 284 200, respectively.

³³ Note that this number does not include Bulgaria, **France**, Greece and Romania.

Figure 8: Net migration by Member State in 2009 (in 1 000), ordered by decreasing numbers


Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. **Missing data for BG, GR, FR, and RO

Five Member States had a negative net migration in 2009: **Ireland** (-27 800), **Lithuania** (-15 500), **Latvia** (-4 700), **Estonia** (-800) and **Malta** (-200). Of these five Member States, **Ireland** and **Malta** went from a positive net migration in 2008 to a negative net migration in 2009 primarily due to a relatively large decrease in immigration to the two Member States of -41% (26 500) and -20% (1 800), respectively. In Ireland, this decrease is attributed to the fact that the Irish economy moved into recession in the first half of 2008 causing a dramatic deterioration in labour market conditions. **Estonia**, **Latvia** and **Lithuania** continued their long-term trend of negative net migration in 2009, which even grew due to continued increases in emigration figures of 6%, 23% and 29%, respectively.

4.2 Usual Residence

In total, on 1st January 2010, 20 251 655 nationals of non EU-27 countries had their usual residence in the EU and **Norway** (145 969).³⁴ At the same time, 12 511 118 citizens of the EU-27 have their usual residence in another Member State or in **Norway** (185 649). [Figure 9](#) provides an overview of the number of third-country nationals who were residents in the EU Member States or **Norway** in 2009. The figure shows that the five Member States with the largest number of immigrants in 2009 were the same as those in 2008 and in the same order. Most third-country nationals live in **Germany** (4 585 000).


³⁴ Data does not include Bulgaria and Romania.

Figure 9: Number of residents who are citizens of countries outside the EU-27 and Norway, by Member State, in 1 000, 1st January 2010, ordered by decreasing numbers

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. Missing data for BG and RO.

Figure 10 shows the share of third-country nationals relative to the Member States' total population. The figure shows that **Luxembourg** hosts the largest share of non-nationals (43%) relative to the size of its population. Of all non-nationals with residence in Luxembourg, nationals of other Member States make up the biggest part (86%, or 37% of the total population). **Latvia** and **Estonia** have the largest shares of third-country nationals, as a percentage of their total populations (17% and 15%, respectively). Of these, “non-citizens” (i.e. persons coming from the former USSR who do not hold citizenship of any country) make up the majority in both **Latvia** (90%) and **Estonia**, (49%) followed by nationals of the Russian Federation (8% and 46%, respectively). In general, the composition of third-country nationals in both Member States has clear historical roots in the former Soviet Union, as nationals of Ukraine and Belarus are also prevalent among the third-country nationals.


Figure 10: Usual residence by Member State and by main group of citizenship, as a percentage of total residents, ordered by percentage, 1st January 2010



Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. **Missing data for BG and RO.

Figure 11 provides a breakdown of residents by main group of citizenship, relative to the size of the Member States' populations. The figure shows that, at EU level, citizens from candidate countries (Croatia, Macedonia and Turkey) in 2009 made up 14% of all non-EU nationals, nationals of highly-developed countries made up 30%, nationals of medium-developed countries 47% and nationals of less-developed countries 8%.

Figure 11: Usual residence of non-EU nationals by Member State and by main group of citizenship, as a percentage of resident citizens of countries outside the EU-27, 1st January 2010



Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. **Missing data for BG and RO.
Note: in the case of NO, the category EFTA does not include nationals of the reporting country.

Nationals of highly-developed countries made up the largest share of third-country nationals with usual residence in **Latvia** (99%, 377 489),³⁵ **Estonia** (97%, 195 165), **Lithuania** (91%, 31 540), **Greece** (75%, 590 124), **Slovenia** (74%, 57 552), **Luxembourg** (58%, 17 186), **Austria** (48%, 264 677) and **Finland** (45%, 42 451). In **Finland**, **Estonia**, **Latvia** and **Lithuania**, nationals of the Russian Federation made up the largest share of residents from highly-developed countries. In **Slovenia**, the largest group was from countries of the former Yugoslavia (i.e. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro).³⁶

In most Member States, the largest share of third-country nationals were nationals of medium-developed countries, specifically **Czech Republic** (78%, 225 414), **France** (69%, 1 698 309), **Spain** (66%, 2 198 760), **Italy** (63%, 1 880 711), **Poland** (57%, 17 618), **Cyprus** (54%, 23 519), **United Kingdom** (52%, 1 279 761), **Belgium** (51%, 172 821), **Hungary** (50%, 40 198), **Slovak Republic** (49%, 11 802), **Netherlands** (49%, 165 858), **Portugal** (47%, 170 416), **Ireland** (43%, 32 038), **Norway** (35%, 50 738) and **Denmark** (32%, 68 492).

Nationals of Ukraine constituted the largest group of residents from third-countries in **Czech Republic** (46%), **Hungary** (21%), **Poland** (44%) and **Slovak Republic** (24%); whereas the majority of third-country nationals residing in **Spain** were from Morocco (22%), in **Italy** were from Albania (15%), in the **Netherlands** and **Denmark** from Turkey (27% and 14%), in **Portugal** from Brazil (32%), in the **United Kingdom** from India (27%)³⁷ and in **Ireland** from Nigeria (12%).

³⁵ For **Estonia** and **Latvia**, “non-citizens” are included in the shares of nationals from “highly-developed countries,” but they are not counted as citizens of the Russian Federation (as citizens of the Russian Federation and “non-citizens” have separate statuses).

³⁶ Top 10 third countries not available for **Austria**, **Greece** and **Luxembourg**.

³⁷ The figure is based on data from the **United Kingdom**’s National Report.


Only in two Member States did nationals of less-developed countries constitute the largest share of third-country nationals: **Sweden** (35%, 114 445) and **Malta** (35%, 3 809). In **Sweden** the largest group of third-country nationals was from Iraq (17%).

Germany reported, as the only Member State, the largest share of third-country nationals to be nationals of candidate countries from 2007 (45%). Of the total number of third-country nationals with usual residence in the Member State, nationals of Turkey made up the bulk (38%) followed by nationals of another 2007 candidate country, Croatia (5%).

4.3 Acquisition of citizenship

In total, approximately 767 000 persons acquired citizenship in a Member State in 2009.³⁸ The largest numbers of acquisitions of citizenships were recorded by (in decreasing order): **United Kingdom** (204 000), **France** (136 000), **Germany** (96 000), **Spain** (80 000) and **Italy** (59 000).³⁹

Figure 12: Acquisition of citizenship by Member State including Norway in 2009, in 1 000's ordered by decreasing numbers of acquisitions



Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. ** UK data taken from National Report. Missing data for BG.

The largest number of acquisitions of citizenship of a Member State was reported by the **United Kingdom** resulting from an increase by 57% (74 000) from the previous year. The increase is mainly attributed to a “catching up” exercise to deal with a “backlog” of applications in 2008, with staff resources being temporarily transferred from decision-making to administration of new applications for citizenship. The two main groups of foreign nationals who were granted citizenship in 2009 were formerly from the Indian subcontinent (51%), with India (13%) and Pakistan (10%) dominating, and then Africa (27%).

After a period of significant decline in the number of acquisitions in the number of citizenships in **France**, from 2005 to 2007 (by approximately 30%), the number stabilised in 2008 and continued to do so through 2009 (136 000). However, this trend covers two opposite developments: a decline in the number of acquisitions “by declaration”, primarily due to an extension of the required period

³⁸ Data do not include Bulgaria and the **United Kingdom**

³⁹ According to Eurostat Metadata, a number of different concepts, definitions and data sources are used in different Member States, which can make comparisons difficult and occasionally misleading. Member States also differ in terms of the conditions that must be fulfilled to acquire or lose a citizenship.


of marriage with a French spouse, from two to four years; as well as an increase in the number of acquisitions “by decree” (accounting for 68% of all acquisitions – primarily naturalisations), which was a specific result of a reduction in the backlog of files awaiting processing. Most of those acquiring French citizenship in 2009 were former nationals of Maghreb countries: Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia (together 41%).

As in previous years, former nationals of Turkey constituted the largest group acquiring citizenship in **Germany**, accounting for 24 647 (26%). This number thus stabilised in 2009, following a downward trend throughout the last decade. In general, the number of foreign nationals acquiring citizenship in **Germany** stabilised in 2009 after a long-term decrease. Spain reported a decrease in the number of acquisitions of citizenship compared to 2008 of 5% (-4 600), whereas **Italy** registered an increase of 11% (5 700), with the largest groups of third-country nationals acquiring Italian citizenship being former nationals of Albania and Morocco, accounting for 16% and 15% of all acquisitions of citizenships. The number of former nationals of Albania acquiring citizenship thus more than doubled from 2008.

The largest relative increase in the number of acquisitions of citizenships was reported by **Luxembourg**, which more than tripled in 2009 (4 000) compared to 2008 (1 200). This large increase was attributed to a new '*Law on the Luxembourgish Nationality*' which entered into force on 1st January 2009. The law was designed to promote integration of foreigners wishing to permanently reside in the Member State, by granting them citizenship and 66% of the citizenships granted were acquired by former nationals of other Member States, whereas 31% were acquired by former nationals of third-countries, of these 58% were nationals of countries of former Yugoslavia (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro and Macedonia).

4.4 Residence permits and residence of third-country nationals

Figure 13 provides an overview of the main reasons for granting first residence permits at the EU level, showing that, overall, most were obtained for “family reasons” (28.2%), followed by “remunerated activities reasons” (27.7%). “Other reasons” account for 22.7% and, finally, the category “education reasons” for 21.4%. The relative percentages roughly correspond to those of the previous year, though the number of residents permits granted by all Member States for educational reasons in 2009 increased by 13% (56 000) and permits granted for "other reasons" by 15% (67 000).


Figure 13: First residence permits, by reason, for EU-27* as a whole, 2009

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables, Eurostat data. *Missing data for LU.

Figure 14 below shows the number of first residence permits granted by each Member State in 2009 and how these permits were distributed among the four main groups of reasons. The **United Kingdom**⁴⁰ issued the largest total number of first residence permits in the EU (671 325), representing 29% of all first residence permits issued the EU-27 in 2009. Even compared to the size of its population, the **United Kingdom** has one of the largest numbers of first residence permits issued. However, **Italy**, by far, reported the largest increase from 2008 to 2009 in the number of first residence permits issued, both in relative and absolute terms (110%, 265 000). This increase is attributed to the regularisation programme implemented for care-workers in September 2009. At an aggregated EU-level there was a small increase from the previous year in the number of first residence permits (4%, 80 100), however if **Italy** is omitted from the EU-total, 2009 in fact shows a decrease of 9% (-185 100) in the aggregated number of first residence permits issued.⁴¹

⁴⁰ The **United Kingdom** does not have residence permits as defined by the Migratory Statistics Regulation EC No 862/2007. As a consequence, the United Kingdom provides estimates of third-country nationals who are granted permission to reside in the United Kingdom (permission to enter) by reason; derived from landing cards issued to non-EEA nationals at the point of entry into the United Kingdom (supplemented with other management information such as visas issued and asylum granted).

⁴¹ **Luxembourg** is not included in the aggregated figures as data for 2009 is missing.

Figure 14: First residence permits, by type of reason and Member State, 2009, ordered by number of first residence permits

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. *Eurostat data used. Missing data for LU. Data for Poland does not include long-term visas.

The largest share of the first residence permits granted by the **United Kingdom** were for educational reasons (40%), which classifies the Member State together with **Ireland** and **Bulgaria** as the only three Member States where educational reasons constitute the main reason of issuance of first residence permits. In the United Kingdom, there was an increase of 21% (46 000) in the number of permits granted for educational reasons in 2009 compared to 2008, following a decrease from 2007. The three main groups of third-country nationals receiving such a permit were from India (20%), China (14%) and the United States (9%). In **Ireland**, the largest groups to receive first residence permits were nationals of the United States (21%) and Brazil (19%) and in **Bulgaria** the dominant group was from Turkey (67%).

In 10 of the EU-15 Member States, first residence permits were primarily granted for family reasons. Austria registered the largest share of residence permits granted for family reasons of all Member States in 2009 (52%, 14 572). Most of these permits were granted to citizens of traditional countries of origin of immigration to Austria: Turkey (3 417) and Serbia (2 239) along with other countries of the former Yugoslavia.

Belgium, which issued 48% (28 523) of its first residence permits for family reasons, reported an increase of 40% (8 203) – the largest in the EU – in the number of first residence permits granted for family reasons compared to 2008. The main groups of third-country nationals to receive a first residence permit for family reasons were nationals of Morocco and Turkey. Of the first residence permits issued to nationals of these two countries, family reasons were the primary reason in 86% and 69% of the cases, respectively. The second largest increase, in relative terms, of first residence permits issued for family reasons was registered in **Germany** (9%, 4 497), where this category constituted 44% of the total number of residence permits issued by the Member State in 2009. The main group of third-country nationals to receive a first residence permit for family reasons were nationals of Turkey who accounted for 16% of all such permits.

In **France** 45% (87 548) of the first residence permits were issued for family reasons, which entailed a small increase of 2% (2 073) in 2009 compared to the year before, following a downward trend since 2006 mainly attributed to the introduction of new legislative requirements aimed at promoting the integration of immigrants into French society.

Sweden, which reported a significant increase in the number of first residence permits for family reasons in 2008 (21%), registered a much more moderate increase of 3% (1 264) in 2009. Family reasons thus remained the primary reason for residence permits issued (41%). Whereas nationals of Iraq remained the largest group of third-country nationals to receive a first residence permits for family reasons (20%, 7 622), nationals of Thailand replaced nationals of Iraq as the primary receivers of the total number of first residence permits issued in 2009 (12%, 11 416).

Like in **Sweden**, family reasons were also the main reason in the **Netherlands** with 41% for granting a first resident permit in 2009. The largest groups of third-country nationals to obtain first residence permits for family reasons were nationals of Turkey (14%) and Morocco (9%), which corresponds to the fact that persons of Turkish or Moroccan origin constitute the largest groups of non-national residents. However, since 2005, there has been a downward trend in the number of applications for family reasons by Turkish and Moroccan nationals, which, in part, is explained by the '*Civic Integration Abroad Act*' introduced in 2005 which tightens the language and income requirements of applicants.

Finland reported a small decline in the number of first residence permits issued for family reasons in 2009 (7%), which however was less than the overall decrease in first resident permits issued compared to 2008 (11%). Family reasons remained the main category of first residence permits issued, of which former nationals of the Russian Federation constituted the largest group (21%). In **Estonia** family reasons were, by a small margin, also the main reason for granting first residence permits (30%, 1 148). Overall, the number of valid residence permits has decreased over the last decade, mainly due a corresponding decrease in the number of recognised non-citizens. This development is linked to the increase in the number of citizens of the Russian Federation with valid residence permit and is partly explained by the fact that many persons with undetermined citizenship have acquired citizenship of the Russian Federation.

Other Member States where family reasons accounted for the largest share of first residence permits issued included: **Austria** (52%, 14 572), Greece (50%, 22 637), **Portugal** (43%, 19 964), Spain (43%, 125 288) and Romania (39%, 6 043). Also in **Norway** residence permits issued for family reasons constituted the largest group (46%, 12 060).

In nine Member States, the primary reason for issuing a first residence permit was on the grounds of remunerated activities in 2009: **Slovenia** (76%, 11 910), Cyprus (54%, 13 762), **Lithuania** (51%, 1 358), **Italy** (47%, 235 966), the **Slovak Republic** (43%, 2 302), Denmark (42%, 11 113), Czech Republic (41%, 11 312), **Hungary** (37%, 5 326) and **Poland** (33%, 11 123).

Of these nine, only the two EU-15 Member States, **Italy** and **Denmark**, reported an increase in the number of first residence permits for the purpose of remunerated activities, of 65% and 50%, respectively. For the other seven Member States, the economic crisis appears to have had an effect on labour migration, in that all seven Member States reported a decrease in the number of first residence permits issued for work reasons of 40% or more compared to 2008. The same general trend could be observed at EU-level where 19 out of 26 Member States reported a decline in the number of residence permits issued for remunerated activities reasons compared to the previous year.⁴²

In **Slovenia** the decrease in first residence permits issued for remunerated activities reasons was 52% (-13 044). The decrease was, besides being caused by the economic crisis, also attributed to the Regulation on limitations and prohibitions of employment of foreigners issued by the Slovene Government.⁴³ The Regulation prohibited the issuance of new permits for work and seasonal work, except in agriculture and forestry, as well as the issuing of work permits to foreigners who are representatives or majority owners of small companies and have their residence in the territory of Kosovo. The decrease in the number of residence permits for the purpose of employment followed a large increase, from 2007 to 2008, of 67%, which was in part attributed to new legislation introduced in 2008 to optimise the procedures for handling applications for residence permits.

Such optimising of procedures was also adopted by the Czech Republic in 2008, through the so-called *Green Card Scheme*. However, in 2009 they nonetheless registered a decrease of no less than 74% (-31 970) in the number of first residence permits issued for the purpose of remunerated activities. **Lithuania** also reported a decrease in the number of resident permits for work reasons in 2009 compared to 2008 (67%, -2 782), which was explained by the fact that the need for foreign workers had considerably decreased during the economic crisis. The **Slovak Republic** cited the same reason for the Member State's decrease in the number of residents permits for work reasons (42%, -1 682).


Poland reported a decrease by 40% (-7 541) in the number of residence permits issued for work reasons in 2009 compared to the previous year. Part of this decrease could be explained by the introduction of a regulation facilitating access to the Polish labour market for citizens of Ukraine, Belarus, Russian Federation and Moldova which was amended in 2009. This Regulation provides for entry and work in **Poland** only on the basis of a visa, and extends the period of legal employment without an obligation to apply for a work permit from three to six months, thereby creating a lower demand for work permits and therefore residence permits for fixed periods, issued for work reasons, with regard to the nationals of this group of countries. In addition, data on first residence permits for 2009 does not include data for long-term visas which generally constitute a high percentage of first residence permits in **Poland**, therefore the statistics reflect only in part the actual migratory situation in that Member State. This suggests changes in the nature of migration flows to **Poland**, in particular, in relation to circular migration patterns, which have begun to increase.

Only in two Member States was the main share of first residence permits issued due to "other reasons": **Malta** (66%) and **Latvia** (38%).

Figure 15 below shows the more specific reasons for granting first residence permits for remunerated activities among the Member States in 2009. At the EU aggregated level, 6% of such permits were issued to highly-skilled workers, 1% to researchers, 8% to seasonal workers and 84% for "other reasons."

⁴² Data for **Luxembourg** not available.

⁴³ The Regulation is based on the seventh paragraph, Article 5, of the Act on Employment and Work of Aliens (Off. Gaz. RS no. 76/07, consolidated version) on 11.6.2009. It was published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia no. 44 dated 12.6.2009 and took effect on 13.6.2009.

Figure 15: First residence permits for remunerated activities, by reason and Member State, 2009, ordered by total number of first residence permits

Source: Eurostat data

**Excluding LU, BG and RO as there is no data for LU and only total figures available for BG and RO. The rest of the data in many Member States is not complete: thus, most of the first residence permits for remunerated activities reasons are categorised under "other."⁴⁴

In eleven Member States, the share of highly-skilled workers was more than 10% of the total number of first residence permits issued for remunerated activities reasons: **Netherlands** (47%), Denmark, (32%), **Ireland** (31%), **Belgium** (22%), **Austria** (21%), **Malta** (20%), **Latvia** (18%), **United Kingdom** (16%), **Sweden** (15%), **France** (12%). In **Norway**, the share was 22%. In the **Netherlands**, the main group of highly-skilled workers consisted of nationals of India (1 791, who made use of the Member State's *Highly Skilled Migrants Scheme*). In **Norway**, compared to 2008, a significant increase in the number of skilled worker permits issued was registered in the petroleum sector, the shipbuilding industry and among higher education institutions.

Few Member States reported a share of more than 5% “researchers” among the first resident permits issued for remunerated activities reasons: **Netherlands** (13%), **France** (11%), Denmark (7%) and **Austria** (5%). The share in **Norway** was 6%. Finally, six Member States registered a share of more than 10% seasonal workers among the resident permits issued for works reasons in 2009: Greece (84%), **Sweden** (36%), **Hungary** (15%), **Slovenia** (14%), **France** (11%) and **Italy** (10%). In **Norway** the share was 23%.

5. IRREGULAR MIGRATION: REFUSALS, APPREHENSIONS AND RETURN

The aims of policy changes in the area of irregular migration overall were two-fold: they attempted to limit/prevent irregular immigration and stay and/or put increased focus on apprehending illegally staying third-country nationals, on the one hand, and on detecting and dismantling the structures or networks supporting or exploiting them, on the other. This means that the effects of policy developments on the number of refusals, apprehensions and returns are not easy to interpret. Where

⁴⁴ According to Eurostat metadata, there are two factors behind this:

- Data "not available": data that are principally existing but cannot be delivered for various reasons (e.g. breakdowns cannot be made, no access to data etc.).
- Data "not applicable": categories of permits which are not existing in national legislation/administrative procedures and therefore such permits cannot be issued.

a focus on preventing illegal entry may point in the direction of decreasing numbers, increased surveillance and cooperation between authorities may in fact lead to increasing numbers.

Developments regarding illegal entry in the different Member States still appear to be influenced by the Schengen Agreement and EU enlargement. The entry of Czech Republic, **Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovak Republic** and **Slovenia** into the Schengen Agreement (21st December 2007) led to changes to cross-border movements and control, especially in those Member States which joined the Schengen Area, and in those Member States which formerly constituted the external borders of the EU.⁴⁵ This still influences developments regarding cross-border traffic, for example between **Poland** and Ukraine. Geography additionally has played a part. Refusals of entry into the Member States with external borders to the Schengen Area (especially Eastern borders) mostly occur at land (or sea) borders, whereas refusals of entry into other Member States are more likely to take place at air borders.

Different reasons for developments regarding illegal stay and the number of apprehensions of third-country nationals staying illegally were noted in the various Member States. They include:

- Changes in irregular migration routes and entry points of third-country nationals into the EU.
- Developments with regard to the number of applicants for international protection, with the number of apprehensions being related to the number of asylum applications in two ways: 1) apprehended third-country nationals may apply for international protection; and 2) some of the persons apprehended may be rejected asylum applicants.
- The impact of increased surveillance and focus on countering irregular immigration resulting from new policies adopted in 2009 and previous years in a number of Member States.
- Co-operation agreements of some Member States with third countries aimed at preventing and managing irregular migration.
- The enlargement of the Schengen Area - resulting in changed patterns of movements, transits and “residence” of illegally staying third-country nationals, as noted in **Estonia, Hungary, Poland** and **Slovak Republic**.

Whilst the data available can at least provide an indication of new trends and/or marked changes in irregular immigration, it should be treated with *caution* as priorities differ regarding national law enforcement and administrative procedures in the Member States and because illegal entries and unlawful residence means that registration is often avoided by illegally entering or staying third-country nationals. Thus it is not possible to establish an overall idea of the total number of illegally-staying immigrants.

As in previous years, the bulk of apprehensions and returns of third-country nationals relate primarily to citizens of third countries neighbouring, or within the geographical proximity of, the relevant Member State, or citizens of third countries with historical, cultural or linguistic ties to the Member State.

With respect to returns, the following general developments have been identified in 2009:

⁴⁵ Note that Bulgaria, Cyprus, **Ireland**, Romania and the **United Kingdom** are not yet part of the Schengen Agreement.

- 595 553 third-country nationals were ordered to leave a Member State in 2009 for various reasons, which is a 1% decrease compared to 2008.
- Across the EU, 252 779 third-country nationals were returned following an order to leave - this represents a 5% increase compared to 2008.
- Both the numbers of orders to leave and returns were generally highest among the EU-15.
- As in 2008, the most orders to leave were issued in Greece (126 140, 22% of total), whereas the largest number of third-country nationals returned to their country of citizenship were recorded in **United Kingdom** (64 945).
- At the EU-level, nationals of Albania by far constituted the largest group (63 190) of third-country nationals returned following an order to leave in, 95% of which were returned by Greece.

Developments in relation to refusals, apprehensions and returns are explored in more detail in Sections 5.1-3 below. The links between refusals and the borders, apprehensions and returns are then presented in Section 5.4.

5.1 Refusals

The number of refusals⁴⁶ reflects the number of individuals which have been refused entry, irrespective of the number of refusals issued to that person.⁴⁷ The overall picture at EU level shows a decrease in the number of persons refused entry, which corresponds to the overall decreasing immigration trend from 2007 onwards. Cooperation agreements between Cyprus, Greece and **Italy** with North African countries may, to some extent, have contributed to this development.⁴⁸

Figure 16 shows the number of third-country nationals refused entry by a Member State. A total of 499 645 third-country nationals were refused entry into an EU Member State in 2009. This represents a notable decrease of 21% compared to 2008, during which 634 975 were refused entry. It is not possible to make a complete comparison at EU level with previous years, as, for example, statistics for Cyprus and **Malta** are not available for 2007 and statistics for **Sweden** are not comparable with previous years due to procedural changes.

The refusals of entry were distributed very unevenly among the Member States. In particular, Spain stands out with 387 015 refusals, which amounts to 77% of the EU-27 total number of refusals in 2008. Of the refusal in Spain, 377 080 (97%) were issued to nationals of Morocco, primarily in the Spanish cities of Ceuta and Melilla bordering Morocco on the North African coast. Indeed, a large proportion of the overall decrease in the EU between 2009 and 2008 can largely be ascribed to the reduced number of refusals issued at the Spanish borders, going down from 510 010 in 2008 to


⁴⁶ The term "refusal" refers to third-country nationals who are refused entry at the external borders because they do not fulfil all the entry conditions laid down in Article 5(1) of Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 and do not belong to the categories of persons referred to in Article 5(4) of that Regulation.

⁴⁷ Eurostat metadata, Enforcement of Immigration Legislation. The Eurostat definition reads: "Each person is counted only once within the reference period, irrespective of the number of refusals issued to the same person." In practice it seems that the data from some Member States (for example **United Kingdom**) refer to "incidents" rather than "individuals".

⁴⁸ For additional information, see e.g. *Annual Policy Report 2009* or *Italy Annual Report in Immigration and International Protection Statistics 2009*. Regarding the agreement in effect in 2009 between Italy and Libya, the Italian authorities' refusal and return of immigrants to Libya without examining their cases has been deemed a violation of Art. 3 of the European Convention of Human Rights in a ruling by the European Court of Human Rights (*Hirsi Jamaa and others v. Italy*, Application no. 27765/09, Judgment of 23 February 2012).

387 015 in 2009, mostly because of a decrease in the number of refusals of citizens of Morocco. The Member State with the second highest number of refusals was **Poland** (26 890), followed by **United Kingdom** (20 460). At the other end of the scale was **Luxembourg** with no recorded refusals and **Sweden** with 35.

Figure 16: Third-country nationals refused entry, by Member State, 2009. Ordered by number of nationals.



Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. * Eurostat data used

In 2008, the developments regarding third-country nationals refused entry at the borders were, to a large extent, influenced by the entry of Czech Republic, **Estonia**, **Hungary**, **Latvia**, **Lithuania**, **Malta**, **Poland**, **Slovak Republic** and **Slovenia** into the Schengen Agreement (21st December 2007), as this led to changes to cross-border movements and control, especially in these Member and in those Member States which formerly constituted the external borders of the EU. Whilst this influence was less strong in 2009, the statistics still show some impact. For example, changes in local border traffic and reasons for refusal in **Poland** and the **Slovak Republic** are related to continuous adaptations to the changes brought about by the Schengen enlargement. However, whereas the Member States entering the Schengen Area, controlling the external borders of the area, experienced a decline in the number of persons refused entry in 2008, the 2009 numbers in these Member States vary.

There were significant changes and variations between the Member States. Compared to 2008, the number of persons refused entry increased in **Belgium**, Czech Republic, Greece, **Hungary**, **Malta**, **Poland** and **Slovenia**. The most notable increases took place in **Belgium** and **Poland**. In **Belgium**, the 76% (+885) increase is attributed to an increase in the number of air border refusals, where citizens of the DR Congo, Turkey, Morocco, Sri Lanka and Senegal were those most frequently refused. In **Poland**, the 60% increase is particularly remarkable when considering that the Member States' accession to the Schengen initially caused a significant decrease in cross-border traffic in 2008, in particular regarding citizens of Ukraine. However, local border traffic regulations between Poland and Ukraine, introduced in 2009, brought about a renewed increase in cross-border traffic, which thus, coupled with a detected large-scale document forgery, account for the increase in 2009.


The number of persons refused entry decreased in **Austria**, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, **Germany**, **Estonia**, **Ireland**, Spain, **France**, **Finland**, **Italy**, **Latvia**, **Lithuania**, **Netherlands**, **Portugal**, Romania, **Slovak Republic**, **Sweden** and **United Kingdom**. The biggest decreases were recorded in **Austria** (76%), **Estonia** (61%) and **Germany** (59%). In **Austria**, the development reflects a continuation of a decrease since 2007, following the accession of Bulgaria and Romania and the entry of new Member States to the Schengen Agreement. A decreasing trend, since 2007, is also noted for **Estonia**, where in particular the number of refusals at the sea border (mainly regarding crew members of cargo ships) decreased. In **Germany**, the number of persons refused entry has continued to decline since 2000. This corresponds with a continuing decrease in persons applying for international protection and is most likely also influenced by the enlargement of the Schengen Area and the abolition of border controls.

5.1.1 Type of border

Refusals at land borders amounted to 87% of all the persons refused entry, 12% occurred at air borders and only 1% at sea borders. These shares largely mirror those of 2008.

The types of border at which refusals occur vary in the Member States, depending on their geography and overall migration flows. This is shown in [Figure 17](#) below.

Figure 17: Third-country nationals refused entry, by Member State and by external border, 2009



Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. * Eurostat data

Unsurprisingly, in the Member States with external land borders, refusals primarily occurred at these borders, whereas other Member States had a higher proportion of refusals of entry at air borders. Examples of neighbouring Member States illustrating this difference are the Czech Republic and **Slovak Republic**. Refusals in the Czech Republic only took place at air borders, whereas in **Slovak Republic**, 95% took place at land border crossings.


Land borders were the predominant site of refusal in Bulgaria, Greece, **Finland**, **Hungary**, **Lithuania**, **Poland**, Romania, Spain, **Slovak Republic** and **Slovenia**. Air borders were the predominant border type in **Austria**, **Belgium**, Cyprus, Czech Republic, **France**, **Germany**, **Ireland**, **Malta**, **Netherlands**, Portugal, **Sweden** and the **United Kingdom**.

The fact that relatively few third-country nationals were refused entry at sea borders is also related to the specific circumstances during interception and rescue operations, especially in the Mediterranean sea, which often do not make it possible to refuse persons who arrive in boats and to send them back. The only Member State to which entry was mostly denied at sea borders is **Estonia**. Behind this figure lies the fact that the persons denied entry were primarily crew members of ships staying at Estonian ports, who wished to leave the ship without holding a valid visa. Persons refused entry at sea borders were most often nationals of the Philippines, whereas persons refused at the land borders of **Estonia** were mostly citizens of the Russian Federation. Apart from Estonia, only in **Italy** did a significant part of the refusals take place at the sea border (32% compared to 23% in 2008). Also **Norway** (19%), **United Kingdom** (14%) and **Malta** (11%) had a share of persons refused at sea borders above 10%.

5.1.2 Reason for refusal

As shown in [Figure 18](#) below, the most frequently used ground for refusal of entry throughout the EU-27 related to the lack of valid visa or residence permit (39% of the total number of refusals). Other frequently reported reasons were unjustified purpose and conditions of stay (24%), insufficient means of subsistence (13%) and lack of valid travel documents (9%).

Figure 18: Third-country nationals refused entry, by reason and EU level 2009



Source: Eurostat data. Reason indicated for 25% of total refusals. Missing data for 97% of refusals in Spain.

The overall pattern is that procedural issues related to travel, such as the lack of appropriate travel and entry documents, or the lack of compliance with conditions of stay are the most commonly used grounds for refusal. Less often, reasons for refusal relate to “fraudulent” attempts to enter a Member State, or to considerations as to whether the person is subject to an alert or considered to be a public threat.

A few Member States differ notably from the pattern outlined above, as they prominently apply ‘insufficient means of subsistence’ and ‘public order’ as grounds for refusal. In **Finland**, insufficient means of subsistence was the reason for refusal in 48% of the refused entries - a reason

primarily given to citizens of the Russian Federation at the land border. In the **United Kingdom**, insufficient means of subsistence was also the most common ground for refusal (46% of the cases), accounting for 58% of all refusals for that reason in the EU as a whole. Overall, Brazil, the United States and India constituted the largest groups of third-country nationals refused entry into the **United Kingdom**. In **Ireland**, 42% of refusals were related to false visa or residence permits. About half of all refusals (51%) based on the reason that the person denied entry is considered to be a public threat were issued in **Slovenia**. Whilst showing a decrease with respect to 2008, this ground still accounts for 19% of all refusals issued in the Member State. 48% of refusals by **Slovenia** were issued to citizens of Croatia, who were denied entrance at the land border.

The statistics do not provide explanations for the varying practices related to the applied grounds for refusal. However, the focus on means of subsistence, as commonly referred to in **Finland** and the **United Kingdom**, as was also the case in 2008, may be related to specific aspects of their immigration policies.

5.1.3 Refusals by country of citizenship

Many third-country nationals attempting to enter the EU and Schengen Area are citizens of third countries in the proximity of the Member States. [Table 1](#) below shows the most frequent countries of citizenship of persons being denied entrance into an EU Member State, and the Member States by which most were refused.

Table 1: Third-country nationals refused entry, EU level, Top 20 countries of citizenship, 2009

	Total refused entry in the EU	Total refused entry in Norway	Refused entry in the EU by ...	in % of cases
Morocco	378 485	0	Spain	99.6%
Ukraine	19 445	0	Poland	66%
Brazil	8 455	0	United Kingdom	27%
Russia	7 925	40	Poland	42%
Georgia	6 095	0	Poland	93%
Belarus	5 005	0	Poland	84%
Croatia	4 835	5	Slovenia	77%
Turkey	4 745	5	Bulgaria	32%
Serbia	3 620	0	Hungary	48%
China (including Hong Kong)	3 610	0	France	43%
United States	3 310	0	United Kingdom	86%
Nigeria	2 365	0	United Kingdom	34%
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	2 280	0	Slovenia	45%
India	2 260	0	United Kingdom	52%
Moldova	2 235	0	Romania	63%
Venezuela	2 010	0	Spain	66%
Albania	1 975	0	Greece	34%
Paraguay	1 650	0	Spain	68%
Argentina	1 505	0	Spain	87%
Pakistan	1 470	0	United Kingdom	56%

Source: Eurostat data

The number of citizens of Morocco being denied entrance is significantly higher than any other groups of citizens, even though the number went down to 378 485 compared to 497 720 in 2008. This large number is attributed to the Spanish cities of Ceuta and Melilla bordering Morocco on the North African coast. After Morocco, Ukraine, Brazil, the Russian Federation, Georgia, Belarus, Croatia, Turkey, Serbia and China are the most frequent countries of citizenship of persons being refused entry into the Member States. Apart from Brazil, Georgia and China, the rest of the ten most frequent countries of citizenship are countries neighbouring the Schengen Area. Amongst the 10 main countries of citizenship, an increase in the numbers of citizens of Belarus, Ukraine and, in particular, Georgia was recorded - all of whom were most often refused in **Poland**. Citizens from Morocco and China, also amongst the 10 main countries of citizenship, witnessed a decline in the number of refusals. Also, the number of citizens of Moldova being refused entry decreased notably, from 6 000 in 2008 to 2 235 in 2009.

As shown in [Table 1](#) above, 27% (11 920) of all refused citizens of Brazil were denied entry into the **United Kingdom**. Many Brazilian citizens were also refused entry into Spain (1 995), **Portugal** (1 670), and **France** (1 505), and they were the most commonly refused in **Ireland** (470, 13%). Nationals of China were the group of nationals most frequently denied entrance into **France** (1 570), the second most in **Ireland** (385), and the third most in the **Netherlands** (155).

The element of historical/colonial and linguistic ties in relation to migration flows are reflected by the fact that citizens of the Spanish-speaking countries of Venezuela, Paraguay and Argentina were primarily denied entry into Spain, and most of the refusals of citizens of the United States, India and Pakistan took place in the **United Kingdom**, as was the case with the largest part of refusals of citizens of Nigeria. The most frequent country of citizenship of persons being refused entry in **Belgium** was the Democratic Republic of Congo.

A few notable changes occurred in 2009 with respect to 2008. For example, the number of refusals of citizens of India declined from 3 140 in 2008 to 2 260 in 2009. This decrease was mainly caused by reduced refusals at the border of **Estonia** (from 1 040 in 2008 to 15 in 2009), which most likely refers to crew members of ships. At the same time, more citizens of India were refused entry into the **United Kingdom** (an increase of 31% to 1 165). Another change was recorded for citizens of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, where the number of refusals in **Germany** decreased from 530 in 2008 to 35 in 2009, while the number of refusals at the border of **Slovenia** rose from 425 to 1 035.

Citizens of the Russian Federation were most frequently denied entrance into the bordering Member States of **Poland** (3 350), **Finland** (1 095) and **Lithuania** (835). The majority of refusals of citizens of Ukraine occurred at the border with **Poland** (12 800 or 66% of the total number of citizens of Ukraine being denied entrance to the EU) and the other Member States bordering Ukraine: **Hungary** (3 710), Romania (935) and **Slovak Republic** (750), which shows an increase in the number of refusals of entry in **Poland** and **Hungary**, while a decrease of refusals in Romania and **Slovak Republic** compared to 2008. A similar pattern was seen regarding citizens of Belarus, who were primarily denied entrance into **Poland** (4 205) and **Lithuania** (530), and citizens of Moldova, most of whom were denied entrance into Romania (1 405).


A somewhat different pattern is seen for nationals of Turkey. Whereas Bulgaria denied entry to the largest number of nationals of Turkey, the refusals tend to be more spread over other Member States, including those without external borders. For example, a significant part of third-country nationals from Turkey were refused entry by Romania, (725), **Germany** (420), **France** (315) and the **United Kingdom** (290). A similar scattered pattern was observed regarding nationals of Serbia in 2008, but in 2009 the refusals of these nationals increasingly occurred at the borders of two Member States, namely **Hungary** (48%) and **Slovenia** (23%).

5.2 Apprehensions

Figure 19 below shows the number of apprehensions by Member State and **Norway** in 2009. A total of 567 427 third-country nationals illegally staying in the Member States were apprehended in 2009. This represents a 7% decrease compared to 2008, where 611 840 were apprehended.

Whilst the number of apprehensions, to some extent, could be considered a possible indicator of the scale of third-country nationals staying illegally, changes to these numbers do not necessarily reflect a higher or lower number of illegally-staying third-country nationals, as they can also be the result of different ways to record and calculate the number of apprehensions and/or a greater focus of police and immigration services on detecting persons staying illegally in their respective Member States. In addition, a high number of apprehensions in some Member States may also be indicative of the increased use of these Member States as transit countries, rather than constituting the place of residence of the apprehended persons.

Figure 19: Third-country nationals apprehended/found to be illegally staying, by Member State, 2009, ordered by number of persons apprehended



Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used

The highest number of apprehensions in the EU took place in Greece (108 317) followed by Spain (90 500), **France** (76 355), **United Kingdom** (69 745) and **Italy** (53 440). Of these, **France** and **Italy** witnessed a significant decrease in numbers compared to 2008 (32% and 22% respectively). The decrease in the number of apprehensions in **France** followed a 60% increase in 2008 compared to 2007. The Member States with the fewest apprehensions in 2009 were **Latvia** (245), **Luxembourg** (260), Denmark (640), **Estonia** (860) and **Slovenia** (1 065).

Sweden stands out with a large increase in the number of apprehensions: 22 230 illegally staying third-country nationals were apprehended in 2009, whereas only 440 were apprehended in 2008. However, the drastic change in numbers is explained by the fact that the statistical procedures in 2008 differed from previous years, and from 2009, in the sense that the 2008 figures did not include persons subsequently applying for asylum. **Norway** also witnessed a significant increase in the number of apprehensions (+108%), which was mostly due to an increase in the number of asylum cases where the applicant were expelled because of false identity information.


In addition to **Sweden** and **Norway**, notable increases in the number of apprehensions, compared to 2008, were detected in **Lithuania** (+64%), **Luxembourg**, (+60%), **Ireland** (+58%), **Finland**

(+24%), Czech Republic (+19%) **Hungary** and **Austria** (both +18%), as well as Romania and Cyprus (both +15%). The increase in **Austria** followed the trend of previous years, however at a much lower level than before 2007, where the number of apprehensions decreased significantly due to the changed status of citizens of Bulgaria and Romania. The largest relative decreases were observed in **Portugal** (-61%), **Malta** (-44%), **France** and **Slovenia** (both -32%). The decrease in **Malta** comes against a backdrop of an increase in the number of apprehensions by 48% from 2007 to 2008, where the developments were related to the number of arrivals by boat.

Policy developments and an increased operational focus of national authorities impacted on the number of apprehensions of Member States in various ways, with some coinciding with an increase in the number of apprehensions and others with a decrease. In **France**, operations dismantling camps inhabited by illegally staying third-country nationals in the Calais area, combined with an increased focus on organised smuggling and trafficking networks, were influential factors in the decrease in the number of apprehensions. Also in **Italy**, several new regulations, which came into force in the course of 2009, may have had an impact on the decreasing numbers of persons being apprehended. In **Finland**, the increase in the numbers of apprehensions in both 2008 and 2009 were attributed to increased surveillance, enhanced co-operation between authorities and an increased number of asylum applicants. In **Luxembourg**, increased sanctions on irregular entry and stay coincided with an increase in the number of persons being apprehended. In **Estonia**, even though the number of apprehensions decreased compared to 2008 (from 1050 to 860), the use of Estonia as a transit country, following its entry into the Schengen Area, was noted - the same was observed in the **Slovak Republic**.

Other factors also played a role in the developments with regard to apprehensions in the Member States. **Lithuania**, witnessing the largest increase in the number of illegally staying third-country nationals being apprehended, attributed this development mainly to the economic crisis, as this meant that many third-country nationals lost their jobs (and thus their legal ground for stay), while other third-country nationals used the Member State as transit country in their quest for employment elsewhere in the EU. The economic crisis also caused increased irregular immigration to **Slovenia** by citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina (while irregular immigration from other Balkan countries decreased due to the upcoming visa liberalisations). [Figure 20](#) below shows the number of apprehensions of third-country nationals by countries of citizenship.

Figure 20: Third-country nationals found to be illegally staying, top 20 countries of citizenship, EU level, 2009. Ordered by number of nationals.



Source: Eurostat data

Like for 2008, the most frequent country of citizenship of the nationals apprehended for illegal stay was Albania. Most of the Albanian citizens (92%) were apprehended in Greece - amounting to 58% of the total number of apprehensions. The remaining most prominent countries of citizenship of persons apprehended in the EU were Afghanistan, Morocco, Iraq and Brazil, which also comprised the top five in 2008. Whereas the number of apprehensions of nationals of Afghanistan remained at the same level as in 2008, a decrease in number was observed regarding nationals of Albania (-5%), Morocco (-18%), Iraq (-37%) and Brazil (-44%).

A significant decrease in the number of apprehension was observed for citizens of Eritrea (-49%) and Serbia (8 335, -42% compared to 2008). The process towards visa liberalisations may have influenced the number of Serbian citizens coming illegally to the EU Member States. New in the 20 main countries of citizenship of persons being apprehended for illegal stay were Vietnam and the Palestinian Territories. Regarding the latter, the Gaza War, which broke out in December 2008, is likely to have been an influential factor.

As in previous years, the apprehensions of citizens of the different third countries tend to “cluster” in certain Member States. More than nine out of ten of the apprehended citizens of Albania were apprehended in Greece (63 140). As in 2008, the majority of the apprehended citizens of Afghanistan were apprehended in **France** (20 765) and Greece (12 390). Most of the nationals of Morocco were apprehended in Spain (12 925) and **Italy** (9 450) and 95% of nationals of Bolivia were also apprehended in Spain. Most citizens of Kosovo were apprehended in **Germany** (35%) and **Austria** (30%) A large proportion of the nationals of Eritrea (57%) were apprehended in **France**, and the majority of the nationals of Brazil were apprehended in Spain (35%) and **Portugal** (33%). A large part of the nationals of India (37%) were apprehended in the **United Kingdom**. In **Malta**, 53% of the persons apprehended were citizens of Somalia, and in **Ireland**, 23% were from Nigeria.

The patterns above show, as mentioned earlier, that geographical proximity, the existence of large migrant communities and/or historical or linguistic ties play a part in apprehension patterns. This is further confirmed in several other Member States: for example, the most prominent countries of citizenship of persons apprehended in **Belgium** came from Algeria and Morocco; Ukraine was the most frequent country of citizenship in Czech Republic, **Hungary** and **Poland**; third-country nationals from the Russian Federation, Belarus and Ukraine were most frequently apprehended in **Lithuania** and almost half of the apprehensions of citizens of Turkey took place in **Germany**.

Some changes in the patterns also occurred. In 2008, 40% of the apprehensions of citizens of Iraq took place in **France**. In 2009, **France** only represented 20% of the apprehensions, while 24% took place in Greece and 19% in **Germany**. The changed pattern runs parallel with a general decrease in influx of citizens of Iraq. A somewhat changed pattern was also noted regarding nationals of Afghanistan. Although the total number of apprehensions across the Member States remain largely unchanged, the number of apprehensions of nationals of Afghanistan decreased significantly in Greece (from 17 995 to 12 390) and **Italy** (from 1 310 to 745). At the same time, the numbers went up, notably in **Germany** (from 880 to 2 665), **Austria** (from 1 045 to 1 865) and **Belgium** (440 to 805). The changes regarding citizens of Iraq and Afghanistan may be attributed to changed migration routes.

Policy changes in some Member States may also influence the patterns, such as in the **Netherlands**, where a significant decrease in the number of citizens of China being apprehended was explained by a court decision stating that Chinese citizens without identification documents could not be apprehended, and a significant increase in the number Somali citizens could be caused by changes in policy regarding international protection. Also, the decrease in apprehensions, for example, of citizens of Serbia, may be influenced by the process of visa liberalisation with the EU Member States.


Of the ten most prominent countries of citizenship on the list in [Figure 20](#), Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia and Nigeria were also amongst the ten most frequent countries of citizenship of persons applying for international protection (see also [Figure 24](#)). A notable exception in this regard is the fact that the Russian Federation, as in 2008, was the second most frequent country of citizenship of persons applying for international protection but constituted the nineteenth most frequent country of citizenship of the third-country nationals being apprehended for illegal stay. As in 2008, they were mainly apprehended in **Austria** and **Germany** (2 230 and 2 085 respectively).

5.3 Returns

The following section covers the number and composition of third-country nationals who were ordered to leave a Member State in 2009 and who were returned following an order to leave. These issues will be presented firstly from a Member State perspective, and secondly by looking at the countries of citizenship of the persons being ordered to leave and/or returned. The figures on the orders to leave contain both the instances of third-country nationals who have entered legally, but who, for various reasons, are no longer eligible to stay in a Member State (e.g. because of an expired residence permit or refused asylum) and third-country nationals who initially entered the Member State illegally. In addition, Eurostat data on returns also include voluntary departures, which is not always the case in the national statistics.

[Figure 21](#) below shows (a) the number of third-country nationals ordered to leave in 2009 for each Member State, as well as (b) the number of third-country nationals actually returned following an order to leave in 2009 (the Member States are ordered according to the number of third-country nationals ordered to leave). The returns include both voluntary and enforced returns following an order to leave. It should be noted that an unknown number of persons ordered to leave may have returned, or left for another country, unknown to the authorities of the Member States. The two figures are not directly comparable, since a share of the third-country nationals returned in 2009 may have been ordered to leave in 2008. For that reason, the number of third-country nationals who have been returned may, in some instances, exceed the number of third-country nationals who received an order to leave in the same year.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ In 2009, this was the case for Cyprus and **Slovenia**.

Figure 21: Third-country nationals (a) ordered to leave and (b) returned following an order to leave, by Member State, 2009. Ordered by number of nationals.

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used

For the EU-27 as a whole, a total of 595 553 third-country nationals were ordered to leave a Member State in 2009 for various reasons, which is a 1% decrease compared to 2008. As in 2008, most orders to leave were issued in Greece (126 140, 22%), whereas the largest number of third-country nationals returned to their country of citizenship were recorded in **United Kingdom** (64 945, 26%). The comparably high numbers of orders to leave in the five Member States representing the highest share were accompanied by a high number of apprehensions of illegally-staying third-country nationals. In this respect, the **Netherlands**, recording the sixth highest number of orders to leave, showed a different pattern with the number of apprehensions amounting to only 21% of the number or orders to leave. Such variations may be related to the number of applications for international protection in the different Member States (see [Section 5.2](#) and [Section 6.1](#)).

Fourteen Member States recorded an increase in the numbers of orders to leave (**Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Lithuania, Hungary, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, and Sweden**). The largest relative increases were recorded in **Finland** (76%, 3 125), **Sweden** (42%, 1 780) and **Romania** (39%, 5 125). In **Finland**, the significant


increase in the number of orders to leave was accompanied by a similar increase in the number of persons returned and was most probably related to increased surveillance since 2008 and initiatives in 2009 aiming at removing illegally staying third-country nationals. An increase in apprehensions in 2008 may thus result in increased orders to leave and returns in 2009. In **Sweden**, the increase in numbers was mainly ascribed to a lower recognition rate for asylum seekers from Iraq.

The slight overall decrease in numbers of orders to leave on EU-level is not in small part attributed to significant decreases in Greece (from 146 335 to 126 140, a 14% decrease) and **Italy** (from 68 175 to 53 440, a 22% decrease). Also **France** recorded a significant decrease (from 97 515 to 88 565, a 9% decrease). The biggest relative decrease compared to 2008 was noted in **Malta** with a decrease of 44% (from 3 015 to 1 690). As was the case for the nationality of persons apprehended, the largest group among those ordered to leave in **Malta** were citizens of Somalia (58% of total). The decrease in the number of orders to leave ran parallel with an increase in persons actually returned (see below) - both developments should be seen in light of the peak in number of irregular arrivals in Malta in 2008.

Of the ten Member States issuing most orders to leave, only one, **Poland**, is not an EU-15 Member State. This may be explained by EU-15 Member States representing a higher level of “attraction,” as also indicated by the higher number of apprehensions and/or a stronger tendency to issue orders to leave to third-country nationals found to be staying illegally reported in these same Member States. In the same vein, the numbers of third-country nationals actually returned following an order to leave were highest among the EU-15, although not entirely following the pattern of the number of orders to leave issued.

Across the EU, 252 779 third-country nationals were returned following an order to leave, which represents a 5% increase compared to 2008. However, whereas only **Lithuania, Malta** and **Poland** recorded decreasing numbers in 2008, in 2009 14 Member States showed a decrease (Denmark, **France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Slovak Republic** and **United Kingdom**). The biggest decreases were found in **Slovak Republic, Italy** and **Poland** (31%, 26% and 19%, respectively). The decreases in **Slovak Republic** and **Poland** are mirrored in the decrease in returns of citizens of Ukraine. In **Italy**, the general decrease reflects the decrease in apprehensions and orders to leave. The biggest increase in the number of returns were found in **Hungary** and **Finland** (both 89%), as well as in **Malta** (74%). In **Hungary**, the main countries of citizenship of those returned were Serbia, Kosovo and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, whereas in **Finland**, nationals of Somalia and the Russian Federation were the most commonly returned. In **Malta**, nationals of Ghana were the ones most frequently returned, which may be largely attributed to the use of initiatives in favour of assisted voluntary return.

At the EU-level, and as for apprehensions, nationals of Albania by far constituted the largest group (63 190) of third-country nationals returned following an order to leave in 2009, as shown in Figure 22 below.

Figure 22: Third-country nationals returned to a third country following an order to leave, by country of citizenship, EU level, 2009, ordered by number of nationals.

Source: Eurostat data. No data for NO

Greece returned the majority (95%) from Albania. Another significant part of third-country nationals returned from Member States were nationals of third countries with land or sea-borders with the EU (e.g. Morocco, Ukraine, Turkey and Serbia). However, compared to 2008, the number of third-country nationals returned to countries neighbouring the EU is decreasing (amongst the 20 main countries of citizenship this applies of Albania, Morocco, Ukraine, Turkey, Algeria, Serbia and Moldova), whereas the number of returns of citizens of Brazil, India, Iraq, China, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Vietnam, Bolivia and United States is increasing. As illustrative examples, whilst Turkey and Serbia were number five and six among the top twenty countries in 2008, they were number nine and eleven in 2009. Whereas India and China were number seven and eleven in 2008, they were number four and seven in 2009.

5.4 Relationship between Refusals, Apprehensions and Returns

The remainder of this section deals with the possible relationship between refusals, apprehensions and returns of third-country nationals. In order to examine the existence of any such relationship, two types of data are reviewed:

- The numbers of refused, apprehended and returned people disaggregated by Member States.
- The numbers of refused, apprehended and returned people disaggregated by country of citizenship.

As explained in previous Synthesis Reports, a relationship between the numbers of refused, apprehended and removed migrants could be expected. When migrants from particular third countries try to enter the EU illegally, they may be refused entry at the border. If, however, they do succeed to enter and then reside illegally they may be apprehended and then removed. Alternatively, they might enter legally and then overstay their visa or permit. At the same time, no overall clear pattern emerges when comparing the number of third-country nationals refused,

apprehended and returned in 2009. Hence, the numbers related to those categories of data does not as such provide an exact overview of irregular migration into or within the EU.

Due to a lack of comparable data, it makes little sense to compare aggregated data on EU-level prior to 2008. When comparing the total numbers of refusals, apprehensions and returns in 2009, it can be seen that both the numbers of refusals and apprehensions decreased compared to 2008 (by 21% and 7% respectively), while the number of returns increased by 5%. This can be interpreted as a sign of a decline in irregular immigration and more effective measures for returning illegally staying third-country nationals, in line with policy developments in several Member States and the implementation of the Schengen Agreement following the enlargement. However, such interpretations should be read with caution, inter alia because:

- Apprehension and return for the same person may be recorded in different years;
- The figures may also relate to the developments regarding legal migration (e.g. the amount of expired visas, where third country nationals have entered legally) or an increase in (forced) returns following a sentence for having committed a crime;
- The development may be related to overall migration patterns, including a change in influx from different third countries, which raises e.g. the following issues:
 - some third country nationals, e.g. from Afghanistan or Somalia, may not be able to return/be returned to their country of citizenship, as opposed to, e.g. citizens of some non-EU Eastern European countries;
 - some third-country nationals may be more difficult to detect than others due to differences in access to diaspora communities, varying employment conditions/working sites, and some groups may be more easily identifiable (access to identification documents).
- Varying effectiveness or focus of control mechanisms in the different Member States influence the overall pattern to be detected, with large Member States and/or Member States with large migrant communities impacting more on the aggregated data.

At the level of individual Member States, a relationship between apprehensions, orders to leave and returns carried out can, in some cases, be identified. For example, in **Hungary** it is observed that apprehensions and returns were closely linked, in the sense that nationals of Ukraine, Serbia, Kosovo, Moldova and Turkey were both the most commonly apprehended and returned. In **Austria**, nationals of Serbia, Turkey, the Russian Federation and India were represented in all main citizenship groups concerning refusals, apprehensions, orders to leave and returns. Also in **Finland**, a clear relation between those apprehended and those returned can be detected, and there was a further correspondence between those apprehended and those seeking international protection. In **Poland**, nationals of Ukraine, Belarus, the Russian Federation and Georgia were all among the most often refused, apprehended and returned – also nationals of Moldova and Armenia were among the top ten countries in all categories. Nationals of Vietnam were among the most commonly apprehended and returned, but relatively seldom refused at the border. In **Ireland**, nationals of Brazil, China, Nigeria, Pakistan and South Africa were common in all categories. However, while nationals of Nigeria and Pakistan were far more often apprehended than refused or returned, nationals of Brazil were most often refused at the border. In **Sweden**, apprehensions and returns reflect the composition of persons applying for international protection; and in **Norway**, third-country nationals who are refused entry are automatically considered and registered as apprehended.

However, in other Member States, such as **Belgium, Germany** and **United Kingdom**, and at the EU level overall, no such connection appears in the statistics. At the EU level, this is *inter alia* due to variation in the procedures and categorisation by the Member States, and due to a lack of data. For example, in **Italy, Malta, Slovenia** and **United Kingdom**, the number of apprehensions of third-country nationals are identical to the reported number of issued orders to leave (pointing to the fact that third country nationals apprehended are consequently ordered to leave). In the **United Kingdom**, it is further noted that, in some cases, third-country nationals who are returned may have been refused at the border, but did not enter the country. Other Member States reported that a large share of the apprehended third-country nationals actually apply for asylum and are consequently not ordered to leave, and/or that the possibilities for return depend on various factors such as agreements with third countries and the situation in terms of stability or safety in the countries of citizenship.

Looking, in turn, at the relationship between refusals and apprehensions, a negative correlation could be assumed, i.e. the more third-country nationals are refused at the border of a certain Member State, the fewer illegally-staying migrants may be present in the Member State and consequently the fewer apprehensions are made. On the other hand, an increase in refusals could be due to an increase in the immigration flow, whereby the migrants succeeding to enter illegally might also increase, leading to a subsequent rise in the number of apprehensions. However, a relation between the number of refusals and apprehensions, in the data disaggregated by Member States, appears not to exist. More refusals do not mean fewer apprehensions at Member State level, or vice versa. Nonetheless, when including the variable of whether or not a certain Member State has external land borders, as presented in [Section 5.1.1](#), and that persons refused entry at land borders amount to 87% of all the persons refused by Member States in 2009, then some relationship does emerge.

Six Member States with external land borders (**Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovenia** and **Spain**) were amongst the ten Member States that recorded the highest numbers of persons refused entry. However, a comparison with the numbers of persons apprehended reveals that only two Member States (**Greece** and **Spain**) with external EU borders are amongst the ten Member States with the highest numbers of apprehensions. In other words, even though there is no clear statistical relationship between the number of refusals and the number of apprehensions, there does, in very general terms, seem to be a negative relationship between the number of refusals and apprehension, when taking into account whether a Member State has land borders that are also external borders of the EU.

Refusals are more of an external land border phenomenon, whereas apprehensions are more likely to take place in Member States without external borders. This could indicate various circumstances: 1) that Member States with external land borders often function as transit states for third-country nationals, who are later apprehended as illegally-staying migrants in other Member States; 2) that those Member States entered by third-country nationals after secondary movements within the EU, place more focus on detecting illegally-staying third-country nationals; and/or 3) that effective external border control diminishes the actual illegal entry of third-country nationals, and consequently the need for apprehensions in the Member States with external EU borders.

The relationship between refusals and apprehensions is further blurred by the fact that many who are apprehended (and subsequently returned) initially entered the Member States legally and then overstayed their visas or residence permits. This was observed in **Austria, Belgium, Estonia** and **Poland**. In **Poland**, it was noted in particular for third country nationals from Vietnam and Armenia who often overstayed their visas. In **Estonia**, there are about 100 000 'non-citizens' with undetermined citizenship, and some did not prolong their residence permits in time. It could be expected that the economic crisis would also influence the number of apprehensions and returns as the legal reason for stay for some third country nationals might expire *inter alia* due to layoffs.

When looking further into the country of citizenship of those apprehended and returned, it shows that Albania, Morocco and Brazil were among the top five countries in both categories. Afghanistan and Iraq were among the top five countries of those apprehended, but not among those returned. This is most likely explained by the fact the conditions in those countries make it more difficult to return their citizens. On the other hand, citizens of India and Ukraine were the fourth and fifth most common country of citizenship of those returned, but not among the top five of those apprehended. The only countries of citizenship in the top five of all three categories - refused, apprehended and returned - were Brazil and Morocco. The Russian Federation and Georgia were among the top five countries of citizenship of those refused entry (both groups most often refused entry into **Poland**), but not the top five of those apprehended or returned.

6. INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION, INCLUDING ASYLUM

New categories of data to be collected on international protection in the Member States and **Norway** were introduced by the [Migratory Statistics Regulation 862/2007](#).⁵⁰ This section presents the categories stipulated by the Regulation and thus includes some issues not included in Annual Reports from before 2007.

This chapter presents the following categories of data on asylum applications:

- Asylum applications and new asylum applications (by Member State, including **Norway**, and by country of citizenship)⁵¹
- Sex of the applicants⁵²
- Unaccompanied minors
- Asylum applications under consideration⁵³
- Withdrawn applications⁵⁴

The following data on decisions of international protection are analysed by Member State and country of citizenship:

- First instance decisions (including type of status granted)⁵⁵
- Final decisions⁵⁶

⁵⁰ Available in all Member State languages from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32007R0862:EN:NOT>.

⁵¹ The figures on new asylum applications do not include repeated applications from the same applicants.

⁵² This has not been presented in previous Annual Reports.

⁵³ This includes persons who are the subject of applications for international protection at the end of 2008. This category of data has not been included in previous Annual Reports.

⁵⁴ When application procedures are terminated by the applicant. This has not been included in previous Annual Reports.

⁵⁵ First decisions (positive and negative) considering applications for international protection as well as the grants of authorisations to stay for humanitarian reasons, including decisions under priority and accelerated procedures taken by administrative or judicial bodies in Member States. First instance decisions include decisions granted to persons who are a subject of the Dublin Convention (Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003).

- The proportion of positive and negative decisions

Available data on resettled persons and Dublin transfers are presented separately in this chapter.

In general, the following main developments and trends have been observed:

- Compared with a downward trend in the number of applications in the period 2004-2006 and a slight increase in 2008, the total number of applications for international protection remained largely stable in 2009. In total, 266 400 applications were lodged in the EU Member States in 2009, and for the 26 Member States with comparable figures for 2008, the total figure represents only a 1% increase, from 225 870 to 234 705).
- The number of applications lodged in the Member States varies significantly. **France** (47 686, being the Member State with the highest total number of applications), **Germany** (33 035), **United Kingdom** (31 695), **Sweden** (24 260) and **Belgium** (22 955) received the highest number of applications. **Estonia** (40), **Latvia** (60), Portugal (140), **Slovenia** (200) and **Lithuania** (450) received the least.
- This variation seems to be dependent on the countries of citizenship of those applying in the various Member States, and hence the conditions in the countries of citizenship and their migration routes, as well as on developments in policy and practice in some Member States. The largest groups of asylum applicants, considering the total number of applications, are nationals of Afghanistan, the Russian Federation, Somalia, Iraq and Kosovo. The number of applications from nationals of Afghanistan and Georgia doubled compared to 2008 and the number of applicants from Kosovo also increased significantly. These increases relate to the conditions of unrest in the above mentioned countries. The numbers of applications from citizens of Serbia continued the decline, as also observed in 2008. New in the 20 main countries of citizenship of applicants in 2009 were, in addition to Kosovo, Zimbabwe and China.
- Several factors influence the influx and distribution of persons seeking international protection: Certain migration routes are accessible and used by certain groups of nationals; geographical proximity is, in some cases, a decisive factor related to applications in the different EU Member States; policy and practice developments in some Member States. In some Member States the figures are also related to the number of persons apprehended as illegally staying third-country nationals, of which some seek asylum. Other factors include the existence of "migration chains" and diaspora or social networks.
- The total number of decisions on asylum applications in the Member States in 2009 reached 325 856. This is an increase from 2008 (298 329). Of the first instance decisions, 62 712 (27%) were positive, while 169 557 (73%) were rejected. Of the positive decisions, 27 822 persons were granted Geneva Convention status, 26 572 were granted subsidiary protection status, while 8 315 were granted humanitarian status. The total number of final decisions amounts to 55% of the number of cases being rejected in the first instance - the positive final decisions amount to 12% of all first instance rejections⁵⁷.

⁵⁶ Decisions on whether the third-country national or stateless person be granted refugee status by virtue of Directive 2004/83/EC and which is no longer subject to a remedy, i.e. decisions in appeals in cases rejected in the first instance.

⁵⁷ The data relate to the number and outcomes of appeals and are calendar-based, i.e. numbers for a particular year will represent decisions from applications made in previous years as well as in the year for which the statistics are given, and as a result, are not directly comparable.

- The largest group of applicants for international protection who were granted protection in 2009 were, in decreasing order, nationals of Somalia (13 890), Iraq (13 145), Afghanistan (7 275), the Russian Federation (6 140) and Zimbabwe (6 115). Compared to 2008, the number of citizens of Somalia who were granted protection increased by 4 230, and the number of citizens of Zimbabwe who received a positive decision more than tripled.

6.1 Applications for International Protection

The number of applications in the EU Member States, first and foremost, depends on the situation in the respective countries of origin (e.g. political and religious persecution, (civil) war, inter-ethnic tensions, and the economic crises). The extent to which asylum applicants are drawn to specific Member States also seems to depend on other factors, such as:⁵⁸

- “Accessible” migration and travel routes (including proximity);
- Existing migration chains, social networks and diaspora;
- The perceived chances of being able to remain in a Member State;
- The ruling practices of the courts, as well as policy developments;
- Perceived work opportunities.

Determining the reasons behind the influx to a particular Member State is thus a complex task of assessing multiple, in some cases interlinked, 'push and pull' factors of varying importance.


6.1.1 Total asylum applications

In total, 266 450 applications for international protection were lodged in the EU Member States in 2009.⁵⁹ There is no data on the total number of applications for the **United Kingdom** for 2008, but for the rest of the EU, the total figure did not change much from 2008 (a 4% increase, from 225 870 to 234 755). The **United Kingdom**, from which data on *new* applications are available from 2008, had a similar stability in numbers.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ These categories were listed in the German National Report. They mirror findings in the report *Why Norway? Understanding Asylum Destinations* (Brekke & Aarset, Institute for Social Research, Oslo, 2009). The factors seem to apply to most Member States.

⁵⁹ This includes repeated applications by the same applicant.

⁶⁰ In 2009, only 3% of the total number of applications were repeat applications - the number of new applications decreased by 2 % from 31 315 to 30 675 from 2008 to 2009.

Figure 23: Total number of asylum applications by Member State, ordered by number of applications, 2009

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used

When looking at the total number of asylum applications in 2009, including repeated applications from the same applicant, shown in [Figure 23](#) above, the number of applications lodged in the Member States varies significantly. **France** (47 686 applications), **Germany** (33 035), **United Kingdom** (31 695), **Sweden** (24 260) and **Belgium** (22 955) all received more than 20 000 applications, whilst **Estonia** (40), **Latvia** (60), Portugal (140), **Slovenia** (200) and **Lithuania** (450) received less than 500.

France recorded an increase of 14% in the number of applications compared to 2008. This increase shows that trends in asylum applicants are mainly based on variations in the country of citizenship of the applicants. The main countries of citizenship of third-country nationals applying for international protection in **France** were from Kosovo (with an increase of more than 70%), Sri Lanka and Armenia. While the number of applicants from the ten main countries of citizenship increased by close to 30%, the total rise in numbers from other third countries was much lower. **Germany** also witnessed an increase in applicants for international protection (of 23%). This was *inter alia* due to an increase in applicants from Afghanistan. **Finland** and **Hungary** also experienced significant increases in the number of applicants (51% and 47% respectively). In **Finland**, citizens of Somalia and Iraq remained the most frequent countries of citizenship of those applying for international protection, but the rise in numbers is mainly attributed to citizens of Afghanistan and the Russian Federation. In addition, exceptionally, 739 cases of citizens of Bulgaria were processed, although in an expedited manner. It appears that the reception conditions and daily allowances provided constituted a pull factor for these applicants. As in 2008, the higher number might also be linked to increased surveillance and enhanced co-operation between authorities concerning illegally-staying third-country nationals. In **Hungary**, recording an increasing trend since 2004, the rise in 2009 is caused by a tenfold rise in the number of applicants from Afghanistan, as well as an increase in applications from citizens of Kosovo and Serbia. Also **Estonia** witnessed a significant relative increase, but whilst the numbers rose from 15 in 2008 to 40 in 2009, the total number of applications remained low compared to other EU Member States.


The most significant decreases in applications were recorded in **Italy** (41%), Spain (33%) and **Ireland** (30%). **Ireland** continued a decreasing trend and witnessed the lowest number of applications since 1997. In **Italy**, the decline comes at the backdrop of a significant increase in 2008 and is explained by new restrictive policies focusing on the Strait of Sicily between Italy and Libya. As in previous years, Nigeria and Somalia were the most frequent countries of citizenship of applicants, although numbers were lower.

Whilst some Member States, such as **Sweden**, recorded stable numbers of applicants, the composition in terms of their nationalities changed. The number of nationals of Iraq continued to decrease, while other groups of nationals, such as from Somalia, increased.

When comparing the number of asylum applicants with the population of the Member States, most applicants per capita were received in Malta (5 800 applicants per 1 000 000 inhabitants, Cyprus (3 300) and **Sweden** (2 600) - the same top three as in 2008. **Norway** recorded 3 570 applicants per 1 000 000 inhabitants. The fewest numbers per capita were recorded in Portugal, **Latvia** and **Estonia** (15, 25 and 30 applicants per 1 000 000 inhabitants, respectively). These Member States, although in a different order, were also the ones receiving the lowest number of applications per capita in 2008.

When looking at the total number of asylum applications (including repeat applications) by countries of citizenship, some patterns emerge in terms of where certain groups of nationals apply for international protection.

Figure 24: Total Asylum Applications at the EU level, top 20 countries of citizenship 2009



Source: Eurostat data

The largest groups of asylum applicants are nationals of Afghanistan, the Russian Federation, Somalia, Iraq and Kosovo. It is notable that the number of applications of nationals of Afghanistan and Georgia doubled, compared to 2008, and Kosovo (number five in 2009) was not among the top 20 countries of citizenship in 2008, reflecting the political unrest and instability in these countries. At the same time, the numbers of applications from citizens of Serbia continued the decline, also observed in 2008, from 13 540 to 5 455. New countries in the top 20 in 2009 were, in addition to Kosovo, Zimbabwe and China. Mali, the Ivory Coast and Algeria disappeared from the top 20 list of countries.

Third-country nationals from Afghanistan in particular applied in **Norway** (3 870), **United Kingdom** (3 650) and **Germany** (3 520) and were spread among several other Member States; nationals of the Russian Federation mostly applied in **Poland** (5 725), **France** (3 785) and **Austria** (3 565); nationals of Somalia applied most often in the **Netherlands** (6 025) and **Sweden** (5 910); and nationals of Iraq especially applied in **Germany** (7 320), **Sweden** (2 310) and the **Netherlands** (2 165). Further down the list, 97% of all applications from nationals of Zimbabwe applied in **United Kingdom**.

In several Member States, certain third-country nationals made up a large part of the applications received. For example, 37% of all applications from citizens of Pakistan were lodged in Greece, amounting to 23% of all applications in the Member State (in 2008, they represented 35% of applications in Greece). Elsewhere, 36% of all applications made by citizens of Nigeria were received in **Italy**, amounting to 21% of the applications received in there and 61% of all applications recorded in **Malta** were from citizens of Somalia, and nationals of Iraq and Somalia comprised 51% of all applicants in the **Netherlands** (which experienced significant increases in applicants from Somalia, Afghanistan and Georgia). Of the persons applying for international protection in **Poland**, citizens of the Russian Federation and Georgia made up respectively 54% and 39%, (and 40% of all citizens of Georgia, who applied for international protection in the EU, applied in **Poland**). In **Austria**, 23% of all applications were from citizens of the Russian Federation. Furthermore, 38% of all applications in **Hungary** were lodged by nationals of Kosovo, and 21% of all applications in **Ireland** were from nationals of Nigeria. Also 22% of all applications in **Norway** were from nationals of Afghanistan. The number of applications from nationals of Eritrea to **Norway** amounted to 33% of all applications from this group in the EU and Norway combined.


The above indicate that there are: 1) certain migration routes accessible and used by certain groups of nationals, and 2) that geographical proximity in some cases is a decisive factor related to applications in the different EU Member States. The figures are also related to the number of apprehensions of illegally staying third-country nationals in some Member States, of which some seek asylum. Other factors include the existence of "migration chains" and diaspora or social networks.

6.1.2 *New applications for international protection*

Figure 25 shows the number of *new* applicants by Member State, i.e. those lodged during 2009 for the first time.⁶¹ The possibility of creating a complete overview of new asylum applications at EU level is limited by the fact that only 18 Member States were able to provide statistics disaggregating new asylum applications from the total number of applications under consideration, including repeated applications. The total number of new applications in these 18 Member States was 192 990. Seventeen of these (except **France**) also provided data on new applications for 2008, which shows a decrease in new applications of 2% (from 153 619 in 2008 to 150 910 in 2009). For those Member States, this slight decrease represents a continuation of a downward trend observed since 2004, which was broken by increases in 2007 and 2008.

⁶¹ Repeated applications by the same applicants are not included in the statistics on new or first-time applications.


Figure 25: Number of new asylum applications by Member State, ordered by number of applications, 2009



Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used

France is the Member State receiving most new applications in 2009 (42 070), followed by **United Kingdom** (30 675), **Germany** (27 650) and **Sweden** (23 680). **Estonia** (35), **Latvia** (50) and **Portugal** (140) reviewed the lowest numbers of new applications. The distribution among the Member States largely follows that of the total number of applications shown in [Figure 23](#) above, with, however, some variations. For example, whereas **Germany** recorded slightly more total applications than the **United Kingdom**, the situation is reversed when only counting *new* applications. Hence, in the **United Kingdom**, 3% of the total number of applications were repeat applications while in **Germany**, repeat applications amounted to 16%. **Belgium** also shows a high share of repeat applications (25%). Such variations can be related to several factors, including the composition of applicants in terms of country of citizenship, with some groups of third-country nationals being more prone to rejection and appeals, and a backlog of applications lodged in previous years, as repeat applications may be from applicants having their first application processed in the first instance in a previous year. Repeat applications may also be launched by applicants who have been returned to another country under the Dublin II Regulation.

[Figure 26](#) illustrates the 20 most prominent countries of citizenship of persons applying for the first time for international protection in the EU Member States. The data is limited by the fact that ten Member States were not able provide such statistics. However, the relative distribution of nationalities does not differ significantly from the breakdown by main countries of citizenship presented in main countries of citizenship presented in [Figure 24](#) above.

Figure 26: New Asylum Applications at EU level, top 20 countries of citizenship, 2009

Source: Eurostat data. No data for BG, DK, GR, ES, LU, HU, AT, RO, SK and FI. No data for NO.

The largest groups of new asylum applicants in 2009 were nationals of Somalia, Iraq, the Russian Federation, Afghanistan and Kosovo, which are the same five main countries of citizenship as those presented in the overview of the total applications (including repeat applications). While nationals of Afghanistan were the most common applicants in the total applications, they were number four regarding new applications, and the reverse was seen regarding nationals of Somalia, which were the most frequent group to lodge first time applications, but fourth on the list including repeat applications.

Compared to the total number of applications, the number of new applications from citizens of Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Serbia is relatively small, which implies that a relatively large part of applications from these groups were repeat applications. The situation is different with regard to citizens of Zimbabwe and Eritrea, where almost all applications processed were first time applications.

With regard to the sex of the asylum applicants, around two thirds of the persons seeking international protection are men. However, the sex distribution varies depending on the country of citizenship of the applicants. More than, or around, half of the applicants from Zimbabwe, the Russian Federation, Democratic Republic of Congo and Mongolia are female, while this is the case for less than 10% of the applicants from Sudan, Pakistan, Algeria, India and Bangladesh.⁶²


As far as age is concerned, the largest share of new applicants (around 55%) fall under the category from 18 to 34 years while 25% are under 18. The proportion of applicants less than 18 years old is higher in some countries, notably Russian Federation and Afghanistan, where it reaches around 45%.

⁶² Share of female applicants among total applicants in EU countries comes from Eurostat data.

6.1.3 Unaccompanied Minors

In 2009, 14 738 asylum applications were lodged by unaccompanied minors in the Member States and **Norway**. This represents a 26% increase compared to 2008, where 11 696 applications were recorded. Changes in trends concerning unaccompanied minors are difficult to interpret. Yearly fluctuations may reflect either changed migratory flows or may be a reflection of changes to administrative procedures concerning the automatic placement of unaccompanied minors within the asylum systems a means of regularising status. [Figure 27](#) below shows the breakdown by Member State and **Norway**.

Figure 27: Asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors, by Member State and Norway, 2009



Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. * Eurostat data used

The five Member States receiving the most applicants from unaccompanied minors (**Austria, Germany, Netherlands, Sweden** and **United Kingdom**) together recorded 70% of the total EU number of unaccompanied minors. **Norway** recorded the second highest number of unaccompanied minors.

In 2008, the **United Kingdom** also received the highest number of unaccompanied minors applying for international protection, but 2009 marked a considerable decline (by 26%, from 4 285 to 3 174). In 2009, the numbers are somewhat more evenly distributed among some Member States, which to an extent reflects the more even distribution of applicants from Afghanistan, from which the largest share of unaccompanied minors originated (see [Figure 31](#) below).


The EMN study on “*Policies on Reception, Return and Integration Arrangements for, and Numbers of, Unaccompanied Minors*”⁶³ found that the reasons and motivations of unaccompanied minors to enter the EU and/or seek international protection in the Member State “[...] range from fleeing persecution and seeking protection, to reunification with family members already residing in the EU, for economic, aspirational reasons, to join the migrant/diaspora community, in order to transit to another (predominantly EU-15) Member State, as victims of trafficking or of smuggling, for medical reasons or abandonment, runaways or drifters.” In 2008, **Finland, Greece, Netherlands,**

⁶³ European Migration Network, *Policies on Reception, Return and Integration Arrangements for, and Numbers of, Unaccompanied Minors – an EU Comparative Study*, 2010, p. 6. Available from: <http://www.emn.europa.eu> under “EMN Studies”.

Germany and **Sweden** in particular experienced a significant increase in asylum applications by unaccompanied minors. This trend continued in 2009 for **Finland**, **Netherlands**, **Germany** and **Sweden**. Additionally, **Austria** and **Hungary** witnessed significant increases (50% and 54%, respectively). In **Austria**, 41% of the unaccompanied minors were from Afghanistan.

The number of applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors disaggregated by their country of citizenship, is shown in [Figure 28](#) below. For the EU-27 overall, Afghanistan and Somalia are the most frequent countries of citizenship of unaccompanied minors (with 4 595 and 1 800 applicants respectively) followed by Iraq with 820 applicants. The main four countries of citizenship of unaccompanied minors are the same as the four main countries of citizenship of all asylum applicants (including repeat applications). The main five countries of citizenship were the same as in 2008, but whereas the number of unaccompanied minors from Afghanistan and Somalia increased significantly (both by 42%), the number of unaccompanied minors from Iraq decreased (by 53%).

Figure 28: Asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors, by country of citizenship, 2009




Source: Eurostat data used

6.1.4 Asylum applications under consideration⁶⁴

At the end of 2009, a total of 175 398 asylum applications were under consideration in the 25 Member States and **Norway** from which data are available. The number of applications per Member State is shown in [Figure 29](#) below.

⁶⁴ This includes persons who are the subject of applications for international protection under consideration by the responsible national authority at the end of 2009 - this may include applications lodged in previous years which have not yet reached a decision; applications which may be lodged in 2009 but finalised earlier in the year are not included in the figure.


Figure 29: Asylum Applications under Consideration per Member State, 2009

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. * Eurostat data used

Of the 25 Member States, **Austria, Belgium, France** and **Germany** processed the highest number of applications, all exceeding 20 000 cases. Compared to the total number of asylum applications received, the figure for **Austria** was comparably high. As in previous years, this could be related to the fact that, before 2006, **Austria** received a considerably higher number of applications and was thus still dealing with a backlog. In 2009, the number of applications in **Austria** rose by 24% (from 12 750 in 2008 to 15 815 in 2009). More than one fourth of the applications under consideration in Austria by the end of 2009 were submitted by citizens of the Russian Federation (16%) and Serbia (11%).

6.1.5 Withdrawn asylum applications

A total of 20 710 asylum applications were withdrawn in the Member States in 2008, which is a 42% increase compared to 2008. [Figure 30](#) below shows the number of withdrawn applications per Member State.

Figure 30: Withdrawn Asylum Applications per Member State, 2009

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. * Eurostat data used

As was the case also in 2008, **Austria** recorded the highest number of withdrawn asylum cases in the EU-27, amounting to 20% of all withdrawals – most withdrawn cases in Austria regarded citizens of the Russian Federation (16%), Kosovo (11%) and Serbia (10%). In the **United Kingdom**, which recorded the second highest number of withdrawals, more than one third of the withdrawn applications were from nationals of Afghanistan, China and India.

6.2 Decisions on International Protection

In accordance with the data collection requirements in the [Migratory Statistics Regulation 862/2007](#), data on first instance decisions as well as on final decisions are presented in this section. In order to present a comprehensive overview on the basis of the data provided, the first-instance decisions and final decisions are presented separately when possible. It is important to note that the data presented are calendar-based, i.e. numbers for a particular year will represent decisions from applications made in previous years as well as in the year for which the statistics are given. A cohort-based analysis, which follows an asylum applicant in time through the asylum decision process, is not possible on the basis of the Eurostat data. Also, because some asylum procedures take a long time, it is not always possible to provide definitive data on positive decisions in this way – complete statistics on decisions for a particular cohort will only become available a long time after the application.

The total number of decisions on asylum applications in the Member States in 2009 reached 325 856 (additionally, **Norway** issued 23 270 decisions). This is an increase from 2008 (298 329), above the level of 2007 (267 059) and 2006 (290 688) but below the level of 2005 (376 587).

The share of positive/negative decisions of first-instance and final decisions varies between the Member States. The extent to which international protection is granted may depend on several factors, such as:


- The countries of origin of applicants, as some Member States receive high numbers of applications from third-country nationals who come from countries of transit, or from countries of origin which are considered safe, while other Member States receive large numbers of applications from countries of origin which are not considered safe.
- Changes to the conditions in the countries of citizenship and new country of origin information received - including decisions on certain groups of applicants which are suspended due to, for example, uncertainty about the conditions in the countries of citizenship.
- National decrees, procedures and practice, including judicial practice. Some Member States tend to put more emphasis on a fast but complete first instance procedure ('frontloading'), and others show a tendency to 'spreading' the decision-making process into multiple stages.

6.2.1 First instance decisions

This section presents an overview of the number of first instance decisions (positive and negative). It considers applications for international protection and the grants of authorisation to stay for humanitarian reasons, including decisions under priority and accelerated procedures taken by administrative or judicial bodies in Member States. First instance decisions include decisions granted to persons who are subject to the Dublin Convention (Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003). Decisions to transfer a person to another Member State under the Dublin Regulation provisions count as a (negative) decision.

Figure 31 below shows the distribution of first instance decisions⁶⁵ in terms of the status granted. A total of 232 281 asylum applications reached a first instance decision in the Member States in 2009. Of these, 62 712 (27%) were positive, while 169 557 (73%) were rejected.⁶⁶ The total number of first instance decisions represents an 8% increase compared to 2008, but the distribution between positive and negative decisions remains the same.

Figure 31: First instance Decisions on Asylum Applications, by type/status, EU level*, 2009




Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. Eurostat data. ** Data on humanitarian status are provided by some Member States to Eurostat under art. 6 of Reg. 862/2007, i.e. residence permits. NO is not included in EU totals.

Note: No Member State has reported having granted the temporary protection status. Data do not add up due to rounding.

Of the positive first instance decisions, 27 822 persons were granted Geneva Convention status, 26 572 were granted subsidiary protection status, while 8 315 were granted humanitarian status. The granting of Geneva Convention status, subsidiary protection status and humanitarian status varies between the Member States, as shown in Figure 32 below.

⁶⁵ First decisions (positive and negative) considering applications for international protection as well as the grants of authorisation to stay for humanitarian reasons, including decisions under priority and accelerated procedures taken by administrative or judicial bodies in Member States. First instance decisions include decisions granted to persons who are subject to the Dublin Convention (Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003).

⁶⁶ The positive/negative figures do not add up to the total because some of the national data are rounded figures from Eurostat.

Figure 32: Positive First Instance Decisions on Asylum Applications, by status granted and by Member State, ordered by number of decisions, 2009

Notes: No Member State has reported having granted the temporary protection status.

Grants of authorisations to stay for humanitarian reasons at first instance are not applicable in Belgium, Bulgaria, Estonia, Ireland, France, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Austria, Portugal, and Slovenia (http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/Annexes/migr_asydec_esms_an1.pdf).

The outcome of an asylum procedure can be the granting of a residence permit for humanitarian reasons

(http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/Annexes/migr_res_esms_an6.pdf). These cases are reflected in the data under art. 6 of Reg. 862/2007, i.e. residence permits.

Data do not add up due to rounding.

Germany had the highest number of positive first instance decisions (9 765), followed by **Italy** (9 065) and **United Kingdom** (8 395). While the Geneva Convention status is granted in **Belgium, Estonia, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, and Slovenia** in three quarters or more of the positive first instance decisions, it is granted in one quarter or less of positive decisions in **Bulgaria, Italy, Greece, Latvia, Malta, Portugal, Slovak Republic and Sweden**. These differences can be attributed either to the varying nationalities of the applicants, and thus varying reasons for applying for international protection, or to varying national procedures and practices of migration authorities (including differing interpretations of the EU Qualification Directive 2004/83/EC and its provisions on the granting of refugee status and subsidiary protection, respectively).

Only **Austria, Belgium, Ireland and Estonia** have planned amendments to their current asylum legislation. Hence, policy developments in this area are less widespread than in 2008, when 13

Member States reported new legislation or amendments to existing legislation related to international protection, among others linked to the transposition of Council Directive 2004/83/EC (Qualification Directive). The Directive stipulates minimum standards for the qualification and status of third-country nationals and stateless persons as refugees (according to the Geneva Convention) or as persons who otherwise need international protection (subsidiary protection).

Within the national legal frameworks that have adopted the Qualification Directive, the statistics still point at varying decision-making practices in the Member States. In **Germany**, for example, 84% of the applicants from Iraq, who received a positive decision in the first instance, were granted refugee status (down from 99% in 2008). In the **Netherlands**, only 11% of nationals of Iraq who were granted international protection in the first instance were granted Geneva Convention status. The granting of the various categories of protection in the **Netherlands** is influenced by the policy of categorical protection, which allows the government to define certain groups of third-country nationals as 'risk groups' which qualify more 'easily' as Geneva Convention refugees or as 'vulnerable minority groups' which qualify for subsidiary protection. As the policy of categorical protection was abolished for applicants from Central Iraq in 2008, many of the applications were reassessed in 2009, and may have been granted subsidiary or humanitarian status. As another example of varying practices, all applicants from Somalia receiving a positive first instance decision in **Malta** (1 445) were granted subsidiary protection, while 80% of positive decisions in **Ireland** granted Geneva Convention status.

6.2.2 Final decisions


Final decisions refer to what is effectively a 'final decision' in the vast majority of all cases in the given Member State, i.e. appeals of cases rejected in the first instance, when all normal routes of appeal have been exhausted. Final appeal decisions concerning the transfer of a person to another Member State under the Dublin Regulation provisions are also included here.

A total of 93 575 final decisions were made in asylum cases in 2009, of which 20 035 (21%) were positive and 73 545 (79%) negative. The overall figure represents a 12% increase compared to 2008, when 83 220 final decisions were reached in the EU. However, the distribution of positive decisions and rejections remained the same. The proportion of positive decisions was thus lower than first instance decisions, but still a relatively large proportion of applications rejected in the first instance are granted international protection when appealed. The total number of final decisions amounts to 55% of the number of cases being rejected in the first instance - the positive final decisions amount to 12% of all first instance rejections.⁶⁷

6.2.3 The proportion of positive and negative decisions by Member States

The proportion of positive/negative decisions varies between the Member States. [Figure 33](#) below provides an overview of the proportion of positive and negative decisions per Member State, in the first instance and as the result of a final decision.

⁶⁷ It should be noted that some of the final decisions may relate to cases and first instance decisions from 2007.

Figure 33: Share of Positive and Negative Decisions on Asylum Applications by Member State, ordered by (a) number of first instance and (b) final decisions, 2009

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. * Eurostat data used.

As in 2008, Greece had very few positive first instance decisions (165, or only 0.01% of total first instance decisions, compared to 0.002% in 2008). Also **Ireland** (4%), Spain (8%), **France** (14%) and **Slovenia** (15%) have low positive first instance rates. At the other end of the scale are **Malta** (66%), **Portugal** (63%), **Slovak Republic** (48%), Denmark and the **Netherlands** (both 47%) with significantly higher acceptance rates.

There are some notable developments at Member State level. The **Slovak Republic** had the fourth lowest first instance acceptance rate in 2008 (9%), and showed a significantly higher rate in 2009 (with 48% being the third highest). At the same time, **Poland**, having the highest first instance acceptance rate in 2008 (65%), recorded a much lower rate of 38% in 2009. In the **Slovak Republic**, nationals of Afghanistan and Iraq continued to be the groups to which the most positive decisions were issued - groups with relatively high acceptance rates. In **Poland**, most rejections were issued to citizens of the Russian Federation and Georgia. A plausible explanation for the higher number of rejections is improved security conditions in Chechnya and the fact that the

relatively high influx of citizens of Georgia was economically motivated. Citizens of Iraq witnessed the highest acceptance rate (83%). While the number of appeals in **Poland** remained fairly low, a significant increase in the number of positive final instance decisions was recorded. In **Lithuania**, the acceptance rate decreased from 65% in 2008 to 29% in 2009, which is also likely to be related to an improved security situation in Chechnya - in 2008, the high number of positive decisions was partly attributed to a high number of decisions regarding citizens of the Russian Federation from Chechnya, who were subject to the non-refoulement principle.

Otherwise, little information was provided on the reasons for the varying shares of positive/negative decisions, but the distribution of countries of citizenship of the applicants is likely to be a major factor. The high acceptance rate in **Malta** may thus be related to a high number of applications from nationals of Somalia (of which many were granted subsidiary protection). Portugal, which also has a high acceptance rate, received few applications from nationals of countries with high rejection rates, such as the Russian Federation, Nigeria or Pakistan.

However, the distribution of countries of citizenship does not seem to explain the differences alone, as there are also differences in the practices or outcome of cases related to certain groups in the Member States. In **Ireland**, the most negative decisions were given in cases regarding citizens of Nigeria (595 or 20% of total number of rejections), which overall saw relatively high rejection rates across the EU. But whereas only 15% of applications of citizens of Iraq and 16% of citizens of Somalia received a positive decision in **Ireland**, the similar figures in the **Netherlands** were 42% and 64%, respectively. **France** had a relatively low acceptance rate of 16%, where the biggest groups rejected were citizens of Kosovo and Turkey, which also witnessed high rejection rates at EU level. However, the figures also show that the acceptance rates in **France** for citizens of Iraq and Somalia were 82% and 77%, respectively. Those rates were significantly higher than, for example, **Belgium**, which otherwise had a relatively high overall acceptance rate of 42%. In **Belgium**, the acceptance rate for citizens of Iraq and Somalia was 52% and 23%, respectively.

Looking at the final decisions, no negative first instance decisions were revoked in **Estonia, Malta, Portugal** or **Slovenia**. Less than five percent of final instance decisions were positive in **Belgium**, Cyprus, Greece, **Italy** and Spain. On the other hand, in **Poland**, 95%⁶⁸ of the final decisions were positive and in **Finland**, 78% were positive. **Finland** also had a high final instance acceptance rate in 2008 (90%, the highest among the Member States), but **Poland** had a significantly lower rate (16%). There is no explanation as such in the national report for this development. In Greece the positive final instance rate dropped from 27% in 2008 to 2% in 2009, where the low rate mirrored that of the first instance recorded in both 2008 and 2009).

There is no obvious correlation between the proportion of positive first instance and final decisions in the Member States. The Member States with no positive final instance decisions (**Estonia, Malta, Portugal** and **Slovenia**) have positive first instance rates varying from 66% (**Malta**) to 15% (**Slovenia**). The only Member States with significantly higher positive final instance rates compared to first instance rates were **Finland, France** and **Ireland**. The number of first instance and final decisions are not directly related, as the final decisions on cases may relate to appeals of first instance decisions from previous years. However, regarding the total number of final decisions, it is notable that in Greece, **Italy** and **Poland**, the number of final decisions in 2009 was particularly low compared to the number of first instance rejections in 2008 and 2009.


⁶⁸ According to national tables of data, 95 positive final instance decisions and ten negative were issued in **Poland**. However, the total number of final decisions recorded is 100. The discrepancy has to do with the rounding of numbers.

6.2.4 Positive and negative decisions by country of citizenship

For the EU as a whole, the largest group of applicants for international protection who were granted protection in 2009 were nationals of Somalia, with a total of 13 890, including both first instance and final decisions. The following largest groups were nationals of Iraq (13 145), Afghanistan (7 275), the Russian Federation (6 140) and Zimbabwe (6 115). In 2008, the top five countries of citizenship comprised, in the following order, Iraq, Somalia, the Russian Federation, Afghanistan and Eritrea. The most notable developments were that the number of citizens of Somalia who were granted protection rose by 4 230 (from 9 660), and that the number of citizens of Zimbabwe who received a positive decision more than tripled (from 1 985 in 2008).

In first instance decisions, Somalia (12 955), Iraq (11 640) and Afghanistan (5 880) were again the most frequent countries of citizenship for applicants granted protection status. Iraq (12 660), the Russian Federation (10 660) and Nigeria (10 540) were the most frequently rejected. The outcome of first instance decisions by countries of citizenship of the applicants is shown in [Figure 34](#) below.


Figure 34: Top 20 Countries of Citizenship, by positive and negative first instance decisions, EU level, 2009



Source: Eurostat data. For positive decisions, no data for LU

Among the top 20 countries of citizenship regarding positive first instance decisions, only citizens of Somalia (with 6 000 rejected cases and 12 955 positive decisions) and Eritrea (being the fifth most common country of citizenship regarding positive decisions, while not among the top 20 of those rejected) received notably more positive decisions than rejections. Some 1 380 positive decisions were granted in **Norway** regarding citizens of Eritrea. On the other hand, at EU level, citizens of Nigeria, Kosovo, Pakistan, Georgia and Turkey received more than ten times as many rejections as positive decisions. Compared to 2008, the neighbouring country of Serbia moved from the fourth most frequent country of citizenship regarding rejections to number 16, and while the country was not among the top 20 countries regarding positive decisions in 2009, it was number eight in 2008. The trends for the countries mentioned were also seen in the final decisions, as shown in [Figure 35](#) below.

Figure 35: Top 20 Countries of Citizenship, by positive and negative final decisions, EU level, 2009



Source: Eurostat data

Most final decisions were issued to applications from citizens of Iraq (8 825), the Russian Federation (7 275) and Zimbabwe (5 705). Zimbabwe stands out on the list with significantly more positive final decisions (3 265) than rejections (2 440). Following Zimbabwe, the most frequent countries of citizenship of applicants being granted citizenship in the final instance were the Russian Federation (1 890) and Sri Lanka (1 805). When looking solely at the final decisions, the three countries from which most citizens were refused international protection in the EU were Iraq (7 320), the Russian Federation (5 385) and Nigeria (3 740).

6.3 Resettled Persons

Twenty Member States and **Norway** have provided data on resettled persons. **Germany** (2 070), **Sweden** (1 890) and **Norway** (1 390) accepted the highest number of refugees, followed by **United Kingdom** (945), **Finland** (725), **France** (493), Denmark (450), **Netherlands** (370), **Ireland** (190), **Italy** (160), **Belgium** (45) and **Luxemburg** (30). **Austria**, Czech Republic, **Estonia**, **Latvia**, **Hungary**, **Malta**, Portugal, Romania, **Slovenia** and the **Slovak Republic** did not resettle any persons in 2009.

The provided data show that in **Norway**, the most frequent countries of citizenship were Myanmar (325), Bhutan (300) and Afghanistan (175). In the **Netherlands**, most nationals of Iraq (90), Ethiopia (45) and Bhutan (40) were resettled. In **Ireland**, the most frequent countries of citizenship were DR Congo (85) and Myanmar (80). In **Belgium**, Iraq was the dominant country of citizenship of the persons resettled.

6.4 Dublin Transfers

In 2009, Member States made a total of 39 133 requests to other Member States, to either take back or take charge of an asylum applicant in accordance with Council Regulation 343/2003 (the Dublin Regulation), also called Dublin-transfers. Of these, 69% (27 026) were requests to take back an applicant and 31% (12 107) to take charge.⁶⁹ This constitutes an increase of 34% in the number of requests made by a Member State compared to 2008.⁷⁰

The number of requests is indicative of secondary movements between the participating states of applicants of international protection and can be set against the number of asylum applications received in the EU. Out of the total 262 615⁷¹ new asylum applications received by the Member States and **Norway** in 2009, the 39 133 requests to other Member States and **Norway** to take back or take charge of an asylum applicant amounted to 15% compared to the number of new applications received. This constitutes an increase of 4 percentage points compared to 2008 in the number of applicants for international protection who were considered to not have applied for protection in the Member State and **Norway** in which they entered in the first place.⁷²

⁶⁹ 'Take back request' refers to requests to a Member State to take back applicants where, for example, asylum applications have already been lodged but not finalised in the Member State. 'Take charge requests' refers to requests to a Member State to take charge of an application if the third country has stayed in the Member State prior to lodging an application in another Member State.

⁷⁰ Data for **Belgium** is not available for 2008 and is therefore not included in the comparison of aggregated data between 2008 and 2009 though it is included in the 2009 total.

⁷¹ In order to compare with data for Dublin transfers, Denmark is not included in this figure though data for Denmark is available for new asylum applications.

⁷² It should be noted that 'first entry' is not the only criterion for determining which the Member State is responsible for the examination of an asylum application. Provisions related to family reunification (Art. 6, 7, 8 or 14) determine inter alia that the responsibility for an unaccompanied minor must be assumed by the Member State where a family member (having custody) of the applicant is legally present. However, requests related to 'first entry' make up the vast majority of cases.

Table 2 contains the total number of incoming and outgoing requests for each Member State, divided into requests to take back or take charge of asylum applicants.

Table 2: Dublin Transfers: Incoming and outgoing requests by type and by Member State, 2009

	Incoming requests			Outgoing requests		
	Total number of taking back requests	Total number of taking charge requests	Total number of pending requests at the end of reference period	Total number of taking back requests	Total number of taking charge requests	Total number of pending requests at the end of reference period
BE*	:	:	:	2 398	891	891
BG	141	55	15	31	42	19
CZ	343	238	15	259	39	10
DK*	:	:	75	:	:	68
DE	2 658	1 275	43	6 215	2 480	413
EE	5	33	2	7	3	1
IE	164	24	8	276	221	21
GR	2 351	7 155	0	7	25	5
ES	705	696	0	70	137	0
FR*	1 895	753	15	4 297	1 052	220
IT	4 849	2 581	2 915	844	316	88
CY	53	7	1	7	5	1
LV	11	52	3	11	3	2
LT	143	137	32	27	17	2
LU	129	4	0	119	68	19
HU	2 235	365	54	220	386	34
MT	1 007	118	0	0	6	0
NL	721	221	76	2 381	1 349	363
AT	2 178	258	51	3 915	1 549	125
PL	1 941	427	83	78	36	23
PT*	17	58	0	16	0	0
RO	270	208	23	57	45	2
SI	140	146	0	47	23	0
SK	608	90	36	109	23	15
FI	166	63	:	1 244	617	:
SE	2 485	139	61	2 669	1 832	382
UK	845	217	39	1 722	942	111
NO**	:	:	:	:	:	:

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables. * Eurostat data used. ** Eurostat data not available.

Reading note: Data includes requests with Iceland, Norway and Switzerland as partner countries

The total number of incoming requests (both taking-back and taking-charge) at EU level in 2009 was 31 874, which constituted an increase of more than a third (36%) compared to 2008.⁷³ Eleven Member States received more than 1 000 incoming requests in 2009 (in decreasing order): Greece (9 506), **Italy** (7 430), **Germany** (3 933), **France** (2 648), **Sweden** (2 624), **Hungary** (2 600), **Austria** (2 436), **Poland** (4 862), Spain (1 401), **Malta** (1 125) and the **United Kingdom** (1 062). In four Member States the total number of incoming requests more than doubled from the previous year: Spain (313%, 1 062), **Hungary** (175%, 1 655), **Estonia** (171%, 24) and **Lithuania** (104%, 137).⁷⁴

Twenty out of 25 Member States received a relatively larger share of take-back requests compared to take-charge requests in 2009.⁷⁵ Hence, in the majority of the Member States, the number of requests related to cases where third-country nationals had already lodged applications in another Member State was relatively higher than the number of cases where third-country nationals had used a Member State as a transit country without filing an application. The five exceptions were **Estonia**, Greece, **Latvia**, Portugal and **Slovenia**.

The largest shares of take-back requests out of the total number of incoming requests were recorded by **Luxembourg** (97%), **Sweden** (95%) and **Malta** (90%).

The total number of outgoing requests (both taking-back and taking-charge) in the EU was 39 133 in 2009, which was an increase by almost half (47%). Nine Member States made more than 1 000 such requests in 2009. This group, which is almost identical to the Member States receiving most requests, consists of **Germany** (8 695), **Austria** (5 464), **France** (5 349), **Sweden** (4 501), **Netherlands** (3 730), **Belgium** (3 289), **United Kingdom** (2 664), **Finland** (1 861) and **Italy** (1 160).

By observing the relationship between incoming and outgoing requests in terms of net amount of requests (number of incoming minus outgoing taking-back and taking-charge requests), the Member States can be divided in two groups, according to whether they receive a net surplus of incoming or outgoing requests to take charge or take back.⁷⁶ The following sixteen Member States reported a net surplus of incoming requests: Greece (+9 474), **Italy** (+6 270), **Poland** (+4 748), **Hungary** (+1 994), Spain (+1 194), **Malta** (+1 119), **Slovak Republic** (+566), Romania (+376), Czech Republic (+283), **Lithuania** (+236), **Slovenia** (+216), Bulgaria (+123), **Portugal** (+59), **Latvia** (+49), Cyprus (+48) and **Estonia** (+28). Nine Member States recorded a net surplus of outgoing requests: **Germany** (+4 762), **Austria** (+3 028), **Netherlands** (+2 788), **France** (+2 701), **Sweden** (+1 877), **Finland** (+1 632), **United Kingdom** (+1 602), **Ireland** (+309), **Luxembourg** (+54).

The above figures again indicate secondary movements within the EU. The general pattern remains that Member States with external Eastern or Southern land or sea borders to the Schengen Area have the largest net surplus of incoming requests, whereas the Member States with the largest net surplus of outgoing requests only have internal borders (e.g. **Germany**, **Austria** and the **Netherlands**).

⁷³ The aggregate number does not include **Belgium**, Denmark and Greece as data is not available for one of both of the years of reference.

⁷⁴ Data from National Reports

⁷⁵ Data not available for **Belgium** and Denmark.

⁷⁶ This relationship is dependent on variations in the number of received asylum applications. For example when a Member State registers an increase higher or lower than the average, the relationship between outgoing and incoming requests will consequently change.

Annex 1: Human Development Index 2009

HDI rank 2009		HDI rank 2009		HDI rank 2009			
Very high HDI		High HDI	Medium HDI	Medium HD (cont.)I			
1	Norway	39	Bahrain	83	Lebanon	126	Vanuatu
2	Australia	40	Estonia	84	Armenia	128	Namibia
3	Iceland	41	Poland	85	Ukraine	129	South Africa
4	Canada	42	Slovakia	86	Azerbaijan	130	Morocco
5	Ireland	43	Hungary	87	Thailand	131	Sao Tome and Principe
6	Netherlands	44	Chile	88	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	132	Bhutan
7	Sweden	45	Croatia	89	Georgia	133	Lao People's Democratic Republic
8	France	46	Lithuania	90	Dominican Republic	134	India
9	Switzerland	47	Antigua and Barbuda	91	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	135	Solomon Islands
10	Japan	48	Latvia	92	China	136	Congo
11	Luxembourg	49	Argentina	93	Belize	137	Cambodia
12	Finland	50	Uruguay	94	Samoa	138	Myanmar
13	United States	51	Cuba	95	Maldives		
14	Austria	52	Bahamas	96	Jordan		
15	Spain	53	Mexico	97	Suriname		
16	Denmark	54	Costa Rica	98	Tunisia	159	Togo
17	Belgium	55	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	99	Tonga	160	Malawi
18	Italy	56	Oman	100	Jamaica	161	Benin
19	Liechtenstein	57	Seychelles	101	Paraguay	162	Timor-Leste
20	New Zealand	58	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	102	Sri Lanka	163	Côte d'Ivoire
21	United Kingdom	59	Saudi Arabia	103	Gabon	164	Zambia
22	Germany	60	Panama	104	Algeria	165	Eritrea
23	Singapore	61	Bulgaria	105	Philippines	166	Senegal
24	Hong Kong, China (SAR)	62	Saint Kitts and Nevis	106	El Salvador	167	Rwanda
25	Greece	63	Romania	107	Syrian Arab Republic	168	Gambia
26	Korea (Republic of)	64	Trinidad and Tobago	108	Fiji	169	Liberia
27	Israel	65	Montenegro	109	Turkmenistan	170	Guinea
28	Andorra	66	Malaysia	110	Occupied Palestinian Territories	171	Ethiopia
29	Slovenia	67	Serbia	111	Indonesia	172	Mozambique
30	Brunei Darussalam	68	Belarus	112	Honduras	173	Guinea-Bissau
31	Kuwait	69	Saint Lucia	113	Bolivia	174	Burundi
32	Cyprus	70	Albania	114	Guyana	175	Chad
33	Qatar	71	Russian Federation	115	Mongolia	176	Congo (Democratic Republic of the Congo)
34	Portugal	72	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	116	Viet Nam	177	Burkina Faso
35	United Arab Emirates	73	Dominica	117	Moldova	178	Mali
36	Czech Republic	74	Grenada	118	Equatorial Guinea	179	Central African Republic
37	Barbados	75	Brazil	119	Uzbekistan	180	Sierra Leone
38	Malta	76	Bosnia and Herzegovina	120	Kyrgyzstan	181	Afghanistan
		77	Colombia	121	Cape Verde	182	Niger
		78	Peru	122	Guatemala		
		79	Turkey	123	Egypt		
		80	Ecuador	124	Nicaragua		
		81	Mauritius	125	Botswana		
		82	Kazakhstan				

Source: Human Development Report 2009: http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2009_EN_Complete.pdf

Annex 2: Tables of Data

LEGAL IMMIGRATION AND INTEGRATION

International Migration Flows

Overall Immigration by Member State in 2002 - 2009

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
BE*	113 857	112 060	117 236	132 810	137 699	146 409	164 152	166 479
BG*	:	:	:	:	:	1 561	1 236	:
CZ*	44 679	60 015	53 453	60 294	68 183	104 445	108 267	75 620
DK*	52 778	49 754	49 860	52 458	56 750	64 656	57 357	51 800
DE*	842 543	768 975	780 175	707 352	661 855	680 766	682 146	346 216
EE*	575	967	1 097	1 436	2 234	3 741	3 671	3 884
IE*	61 725	58 875	78 075	102 000	103 260	88 779	63 927	37 409
GR*	:	:	:	:	86 693	133 185	74 724	:
ES	483 260	672 266	684 561	719 284	840 844	958 266	726 009	498 977
FR*	:	236 037	225 629	219 537	219 407	209 781	216 937	:
IT	222 801	470 491	444 566	325 673	297 640	558 019	534 712	442 940
CY	14 370	16 779	22 003	24 419	15 545	19 017	14 095	11 675
LV	1 428	1 364	1 665	1 886	2 801	3 541	3 465	2 688
LT*	5 110	4 728	5 553	6 789	7 745	8 609	9 297	6 487
LU	12 101	13 158	12 872	14 397	14 352	16 675	17 758	15 751
HU	19 855	21 327	24 298	27 820	25 732	24 361	37 652	27 894
MT	533	:	:	187	1 829	6 730	9 031	7 230
NL	121 250	104 514	94 019	92 297	101 150	116 819	143 516	128 813
AT*	108 125	111 869	122 547	114 465	98 535	106 659	110 074	73 278
PL*	6 587	7 048	9 495	9 364	10 802	14 995	47 880	56 359
PT*	79 300	72 400	57 920	49 200	38 800	46 300	29 718	32 307
RO*	6 582	3 267	2 987	3 704	7 714	9 575	10 030	:
SI*	9 134	9 279	10 171	15 041	20 016	29 193	30 693	30 296
SK	2 312	6 551	10 390	9 410	12 611	16 265	17 820	15 643
FI	18 113	17 838	20 333	21 355	22 451	26 029	29 114	26 699
SE	64 087	63 795	62 028	65 229	95 750	99 485	101 171	102 280
UK	385 901	431 487	518 097	496 470	529 008	526 714	590 242	566 490
NO*	40 122	35 957	36 482	40 148	45 776	61 774	58 123	55 953
Sub Total: EU countries with all years available**	2 669 891	3 075 540	3 180 414	3 049 449	3 163 763	3 659 743	3 522 736	2 719 985
Total EU ***	2 677 006	3 314 844	3 409 030	3 272 877	3 479 406	4 020 575	3 834 694	2 727 215

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. NO is not included in EU totals.

** This excludes BG, GR, FR, MT, RO

*** with missing data for some countries for some years.

Note: Eurostat indicates breaks in series, in 2009, for DE, NL and AT and, in 2008, for CZ, DK, EE, HU, PL, SI, UK and NO.

Immigration by Member State and by main group of citizenship, 2009

	Total	Declaring country	EU27-countries except declaring country	Non EU27-countries nor declaring country	European Free Trade Association	Candidate countries in 2007 (3 countries)	Countries other than EU-27, EFTA and Candidate countries	Highly developed countries	Medium developed countries	Less developed countries	Stateless	Others	Unknown
BE*	166 479	39 602	66 379	60 226	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	272
BG*	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
CZ*	75 620	21 744	15 502	38 374	75	581	37 718	9 116	28 398	204	5	103	0
DK*	51 800	19 281	16 218	16 287	2 406	789	13 092	3 079	8 728	1 285	73	33	14
DE*	346 216	79 165	125 772	140 332	2 298	17 169	120 865	46 209	54 639	20 017	:	:	947
EE*	3 884	1 655	1 042	1 186	24	21	1 141	715	421	5	0	0	1
IE*	37 409	14 734	15 978	6 502	92	56	6 354	2 978	2 733	643	47	421	195
GR*	:	:	29 545	54 648	570	522	53 556	31 975	21 123	458	:	:	0
ES	498 977	29 635	144 867	324 475	2 262	889	321 324	83 192	223 593	14 539	24	165	0
FR*	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
IT	442 940	36 215	136 133	270 592	616	7 016	262 960	64 066	184 032	14 862	16	0	0
CY	11 675	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
LV	2 688	521	1 080	1 087	54	9	1 024	853	159	12	6	0	0
LT*	6 487	4 821	261	1 405	6	61	1 338	867	448	23	15	0	0
LU	15 751	1 116	11 929	2 667	88	102	2 477	1 219	1 026	232	3	131	39
HU	27 894	2 312	14 244	11 338	277	697	10 364	4 753	5 299	312	:	97	0
MT	7 230	1 226	3 955	2 049	0	8	2 041	152	207	1 682	:	:	0
NL	128 813	36 929	47 312	34 577	636	3 253	30 688	9 799	18 158	2 731	127	29	9 995
AT*	73 278	9 521	39 068	24 576	674	4 520	19 382	8 765	6 802	3 815	:	:	113
PL*	56 359	43 180	3 555	9 599	62	369	9 168	2 868	6 013	287	24	0	25
PT*	32 307	18 044	3 999	10 264	6	49	10 209	6 316	3 093	800	:	:	0
RO*	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
SI*	30 296	2 903	1 881	25 490	20	4 470	21 000	19 918	1 061	21	0	3 577	22

EMN Synthesis Report: Migration and International Protection Statistics 2009

	Total	Declaring country	EU27-countries except declaring country	Non EU27-countries nor declaring country	European Free Trade Association	Candidate countries in 2007 (3 countries)	Countries other than EU-27, EFTA and Candidate countries	Highly developed countries	Medium developed countries	Less developed countries	Stateless	Others	Unknown
SK	15 643	1 205	6 868	7 568	130	333	7 105	3 193	3 711	201	25	0	2
FI	26 699	8 612	6 472	11 331	132	466	10 733	3 511	4 630	2 592	50	0	284
SE	102 280	18 517	26 857	56 615	2 763	2 395	51 457	8 467	20 879	22 111	1 379	914	291
UK	566 490	95 966	167 415	303 109	2 107	2 736	298 266	79 874	183 498	34 894	:	:	0
NO*	55 953	7 303	26 884	21 752	8 581	494	19 980	3 948	8 258	7 774	1 191	0	14
EU**	2 727 215	486 904	886 332	1 414 297	15 298	46 511	1 292 262	391 885	778 651	121 726	1 794	5 470	12 200

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used.

**Missing data for BG, FR, RO and for some other countries for some categories. NO is not included in EU totals.

Immigration from citizens of countries outside the EU-27 into the EU, top 20 country of citizenship, 2009**

	in the EU	in Norway
Morocco	97 121	109
Ukraine	49 113	342
China (incl. HK)	47 383	658
Colombia	28 426	52
Albania	28 200	34
Peru	27 366	86
Brazil	26 777	395
India	26 391	617
Ecuador	24 813	23
Russian Federation	23 170	915
Pakistan	21 542	563
Moldova	21 293	34
Philippines	17 887	1 562
Bosnia and Herzegovina	15 692	119
Dominican Republic	14 468	36
United States	14 464	700
Senegal	14 043	22
Paraguay	13 698	8
Bangladesh	12481	69
Serbia	11727	2,860

Source: Eurostat data

**Missing data for BG, FR, RO

Overall Emigration by Member State in 2002 – 2009

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
BE*	75 960	79 399	83 895	86 899	88 163	91 052	100 275	103 718
BG*	:	:	:	:	:	2 958	2 112	:
CZ*	32 389	34 226	34 818	24 065	33 463	20 500	51 478	61 782
DK*	43 481	43 466	45 017	45 869	46 786	41 566	38 356	39 899
DE*	623 255	626 330	697 632	628 399	639 064	636 854	737 889	286 582
EE*	2 038	3 073	2 927	4 610	5 527	4 384	4 406	4 658
IE*	28 375	27 200	28 675	34 350	38 866	42 538	60 189	65 253
GR*	:	:	:	:	:	:	51 489	:
ES	36 605	64 298	55 092	68 011	142 296	227 065	266 460	323 641
FR*	:	134 037	120 629	127 537	107 407	135 781	140 937	:
IT	49 383	62 970	64 849	65 029	75 230	65 196	80 947	80 597
CY	7 485	4 437	6 279	10 003	6 874	11 389	10 500	9 829
LV	3 262	2 210	2 744	2 450	5 252	4 183	6 007	7 388
LT*	7 086	11 032	15 165	15 571	12 602	13 853	17 015	21 970
LU	9 452	7 746	8 480	8 287	9 001	10 674	10 058	9 168
HU	3 126	3 122	3 820	3 658	4 314	4 500	9 591	10 483
MT	96	:	:	:	1 908	5 029	6 597	7 389
NL	66 728	68 885	75 049	83 399	91 028	91 287	90 067	85 357
AT*	74 831	71 996	71 721	70 133	74 432	71 928	75 638	56 397
PL*	24 532	20 813	18 877	22 242	46 936	35 480	74 338	41 933
PT*	9 300	8 900	10 680	10 800	12 700	26 800	20 357	16 899
RO*	8 154	10 673	13 082	10 938	14 197	8 830	8 739	:
SI*	7 269	5 867	8 269	8 605	13 749	14 943	12 109	18 788
SK	1 411	4 777	6 525	2 784	3 084	3 570	4 857	4 753
FI	12 891	12 083	13 656	12 369	12 107	12 443	13 657	12 151
SE	33 009	35 023	36 586	38 118	44 908	45 418	45 294	39 240
UK	305 931	313 960	310 389	328 408	369 470	317 587	427 208	368 150
NO*	22 948	24 672	23 271	21 709	22 053	22 122	12 976	17 072
Sub Total: EU countries with all years available**	1 457 799	1 511 813	1 601 145	1 574 059	1 775 852	1 793 210	2 156 696	1 668 636
Total EU ***	1 466 049	1 656 523	1 734 856	1 712 534	1 899 364	1 945 808	2 366 570	1 634 092

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used.

** This excludes BG, GR, FR, MT, and RO

*** with missing data for some countries for some years. NO is not included in EU totals.

Note: Eurostat indicates breaks in series, in 2009, for DE, NL and AT and, in 2008, for CZ, DK, EE, HU, PL, SI, UK and NO.

Net migration by Member State (2002-2009; total population and per 1 000 inhabitants in 2009)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Population as of 1 January 2009	Net migration per 1 000 inhabitants
BE*	37 897	32 661	33 341	45 911	49 536	55 357	63 877	62 761	10 753 080	6
BG*	:	:	:	:	:	- 1 397	- 876	:	7 606 551	:
CZ*	12 290	25 789	18 635	36 229	34 720	83 945	56 789	13 838	10 467 542	1
DK*	9 297	6 288	4 843	6 589	9 964	23 090	19 001	11 901	5 511 451	2
DE*	219 288	142 645	82 543	78 953	22 791	43 912	- 55 743	59 634	82 002 356	1
EE*	- 1 463	- 2 106	- 1 830	- 3 174	- 3 293	- 643	- 735	- 774	1 340 415	- 1
IE*	33 350	31 675	49 400	67 650	64 394	46 241	3 738	- 27 844	4 450 030	- 6
GR*	:	:	:	:	:	:	23 235	:	11 260 402	:
ES	446 655	607 968	629 469	651 273	698 548	731 201	459 549	175 336	45 828 172	4
FR*	:	102 000	105 000	92 000	112 000	74 000	76 000	:	64 369 050	:
IT	173 418	407 521	379 717	260 644	222 410	492 823	453 765	362 343	60 045 068	6
CY	6 885	12 342	15 724	14 416	8 671	7 628	3 595	1 846	796 875	2
LV	- 1 834	- 846	- 1 079	- 564	- 2 451	- 642	- 2 542	- 4 700	2 261 294	- 2
LT*	- 1 976	- 6 304	- 9 612	- 8 782	- 4 857	- 5 244	- 7 718	- 15 483	3 349 872	- 5
LU	2 649	5 412	4 392	6 110	5 351	6 001	7 700	6 583	493 500	13
HU	16 729	18 205	20 478	24 162	21 418	19 861	28 061	17 411	10 030 975	2
MT	437	:	:	:	- 79	1 701	2 434	- 159	413 609	0
NL	54 522	35 629	18 970	8 898	10 122	25 532	53 449	43 456	16 485 787	3
AT*	33 294	39 873	50 826	44 332	24 103	34 731	34 436	16 881	8 355 260	2
PL*	- 17 945	- 13 765	- 9 382	- 12 878	- 36 134	- 20 485	- 26 458	14 426	38 135 876	0
PT*	70 000	63 500	47 240	38 400	26 100	19 500	9 361	15 408	10 627 250	1
RO*	- 1 572	- 7 406	- 10 095	- 7 234	- 6 483	745	1 291	:	21 498 616	:
SI*	1 865	3 412	1 902	6 436	6 267	14 250	18 584	11 508	2 032 362	6
SK	901	1 774	3 865	6 626	9 527	12 695	12 963	10 890	5 412 254	2
FI	5 222	5 755	6 677	8 986	10 344	13 586	15 457	14 548	5 326 314	3
SE	31 078	28 772	25 442	27 111	50 842	54 067	55 877	63 040	9 256 347	7
UK	79 970	117 527	207 708	168 062	159 538	209 127	163 034	198 340	61 595 091	3
NO*	17 174	11 285	13 211	18 439	23 723	39 652	45 147	38 881	4 799 252	8
Sub Total: EU countries with all years available**	1 212 092	1 563 727	1 579 269	1 475 390	1 387 911	1 866 533	1 366 040	1 051 349	394 557 171	3
Total EU ***	1 217 544	1 658 321	1 674 174	1 569 707	1 590 844	2 089 762	1 516 004	1 093 123	499 705 399	n.a.

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used.

** This excludes BG, GR, FR, MT, RO

*** with missing data for some countries for some years. NO is not included in EU totals.

Note: Eurostat indicates breaks in series, in 2009, for DE, NL and AT and, in 2008, for CZ, DK, EE, HU, PL, SI, UK and NO.

Usual Residence

Usual residence by Member State and by main group of citizenship as of 1st January 2010

	Total	Declaring country	EU27-countries except declaring country	Non EU27-countries nor declaring country	European Free Trade Association	Candidate countries in 2007 (3 countries)	Countries other than EU-27, EFTA and Candidate countries	Highly developed countries	Medium developed countries	Less developed countries	Stateless	Others	Unknown
BE*	10 839 905	9 782 239	715 121	337 723	3 599	43 649	290 475	68 881	172 821	48 773	637	1 654	4 822
BG*	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
CZ*	10 506 813	10 082 394	137 003	287 416	680	5 186	281 550	53 628	225 414	2 508	595	381	0
DK*	5 534 738	5 204 798	115 523	214 274	25 272	31 794	157 208	46 358	68 492	42 358	3 263	1 508	143
DE	81 802 257	74 671 338	2 546 259	4 584 660	48 503	2 063 854	2 472 303	1 250 153	967 135	255 015	15 402	95 298	0
EE*	1 340 127	1 126 708	10 968	201 691	203	69	201 419	195 165	6 228	26	:	:	760
IE*	4 467 854	4 026 561	309 366	75 033	661	958	73 414	27 675	32 038	13 701	736	6 043	56 894
GR	11 305 118	10 350 334	163 060	791 724	1 484	4 806	785 434	590 124	187 927	7 383	:	:	0
ES	45 989 016	40 325 491	2 327 843	3 335 682	38 401	4 826	3 292 455	972 559	2 198 760	121 136	510	943	0
FR*	64 716 310	60 947 294	1 317 602	2 451 414	45 374	230 702	2 175 338	249 308	1 698 309	227 721	:	:	0
IT	60 340 328	56 105 269	1 241 348	2 993 711	11 015	131 759	2 850 937	827 523	1 880 711	142 703	854	:	0
CY	803 147	672 800	83 477	43 839	450	102	43 287	10 507	23 519	9 261	:	:	3 031
LV	2 248 374	1 856 224	9 712	382 438	230	94	382 114	377 489	4 358	267	217	0	0
LT*	3 329 039	3 292 038	2 424	34 577	109	22	34 446	31 540	2 855	51	:	:	0
LU	502 066	285 721	186 244	29 455	1 396	1 190	26 869	17 186	8 477	1 206	:	:	646
HU	10 014 324	9 814 319	118 875	81 130	1 699	2 752	76 679	33 857	40 198	2 624	217		
MT	414 372	396 278	7 307	10 781	303	324	10 154	2 676	3 669	3 809	:	:	6
NL	16 574 989	15 839 792	310 930	341 258	4 496	93 065	243 697	56 682	165 858	21 157	2 060	177	83 009
AT*	8 367 670	7 482 588	328 330	548 025	8 311	185 383	354 331	264 677	69 709	19 945	:	:	8 727
PL*	38 167 329	38 117 697	14 777	30 687	218	608	29 861	11 480	17 618	763	209	0	4 168
PT*	10 637 713	10 180 407	94 160	363 146	1 420	431	361 295	133 907	170 416	56 972	30	64	0

EMN Synthesis Report: Migration and International Protection Statistics 2009

	Total	Declaring country	EU27-countries except declaring country	Non EU27-countries nor declaring country	European Free Trade Association	Candidate countries in 2007 (3 countries)	Countries other than EU-27, EFTA and Candidate countries	Highly developed countries	Medium developed countries	Less developed countries	Stateless	Others	Unknown
RO*	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
SI*	2 046 976	1 964 660	4 626	77 550	92	16 940	60 518	57 552	2 910	56	0	7 928	140
SK	5 424 925	5 362 043	38 717	24 165	601	1 183	22 381	10 091	11 802	488	81	0	0
FI	5 351 427	5 195 722	56 115	98 508	1 282	4 276	92 950	42 451	33 475	17 024	730	0	1 082
SE	9 340 682	8 737 789	265 818	324 657	41 442	14 757	268 458	56 600	97 413	114 445	7 758	1 061	12 418
UK	62 026 962	57 643 032	1 919 864	2 442 142	32 378	50 055	2 359 709	662 273	1 279 761	417 675	:	:	21 924
NO*	4 854 512	4 522 809	185 649	145 969	4 529 185	4 902	134 691	39 517	50 738	44 436	2 851	0	85
EU**	472 092 461	439 463 536	12 325 469	20 105 686	269 619	2 888 785	16 947 282	6 050 342	9 369 873	1 527 067	33 299	115 057	197 770

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. **Missing data for BG and RO. NO is not included in EU totals.

Acquisition of citizenship

Acquisition of citizenship by Member State and by main group of citizenship, 2009

Row Labels	Total	European Union (27 countries)	Non EU27-countries nor declaring country	European Free Trade Association	Candidate countries in 2007 (3 countries)	Countries other than EU-27, EFTA and Candidate countries	Highly developed countries	Medium developed countries	Less developed countries	Stateless	Others	Unknown
BE*	32 767	5 520	26 567	21	3 051	23 495	4 778	14 207	4 510	53	49	680
BG*	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
CZ*	1 149	260	879	0	20	859	145	676	38	7	:	10
DK*	6 852	477	6 370	114	546	5 710	973	1 666	3 071	458	79	5
DE	96 122	13 863	81 505	326	26 019	55 160	16 679	25 304	13 177	1 001	1 425	754
EE*	1 670	3	1 667	0	0	1 667	1 645	22	0	0	0	0
IE*	4 533	262	4 271	8	94	4 169	881	2 398	890	0	37	0
GR	17 019	463	16 462	13	181	16 268	15 200	1 040	28	11	8	94
ES	79 590	1 057	78 522	19	44	78 459	39 650	37 823	986	8	145	11
FR*	135 842	10 670	120 239	327	9 215	110 697	11 455	85 696	13 546	29	0	4 933
IT	59 369	5 779	53 590	402	1 980	51 208	21 723	26 762	2 723	22	:	0
CY	4 073	794	1 746	4	87	1 655	637	980	38	0	0	1 533
LV	3 235	10	3 225	0	0	3 225	3 159	52	14	13	0	0
LT*	203	0	203	0	0	203	69	27	107	106	0	0
LU	4 022	2 670	1 352	32	90	1 230	929	255	46	8	80	0
HU	5 802	4 065	1 737	0	35	1 702	965	708	29			
MT	817	187	615	3	3	609	473	117	19	4	0	15
NL	29 754	1 881	20 844	16	4 282	16 546	2 088	12 101	2 357	158	12	7 029
AT*	7 978	856	7 113	23	1 963	5 127	3 842	974	311	45	0	9
PL*	2 503	209	2 292	3	43	2 246	742	1 367	137	78	2	2

EMN Synthesis Report: Migration and International Protection Statistics 2009

Row Labels	Total	European Union (27 countries)	Non EU27-countries nor declaring country	European Free Trade Association	Candidate countries in 2007 (3 countries)	Countries other than EU-27, EFTA and Candidate countries	Highly developed countries	Medium developed countries	Less developed countries	Stateless	Others	Unknown
PT*	25 570	425	21 903	8	19	21 876	4 537	12 241	5 098	0	0	3 242
RO*	9 399	222	9 177	11	55	9 111	272	6 685	2 154	2 068	0	0
SI*	1 792	210	1 571	3	353	1 215	1 159	52	4	1	193	11
SK	262	90	169	0	5	164	61	101	2	0	0	3
FI	3 413	418	2 972	7	105	2 860	1 422	625	813	56	0	23
SE	29 525	6 005	21 449	530	1 540	19 379	4 144	7 361	7 874	963	11	2 071
UK	203 630	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
NO*	11 444	837	10 605	27	256	10 322	1 797	3 862	4 663	152	0	2
EU**	766 891	56 396	486 440	1 870	49 730	434 840	137 628	239 240	57 972	5 089	2 041	20 425

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. ** UK total taken from National Report. Missing data for BG. NO is not included in EU totals.

First residence permits, by reason and Member State, 2009

	Family reasons	Education reasons	Remunerated activities reasons	Other reasons	TOTAL
BE*	28 523	7 222	5 391	17 803	58 939
BG	1 539	1 623	769	454	4 385
CZ	9 283	4 142	11 312	2 802	27 539
DK*	4 680	6 406	11 113	4 210	26 409
DE	54 139	31 345	16 667	19 803	121 954
EE	1 148	383	1 135	1 111	3 777
IE	2 608	12 263	4 827	5 811	25 509
GR	22 637	1 489	16 383	4 639	45 148
ES	125 288	22 068	102 736	40 721	290 813
FR*	87 548	53 309	19 650	32 993	193 500
IT	75 153	32 634	235 966	163 080	506 833
CY	640	5 407	13 762	5 829	25 638
LV	759	212	464	869	2 304
LT	788	422	1 358	91	2 659
LU	:	:	:	:	:
HU	1 753	4 234	5 326	2 976	14 289
MT	391	191	669	2 431	3 682
NL	23 078	9 944	10 433	13 034	56 489
AT	14 572	3 233	2 692	7 538	28 035
PL	8 699	7 066	11 123	6 539	33 427
PT*	19 964	4 302	18 275	3 783	46 324
RO	6 043	3 541	4 724	1 072	15 380
SI	3 116	666	11 910	67	15 759
SK	1 156	334	2 302	1 544	5 336
FI	6 643	3 949	2 754	4 688	18 034
SE	37 890	13 968	18 978	20 501	91 337
UK	121 268	268 506	116 668	164 882	671 324
NO	12 060	3 037	6 624	4 677	26 398
EU**	659 306	498 859	647 387	529 271	2 334 823

Source: Eurostat data

**No data for LU. NO is not included in EU totals.

First residence permits for remunerated activities, by reason and Member State, 2009

	Remunerated activities reasons	Remunerated activities reasons: Highly skilled workers	Remunerated activities reasons: Researchers	Remunerated activities reasons: Seasonal workers	Remunerated activities reasons: Other remunerated activities
BE	5 391	1 202	0	0	4 189
BG	769	:	:	:	:
CZ	11 312	18	61	:	11 233
DK	11 113	3 594	783	:	6 736
DE	16 667	119	94	0	16 454
EE	1 135	:	15	:	1 120
IE	4 827	1 483	166	:	3 178
GR	16 383	0	31	13 835	2 517
ES	102 736	2 071	390	5 314	94 961
FR	19 650	2 366	2 243	2 236	12 805
IT	235 966	:	118	23 034	212 814
CY	13 762	436	0	1 256	12 070
LV	464	85	1	:	378
LT	1 358	:	2	:	1 356
LU	:	:	:	:	:
HU	5 326	:	35	791	4 500
MT	669	135	0	0	534
NL	10 433	4 895	1 305	:	4 233
AT	2 692	575	143	:	1 974
PL	11 123	:	11	:	11 112
PT	18 275	307	:	:	17 968
RO	4 724	:	:	:	:
SI	11 910	0	8	1 627	10 275
SK	2 302	0	10	0	2 292
FI	2 754	:	:	:	2 754
SE	18 978	2 810	812	6 879	8 477
UK	116 668	18 931	:	:	97 737
NO	6 624	1 464	417	1 543	3 200
EU**	647 387	39 027	6 228	54 972	541 667

Source: Eurostat data

**Excluding LU, BG and RO as there is no data for LU and only total figures available for BG and RO. The rest of the data is not complete: most of the first residence permits for remunerated activities reasons are categorised under "other".

According to Eurostat metadata, there are two factors behind this:

- Data "*not available*": data that are principally existing but cannot be delivered for various reasons (e.g. breakdowns cannot be made, no access to data etc.).
- Data "*not applicable*": categories of permits which are not existing in national legislation/administrative procedures and therefore such permits cannot be issued.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION AND RETURN**Apprehensions****Third-country nationals apprehended/found to be illegally present, by Member State, 2009**

	Third country nationals apprehended / found to be illegally present
BE*	13 710
BG	1 465
CZ	3 955
DK*	640
DE	49 555
EE	860
IE	5 035
GR	108 317
ES	90 500
FR*	76 355
IT	53 440
CY	8 030
LV	245
LT	1 495
LU	260
HU	5 735
MT	1 690
NL	7 565
AT	17 145
PL	4 520
PT*	11 130
RO	4 365
SI	1 065
SK	1 715
FI	6 660
SE	22 230
UK	69 745
NO	1 600
EU	567 427

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. NO is not included in EU totals.

Third-country nationals found to be illegally staying, top 20 countries of citizenship, EU level, 2009

	in the EU	in Norway
Albania	68 985	20
Afghanistan	49 670	85
Morocco	32 555	15
Iraq	23 425	245
Brazil	18 565	5
China (incl. HK)	17 055	15
India	16 655	20
Somalia	16 605	245
Nigeria	16 420	60
Algeria	15 920	25
Pakistan	15 480	20
Bolivia	14 835	
Tunisia	13 880	5
Vietnam	12 950	30
Turkey	11 760	35
Ukraine	11 220	10
Palestinian territory	11 020	
Eritrea	10 680	210
Russia	10 335	35
Iran	9 320	25

Source: Eurostat data

Third-country nationals ordered to leave and returned following an order to leave, by Member State, 2009

	Third country nationals ordered to leave	Third country nationals returned following an order to leave
BE*	27 980	4 060
BG	1 465	285
CZ	3 805	850
DK*	:	800
DE	14 595	11 900
EE	150	115
IE	1 615	830
GR	126 140	62 850
ES	103 010	28 865
FR*	88 565	18 400
IT	53 440	5 315
CY	3 205	4 520
LV	220	205
LT	1 120	925
LU	183	94
HU	4 850	2 245
MT	1 690	530
NL	35 575	8 980
AT	10 625	6 410
PL	11 875	6 945
PT*	10 295	1 220
RO	5 125	4 670
SI	1 065	2 220
SK	1 180	900
FI	3 125	1 720
SE	17 820	11 980
UK	69 745	64 945
NO	:	:
EU**	569 018	248 434

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used ** Missing data for NO and for Third country nationals ordered to leave, for DK. NO is not included in EU totals.

Third-country nationals returned following an order to leave, by main country of citizenship, EU level, 2009

Country of citizenship	Third country nationals returned following an order to leave
Albania	63190
Morocco	15380
Brazil	11710
India	8710
Ukraine	8340
Iraq	8055
China (incl. HK)	7815
Afghanistan	6745
Turkey	6740
Algeria	6630
Serbia	5855
Nigeria	5850
Russia	5180
Pakistan	4835
Vietnam	4615
Kosovo (1244/99)	4195
Bolivia	3765
United States	3655
Moldova	3090
Tunisia	2865

Source: Eurostat data. Missing data for NO

Third-country nationals refused entry, by Member State and by external border, 2009

	Persons refused entry	Refused at the land border	Refused at the sea border	Refused at the air border
BE*	2 055	:	60	1 990
BG	3 030	2 405	80	540
CZ	380	:	:	380
DK*	60	:	5	55
DE	2 980	:	55	2 920
EE	915	315	595	10
IE	3 560	630	225	2 710
GR	3 000	1 875	385	740
ES	387 015	375 905	1 165	9 945
FR*	14 280	2 565	580	11 135
IT	3 700	:	1 190	2 510
CY	670	:	55	615
LV	670	475	15	185
LT	1 750	1 655	50	45
LU	0	:	:	0
HU	8 233	8 068	:	165
MT	140	:	15	125
NL	2 500	:	60	2 445
AT	645	205	:	445
PL	26 890	26 230	45	610
PT*	2 565	:	5	2 560
RO	4 595	3 285	105	1 205
SI	7 895	7 720	5	170
SK	855	815	:	40
FI	1 300	1 060	0	235
SE	35	:	0	35
UK	20 460	1 765	2 900	15 795
NO	80	25	15	40
EU	500 178	434 973	7 595	57 610

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. NO is not included in EU totals.

Third-country nationals refused entry, by reason, EU level, 2009**

	Refusals - EU level**	Share	Refusals in NO
No valid visa or residence permit	48 160	39%	10
Purpose and conditions of stay not justified	30 415	24%	
No sufficient means of subsistence	16 295	13%	30
No valid travel document(s)	10 655	9%	
An alert has been issued	8 175	7%	25
False travel document	3 390	3%	
False visa or residence permit	2 955	2%	5
Person considered to be a public threat	2 800	2%	5
Person already stayed 3 months in a 6-months period	1 915	2%	5

Source: Eurostat data. Reason indicated for 25% of total refusals. Missing data for 97% of refusals in Spain. NO not included in EU level

ASYLUM: INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION**Applications for International Protection****Number of applications by Member State and by type, 2009**

	All asylum applicants	New asylum applicants	Asylum Applications under Consideration, end 2009	Withdrawn Asylum Applications
BE*	22 955	17 215	28 515	1 495
BG	855	:	1 315	45
CZ	1 245	630	750	75
DK*	3 775	:	1 195	:
DE	33 035	27 650	22 710	2 130
EE	40	35	25	5
IE	2 690	2 660	5 780	900
GR	15 925	:	1 330	415
ES	3 005	:	3 280	225
FR	47 686	42 070	22 820	160
IT	17 670	17 670	4 365	1 225
CY	3 200	3 200	:	:
LV	60	50	50	10
LT	450	210	140	85
LU	480	:	418	:
HU	4 670	4 113	450	350
MT	2 385	2 385	220	300
NL	16 140	14 880	16 245	635
AT	15 815	:	28 600	4 075
PL	10 590	9 655	2 785	1 345
PT*	140	140	5	5
RO	965	:	25	10
SI	200	185	110	95
SK	820	:	70	40
FI	5 700	:	4 260	450
SE	24 260	23 680	18 935	2 915
UK	31 695	30 675	:	3 720
NO	17 225	:	11 000	560
EU	266 451	197 103	164 398	20 710

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. **Data is not complete for all series. NO is not included in EU totals.

New Asylum Applications at EU level*, top 20 countries of citizenship, 2009

Top 20 countries of citizenship	New Asylum Applications at EU level*
Somalia	16 690
Iraq	13 800
Russia	13 060
Afghanistan	12 470
Kosovo (1244/99)	9 655
Zimbabwe	7 815
Nigeria	7 680
Georgia	6 755
Sri Lanka	6 020
Iran	5 825
Armenia	5 525
Pakistan	5 340
Eritrea	4 950
Turkey	4 910
China (incl. HK)	4 495
Dem. Rep. Congo	4 150
Guinea	3 715
Bangladesh	3 420
Serbia	3 060
Algeria	2 530

Source: Eurostat data. *No data for BG, DK, GR, ES, LU, HU, AT, RO, SK and FI. No data for NO.

Asylum Applications at the EU level, top 20 countries of citizenship, 2009

	in the EU	in Norway
Afghanistan	20 455	3 870
Russia	20 095	865
Somalia	18 995	1 900
Iraq	18 835	1 215
Kosovo (1244/99)	14 275	0
Georgia	10 490	45
Nigeria	10 270	580
Pakistan	9 935	140
Iran	8 570	575
Zimbabwe	8 045	35
Sri Lanka	7 390	210
Turkey	7 025	80
Armenia	6 850	30
Bangladesh	5 980	20
China (incl. HK)	5 795	70
Serbia	5 455	405
Eritrea	5 225	2 665
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	4 955	105
Syria	4 750	280
Guinea	4 480	75

Source: Eurostat data

Asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors, by Member State, 2009

	Asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors
BE*	730
BG	10
CZ	10
DK*	520
DE	1 305
EE	0
IE	55
GR	40
ES	20
FR*	445
IT	420
CY	20
LV	0
LT	3
LU	13
HU	270
MT	45
NL	1 040
AT	1 040
PL	360
PT*	0
RO	40
SI	25
SK	30
FI	555
SE	2 250
UK	3 174
NO	2 500
EU	12 420

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. NO is not included in EU totals.

Asylum applicants considered to be unaccompanied minors, by country of citizenship, 2009

	in the EU	in Norway
Afghanistan	4 595	1 720
Somalia	1 800	245
Iraq	820	85
Russia	470	25
Eritrea	405	145
Nigeria	320	15
Guinea	310	5
Iran	305	15
Dem. Rep. Congo	185	5
Vietnam	165	0
Algeria	140	25
China (incl. HK)	120	0
Sri Lanka	120	35
Kosovo (1244/99)	115	0
Turkey	110	0
Albania	95	0
India	95	0
Moldova	90	0
Ethiopia	90	50
Gambia	90	10

Source: Eurostat data

Decisions on International Protection

	First instance decisions							Decisions Withdrawing Status Granted at First Instance Decision	Final decisions			Decisions Withdrawing Status Granted as Final Decision
	TOTAL	Total positive	Geneva Convention status	Subsidiary protection status	Temporary protection status	Humanitarian status	Rejected		TOTAL	Total positive	Rejected	
BE*	15 310	2 910	2 425	480	0	:	12 400	540	7 550	280	7 270	:
BG	645	270	40	230	0	:	375	0	50	10	40	:
CZ	535	100	60	20	0	20	435	0	420	25	395	0
DK*	1 675	790	350	345	0	95	880		440	130	310	:
DE	26 855	9 765	8 155	405	0	1 205	17 090	4 810	6 740	2 295	4 445	800
EE	25	4	3	1	0	:	20	0	0	0	0	0
IE	3 135	125	105	25	0	:	3 010	5	3 425	270	3 160	5
GR	14 355	165	35	105	0	25	14 185	0	2 105	40	2 065	0
ES	4 490	350	180	160	0	10	4 140	0	1 715	30	1 685	:
FR	35 295	5 050	3 910	1 140	0	:	30 240	80	19 565	5 365	14 200	25
IT	23 015	9 065	2 250	5 335	0	1 480	13 950	140	1 525	45	1 475	10
CY	3 855	1 130	50	1 040	0	40	2 725	0	2 660	80	2 580	0
LV	40	10	0	5	0	:	35	0	15	5	10	0
LT	145	40	10	30	0	:	100	10	55	5	50	0
LU	471	112	112	2	0	:	357	27	205	30	170	0
HU	1 805	390	170	60	0	155	1 415	25	150	10	145	0
MT	2 575	1 690	20	1 660	0	10	885	0	475	0	475	0
NL	17 565	8 245	695	3 270	0	4 280	9 320	770	645	220	425	:
AT	14 845	3 220	1 885	1 335	0	:	11 625	285	11 865	1 780	10 085	35
PL	6 555	2 510	130	2 315	0	65	4 045	7	100	95	10	:
PT*	95	50	5	45	0	:	45	0	0	0	0	0
RO	540	115	50	10	0	55	430	0	670	95	575	0
SI	130	20	15	5	0	:	110	20	70	0	70	0

EMN Synthesis Report: Migration and International Protection Statistics 2009

	First instance decisions							Decisions Withdrawing Status Granted at First Instance Decision	Final decisions			Decisions Withdrawing Status Granted as Final Decision
	TOTAL	Total positive	Geneva Convention status	Subsidiary protection status	Temporary protection status	Humanitarian status	Rejected		TOTAL	Total positive	Rejected	
SK	280	135	15	90	0	30	145	45	35	15	20	0
FI	2 960	960	75	805	0	80	2 000	:	65	50	15	0
SE	23 985	7 095	1 480	4 970	0	640	16 890	145	15 435	1 995	13 440	10
UK	31 100	8 395	5 595	2 680	0	125	22 705	:	17 595	7 165	10 430	:
NO	14 760	4 510	1 755	1 630	0	1 125	10 250	30	8 510	430	8 080	5
EU**	232 281	62 711	27 820	26 568	0	8 315	169 557	6 909	93 575	20 035	73 545	885

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. **Data is not complete for all series. NO is not included in EU totals.

Top 20 countries of citizenship by positive and negative first instance decisions, EU level*, 2009

	Total first instance positive decisions in the EU	Total first instance decisions in Norway		Rejected first instance decisions in the EU	Rejected first instance decisions in Norway
Somalia	12 955	645	Iraq	12 660	1 895
Iraq	11 640	365	Russia	10 660	675
Afghanistan	5 880	980	Nigeria	10 540	515
Russia	4 520	50	Afghanistan	8 320	1 810
Eritrea	4 020	1 380	Kosovo (1244/99)	8 050	0
Zimbabwe	2 850	0	Pakistan	7 735	70
Iran	2 070	170	Somalia	6 000	855
Sri Lanka	1 655	40	Georgia	5 925	30
Palestinian territory	1 125	0	Zimbabwe	5 690	15
Guinea	850	5	Turkey	5 405	45
Nigeria	815	10	Iran	5 190	435
Turkey	805	0	Bangladesh	5 180	5
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	765	20	Sri Lanka	4 340	285
China (incl. HK)	700	45	Armenia	4 095	30
Côte d'Ivoire	670	0	China (incl. HK)	3 730	10
Kosovo (1244/99)	620	0	Serbia	3 525	330
Pakistan	615	0	Dem. Rep. of the Congo	3 445	40
Mali	605	0	Syria	3 200	130
Syria	585	5	Algeria	3 040	110
Sudan	560	55	Guinea	2 835	40

Source: Eurostat data * for positive decisions, no data for LU

Top 20 countries of citizenship by positive and negative final decisions, EU level, 2009

Country of citizenship	Total final positive decisions in the EU	Total final positive decisions in Norway	Country of citizenship	Rejected decisions in the EU	Rejected decisions in Norway
Zimbabwe	3265	0	Iraq	7320	1860
Russia	1890	145	Russia	5385	905
Sri Lanka	1805	20	Nigeria	3740	390
Iraq	1505	20	Turkey	3375	60
Afghanistan	1395	55	Pakistan	3245	50
Iran	1215	45	Serbia	3090	475
Somalia	935	35	Armenia	2650	10
Turkey	775	0	Kosovo (1244/99)	2595	300
Armenia	490	0	Afghanistan	2545	320
Eritrea	475	10	Zimbabwe	2440	25
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	470	10	Iran	2395	305
Serbia	455	20	Dem. Rep. of the Congo	2225	70
Pakistan	370	5	Bangladesh	2170	15
Kosovo (1244/99)	340	5	Sri Lanka	2160	215
Bangladesh	335	0	Georgia	1675	15
Guinea	275	0	China (incl. HK)	1645	15
Azerbaijan	275	0	Syria	1385	65
Sudan	255	0	Somalia	1130	660
Nigeria	185	0	India	1130	10
Syria	165	0	Algeria	945	80

Source: Eurostat data

Resettled persons by Member State, 2009

	Resettled persons
BE*	45
BG	:
CZ	0
DK*	450
DE	2 070
EE	0
IE	190
GR	:
ES	:
FR	493
IT	160
CY	:
LV	0
LT	:
LU	30
HU	0
MT	0
NL	370
AT	:
PL	:
PT*	0
RO	0
SI	0
SK	0
FI	725
SE	1 890
UK*	945
NO	1 390
EU**	7 368

Source: EMN NCP National Statistical Tables * Eurostat data used. **Data is not complete. NO is not included in EU totals.