

Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics 2006

produced by the

European Migration Network

October 2009

This EMN Synthesis Report summarises the main findings for the year 2006 of the analysis of asylum and migration statistics undertaken by 24 EMN NCPs (**Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom**).

Topics covered are Asylum Applications and Decisions, Migration Flows to/from an EU Member State, Population by Citizenship, then Refusals, Apprehensions and Removals.

The [EMN NCP National Reports and Data](http://emn.sarenet.es/Downloads/prepareShowFiles.do?directoryID=110), upon which this Synthesis Report is based, may be obtained directly from the EMN NCPs concerned themselves or from <http://emn.sarenet.es/Downloads/prepareShowFiles.do?directoryID=110>.

CONTENTS

Disclaimer.....	3
Explanatory Note.....	3
<i>Executive Summary</i>	4
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. METHODOLOGY	7
3. ASYLUM APPLICANTS AND DECISIONS MADE	9
3.1 Asylum Applications	9
Table 1: First-time asylum applications in 2006 ordered by ratio of Asylum applicants per 1 000 habitants in each Member State	11
3.2 Asylum Applications by Unaccompanied Minors	18
3.3 Decisions	19
Table 2: Overview of Decisions made in period 2004 to 2006 inclusive, including first instance	21
4. MIGRATION FLOWS	26
Table 3: Migration flows 2003 to 2006	27
5. POPULATION BY CITIZENSHIP	33
Table 4: Population by (non) EU Nationality	35
6. RESIDENCE PERMITS	41
Table 5: Overview of residence Permits issued over the period 2004 to 2006 inclusive	42
7. REFUSALS, APPREHENSIONS AND REMOVALS	50
Table 6: Overview of number of Refusals, of Apprehensions of illegally- resident migrants and of Removals for the period 2004 to 2006 inclusive	51
7.1 Refusals	53
7.2 Apprehensions of illegally-resident migrants	58
7.3 Removals	62
7.4 Relationship between refusals, apprehensions and removals	67

Disclaimer

This Report has been produced by the European Migration Network (EMN), and was completed by the European Commission, in co-operation with the 24 EMN National Contact Points participating in this activity. This report does not necessarily reflect the opinions and views of the European Commission, or of the EMN National Contact Points, nor are they bound by its conclusions.

Explanatory Note

Twenty-four EMN National Contact Points (NCPs) contributed to producing the Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics 2006. Of these, EMN NCPs from **Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden** and the **United Kingdom** produced accompanying National Reports, along with verification of their data as provided from the Commission's Eurostat. For the other Member States, namely **Belgium, Denmark, Malta** and **Netherlands**, a verification of their data was undertaken, but no National Report produced. Unfortunately, it was not possible for Cyprus, Luxembourg and Romania to participate in this activity, but they shall be involved for future reports.

The data for the Member States of the participating EMN NCPs presented in this report is as verified by the participating EMN NCPs. Therefore, in some cases, there may currently be differences from the Commission's Eurostat data, as well as differences from the published national statistical data, which may have been updated since they were obtained (latter quarter of 2008) by the EMN NCPs. Likewise the Tables in this report reflect the data as of October 2009. For the remaining Member States, plus Iceland and Norway, mainly data as provided from Eurostat were used. The Notes on the various Tables to be found in this Synthesis Report clearly indicate when data from other sources have been used.

The Member States mentioned above are given in **bold** when mentioned in the report and when reference to "Member States" is made, this is specifically for these Member States.

Executive Summary

This Synthesis Report summarises the main findings for the year 2006 of the analysis of asylum and migration statistics undertaken by 24 EMN NCPs (**Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden** and the **United Kingdom**).

On asylum applications ([Section 3.1](#) and [Table 1](#)), **Malta** (3.15), **Sweden** (2.63) and **Austria** (1.61) had the largest proportion of asylum applicants per 1 000 inhabitants, whilst those with the lowest proportion and lowest absolute number remained **Estonia** (0.01), **Latvia** (0.003) and **Lithuania** (0.04), as well as **Portugal** (0.01). In terms of absolute numbers, those receiving the largest number of asylum applicants were **France** (30 748), **United Kingdom** (28 320), **Sweden** (23 785) and **Germany** (21 029). **United Kingdom** (3 450), **Sweden** (820), **France** (571), **Belgium** (491), **Austria** (488) and the **Netherlands** (410) received the largest numbers of unaccompanied minors applying for asylum ([Section 3.2](#)). In terms of trends, *decreases* continued for **Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Poland, Slovak Republic, Slovenia** and the **United Kingdom**, whilst *increases* occurred for **Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania** and **Sweden**. Numbers remained relatively *stable* for **Ireland, Portugal** and **Spain**. On average, for those Member States with such data available, most asylum applicants were aged between 18 and 35 years and 73% (ranging from 63% in **Germany** to 94% in **Greece**) of all asylum applicants were men. In terms of nationalities of asylum applicants, the most notable, taking the Member States as a whole, were (in alphabetical order) nationals of *Afghanistan, Colombia, Eritrea, Iraq, Nigeria, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Ukraine* and *Vietnam*.

With regard to the total (positive and negative) number of asylum decisions made ([Section 3.3](#) and [Table 2](#)), an *increasing* trend since 2004 is observed for **Greece, Latvia, Hungary, Malta, Poland** and **Portugal**, whilst there is a *decrease* for **Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany** and **Slovak Republic**. An increase from 2005 occurred for **Ireland** and **Latvia**, for **Sweden** it remained more-or-less stable and for **Estonia, Italy, Netherlands** and **Slovenia** a decrease compared to 2005 occurred. The highest number of positive decisions made in 2006 occurred in **Sweden** (22 728), by far the highest, then **Netherlands** (6 389), **United Kingdom** (5 045) and **Austria** (4 063), with the lowest number granted by **Estonia** (None), **Slovak Republic** (8), **Slovenia** (9) and **Latvia** (10). In terms of the proportion of positive to total decisions made in 2006, and this should not in any way be understood as "recognition rates," this was highest for **Lithuania** (86.5%), **Sweden** (49%), **Malta** (46%), **Latvia** (43%) and lowest for **Estonia** (0%), **Slovak Republic** (0%), **Greece** (1%) and **Slovenia** (1%). Again taking the Member States as a whole, most prominent nationalities granted a positive decision were nationals of *Afghanistan, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iraq, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Somalia* and *Ukraine*.

With regard to Migration Flows ([Section 4](#) and [Table 3](#)), and in terms of trends over the period 2003 to 2006, it can be broadly observed that for **Austria** (in going from 2005 to 2006), **Germany, Italy, Portugal**, and the **United Kingdom** their *positive (i.e. more immigration than emigration) Net Migration* has decreased (e.g. as a result of increasing emigration and/or decreasing immigration); whilst for **Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Slovak Republic, Spain** and **Sweden** (particularly in going from 2005 to 2006) their *positive Net Migration* has increased (primarily as a result of increasing immigration). Amongst the EU-15 Member States, the **Netherlands** remains an exception in that it has *negative Net Migration (i.e. more emigration than immigration)*, a trend which has been increasing in magnitude since 2003. Where data are available, for EU-10 Member States, **Latvia, Lithuania** and **Poland** also exhibit *negative Net Migration* which can at least in part be attributed to the impact of EU accession, but also, as indicated above and outlined in the previous Synthesis Report, to the manner in which the data are processed. The **Czech Republic** and

Ireland both experienced a significant increase in the magnitude of their respective (positive) Net Migration in going from 2004 to 2005, following EU enlargement, with then both of these Member States each experiencing a slight decrease of approximately 4% in 2006. Similarly, **Hungary** (by 11.9%) and **Slovenia** (by 2.6%) had a decrease in its (positive) Net Migration in going from 2005 to 2006.

The Population by Citizenship ([Section 5](#) and [Table 4](#)) shows that the EU-15 Member States with the largest proportion of non-nationals, calculated as a percentage of their Total Population, in 2006 are (in decreasing order) **Ireland** (10.2%, including 3.5% third country nationals), **Austria** (9.7%, including 7.0% third country nationals), **Spain** (9.1%, including 7.2% third country nationals), **Belgium** (8.6%, including 2.8% third country nationals) and **Germany** (8.2%, including 5.6% third country nationals). Those EU-15 Member States with the lowest proportion are **Finland** (2.2%, including 1.4% third country nationals), **Italy** (3.9%, including 3.5% third country nationals), **Portugal** (4.1%, including 3.3% third country nationals) and **Netherlands** (4.2%, including 2.8% third country nationals). Similarly, the available data for the EU-10 Member States shows that, also in 2006, **Latvia** (19.9%, including 18.3% non-citizens of Latvia and 1.4% other third country nationals) and **Estonia** (18.5%, including 10.1% with undefined citizenship and 7.5% third country nationals) have the largest proportion, whilst **Slovak Republic** (0.5%, including 0.2% third country nationals), **Lithuania** (1%, essentially all third country nationals) and **Hungary** (1.5%, including 1.3% third country nationals) have the lowest proportion. In terms of the most prominent nationalities, taking the Member States as a whole, these are (in alphabetical order only) nationals of *China, Romania, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro (and other former (non-EU) Yugoslav Republic states), Ukraine and Vietnam*. A number of Member States have a strong predominance of nationals from a specific region or country, which can be attributed to historical ties (e.g. guest worker programmes, from colonial times) and/or geographical proximity. For example, **France**, has most of its third country nationals coming from the *Maghreb*, for **Germany, Austria** and the **Netherlands** from *Turkey*, for **Greece** and **Italy** from *Albania*, for **Portugal** from *Brazil*, for **Spain** from *Morocco* and *South America* (e.g. *Ecuador, Colombia*), and for the **United Kingdom** from *India* and the *USA*.

At a qualitative level at least, it is observed, from the data on Residence Permits ([Section 6](#) and [Table 5](#)), that those issued for the purpose of *family formation/reunification* are the main reason in **Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Spain** and **Sweden**; for the purpose of *study* in **Bulgaria** and the **United Kingdom**; for the purpose of *employment* in **Czech Republic**, again **Finland** and **Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Portugal** and **Slovenia**; and *"other"* in **Estonia** (international agreements) and again **Sweden** (asylum permits issued under temporary law).

There are particular caveats to be applied to the data on refusals, apprehensions and removals ([Section 7](#)). Given this, it was, however, observed that the number of Refusals ([Section 7.1](#) and [Table 6](#)) by the Member States in 2006 ranged from 630 305 (including refusals of entry at the two Spanish cities located on the African continent: Ceuta and Melilla) for **Spain**, which was by far the largest, the next being **Poland** with 40 282, down to 210 for **Denmark**. Compared to 2005, an *increase* in the number of refusals, in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, was observed for **Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland** and **Latvia**, whilst a *decrease*, again in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, occurred for **Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Greece, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia** and **Sweden**. Taking the Member States a whole, refusals to nationals of *Bulgaria* and *Romania* were prominent, as well as to nationals of (in alphabetical order only) *Brazil, Bolivia, Morocco, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Turkey* and *Ukraine*.

The number of Apprehensions ([Section 7.2](#) and [Table 6](#)) by the Member States in 2006 ranged from 95 765 for **Spain**, and note they were also the highest for refusals but not by as large a margin compared to other Member States as the next highest was **Greece** with 95 239, down to 247 for **Latvia**. Compared to 2005, an *increase* in the number of apprehensions, in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, was observed for **Greece, France, Germany, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain** and **Sweden**, whilst a *decrease*, again in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, occurred for **Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Poland** and **Slovenia**. For **Austria, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands** and **Slovak Republic** the number of apprehensions remained more-or-less *stable*. With regard to the main nationalities apprehended, and taking the Member States as a whole, as well as nationals of **Bulgaria** and **Romania**, other prominent groups were nationals of (in alphabetical order only) *Albania, Brazil, Iraq, Serbia and Montenegro, Turkey* and *Ukraine*.

Removals ([Section 7.3](#) and [Table 6](#)) by the Member States in 2006 ranged from 63 865 for the **United Kingdom**, down to 91 for **Estonia**. Compared to 2005, an *increase* in the number of removals, in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, was observed for **Estonia** (to a level similar to 2004 following a decrease in 2005), **Greece, France, Poland** (a dramatic increase) and **United Kingdom**, whilst a *decrease*, again in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, occurred for **Austria, Belgium** (to a level similar to 2004 following a decrease in 2005), **Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta** (to a level similar to 2004 following a decrease in 2005), **Portugal** and **Sweden** (for the latter two a dramatic decrease). For **Hungary, Netherlands, Slovak Republic** and **Slovenia**, the number of removals remained more-or-less *stable*. With regard to the main nationalities removed, again in addition to nationals of **Bulgaria** and **Romania** and taking the Member States as a whole, other prominent groups removed (in alphabetical order only) were nationals of *Albania, Brazil, India, Moldova, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Turkey* and *Ukraine*.

A relationship(s) between the statistics on refusals, apprehensions and removals ([Section 7.4](#)) may be found. For example, in **Austria**, a correlation between the nationality of apprehended aliens and of asylum applicants is now recognised for two reasons: on the one hand, asylum applicants who enter Austria illegally are automatically registered as apprehended persons and, on the other hand, there are tendencies to enter illegally and then file an asylum application upon apprehension, which is legally possible. In the **Czech Republic**, apprehensions and removals are closely interlinked and primarily for nationals of Ukraine, whilst in **Estonia**, owing to its geographical proximity, it is mostly nationals of Russia who feature in all three categories. Similarly for **Greece** and **Poland**, there is a strong domination in all three categories of nationals of neighbouring (non-EU) states. In **France** also, certain nationalities are more prominent in one category only. For example, nationals of China account for 10% of all refusals, but are much less present in the other categories. Nationals of Iran and Pakistan account for 9% and 12 % respectively of apprehensions, but are practically absent from the figures for actual removals. Apprehensions and removals in **Sweden** usually reflect the overall composition of asylum applicants, with removals also closely linked to the possibilities to enforce removals. Asylum applicants from Iraq represent, for example, a large proportion of all asylum applicants, but a very small number are removed. Refusals are usually of people who do not apply for asylum and thus represent other categories, often from countries in the region.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the tasks of the European Migration Network (EMN), following Council Decision [2008/381/EC](#)¹ of 14 May 2008 establishing its legal base, is to produce the Annual Reports on Asylum and Migration 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 working with the relevant official national data providers, who are often from the same entity as the EMN NCP. Instead, the purpose of the EMN's contribution is to analyse the statistical trends on asylum, migration, illegal entry and stay, and removals in their Member State, and thereby facilitate comparisons and interpretations pertaining to migratory trends on the European level, as well as in the international context.

This Synthesis Report summarises the main findings for the year 2006 and is the latest addition to a series of similar Annual Reports on Asylum and Migration Statistics from [2001](#), [2002](#), [2003](#) and [2004/2005](#).² For continuity, data from previous years are provided in some of the Tables presented in the following sections.

2. METHODOLOGY

The first step was for the participating [EMN NCPs](#)³ to ascertain that the data as provided by the European Commission's [Eurostat](#)⁴ were indeed consistent with their national data, and, in some cases, to add data. Afterwards, any necessary corrections, additions or modifications would be provided to Eurostat via the official national data providers in the participating Member States. The following migration and asylum data were provided for each Member State:

- Migration flows
- Population by main groups of nationality
- Residence Permits
- First time asylum applications, also broken down by main countries of nationality, and decisions made
- Refused migrants, including by main country of nationality
- Apprehension of illegally-resident migrants, including by main country of nationality
- Removed migrants, including by main country of nationality

¹ Available from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ%3AL%3A2008%3A131%3ASOM%3AEN%3AHTML>.

² Available from http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/doc_centre/immigration/statistics/doc_immigration_statistics_en.htm.

³ 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 Report or from <http://emn.sarenet.es/Downloads/download.do?fileID=554>.

⁴ See EUROSTAT Population and Social Conditions section, at http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page?_pageid=0.1136184.0_45572595&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL.

Consequently, the data for the Member States of the participating EMN NCPs presented in this report is as verified by the participating EMN NCPs. Therefore, in some cases, there may currently be differences from Eurostat data, as well as differences from the published national statistical data, which may have been updated since they were obtained (latter quarter of 2008) by the EMN NCPs. Likewise the Tables in this report reflect the data as of October 2009. For the remaining Member States, plus Iceland and Norway, mainly data as provided from Eurostat were used. The Notes on the various Tables to be found in this Synthesis Report clearly indicate when data from other sources have been used.

Some Member States, specifically **Austria** (labour market and employment, naturalisations, voluntary return), **Estonia** (citizenship and naturalisation, labour market and employment), **Finland** (naturalisations), **France** (data on unskilled/seasonal workers, acquisition of citizenship, voluntary returns, regularisations), **Germany** (domestic labour, bi- and multilateral agreements, students, self-employment/entrepreneurship), **Ireland** (citizenship, labour market), **Italy** (number of minors registered on residence permits), **Poland** (naturalisations, emigration), **Portugal** (labour market), **Slovak Republic** (citizenship) and **Spain** (granting on nationality on grounds of residence) have provided additional data to that indicated above. These data may be found in their respective National Reports and/or Tables of Data.

Once the data had been verified, most of the EMN NCPs participating in this activity (i.e. **Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden** and the **United Kingdom**) each produced also a National Report according to common specifications and using their verified data, analysing in more detail each of the topics given above, placing them within national and international developments. For the other Member States, namely **Belgium, Denmark, Malta** and the **Netherlands**, a verification of the data was undertaken, but no National Report produced.

Each National Report provides a description of the methodology followed, the national sources and authorities used to verify and/or add data, clarification of definitions used and any caveats to apply to the data presented. In some cases, when there were too few data, data protection legislation prevented publication of, for example, number of asylum applications from a particular country, in order to protect the identity of the person(s) concerned.

The accession of two new EU Member States (**Bulgaria**, Romania), occurred immediately after the period covered by this report (on 1st January 2007). Therefore, and in order to reflect the practice of national statistical offices, nationals from these (now) EU-2 Member States were considered as *third country nationals* up to and including 2006 and then as *EU(-27) nationals* from 2007 onwards. Similarly, nationals of EU(-10) Member States who acceded on 1st May 2004 have been considered as *EU(-25) nationals* from 2004 onwards. The tables in the following sections have been constructed to reflect these different statuses, but give data, to the extent possible, 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 is given first. This is then followed by a summary of the key findings from the Member States in order to place their data in the context of national developments. Note that, given the purpose of an EMN Synthesis Report, not all Member States are represented in each of the following sections, instead the approach has been to highlight in this report only those developments which occurred in 2006, were different from those reported in 2004/2005, and are considered to be of relevance to giving an EU perspective. More details on the situation in a particular Member State(s) are given in the available National Report(s), as well as the corresponding Tables of national data and the Synthesis Report for the 2004/2005 [Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics](#).⁵ Similarly, more information on the political and legislative developments may be found in the [EMN Annual Policy Reports](#).⁶

3. ASYLUM APPLICATIONS AND DECISIONS MADE

3.1 Asylum applications

[Table 1](#) summarises the number of first-time asylum applications, including (when available) of unaccompanied minors, made in 2006 ordered by the ratio of asylum applicants per 1 000 habitants in each Member State (highest first). Where available, the breakdown by gender, and for adults and children, is also given (in brackets).

Malta (3.15), **Sweden** (2.63) and **Austria** (1.61) had the largest proportion of asylum applicants per 1 000 inhabitants, like in 2005 but with an increased ratio for the first two Member States, whilst

⁵ Available from <http://emn.sarenet.es/Downloads/prepareShowFiles.do?directoryID=15>.

⁶ Available from <http://emn.sarenet.es/Downloads/prepareShowFiles.do?directoryID=14>.

those with the lowest proportion and lowest absolute number remained **Estonia** (0.01), **Latvia** (0.003) and **Lithuania** (0.04), as well as **Portugal** (0.01). In terms of absolute numbers, those receiving the largest number of asylum applicants were **France** (30 748), **United Kingdom** (28 320), **Sweden** (23 785) and **Germany** (21 029). **United Kingdom** (3 450), **Sweden** (820), **France** (571), **Belgium** (491), **Austria** (488) and the **Netherlands** (410) received the largest numbers of unaccompanied minors applying for asylum.

In terms of trends, *decreases* continued for **Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Poland, Slovak Republic, Slovenia** and the **United Kingdom**, whilst *increases* occurred for **Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania** and **Sweden**. Numbers remained relatively *stable* for **Ireland, Portugal** and **Spain**. On average, for those Member States with such data available, most asylum applicants were aged between 18 and 35 years and 73% (ranging from 63% in **Germany** to 94% in **Greece**) of all asylum applicants were men.

In terms of the origin of the most of the asylum applicants, nationals of *Serbia and Montenegro* were prominent in **Germany** (3 237), **France** (3 047), **Austria** (2 515), **Sweden** (1 760), **Netherlands** (607), **Italy** (581), **Hungary** (384), **Finland** (277) and **Slovenia** (240); nationals of *Iraq* were particularly prominent in **Sweden** (8 951), as well as in **Netherlands** (2 766), **Germany** (2 117), **Greece** (1 415), **Finland** (225), **Ireland** (213), **Slovak Republic** (206) and **Bulgaria** (71); and of *Russia* in **Poland** (3 363), **Austria** (2 441, and notably from the region of *Chechnya*), **France** (2 313), **Slovak Republic** (463), **Finland** (176), **Lithuania** (98, again notably from the region of *Chechnya*), **Estonia** (4) and **Latvia** (4). Other prominent applications came from nationals of *Afghanistan* [in **United Kingdom** (2 660), **Greece** (1 415), **Netherlands** (932), **Bulgaria** (292)], of *Eritrea* [**United Kingdom** (2 735), **Italy** (2 151)], of *Nigeria* [**Ireland** (1 022), **Italy** (830), **Spain** (632)] and of *Vietnam* [**Hungary** (406), **Czech Republic** (124)]. For **Spain** asylum applicants from nationals of *Colombia* (2 239) were most prominent.

Table 1: First-time asylum applications in 2006 ordered by ratio of asylum applicants per 1 000 habitants in each Member State (highest first)

	2006				
	Male (incl.child)	Female (incl. child)	Total (incl. children)	Asylum applicants per 1000 inhabitants	Unaccompanied Minors
MALTA	N/A	N/A	1 272	3.15	109
SWEDEN	15 632 (3 405)	8 153 (2 666)	23 785 (6 071)	2.63	820
AUSTRIA	8 780 (N/A)	4 569 (N/A)	13 349	1.61	488
LUXEMBOURG	N/A	N/A	523	1.14	N/A
IRELAND	2 833	1 408	4 241	1.00	131
GREECE	10 448 (444)	640 (55)	11 088 (499)	1.00	165
NETHERLANDS	8 968 (2 380)	5 482 (2 131)	14 465 (4 515)	0.89	410
BELGIUM	N/A	N/A	9 030	0.86	491
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	2 395 (230)	454 (129)	2 849 (359)	0.53	138
FRANCE	11 493 (2 332)	19 255 (2 734)	30 748 (5 066)	0.49	571
UNITED KINGDOM	18 670 (5 420)	9 650 (2 970)	28 320 (8 385)	0.47	3 450
FINLAND	1 526 (324)	809 (302)	2 335 (626)	0.44	111
DENMARK	507 (300)	1 453 (166)	1 960 (466)	0.36	107
CZECH REPUBLIC	2 257 (230)	759 (178)	3 016 (408)	0.29	81
SLOVENIA	426	92	518	0.26	21
GERMANY	13 165 (5 259)	7 864 (4 322)	21 029 (9 581)	0.26	186
HUNGARY	N/A	N/A	2 117	0.21	61
ITALY	N/A	N/A	10 348	0.18	N/A
SPAIN	3 413	1 884	5 297 (799)	0.12	N/A
POLAND	1 986 (766)	1 827 (763)	3 813 (1 529)	0.10	Nil
LITHUANIA	N/A	N/A	147	0.04	3
PORTUGAL	N/A	N/A	129	0.01	3
ESTONIA	3 (0)	4 (0)	7 (0)	0.01	None
LATVIA	7 (2)	1 (0)	8 (2)	0.003	None
CYPRUS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Total (EU-10)		-		
	Total (EU-15)		176 647		
	TOTAL (EU-25)		-		
BULGARIA	N/A	N/A	639	N/A	73
ROMANIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Notes:

1. Data for **Belgium, Czech Republic, Netherlands** includes first and repeated applications.
2. Data for **United Kingdom** includes dependants.

Asylum applications continued to fall sharply in **Austria** in 2006 for the fourth year in a row. In 2006, a total of 13 349 applications for asylum were filed, lower than in 2005 when it was 22 461. Almost two-thirds of all applications were made by men. The main countries of origin were similar to 2005, with, following the separation of Serbia and of Montenegro, applications from nationals of Serbia (2 515) representing the largest group, followed by nationals of Russia, primarily from the region of Chechnya (2 441), then Moldova (902), Afghanistan (699), Turkey (668) and Georgia (564). The number of applications from nationals of India dropped significantly from 1 530 in 2005 to 479 in 2006. An important legislative development occurred with the entry into force of the Aliens' Act Package 2005, with an amendment of the Asylum Act (Asylgesetz, AsylG), though mainly in terms of procedural changes, such as provisions for accelerating the asylum process, including the lifting of the suspension of appeals on certain grounds; the prerequisite that an asylum applicant must meet certain obligations of co-operation during the asylum procedure; granting the *Independent Federal Asylum Review Board* (Unabhängige Bundesasylsenat, UBAS) the power to set precedents in order to accelerate similar cases in the future; creating a country of origin documentation centre; and no longer allowing the dismissal of asylum applications as "obviously unfounded."⁷ However, it is too early to determine what effect these changes have had on the number of asylum applications.

The number of asylum applications in **Bulgaria** during 2006 was 639, continuing a decrease from a peak of 2 888 in 2002, although the rate of decrease was smaller than the previous year (985 in 2004; 698 in 2005). One of the reasons for the drop in the number of asylum applications was the measures for strengthening border control, which are implemented both by the Bulgarian Border Police and Turkish border services. Other reasons include an accelerated procedure for the implementation of the regulation regarding manifestly unfounded applications; implementation of effective legal measures preventing misuse of the asylum system; and the introduction of procedures for routinely taking fingerprints. Asylum applications were predominantly made by single men, approximately 87% (including unaccompanied minors) or 75% (not including unaccompanied minors) of the total, and the main country of origin of all applications was Afghanistan (292 in 2006), followed by Iraq (71) and then Armenia (68). A new country of origin was China (10 applications in 2006). There was an expectation that the number from Armenia would decrease as a result of amendments to the [Law on Asylum and Refugees](#)⁸ regarding the subsequent applications, but this was not the case.

⁷ Further details of these changes may be found in the Austria Annual Policy Report at <http://emn.sarenet.es/Downloads/prepareShowFiles.do?directoryID=104>.

⁸ Available from http://www.mvr.bg/NR/rdonlyres/BC96E947-6DF6-48F6-9872-85F94CE8FC6C/0/07_Law_Asylum_Refugees_EN.pdf.

The **Czech Republic** also saw a general decrease in the number of asylum applications, this time from a peak of 18 094 in 2001 to 3 016 in 2006, although an increase was observed in 2003 attributed to an influx of nationals of Russia from the region of Chechnya. Again, men made up the majority of applications (75%), primarily aged 18 to 35 years. Nationals of Ukraine remained the main country of origin of asylum applicants (571 in 2006), although their share of the total is decreasing (29% in 2005 decreasing to 19% in 2006). Of particular note in 2006 was an influx of applications from nationals of Egypt (422 in 2006) and Kazakhstan (236 in 2006). However, and particularly in the case of nationals of Egypt, their motive for entering the Czech Republic was considered to be for economic reasons and to be misusing the asylum process. Following the introduction of airport visas, these numbers decreased. Other significant countries of origin were Belarus, Russia, Vietnam and China.

The number of asylum applications made in **Estonia** continued to be low (11 in 2005 and 7 in 2006), despite concerns that, following accession, a significant increase in applications would occur. Owing to its geographical proximity, most applications are from nationals of Russia. The low number is attributed to Estonia's strict asylum policy and limited social support provided. On 1st July 2006, the [*Granting Aliens International Protection Act*](#)⁹ entered into force, bringing Estonia's national legislation in line with [*EU asylum acquis*](#).¹⁰ Among the changes introduced, were the granting of access to the labour market after one year if a decision has not been made and speeding up of the process for removal, in cases when an application has been refused.

There was a total of 2 324 applications for asylum from 75 countries made in **Finland** during 2006, a two-thirds decline when compared to 2005 (3 574). The majority of applicants were men (65% of total) and were aged 18 to 35 years. As in 2005, the largest numbers of asylum applications were made by nationals of **Bulgaria** (463 in 2006, mainly from the Roma minority), followed by Serbia and Montenegro, almost all of them originating from the (then) province of Kosovo. The next largest groups were nationals of Iraq (225), Russia (176), Afghanistan and Belarus (97 from each). Nearly 70% (1 620) of all applications made came from the main top ten countries.

France also saw a decrease in the number of applications compared to previous years, with 26 269 applications filed in 2006 (42 578 in 2005) plus an additional 4 479 applications from accompanied children. Reductions occurred in most of the main countries of origin, with a slight increase (+5.2%) from Sri Lanka and Armenia (+0.7%). Substantial decreases in applications from nationals

⁹ Available in EN from <http://soderkoping.org.ua/page11357.html>.

¹⁰ Available from http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/doc_centre/intro/doc_intro_en.htm.

of declared Safe Countries of Origin (Benin, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cap Verde, Croatia, Georgia, Ghana, India, Mali, Mauritius, Mongolia, Senegal, Ukraine plus Albania, FYROM (Macedonia), Madagascar, Niger, Tanzania) also occurred, accounting for 3.4% of total applications in 2006 compared with 11.4% in 2005. Some 35.8% of all applications were made by women, an increasing proportion compared to previous years, which is attributed to the growing importance placed by the [*Office Français de Protection des Réfugiés et Apatrides \(OFPRA\)*](#)¹¹ on issues related to subsidiary protection, particularly domestic violence and prostitution. Other measures implemented were a crackdown on illegal Chinese immigration networks; a targeted response by the Département of Guadeloupe to the explosion of applications by nationals of Haiti; the introduction of a single asylum-granting body; abolition of the territorial asylum procedure and improved application processing times for applications from Algeria.

The lowest level of asylum applications (21 029 compared to 28 914 in 2005) since 1983 were made in **Germany** during 2006. Of these, 62.6% were males and most applicants were under 30 years of age. For those aged under 18 years, 55% were female. With regard to nationality, most came from nationals of Serbia and Montenegro¹² (3 237 in 2006), followed by Iraq (2 117) and Turkey (1 949). As also observed in 2004 and 2005, the composition of the countries of origin has undergone considerable change over time. Whilst countries of origin such as **Bulgaria** and Romania were predominant at the beginning of the nineties, their position has now been taken up by Serbia and Montenegro, as well as by Iraq. Also the share of “other countries” (i.e. all countries other than the main top ten) has risen considerably in recent years, being 44.7% in 2006.

Conversely to the situation in many other Member States, the increase in the number of asylum applications in **Greece** in recent years continued, with 12 267 applications in 2006 (9 050 in 2005). A remarkable increase in the number of children (up to the age of 17 years) from 319 in 2005 to 499 in 2006 was also observed. It is not clear that these increases, observed since 2003, can be attributed to legislative or administrative changes and may be attributed more to external factors. Almost one in three applications were made by nationals of Bangladesh, representing an almost seven-fold increase from 2005, followed by Pakistan (one in five), double that in 2005. Significant increases continued to be observed for applications from nationals of Iraq (1 415 in 2006 and 971 in 2005) and Afghanistan (1 087 in 2006), representing 70% of all applications made in 2006. It is considered that an increasing number of illegally-staying migrants use the asylum procedure to acquire short-term legal status.

¹¹ See <http://www.ofpra.gouv.fr/>.

Similarly, **Hungary** had an increase in the number of asylum applications, with 2 117 in 2006 and 1 609 in 2005, although this is still less than the peak of 6 000 in 2002. The main countries of origin are Vietnam (406 in 2006), Serbia and Montenegro (384), China (275), Georgia (175) and Nigeria (109). Of particular note are the number of asylum applications from nationals of China and Vietnam. The current legislative framework, which includes asylum appeals being litigious and that during an appeal an asylum applicant has the right to residence, is considered to have created a pull effect for nationals from these two countries in particular. They are also considered to be economic migrants rather than genuine asylum applicants and thus abusing the asylum process, using the appeals procedure as a means to gain long-term residence.

The number of asylum applications submitted in **Ireland** in 2006 (4 314) was similar to 2005 (4 323), and at the lowest level since 1997. Two-thirds of the asylum applicants were male (2 875), and the majority of applicants (2 658) were in the '18-35' age group (2 658 applications), with applications by minors (aged '0-17' years, both accompanied and unaccompanied) comprising the second largest grouping (964). Main countries of origin were similar to 2005 being predominantly Nigeria (1 038 in 2006), then Sudan (308), Romania (289), Iraq (215), Iran (205) and Georgia (171). Other than for Iran and Georgia, there were decreases in the absolute number compared to 2005. In addition, 65 Refugees from Iran were resettled in Ireland under the United Nation's Refugee Resettlement Programme. This group was the first of a total group of 180 who are due to be resettled in Ireland.

There were 10 348 applications for asylum in **Italy** in 2006, an increase of 10.4% from 2005. It is estimated that at least 60% of all applications made were submitted by migrants arriving from Africa along the coastlines of Apulia, Calabria, Sicily and, in particular, Lampedusa. In fact, by far the largest number of applications were from nationals of Eritrea (2 151), followed by Nigeria (830), Togo (584), Serbia-Montenegro (581), Ghana (530), Cote d'Ivoire (508), Ethiopia (453), Morocco (354), Sudan (308) and Bangladesh (283). In terms of applications from nationals of Iraq, there were 100 made in 2006, a slight decrease from 2005.

The number of asylum applicants in **Latvia** (like for **Estonia**) is relatively small, being 8 in 2006 and lower than in 2005 when it was 20. The main reasons for this are considered to be that the economic situation in Latvia, as well as the geographical location of the country, the small allowance and the lack of diaspora discourages applications to be made there. It is also believed that

¹² Serbia and Montenegro have been two independent states since June 2006. They are however still kept together in the national statistics for 2006.

Latvia was not the original destination of the asylum applicants. Of the applications made, seven were men and most came from the Commonwealth of Independent States (Russia, Belarus, Georgia and Kyrgyzstan). The availability of the Russian language and visual likeness to the national population are considered to be the main reasons for this tendency.

By contrast, the neighbouring **Lithuania** received 147 applications for asylum in 2006, an increase from 2005 when there were 118, but lower than in 2004 when there were 167. The majority of applications are made by nationals of Russia from the region of Chechnya. The main reasons for the difference from **Estonia** and **Latvia** are considered to be (a) the political support given by Lithuania to Chechnya independence which was then perceived as support for refugees from this region and, at the beginning of 2000, Chechen expectations for available support in Lithuania were very high resulting in an increased numbers of asylum applicants; (b) that the real destination is not considered to be the Baltic States, but mainly Western Europe and Lithuania is the only Baltic States having an overland border to the “west”; and (c) the social network developed in Lithuania over the years which facilitates their arrival and possible integration in Lithuania.

Poland received 3 813 (including 1 457 from minors) applications in 2006, a substantial decrease from 2005 when it was 5 240. Prior to 2005 and accession of Poland to the EU, the number of asylum applications had been increasing, reaching a peak of 7 924 in 2004. Some 3 279 repeat applications were also made during 2006. The main country of origin has remained stable over recent years being Russia (3 363 in 2006 or 88% of the total), of which 2 992 declared they were from the region of Chechnya. Other significantly lower applications came from nationals of Belarus (55), Ukraine (45), Pakistan (39), Iraq (33), and Armenia (32). For the latter three plus nationals of Vietnam, it is observed that, prior to submitting their application in Poland, they would have tried to enter another Member State illegally. The significant proportion of applications from nationals of Russia and in particular from the region of Chechnya is attributed to geographic proximity, to being an EU Member State, the political situation in Chechnya, the social protection offered, and the visa regime introduced in 2003 for nationals of eastern-neighbouring states (Russia, Ukraine and Belarus).

In **Portugal**, there were 129 applications for asylum in 2006, a slight increase from 2005 when there were 113, with a more than double increase in the number of nationals from the Democratic Republic of the Congo applying for asylum (16 in 2006 from 7 in 2005) and a significant increase also in the number of applications originating from Israel (9 in 2006 from less than 3 in 2005). Similar to **Germany**, there was an increase in the range of nationalities applying for asylum.

Conversely, there was a significant decrease in number of applicants by nationals of Colombia (6 in 2006 and 26 in 2005).

From a peak of 11 395 in 2004, the number of asylum applications in the **Slovak Republic** has dropped dramatically to 3 549 in 2005 and then 2 871 in 2006. Over the period 2004 to 2006, most applications were made by males (80-85%) and 40-45% of all applicants were aged between 18 and 25 years. Most asylum applicants are primarily from Asia (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Iraq, Pakistan plus China), constituting 50-60% of all applications in the period 2003 to 2006, plus former Soviet Union countries (principally Russia, Moldova, Georgia), constituting 40-50% of all applications in the same period but increasing at a higher rate than for Asia. The development of asylum applicants since 2000 is considered to mirror that of illegal immigration. Following an amendment to the Asylum Act, it became possible for an illegally-resident migrant detained by the police to request asylum. The considered view was that, for a majority of asylum applicants, the possibility to then stay in the Slovak Republic whilst asylum proceedings progressed, gave them, on the one hand, the security of not being removed, and, on the other hand, enabled the preparation and realisation of the intention to continue to an originally planned destination elsewhere in Europe. Following accession to the EU, however, there were more severe controls and increased pressure upon human traffickers, as well as the application of the Dublin Regulation. These actions are considered to be the main cause for the significant decrease in the number of applications.

Slovenia too has seen a significant decrease in the number of asylum applications (from 1 597 in 2005 to 518 in 2006), which also is primarily attributed to the transposition into national legislation of EU asylum acquis. Specifically the reasons for the decrease are attributed to strict implementation of the Dublin System, and 11 applicants were transferred to another Member State in 2006; a more efficient border control; and smoother and more efficient asylum procedures. Most applications came from nationals of Serbia and Montenegro, primarily from the Albanian ethnic group (240, which is a significant reduction from 2005 when there were 518 and is attributed to the relative political stability in the Western Balkans), followed by Turkey (62), Bosnia and Herzegovina (44) and Albania (32).

There was a small increase in the number of applications in **Spain** to 5 297 in 2006 from 5 257 in 2005. From a peak of 9 490 in 2001, the number of applications has levelled off in the last three years. In 2006, approximately 64% of the applicants were males, with the proportion of women continuing to increase since 2004, and 66% of all applicants were between 18 to 35 years of age,

although this proportion has been decreasing since 2004. In terms of nationalities, most applications were from nationals of Colombia (2 239), Nigeria (632) and Morocco (281).

Sweden experienced a 40% increase in the number of applications in 2006 (23 785) compared to 2005 (17 530). Particularly in the second half of 2006 there was a 75% increase compared to the same period the previous year. Most applications were from nationals of Iraq. This increase is, at least partly, attributed to the introduction of a pardon (temporary law) which was effective from 15th November 2005 to 30th March 2006 and considered to act as a major pull-factor for nationals of Iraq in particular. The temporary law allowed the Swedish Migration Board, upon request or on its own initiative, to re-process applications for asylum/residence permits that had previously been rejected. The main target groups were families with small children who had been waiting for a decision from the Migration Board and had established themselves in Sweden for a certain period of time, and persons subject to legally binding decisions of removal, but for whom there were impediments to enforcement. After this period, a new Aliens Act entered into force which established a new system for appeals and procedures.

Asylum applications, including dependants, in the **United Kingdom** during 2006 (28 320) were 8% fewer than in 2005 (30 840), continuing a downward trend since 2002 when over 100 000 applications were made. Approximately two-thirds of all the applicants in 2006 were male, similar to 2005, and 54% of the total number of applicants were aged between 18 and 34 years. The highest number of applications came from nationals of Eritrea (2 735) followed by Iran (2 685), Afghanistan (2 660, a 50% increase from 2005), Somalia (2 175), Zimbabwe (2 145, also a 54% increase from 2005) and China (2 030).

3.2 Asylum Applications by Unaccompanied Minors

Whilst data on asylum applications made by unaccompanied minors are more limited, some Member States reported on developments. The total number of unaccompanied minors in **Austria** decreased by -45%: 881 applications were registered in 2005, decreasing to 488 in 2006. Of these, fifty-three (or 11%) were aged under 14 years. For the **Czech Republic**, the number has remained relatively stable over recent years, being 81 in 2006, the majority (73%) aged 16 years or more with then 20% aged 13 years or less. The number in **Finland** declined by half compared to 2005, with 112 unaccompanied minors seeking asylum, compared to 220 in 2005. The majority of these unaccompanied minors were 16-17 years old boys. Of the 186 unaccompanied minors (in this case meaning those who have not yet reached the age of 16 years) recorded in **Germany** in 2006, more than half of them (54.3%) were male. For **Greece**, there was a slight increase in applications

compared to 2005 (165 in 2006 and 158 in 2005), whilst for **Hungary** it changed little, being 43 in 2006 and 42 in 2005. There was an increase in **Ireland** from 96 in 2005 to 131 in 2006, which might be a result of either changed migratory flows or a change to administrative procedures concerning the automatic placement of unaccompanied minors within the asylum system as a means of regularising their status. Similarly, according to estimations gathered by the National Association of Italian Municipalities, an increase has been observed in **Italy** recently with 102 in 2004, 144 in 2005 and 251 in 2006. For the latter year, 88% were aged 16 and 17 years, and 167 of the unaccompanied minors came from Afghanistan, followed by from the Horn of Africa. The **Slovak Republic** has also experienced a significant growth of the number of unaccompanied minors. In the period 2002-2004, there were more than 2 000 applications from unaccompanied minors, although more recently this has dropped, being 138 in 2006. The majority of the unaccompanied minors come from Bangladesh, India, Afghanistan, Pakistan, China, Vietnam, Moldova, Russia, Georgia plus Somalia. For the **United Kingdom**, there were 3 450 asylum applications made by unaccompanied minors in 2006, 16% more than in 2005 (2 965). Of the 3 450 unaccompanied minors, 75% (2 585) were male, a similar proportion to 2005, with most (53%, 1 840) aged 16 and 17 years.

3.3 Decisions

[Table 2](#) provides an overview of the number of decisions made in the period 2004 to 2006 inclusive, including, where available, first instance data. Note that the data presented is *calendar-based*, i.e. a particular year represents mainly decisions from applications made in previous years, as well as the current year for which data are given. A *cohort-based* analysis, which follows an asylum applicant in time through the asylum decision process, requires more analysis and, because some asylum procedures take a long time, it is not always possible to give definitive data on positive decisions this way.

With regard to the total (positive and negative) number of decisions made, an *increasing* trend since 2004 is observed for **Greece, Latvia, Hungary, Malta, Poland** and **Portugal**, whilst there is a *decrease* for **Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany** and **Slovak Republic**. An increase from 2005 occurred for **Ireland** and **Latvia**, for **Sweden** it remained more-or-less stable and for **Estonia, Italy, Netherlands** and **Slovenia** a decrease compared to 2005 occurred.

The highest number of positive decisions made in 2006 occurred in **Sweden** (22 728), by far the highest, **Netherlands** (6 389), **United Kingdom** (5 045) and **Austria** (4 063), with the lowest

number granted by **Estonia** (None), **Slovak Republic** (8), **Slovenia** (9) and **Latvia** (10). In terms of the proportion of positive to total decisions made in 2006, and, referring also to comments above, this should not in any way be understood as "recognition rates," this was highest for **Lithuania** (86.5%), **Sweden** (49%), **Malta** (46%), **Latvia** (43%) and lowest for **Estonia** (0%), **Slovak Republic** (0%), **Greece** (1%) and **Slovenia** (1%). With regard to the proportion of negative to total decisions made in 2006, this was highest for **Estonia** (100%), **France** (92%), **Ireland** (90%) and **Spain** (90%) and lowest for **Lithuania** (6.3%) and **Poland** (13%).

Comparing to the main nationalities making an asylum application in [Section 3.1](#), nationals of *Russia* were the most prominent of those granted a positive decision in **Poland** (2 406), **Austria** (2 090, notably from the region of *Chechnya*), **France** (370), **Germany** (197), **Czech Republic** (52), **Spain** (27) and **Latvia** (2); for nationals of *Iraq* they were most prominent amongst the positive decisions made most significantly in **Sweden** (8 397), as well as in **Netherlands** (392), **Germany** (189), **Finland** (113), **Bulgaria** (28) and **Hungary** (26); for nationals of *Afghanistan*, it was **Sweden** (1 142), **United Kingdom** (835), **Austria** (475), **Netherlands** (366), **Germany** (244), **Finland** (132), **Bulgaria** (38), **Greece** (17) and **Hungary** (17); and for nationals of *Serbia and Montenegro* they featured prominently in **Sweden** (2 345), **Finland** (31) and **Hungary** (26). With regard to others, nationals of the *Democratic Republic of Congo* were amongst the main groups accorded a positive decision in **France** (239), **Greece** (11) and **Portugal** (6); of *Colombia* in **Spain** (98) and of *Somalia* in **Sweden** (2 248), **United Kingdom** (940), **Netherlands** (897) and **Finland** (184).

Table 2: Overview of decisions made in period 2004 to 2006 inclusive, including first instance

	2004				2005				2006			
	Positive (First instance)	Negative (First instance)	Other non- status (First instance)	Total (First instance)	Positive (First instance)	Negative (First instance)	Other non- status (First instance)	Total (First instance)	Positive (First instance)	Negative (First instance)	Other non- status (First instance)	Total (First instance)
BELGIUM	2 374 (2 275)	14 841 (13 037)	1 319 (1 175)	18 534 (16 487)	3 730 (3 059)	15 334 (13 732)	4 204 (3 301)	23 268 (20 092)	2 391 (1 914)	12 915 (10 430)	3 056 (1 248)	18 362 (13 592)
CZECH REPUBLIC	184 (176)	4 654 (4 635)	3 089 (3 065)	7 927 (7 876)	330 (330)	2 636 (2 636)	1 410 (1 410)	4 376 (4 376)	327	2 195	499	3 021
DENMARK	210	1 945	None	2 155	229	1 098	None	1 327	308 (170)	1 234 (755)	Nil	1 542 (925)
GERMANY	3 031	38 599	20 331	61 961	3 121	27 452	17 529	48 102	1 951	17 781	11 027	30 759
ESTONIA	None	8	None	8	1	13	None	14	Nil	4	0	4
IRELAND	1 138 (430)	10 300 (4 906)	1 739 (1 562)	13 177 (6 898)	966 (455)	7 356 (3 952)	941 (835)	9 263 (5 242)	648 (397)	4 863 (3 249)	676 (598)	6 187 (4 244)
GREECE	33	3 722	None	3 755	88	4 585	5 712	10 421	91	10 451	2 624	13 166
SPAIN	N/A (161)	N/A (6 301)	N/A (163)	N/A (6 625)	N/A (202)	N/A (4 531)	N/A (124)	N/A (4 857)	212 (168)	7 567 (3 892)	619 (188)	8 398 (4 248)
FRANCE	10 932 (6 358)	94 251 (61 760)	None	105 183 (68 118)	12 559 (4 184)	94 858 (47 088)	None	107 417 (51 272)	7 380 (2 929)	59 491 (34 786)	271 (271)	67 142 (37 986)
ITALY	3 134	3 114	2 084	8 332	4 384	4 645	1 882	10 911	878	8 019	363	9 260
CYPRUS	74	2 734	2 525	5 333	162	3 126	2 508	5 796	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
LATVIA	None	7 (6)	5 (5)	12 (11)	None	15 (12)	7 (7)	22 (19)	10 (3)	10 (2)	3 (3)	23 (8)
LITHUANIA	420	51	91	562	343	30	11	384	397	29	18	444
LUXEMBOURG	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	671	554	257	1 482	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
HUNGARY	326	931	527	1 784	192	853	609	1 654	198	1 217	603	2 018
MALTA	533	223	None	756	534	548	None	1 082	550 (55)	637 (637)	Nil	1 187 (1 187)
NETHERLANDS	5 463 (4 537)	10 657 (8 178)	4 237 (2 939)	20 357 (15 654)	9 959 (8 818)	10 051 (8 084)	6 058 (2 848)	26 067 (19 750)	6 389 (4 344)	8 844 (7 519)	4 042 (2 318)	19 275 (14 181)
AUSTRIA	5 136 (2 808)	5 069 (3 137)	15 219	25 424 (5 945)	4 528	5 427	8 630	18 585	4 063 (2 314)	5 867 (3 216)	5 558 (Nil)	15 488 (5 530)
POLAND	1 131	2 002	2 763	5 896	2 144	2 284	4 413	8 841	2 471	939	3 875	7 285
PORTUGAL	9	62	2	73	16	73	Nil	89	30	74	Nil	104
SLOVENIA	39	317	769	1 125	26	661	1 161	1 848	9	561	331	901
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	15	1 592	11 782	13 389	25	827	2 930	3 782	8	862	1 944	2 814
FINLAND	800	3 418	546	4 764	597	2 472	370	3 439	618	1 481	287	2 386
SWEDEN	4 407 (3 396)	42 556 (27 870)	5 159 (3 993)	52 122 (35 259)	6 974 (5 358)	34 316 (15 923)	3 919 (2 638)	45 212 (23 922)	22 728	12 503	10 737	45 968
UNITED KINGDOM	N/A (6 355)	N/A (49 040)	N/A (4 195)	N/A (55 390)	N/A (5 425)	N/A (27 780)	N/A (2 955)	N/A (33 210)	N/A (5 045)	N/A (20 430)	N/A (2 410)	N/A (25 475)
BULGARIA	270	334	361	965	86	380	478	944	95	215	284	594
ROMANIA	88	406	63	557	54	417	None	471	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ICELAND	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	None	55	28	83	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NORWAY	3 480	8 346	695	12 521	2 480	4 270	694	7 444	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Notes:

1. For **Belgium**, the figures are for Adults only (dependent minor children are not included). *Positive first instance* relates to the recognition of refugee status made by the Commissioner General for Refugees and Stateless Persons (CGRS); *Positive first appeal* relates to the recognition of refugee status by the Permanent Appeals Commission (PCA); *Negative first instance* comprises (a) negative decisions (on the admissibility) made by the Immigration Office (IO) and for which the person did not lodge an urgent appeal at the CGRS, (b) (final) negative decisions on the admissibility by the CGRS, plus (c) final negative decisions on the merit of the request made by the CGRS. Other non-status decisions (*First instance*) comprises the number of files/persons who have been cancelled or declared "without object" (devenu sans objet) as a result of (a) people who desisted voluntarily from their asylum application (at the CGRA); or (b) people who desisted voluntarily from their asylum application, deceases, naturalizations, people who left the country, etc. (at the PCA).

2. For **Czech Republic**, the Total number of decisions refers to the numbers of decisions of the first and second instance. Appeals to the regional court and cessations are not included in the total number of decisions as they are decisions on legality, not decisions on asylum.

3. Data for **United Kingdom** includes dependants and the First instance Total includes also withdrawn applications (3 520 in 2004; 3 440 in 2005 and 2 050 in 2006).

Austria issued 15 488 decisions (first instance and appeal) in 2006, of which 4 063 were positive, 5 867 were negative and 5 558 non-status (as a result of, for example, cessation of asylum proceedings, absence of asylum applicant). This number of decisions continued a decrease from 2005, prior to which, and since 1997, the number of decisions made had been increasing. Disaggregated by instance, 2 314 positive and 3 216 negative final decisions were taken by the first instance *Federal Asylum Office* (Bundesasylamt, BAA), whilst 1 749 positive and 2 651 negative decisions were taken by the first appeal instance of the *Independent Federal Asylum Review Board* (Unabhängiger Bundesasylsenat, UBAS), which indicates that more than 43% of all positive decisions were made at the second instance. With regard to the nationalities to which a positive decision was given, by far the largest was for nationals of Russia and predominantly applicants from the region of Chechnya, with 2 090 (or 51%), followed by nationals of Afghanistan (475), Serbia (318), Iran (211) and Turkey (113). This breakdown is similar to that in 2005, although the recognition rate, based on positive and negative decisions (first and appeal instance), for nationals of Russia was lower in 2006 at 71% compared to 91% the previous year. For nationals of Afghanistan the recognition rate was 64% (79% in 2005), for Iraq 35%, Serbia 12% (29% for nationals of Serbia-Montenegro in 2005) and Turkey 14%. Similar to previous years, the recognition rates of nationals of Georgia (4%), Nigeria (2%) and Moldova (1%) remained very low.

Of the 594 decisions taken in **Bulgaria** in 2006, 95 were positive, mainly for nationals of Afghanistan (38) and Iraq (28). This was an increase, not only in the absolute number of positive decisions, but also in the proportion compared to 2005 when of the 952 decisions taken, 86 were positive. Other positive decisions in 2006 were given to nationals of Iran (9), Armenia (7) and Somalia (4). The 10 nationals of China who sought protection in 2006 had their applications refused.

In the **Czech Republic**, decisions were made in 3 021 cases in 2006, of which 364 were positive including 268 granting asylum. This represented an 11% increase in positive decisions compared to 2005 (330 positive decisions). The majority of positive decisions were given to nationals of former Soviet States (Belarus 115, Russia 54, Kazakhstan 31 and Ukraine 31). In previous years, most positive decisions were given to nationals of Russia (2004 46; 2005 119).

The total number of asylum decisions in **Finland** decreased by 30% in 2006 compared to the previous year. Of the 2 386 decisions made in 2006 (3 439 in 2005), there were 618 positive decisions (597 in 2005), 1 481 negative decisions (2 472 in 2005) and 287 other non-status decisions (370 in 2005). One reason for the larger number of negative decisions in 2005 and 2006

was the relatively high number of asylum applicants from **Bulgaria**, none of which received positive decisions. In 2006, the highest number of positive decisions were given to nationals of Somalia (184), Afghanistan (132), Iraq (113), Serbia and Montenegro (310), Russia and Iran (each 25).

France made 37 715 first instance decisions in 2006, of which 2 929 were positive decisions. Most positive decisions were awarded to nationals of Russia (370), followed by Haiti (295), the Democratic Republic of Congo (239), Turkey (208) and Sri Lanka (143). However, this was a significant decline from the previous two years (6 358 positive decisions were made in 2004 and 4 184 in 2005), although it should be noted that an exceptionally high number of decisions were taken within the framework of processing outstanding appeals in these two years. Including appeal decisions, 7 380 asylum applicants have been granted positive decisions in 2006 and 12 559 in 2005. The decrease affected a wide range of geographic origins, and for some severely so. For example, the number of nationals of Sri Lanka and Turkey obtaining asylum in 2006 was halved compared with 2005 (485 and 498 in 2006 compared with 1022 and 972 in 2005 respectively). Only a very limited number of countries saw higher numbers of their nationals being granted asylum in 2006, including Iraq, Egypt, Haiti and Sudan. These changes did not, however, radically change the composition of countries of origin, essentially from Africa (38.1%), and mostly from the Democratic Republic of Congo (490 new refugees), Mauritania (224), Côte d'Ivoire (216) and Congo (172). Next are nationals from the Commonwealth of Independent States (20.3%, mostly from Russia), Asia (14.8%, primarily from Sri Lanka), and Turkey (6.8%).

The share of positive decisions made in **Germany** in 2006 amounted to 6.3% or 1 951 of the total number of decisions made (30 759). This is comparable to previous years from 2002 onwards. Negative decisions at first instance constituted 57.8% (or 17 780), whilst almost one-third of cases were concluded by other means. Most positive decisions made are recognition of refugee status according to the Geneva convention and the highest rates of positive decisions are given to nationals of Russia (29.4% of decisions made for these nationals were positive and 173 Geneva Convention statuses were given), Iraq (28.2%; 161) and Turkey (25.7%; 147), with that for Serbia and Montenegro (15.5%; 90) also being above the average. The proportion of positive decisions for Russia and Turkey had increased from the previous year when they were 18.2% and 8.1% respectively.

Of the 13 166 decisions made in **Greece** in 2006, 91 were positive, which is less than in 2005 when of the 10 421 decisions made, 124 were positive. Whilst the proportion of Geneva Convention

positive decisions increased to 64 from 39 in 2005, there was a drastic decline in positive decisions for Humanitarian Status to 27 from 85 in 2005. Geneva Convention positive decisions were given mainly to nationals of Afghanistan (10; 3 in 2005), Democratic Republic of Congo (10; 4 in 2005), Iran (8; 3 in 2005), Somalia (7) and Libya (6). The decline in the number of positive decisions for humanitarian status is attributed to a decline in the number of positive decisions issued to nationals of Iraq, Afghanistan and Sudan.

Hungary made 2 018 decisions in 2006, of which 198 were first positive decisions (99 Geneva Convention). This number of positive decisions was comparable to the previous year, being 192 out of 1 654 decisions made, but less than in 2004, when 326 positive decisions were made out of a total of 1 784. Nationals of Somalia (29) and Iraq (15) constituted the bulk of Geneva Convention statuses granted, whilst for other forms of protection, the largest was for ethnic minorities (ethnic Albanian, Hungarian, Serbian, Roma, Bosnian) from Serbia and Montenegro (26).

The overall number of asylum decisions in **Ireland** increased to 6 194 in 2006 compared to 5 242 in 2005. The proportion of positive decisions to total decisions also increased slightly from 8.6% in 2005 to 10.4% in 2006. Of the 648 positive decisions in 2006, over 60% were granted at first instance. Whilst there are limited data available on the nationality of those accorded positive decisions and no data available for those accorded negative decisions, the estimation is that the continuing trend for a higher proportion of positive determinations is partly a result of changed migration flows to Ireland.

Following the introduction in **Italy** of new procedures for the recognition of refugee status from April 2005, involving the creation of Territorial Committees to complement the national one and the examination of applications by a *National Commission for Asylum right – Special Supernumerary Division*, there was an increase in the number of decisions made from 8 332 (of which 3 134 were positive) in 2004 to 10 911 (4 384 positive) in 2005 to 9 260 (878 positive) in 2006. Whilst there was a significant decrease in the number of positive decisions recognising refugee status in 2006, this was, to a certain extent, offset by an increase in the granting of Humanitarian Protection (4 338 in 2006). One aspect observed following the introduction of the new procedure, was that the rate of untraceable cases (36.7% of cases with the old procedure, that is 4 258 out of 11 589) decreased to 2.8% (262 cases) indicating that applicants have more confidence in receiving an answer within a reasonable time.

For **Latvia**, there were 10 positive decisions out of the 23 decisions in 2006, including 8 decisions made on 20 applications submitted in 2005. Of these 10, refugee status was granted to one national from Russia and one from Belarus and alternative status was granted to seven nationals from Somalia and one from Russia.

Poland issued 2 471 positive decisions (423 granting refugee status mostly to nationals of Russia and 2 048 granting "tolerated stay" status) out of the 7 285 decisions made in 2006. This was the highest number of positive decisions since 1994 and also represented a 35% increase compared to 2005 when of the 8 841 decisions made, 2 144 were positive.

The number of positive decisions granted by **Portugal** increased to 30, out of 104 decisions made, in 2006 from 16, out of 89 decisions in 2005. The boost in positive decisions is explained by the fact that 17 refugees were accepted in 2006 as part of the UNHCR Resettlement Programme. There was also a change in the composition of nationalities receiving a positive decision. In 2005, the majority of positive decisions were for nationals of Colombia and Turkey, whilst in 2006 it was nationals of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (6), Cote d'Ivoire (5), Russia (4) and Eritrea (4).

There were a total of 4 248 first instance decisions in **Spain** in 2006, of which 356 were positive. Of the positive decisions made, 168 were for granting Refugee Status pursuant to the Geneva Convention (34 fewer than in 2005), mainly to nationals of Colombia (40, which is 41 less than in 2005), Venezuela (16, with essentially none in 2005) and Russia (14, which is 9 less than in 2005). Colombia continues to be, since 2002, the country of origin of asylum applicants with the greatest number of positive decisions, although the proportion has decreased from 40.1% in 2005 (a year with a significant increase) to 23.8% in 2006. There has also been a steady decline in the proportion of positive decisions granted to nationals of Russia and an increase in the number to nationals of Iraq, doubling from 6 in 2005 to 12 in 2006. The remaining 188 positive decisions were for the granting of some type of Subsidiary Protection. Of these, 37% (69) were for nationals of the Ivory Coast, 22 to nationals of Iraq and 13 to nationals of Russia.

The number of positive decisions in **Sweden** in 2006 amounted to 22 728 or 49% of the total number of decisions made (45 968). This was a significant increase compared to 2005 when 22% of the decisions taken were positive (5 357 out of 23 922) and is attributed to the aforementioned temporary law and a high recognition rate in first instance, especially for nationals of Iraq. Most of the positive decisions made (20 753) were either under the temporary law based on humanitarian

considerations and for nationals of Iraq, Somalia and some other countries because they were considered in need of protection according to the rules in the Aliens Act on subsidiary protection.

A total of 25 475 initial decisions were made on asylum applications in the **United Kingdom** in 2006, a decrease from 2005 when it was 33 210, of which 20% were positive (5 045 – a 7% decrease from 2005). Of these 5 045 positive decisions, 2 630 were for the granting of asylum and the remaining 2 410 were for the granting of Humanitarian Protection (HP) or Discretionary Leave (DL). Of the total positive decisions, the nationalities accounting for the highest numbers of applicants were Somali (940, 19% of positive decisions granting asylum), Eritrea (895, 18%), Afghanistan (835, 17%), Iran (380, 7%) and Zimbabwe (235, 5%).

4. MIGRATION FLOWS

[Table 3](#) provides an overview of Migration Flows (emigration, immigration and net migration¹³) for each Member State and for the years 2003 to 2006 inclusive. Note that these data include both migration from/to third countries, as well as intra-EU movements and, owing to the sometimes different definitions used by Member States, caution should be exercised when making comparisons between their data.

In terms of trends over the period 2003 to 2006, it can be broadly observed that for **Austria** (in going from 2005 to 2006), **Germany, Italy, Portugal**, and the **United Kingdom** their *positive (i.e. more immigration than emigration) Net Migration* has decreased (e.g. as a result of increasing emigration and/or decreasing immigration); whilst for **Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Slovak Republic, Spain** and **Sweden** (particularly in going from 2005 to 2006) their *positive Net Migration* has increased (primarily as a result of increasing immigration). Amongst the EU-15 Member States, the **Netherlands** remains an exception in that it has *negative Net Migration (i.e. more emigration than immigration)*, a trend which has been increasing in magnitude since 2003. Where data are available, for EU-10 Member States, **Latvia, Lithuania** and **Poland** also exhibit *negative Net Migration* which can at least in part be attributed to the impact of EU accession, but also, as indicated above and outlined in the previous Synthesis Report, to the manner in which the data are processed. The **Czech Republic** and **Ireland** both experienced a significant increase in the magnitude of their respective (positive) Net Migration in going from 2004 to 2005, following EU enlargement, with then both of these Member States each experiencing a slight decrease of

¹³ Calculated as Immigration minus Emigration. When positive, this indicates net immigration and when negative, net emigration.

Table 3: Migration Flows 2003 to 2006

	2003			2004			2005			2006		
	Immigration	Emigration	Net Migration									
BELGIUM	112 060	79 399	32 661	117 236	83 895	33 341	132 810	86 899	45 911	137 699	88 163	49 536
CZECH REPUBLIC	60 015	34 226	25 789	53 453	34 818	18 635	60 294	24 065	36 229	68 183	33 463	34 720
DENMARK	49 754	43 466	6 288	49 860	45 017	4 843	52 458	45 869	6 589	56 750	46 786	9 964
GERMANY	768 975	626 330	142 645	780 175	697 632	82 543	707 352	628 399	78 953	661 855	639 064	22 791
ESTONIA	N/A	N/A										
IRELAND	61 725	28 375	33 350	58 875	27 200	31 675	78 075	28 675	49 400	102 000	34 350	67 650
GREECE	45 500	10 118	35 382	50 101	8 713	41 388	42 015	2 041	39 974	83 789	N/A	N/A
SPAIN	470 010	25 959	444 051	684 561	55 092	629 469	719 284	68 011	651 273	840 844	142 296	698 548
FRANCE	190 825	N/A		191 850	N/A		187 134	N/A		183 261	N/A	
ITALY	470 491	62 970	407 521	444 566	64 849	379 717	325 673	65 029	260 644	297 640	75 230	222 410
CYPRUS	16 779	4 437	12 342	22 003	6 279	15 724	24 419	10 003	14 416	N/A	N/A	
LATVIA	1 364	2 210	-846	1 665	2 744	-1 079	1 886	2 450	-564	2 801	5 252	-2 451
LITHUANIA	4 728	11 032	-6 304	5 553	15 165	-9 612	6 789	15 571	-8 782	7 745	12 602	-4 857
LUXEMBOURG	12 613	10 540	2 073	12 495	10 911	1 584	13 512	10 841	2 671	14 352	9 001	5 351
HUNGARY	19 365	2 553	16 812	22 164	3 466	18 698	25 582	3 320	22 262	23 569	3 965	19 604
MALTA	1 239	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	
NETHERLANDS	104 514	104 831	-317	94 019	110 235	-16 216	92 297	119 725	-27 428	101 150	132 470	-31 320
AUSTRIA	111 869	71 996	39 873	122 547	71 721	50 826	114 465	70 133	44 332	98 535	74 432	24 103
POLAND	7 048	20 813	-13 765	9 495	18 877	-9 382	9 364	22 242	-12 878	10 802	46 936	-36 134
PORTUGAL	79 300	9 300	70 000	72 400	8 900	63 500	57 920	10 680	47 240	49 200	10 800	38 400
SLOVENIA	9 279	5 867	3 412	10 171	8 269	1 902	15 041	8 605	6 436	20 016	13 749	6 267
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	6 551	4 777	1 774	10 390	6 525	3 865	9 410	2 784	6 626	12 611	3 084	9 527
FINLAND	17 838	12 083	5 755	20 333	13 656	6 677	21 355	12 369	8 986	22 451	12 107	10 344
SWEDEN	63 795	35 023	28 772	62 028	36 586	25 442	65 229	38 118	27 111	95 750	44 908	50 842
UNITED KINGDOM	508 000	361 000	147 000	586 000	342 000	244 000	563 000	359 000	204 000	591 000	400 000	191 000
Total (EU-10)												
Total (EU-15)												
Total (EU-27)												
BULGARIA	N/A	N/A										
ROMANIA	3 267	10 673	-7 406	2 987	13 082	-10 095	3 704	N/A		N/A	N/A	
ICELAND	3 704	3 837	-133	5 350	4 820	530	7 773	3 913	3 860	N/A	N/A	
NORWAY	35 957	24 672	11 285	36 482	23 271	13 211	40 148	21 709	18 439	N/A	N/A	

Notes:

1. Unless otherwise stated below, the data from those Member States indicated in *italics* are as provided by EUROSTAT and have not been verified by their respective EMN NCP.
2. N/A means that these data are "Not Available." Green (light) shading is used to indicate a *positive* net migration and orange (dark) shading a *negative* net migration.
3. These data include **both** intra-EU mobility and migration to/from third countries.
4. For **Greece**, immigration data are based on initial residence permits issued, whilst emigration is estimated based on recoded immigration and natural population movement (births-deaths).
5. For **France**, Immigration data excludes FR nationals, EU/EEA and Swiss nationals and minors. Emigration data are not available, but the Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques (INSEE) is able to provide an estimation of the Net Migration. ?ADD MORE FROM REPROT
6. Emigration data used for the **Netherlands** are including administrative corrections. This increases the total number of emigrants and causes the emigration surplus. EUROSTAT emigration statistics do not include administrative corrections and therefore show an immigration surplus in 2004 and 2005.
7. For **Austria**, immigration data also includes asylum applicants (since 2004).
8. Since in **Portugal** there is no population register or recorded migration flows, data on international migration flows are estimates based on several statistical sources, such as long term visas, resident permits, stay permits, estimates on Portuguese return.
9. The data for the **United Kingdom** are rounded to the nearest thousand. Note also that they are not the same as in their Country Study report, as they have been subsequently updated. Their Table of data has, however, been updated.
10. For **Hungary**, only foreign (i.e. non-hungarian nationals) are counted.
11. For **Malta**, data comes from 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics and refers to persons who intend to reside in Malta and are therefore entitled to tax reductions.
12. For **Poland**, 2003 data comes from 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics.
13. For **Romania**, data for 2003 comes from 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics.

approximately 4% in 2006. Similarly, **Hungary** (by 11.9%) and **Slovenia** (by 2.6%) had a decrease in its (positive) Net Migration in going from 2005 to 2006.

The decrease in immigration in **Austria** since 2004 continued amounting to 100 972 in 2006 (a 14% decrease compared to 2005). With regard to emigration this increased compared to 2005 to be 73 495, although still less than in the period 2000 to 2004 when annual emigration was around 77 000. The resultant net migration in 2006 was thus 27 477, a significant decrease (-44%) compared to 2005 (49 172). The decrease in immigration was primarily as a result of a decrease in the inflow of third country nationals (62 446 in 2005 but 46 447 in 2006) which has been attributed to stricter legal regulations for the entry of third country nationals. There was also an increase (+9% compared to 2005) in the number of emigrations by third country national emigrations (31 603, 43% of the total number in 2006), as well as other Union citizens (+15%, 21 314, 29% of the total number in 2006), whilst that of Austrian nationals decreased slightly (-3%, 20 579, 28% of the total number in 2006). In terms of net migration, other Union citizens constituted 65% (or 17 745, although lower than 2005 when it was 20 431) of the total, of which 11 320 were other EU-15 nationals, mainly from **Germany**, and 6 425 EU-10 nationals, mainly from **Poland**, **Slovak Republic** and **Hungary**. The decrease in the net migration resulted predominantly from the changes in immigration and emigration of third country nationals.

Between 2002 and 2006, as well as between 2005 and 2006, emigration from **Finland** did not significantly change. Conversely, immigration has increased significantly. Compared to 2002, approximately 24% more immigrants moved to Finland in 2006, and, when compared to 2005, there was a 5% increase in the number of immigrants (21 355 in 2005 and 22 451 in 2006). Emigration has continued its decreasing trend since 2002, being 12 107 in 2006 (12 369 in 2005). Consequently, net migration has increased, particularly in 2005 (when it was 8 986) and 2006 (when it was 10 344).

The number of foreign nationals entering **Germany** continued to decrease in 2006, being 661 855, a decrease of 6.4% compared to 2005 and the lowest since 1987, likewise for the immigration rate (immigrants per thousand inhabitants) which was 8.0 in 2006. Conversely, the number of persons leaving continued its increase since 2001, reaching 639 064 in 2006, a 1.7% increase compared to 2005 (when it was 628 399), giving an emigration rate of 7.8, a slight increase from 2005 (when it was 7.6). This continuing trend since 2001 with high numbers both of people leaving and entering is considered to indicate a primarily temporary migration process.

The number of migrants entering **Hungary** in 2006 was 23 569, a slight decrease compared to 2005 (when it was 25 582) but more similar to 2004 (when it was 22 164). The reason for the peak in 2005 is attributed to Hungary's accession to the EU resulting in the southern and eastern border becoming one segment of the EU's external border, prompting the development of a migration strategy, and amendments of acts with regard to migration. The decrease observed in 2006 might be owing to the declared integration policy not yet being adopted which in turn might contribute to the increasing emigration by non-nationals. The migration flows of third country nationals have been dominated by returning ethnic Hungarian minorities from neighbouring countries, and, as a result of this, policy debates in recent years have focused on simplified visas and facilitated naturalisation procedures for these preferred groups.

Significant increases in immigration flows occurred in **Ireland** in 2006 with high rates of both immigration and emigration recorded. Over the reference period (April 2006 to April 2007), net migration was 67 300, with recorded immigration reaching a high of 109 500 (it was 107 800 in 2005 and 84 600 in 2004). Recorded emigration also continued to increase, from 36 000 in 2005 to 42 200 during 2006 (an increase of 17.2%).

The population of **Italy**, not including immigrants and asylum applicants, has been decreasing for ten years now and, according to the demographic estimates of the National Institute of Statistics, is increasingly ageing. Moreover, during the 1999-2006 period, recorded emigration remained stable at an average of 60 000 per year, with approximately 10 000 of these being non-nationals.

The number of the inhabitants of **Latvia** continued to decrease in 2006 by 2 451, continuing a trend since 2001, although the rate of the decrease in 2006 was larger than in the previous year: 0.58% in comparison with 0.51% in 2005. In 2006 negative net migration was 2.2 times more than in 2004 and 4.3 times more than in 2005. Of the registered total emigration (5 252 persons), most was to Russia (899), followed by Belarus (331), Germany (239), Ukraine (214) and USA (214). However, it is also known that there is a significant, but unregistered, emigration of nationals of Latvia to other EU Member States (mainly to the **United Kingdom** and **Ireland**).

Lithuania too has observed that the number of its nationals who have emigrated far exceeds the official recorded emigration. Since 2002 in fact, the migration trend has been of emigration, with a peak after the accession to the EU in 2004. At the same time, however, there has been a steady rise in immigration, principally owing to the shortage of workers in Lithuania in specific sectors, such as construction and logistics (international drivers in particular).

Migration flow in **Poland** is characterised, especially since 2004, by a continued increase both in the numbers of foreigners ('permanent residents') in Poland and in numbers of emigrating nationals. In 2006, both emigration from and immigration to Poland reached its highest levels since the end of the 1950's, with four times more people emigrating (46 936) than immigrating (10 802) to Poland. Immigration in 2006 was composed predominantly of returning nationals of Poland and primarily from **Germany** (nearly 30%) and the United States, i.e. previously two main destinations of Polish emigration. Nearly 15% arrived from the **United Kingdom** (less than 5% in 2005), which may be explained by the increased emigration of nationals of Poland to the United Kingdom after 1st May 2004. There was also a relatively large proportion of "immigrants" who were nationals of Ukraine in 2006, but this was more as a result of the registering for 'permanent residence' of persons who had previously held another legal title to reside in Poland (e.g. the residence permit for a fixed period). Of 40 700 persons who actually enter Poland in 2006 and were registered for 'temporary stay for above 3 months', nearly 11 000 (more than 25%) came from Ukraine. Other important nationalities in this category were of Belarus, Germany, Russian Federation and Vietnam.

The migration flow for **Portugal** nowadays has larger immigration than emigration, which is a reversal of the situation prior to the mid-1980's. An analysis of the migration flows since 2002 shows that in the five year period up to 2006 immigration and emigration mirrored each other. Initially immigration increased until 2004 and has been declining since, while emigration, which had been decreasing, suddenly increased by 20% in 2005 and in 2006 has remained at about the same level. Overall, immigration decreased by 34% from 2002 to 2006, while emigration increased by 10% in the same period. These trends do not, however, seem to be a direct result of policies or even of macroeconomic trends.

The population of the **Slovak Republic** has increased every year since 2002, primarily through immigration. Immigration in 2006 was 12 611, of which 1 302 (10.3%) were nationals of the Slovak Republic and 6 926 (54.9%) other EU(-25) nationals. The largest share of immigration was of nationals of the **Czech Republic** (1 294), **Poland** (1 132) and Ukraine (1 007). More than 64% of immigrants were aged between 20 to 44, with 7.8% (885) children under 15 years old, and mostly men (8 028 or 63.7% of total). A significant increase (a doubling compared to 2005) was also observed in the number of immigrants who were nationals of China (593), Korea (503) and Vietnam (466). With regard to emigration, some 3 084 were registered in 2006, although this may be an underestimate since not all persons submitted a declaration on change of residence with the respective institutions. Nationals of the Slovak Republic represented the largest proportion of emigrations (1 560 or 50.6%), followed by nationals of Ukraine (237), USA (151) and **Germany**

(142). In terms of gender, there was a relatively even balance, with 1 614 men and 1 470 women emigrating.

The increasing trend in international migration flows received by **Spain** continued in 2006, with net migration approaching 700 000, of which 682 717 corresponded to non-nationals of Spain. An increase in both immigration and emigration was detected and the main continent of nationality of those entering Spain in 2006 was South America (38.7%), followed by non-EU European countries (23.0%) and other EU(-25) nationals (18.8%). An increase in the flow from Africa was also observed, with a steady increase between 2002 and 2005 (from 12.6% to 17.7%) and a slight decline in 2006 to 14.5% of all immigration; as well as from Asia, with a trend mirroring that from Africa, and accounting for 4.8% of all immigration in 2006. The three third country nationalities that contributed most to immigration came from Romania (131 457), Morocco (78 512) and Bolivia (77 755), with also more than 150 000 other EU nationals, of which nationals of the **United Kingdom** (42 535) and **Portugal** (20 658) were the most prominent. The total number of immigrants amounted to 840 844, the highest figure since 2002, and there were 142 296 emigrations, also a steadily increasing amount. An analysis of the composition of immigration showed that the most numerous group was comprised of persons born outside Spain, the number of which practically doubled from 2002 (441 000) to 2006 (798 158). Of increasing significance, albeit with low numbers for the moment, is the immigration of persons born in Spain and are the descendents of immigrants who had previously left the country and returned to live in Spain after some time (they numbered less than 2 000 in 2002 and amounted to 4 813 in 2006). For emigration, the main component is also comprised of persons born outside of Spain and their numbers have grown steadily, amounting to less than 10 000 people in 2002 and 2003, more than 40 000 in 2004 and 2005 and reaching 116 878 in 2006. Such data suggest that both entry and exit flows of persons born outside Spain are increasing.

During 2006, 95 750 people immigrated to **Sweden**, an increase compared to 2005 when it was 65 229. The increase has been attributed to the temporary asylum law, which came into force in the middle of November 2005 and remained in force until 31 March 2006. There was also an increase in the number of permits issued on the basis of family reunification, which to some extent, was caused by the increase of asylum permits. During 2006, 44 908 people emigrated from Sweden, which is an increase of 18% compared to 2005.

In 2006, an estimated 591 000 people entered the **United Kingdom**, a slight increase on the previous highest estimate of 586 000 observed in 2004 and a 5% increase compared to 2005.

Estimated emigration was 400 000 (the highest level since the method to calculate ‘Total International Migration’ was implemented in 1991), an 11% increase from 2005. The net migration was thus 191 000, lower than the net migration record high of 244 000 in 2004 and 13 000 lower than in 2005. This decline was due to emigration increasing more than immigration. Some 86% (510 000) of immigrants were non-UK nationals, of which 343 000 were third country nationals, an 8% increase compared to previous year (when it was 317 000). In terms of other EU(-25) nationals, immigration amounted to 167 000 in 2006 (149 000 in 2005), of which 92 000 were EU-8 nationals (76 000 in 2005) and primarily nationals of **Poland** (68 000), whilst emigration amounted to 66 000. There is a continuing trend for more men than women to migrate from and to the United Kingdom, particularly for those aged between 25 and 44. The difference for all ages became less in 2006 though, as there were 9 women (8 in 2005) for every 10 men that immigrated, and 8 women (7 in 2005) for every 10 men that emigrated.

5. POPULATION BY CITIZENSHIP

[Table 4](#) presents an overview of the composition of each Member State's population, in terms of its nationals, other EU(-15 or -25) nationals and third country nationals, including EU-2 (**Bulgaria** and **Romania**). Note that the data given in this Section represents, unless stated to the contrary, the situation at the beginning of 2006.

From the data available, it is observed that the EU-15 Member States with the largest proportion of non-nationals, calculated as a percentage of their Total Population, in 2006 are (in decreasing order) **Ireland** (10.2%, including 3.5% third country nationals), **Austria** (9.7%, including 7.0% third country nationals), **Spain** (9.1%, including 7.2% third country nationals), **Belgium** (8.6%, including 2.8% third country nationals) and **Germany** (8.2%, including 5.6% third country nationals). Those EU-15 Member States with the lowest proportion are **Finland** (2.2%, including 1.4% third country nationals), **Italy** (3.9%, including 3.5% third country nationals), **Portugal** (4.1%, including 3.3% third country nationals) and **Netherlands** (4.2%, including 2.8% third country nationals). Similarly, the available data for the EU-10 Member States shows that, also in 2006, **Latvia** (19.9%, including 18.3% non-citizens of Latvia¹⁴ and 1.4% other third country nationals) and **Estonia** (18.5%, including 10.1% non-citizens¹⁵ and 7.5% third country nationals) have the largest proportion, whilst **Slovak Republic** (0.5%, including 0.2% third country nationals), **Lithuania** (1%, essentially all

¹⁴ In accordance with the law “On the Status of those Former U.S.S.R. Citizens who do not have the Citizenship of **Latvia** or that of any Other State” *non-citizens of Latvia* are persons who are citizens of the former USSR, who do not hold citizenship of any country and who permanently reside in the Republic of Latvia.

¹⁵ Like for Latvia, *non-citizens* in **Estonia** are persons who are citizens of the former USSR, who do not hold citizenship of any country and who permanently reside in Estonia.

third country nationals) and **Hungary** (1.5%, including 1.3% third country nationals) have the lowest proportion.

In terms of the most prominent nationalities to be found in the Member States, nationals of *Serbia and Montenegro* are one of the main groups to be found in **Austria** (137 859), **Hungary** (12 111) and **Slovenia** (9 279), along with nationals from other *Former (non-EU) Yugoslav Republic states*, plus **Finland** (3 321) and **Germany** (297 004). For nationals of *Russia*, these are most prominent in **Finland** (24 621) and **Slovak Republic** (1 246), and for nationals of *Ukraine* in **Czech Republic** (75 663), **Hungary** (15 337), **Italy** (115 087), **Portugal** (44 937) and **Slovak Republic** (3 703). Amongst other prominent nationalities are those of *China* in **Ireland** (11 161), **Italy** (114 165) and the **United Kingdom** (75 000), of *Romania* in **Hungary** (66 183), **Italy** (271 491) and **Spain** (388 422), and *Vietnam* in **Czech Republic** (34 735), **Slovak Republic** and **Poland**.

A number of Member States have a strong predominance of nationals from a specific region or country, which can be attributed to historical ties (e.g. guest worker programmes, from colonial times) and/or geographical proximity. **France**, for example, has most of its third country nationals coming from the *Maghreb* (1 100 000); for **Germany** (1 764 041), **Austria** (113 068) and the **Netherlands** (98 920) from *Turkey*; for **Greece** (361 766) and **Italy** (256 916) from *Albania*; for **Portugal** from *Brazil* (70 334), for **Spain** from *Morocco* (542 969) and *South America* (e.g. *Ecuador* 459 993, *Colombia* 266 548), and for the **United Kingdom** from *India* (263 000) and the *USA* (119 000). **Ireland** also has nationals from the *USA* (12 475) as one of the main groups of third country nationals, along with nationals of *Nigeria* (16 300).

Table 4: Population by (non) EU Nationality (on 1st January)

	2003				2004				2005				2006				
	Nationals	Other EU(-14) Nationals	Non EU-14 Nationals	incl. future EU-10 Nationals	Nationals	Other EU(-14) Nationals	Non-EU-14 Nationals	incl. future EU-10 Nationals	Nationals	Other EU(-24) Nationals	incl. EU-10 Nationals	Non-EU-25 Nationals	Nationals	Other EU(-24) Nationals	incl. EU-10 Nationals	Non-EU-25 Nationals	incl. future EU-2 Nationals
BELGIUM	9 505 767	566 665	283 412	14 532	9 536 134	569 011	291 276	16 575	9 574 990	571 264	19 780	299 598	9 610 909	603 383	26 001	297 090	10 814
DENMARK	5 118 083	55 415	210 009	9 707	5 126 429	56 363	214 848	10 007	5 143 801	68 220	N/A	199 384	5 157 408	71 994	N/A	198 057	N/A
GERMANY	75 188 729	1 862 066	5 473 526	467 772	75 196 906	1 849 986	5 484 779	481 998	75 212 869	2 108 010	439 948	4 609 105	75 148 846	2 144 648	482 864	4 611 163	112 196
GREECE	10 158 915	N/A	N/A	N/A	10 149 453	5 952	585 091	4 999	10 138 062	11 744	5 399	592 471	10 127 964	3 599	2 797	603 493	79 103
SPAIN	39 352 775	448 283	1 749 526	27 558	39 425 665	536 357	2 235 843	42 432	39 666 641	700 187	55 933	2 671 207	39 755 741	835 731	70 815	3 166 778	490 397
FRANCE	56 505 915	1 183 543	2 166 365	37 572	56 477 017	1 186 407	2 237 856	38 175	57 983 175	1 300 000	N/A	2 200 000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
IRELAND	3 762 500	N/A	N/A	N/A	3 830 087	N/A	N/A	N/A	3 877 636	N/A	N/A	N/A	3 706 683	275 775	N/A	145 276	8 665
ITALY	55 817 784	150 866	1 352 420	N/A	55 660 678	148 194	2 079 373	N/A	56 216 827	239 192	N/A	2 006 356	56 465 687	233 867	N/A	2 052 157	N/A
LUXEMBOURG	277 600	146 070	24 630	N/A	277 400	148 670	25 530	N/A	277 600	152 400	N/A	25 000	277 700	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NETHERLANDS	15 492 618	210 549	489 405	12 393	15 555 847	211 009	491 176	13 276	15 606 175	228 141	18 000	471 279	15 642 853	233 867	23 347	457 490	5 082
AUSTRIA	7 353 520	115 090	631 663	57 407	7 388 357	122 394	631 822	59 730	7 426 958	199 630	67 791	574 771	7 457 632	218 746	75 273	577 920	28 422
PORTUGAL	9 984 178	66 057	357 221	2 826	10 031 859	69 868	372 958	3 049	10 062 944	74 337	2 776	391 974	10 138 845	77 789	1 529	352 958	92 142
FINLAND	5 102 613	17 975	85 707	14 787	5 112 729	18 682	88 321	15 876	5 128 265	35 356	16 508	72 990	5 141 728	37 923	18 314	75 929	970
SWEDEN	8 466 689	185 397	288 702	21 522	8 499 594	185 691	290 385	21 286	8 530 251	208 958	23 405	272 183	8 567 853	213 168	27 026	266 731	N/A
UNITED KINGDOM	55 968 000	906 000	1 936 000	99 000	56 091 000	951 000	2 007 000	143 000	56 229 000	1 198 000	253 000	2 007 000	56 162 000	1 403 000	422 000	2 216 000	28 000
EU-15 Total	358 055 686	N/A	N/A	N/A	358 359 155	N/A	N/A	N/A	361 075 194	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Nationals	EU-15 Nationals	Non EU-15 Nationals	incl. other future EU-10 Nationals	Nationals	EU-15 Nationals	Non EU-15 Nationals	incl. other future EU-10 Nationals	Nationals	Other EU(-24) Nationals	incl. EU-10 Nationals	Non-EU-25 Nationals	Nationals	Other EU(-24) Nationals	incl. EU-10 Nationals	Non-EU-25 Nationals	incl. future EU-2 Nationals
CZECH REPUBLIC	10 024 115	12 394	166 760	46 728	10 016 061	13 223	182 171	50 075	10 027 097	65 479	N/A	127 553	9 992 719	87 144	N/A	171 216	6 787
ESTONIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1 099 025	1 652	273 913	N/A	1 113 675	5 069	N/A	258 879	1 076 458	7 067	N/A	236 729	N/A
CYPRUS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	646 900	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
LATVIA	1 796 946	860	533 491	611	1 804 237	1 284	513 434	883	1 819 222	4 797	1 050	482 124	1 837 832	5 490	1 233	450 996	37
LITHUANIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3 392 997	1 451	N/A	30 876	3 370 422	1 916	N/A	30 946	N/A
HUNGARY	10 026 474	11 654	104 234	3 954	9 986 633	12 143	117 966	5 204	9 955 396	13 360	N/A	128 793	9 922 151	24 879	N/A	129 551	66 183
MALTA	386 938	N/A	N/A	N/A	388 867	N/A	N/A	N/A	390 668	8 000	N/A	4 000	391 906	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
POLAND	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SLOVENIA	1 950 340	1 409	43 284	420	1 951 139	1 468	43 826	496	1 953 305	1 235	204	43 050	1 954 390	2 540	659	46 428	208
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5 350 198	2 811	27 044	9 392	5 362 571	10 876	7 781	11 375	5 363 617	14 041	9 080	11 522	971
EU-10 Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Nationals	EU-15 Nationals	Future EU-10 Nationals	Other non-nationals	Nationals	EU-15 Nationals	Future EU-10 Nationals	Other non-nationals	Nationals	EU-25 Nationals	incl. EU-10 Nationals	Other non-nationals	Nationals	EU-25 Nationals	incl. EU-10 Nationals	Other non-nationals	incl. other future EU-2 Nationals
BULGARIA	7 820 537	N/A	N/A	N/A	7 776 113	N/A	N/A	N/A	7 775 700	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ROMANIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	21 671 748	10 128	N/A	N/A	21 632 599	N/A	N/A	N/A	21 584 220	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Nationals	EU-15 Nationals	Non EU-15 Nationals	incl. future EU-10 Nationals	Nationals	EU-15 Nationals	Non EU-15 Nationals	incl. future EU-10 Nationals*	Nationals	EU-25 Nationals	incl. EU-10 Nationals	Non EU-25 Nationals	Nationals	EU-27 Nationals	incl. EU-10 Nationals	Non EU-25 Nationals	incl. future EU-2 Nationals
ICELAND	278 250	3 085	7 136	2 468	280 390	2 919	7 261	2 555	282 941	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NORWAY	4 354 584	82 213	115 545	5 220	4 372 726	83 058	121 673	5 601	4 393 060	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Notes:

1. Unless otherwise indicated below, the data from those Member States indicated in italics are as provided by Eurostat and have not been verified by their respective EMN NCP.
2. N/A means that these data are "Not Available."
3. For the 2003 and 2004 data given for **EU-15 Member States**, the column heading "*incl. future EU-10 Nationals*" gives the number of EU-10 Nationals making up the number given for "*Non EU-14 Nationals*". For 2005, the headings are changed to reflect accession of the EU-10 Member States, with "*Other EU(-24) Nationals*" being the number of all other EU-24 nationals, i.e. excluding the number of nationals for a particular Member State (which is given in the "*Nationals*" column). The column "*incl. EU-10 Nationals*" then gives the number of EU-10 Nationals contained within the "*Other EU(-24) Nationals*" column. The column "*Non-EU-25 Nationals*" then gives the total of third country nationals, including of Bulgaria and Romania.
4. For the 2003 and 2004 data given for **EU-10 Member States**, the column heading "*incl. other future EU-10 Nationals*" gives the number of Nationals from other EU-10 Member States (i.e. excluding the number of nationals for a particular Member State which is given in the "Nationals" column) making up the number given for "*Non EU-15 Nationals*". For 2005, the headings are changed to be the same as for EU-15 Member States to reflect the accession of these EU-10 Member States (see note above).
5. For **Bulgaria, Romania, Iceland and Norway**, a similar approach to that outlined above is used, i.e. before accession EU-10 Nationals are counted as part of the "Non EU-15 Nationals" and in 2005 as part of "EU-25 Nationals."
6. For **Denmark**, the data for 2003 and 2004 comes from the 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics. For 2005, the data are from EUROSTAT.
7. For **Germany**, the numbers for the total population stem from the general population adjustment system. The data on non-nationals are calculated on the basis of the Central Register on Foreign Nationals (Ausländerzentralregister; AZR). These two data sources are not compatible.
8. For **Greece**, data for 2004 & 2005 regarding 3rd country nationals, as well as other EU(-24) nationals, are based on valid residence permits. Consequently, the data for EU-14 and EU-10 nationals are considered to be extremely underestimated, since many EU nationals do not apply for residence permits, as there are no sanctions. Indicative of this underestimation is that according to 2001 Population Census, the number of EU nationals approaches 80 000. For the same reason, non nationals + nationals are less than total population.
9. For **France**, the data for 2003 and 2004 comes from the 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics. For 2005, the number of nationals comes from INSEE, with the remaining data being an estimation is provided by G  DAP, UCL.
10. For **Ireland**, stock by nationality exists only for census dates (28th April 2002 & 23rd April 2006). The total non-national population (i.e. including both other EU and third country nationals) was 200.229 (2003); 198.732 (2004) and 233.873 (2005).
11. For **Italy**, in 2006, these data do not include the number of minors under 14 years of age (totalling 562 696) who have not been issued with an individual residence permit.
12. For **Luxembourg**, the data for 2003 and 2004 comes from the 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics. For 2005 onwards, data is provided from Service du repertoire des Personnes Physiques.
13. For **Portugal**, data refers to 31st December before the reference year and Non-EU nationals data is based on residence permits stock, consular visas - work, family reunification and study purposes and permanence permits issued.
14. For **Czech Republic**, only foreigners with permit to stay exceeding one year are included in their data.
15. For **Estonia**, 2004 data corresponds to 2 April 2004, i.e. one month before accession. The number of non EU-15 & EU-25 Nationals includes "non-citizens". Like for **Latvia**, these are persons who are citizens of the former USSR, who do not hold citizenship of any country and who permanently reside in Estonia. According to the Estonian Ministry of the Interior Population Registration Bureau, in 2004, there were 135 337 non-citizens and, in 2005, 138 084 non-citizens.
16. For **Cyprus**, the total number of all non-nationals was 74 800 in 2003 and 83 500 in 2004 (data taken from the 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics).
17. For **Latvia**, the number of non EU-15 & EU-25 Nationals includes "non-citizens of Latvia". Like for **Estonia**, these are persons who are citizens of the former USSR, who do not hold citizenship of any country and who permanently reside in the Republic of Latvia. Whilst the Central Statistical Bureau, which provided these data, officially include these non-citizens of Latvia with the number of nationals of Latvia, for the purpose of comparing with other Member States, they have been considered here as non-EU-15 or EU-10 nationals. In 2003, there were 504 572 Latvia non-citizens; in 2004, 481 635 Latvian non-citizens; and, in 2005, 452 302 non-citizens of Latvia.
18. For **Malta**, from the 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics, in 2003 there were a total of 10 358 non-nationals (third country plus other EU-24 nationals); in 2004 this figure was 11 000.
19. For **Poland**, only Total Population data are available being 38 218 531 (in 2003); 38 190 608 (in 2004); 38 173 835 (in 2005) and 38 157 055 (in 2006).
20. For **Bulgaria**, the total number of all non-nationals was 25 304 in 2003; 25 160 in 2004 (data taken from the 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics) and for 2005 25 600 (data estimation provided by G  DAP, UCL).
21. For **Romania**, 2004 data comes from 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics
22. For **Iceland and Norway**, the data for 2003 and 2004 comes from the 2003 Annual Report on Asylum and Migration Statistics.

In December 2006, there were 826 013 non-nationals residing in **Austria**, accounting for 10% of the total population and an increase from December 2005 of 11 948. The largest group, accounting for more than a third (36%; 297 141 and a decrease from 2005 by -5 081) of the total foreign population, are nationals of the Former Republic of Yugoslavia (excluding **Slovenia**), which has been traditionally the source countries of former “guest-worker” recruitment. Another 30% (245 926 and an increase from 2005 of +18 251) of the foreign population were other EU-25 nationals, of which two thirds (66%; 161 803) were other EU-15 and one third (33%; 84 123) EU-10 nationals. In terms of nationalities, those from Serbia and Montenegro represented the largest group (17%; 137 289), followed by nationals of **Germany** (14%; 113 668), Turkey (13%; 108 808 and a decrease of -4 827 from 2005), Bosnia-Herzegovina (10%; 86 427) and Croatia (7%; 57 103). There were also significant numbers of nationals of Russia (2%; 18 897) and China (1%; 9 153).

Nationals of the **Czech Republic** constitute 97.1% (or 9 992 719) of the total population, with other EU-25 nationals making up 1% (87 144) and non-EU-25 nationals 1.9% (171 216). The most frequent non-EU nationals in the Czech Republic are nationals of Ukraine, constituting almost 45% (or 75 663) of all non-EU-25 nationals legally present in the country. This was an increase of 15% compared to the previous year, more modest than in 2004 when it was a 48% increase. Nationals of Vietnam are the second largest group (20% or 34 735), an 11% increase from 2005, followed by Russia (9% or 15 004), a 15% increase from 2005. These main three nationalities enter mainly for economic reasons, particularly as a result of the economic growth in the Czech Republic.

The number of non-nationals living in **Finland** in 2006 was 113 852, of which one third were other EU(-25) nationals (37 923) and two thirds non-EU nationals (75 929). The proportion of non-nationals in the resident population was 2.3% and the number had increased by 7 887 since 2005. Nationals of Russia remain the largest single nationality group amounting to 24 621 in 2006. As well as this group being constituted of returning Ingrian Finns, another explanation is immigration of Russian women specifically for the purpose of marriage. The second largest group of third-country nationals in Finland in 2006 were from Somalia (4 704), Serbia and Montenegro (3 321), Iraq (3 267) and then China (2 992). In terms of gender, overall there were almost as many women as men among the foreigner population in 2006. However, variations between different nationalities do exist. For example, a significant number of nationals of Turkey were men, whilst of Thailand the majority were women. Women were very clearly in the majority also for nationals of Russia, Japan, **Estonia** and Ukraine.

Data from censuses in **France** indicate that, in 2005 at least, there were 3.5 million non-nationals residing in metropolitan France, i.e. 5.7% of the total population, of whom 534 000 were born in France and 1.2 million were other EU(-25) nationals, predominantly nationals of **Spain, Italy** and **Portugal**. Nationals from countries of the Maghreb are the next largest, numbering 1.1 million, and there are significant and increasing numbers also of nationals of Turkey and Asian countries.

According to the Federal Register of Foreigners in **Germany**, there were 6.8 million non-nationals at the beginning of 2006, a slight increase from 2005 of +0.6%. Less than one-third (approx. 2.2 million) are other EU(-25) nationals, with nationals of Turkey, at almost 1.8 million persons (or 26.1% of all non-nationals), constituting by far the largest single group of non-nationals at the beginning of 2006, followed by Serbia and Montenegro with 493 915 (or 7.3% of all non-nationals). All other third-country nationalities are less than 5% of all non-nationals indicating the country-of-origin structure of the non-national population in Germany is highly varied.

There were 603 500 legally-resident third country nationals in **Greece** at the beginning of 2006, which increased by 3% during the year to 621 000, primarily attributed to the *Third Regularisation Programme*. Nationals of Albania are by far the largest group of third country nationals (361 766 in 2006), followed by **Bulgaria** (49 769) and Romania (29 334). A low proportion (9%) originate from certain countries of the former USSR, such as Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova and Russia and third country nationals originating from certain Asian and African countries are on the rise. It should be noted also that, owing to other EU(-25) nationals tending not to register their residence, their official number of around 5 000 is extremely underestimated and in reality is understood to be at least ten times this number.

The overwhelming majority (around 85%) of migrants in **Hungary** are from neighbouring (including other EU-25) European states, and an additional 11% come from Asia, primarily from China and a smaller proportion from Vietnam. Migrants from other parts of the world are marginal. Among the European migrants, half are nationals of Romania (mostly ethnic Hungarians), 11 to 12% are of Serbian-Montenegrin or Ukrainian origin (also partly ethnic Hungarians) and nearly a quarter of the total (22.5%) come from other EU(-25) Member States.

A Census of Population¹⁶ took place in **Ireland** in April 2006 and substantial efforts were made to increase participation of migrant and ethnic minority communities. An ethnicity question was

¹⁶ Further information on the census, including the multilingual forms produced, can be obtained from <http://www.cso.ie/census/default.htm>.

included in the Census for the first time. The results of the census showed that non-Irish nationals who were present and usually resident in the State increased from 224 000 in the previous census of 2002 to 420 000 in 2006, constituting 10% of the total. The fastest growing categories were other EU(-25) Nationals (excluding nationals of the **United Kingdom**), along with Africans and Asians. Nationals of Nigeria were the largest single group of non-EU/EEA nationals (16 300, or 0.39% of the overall population), followed by nationals of the USA (12 475, 0.29%); China (11 161, 0.26%); the Philippines (9 548, 0.22%); India (8 460, 0.20%); and Romania (7 696, 0.18%). There were also approximately 5 000 each of nationals from South Africa, Pakistan, Russia and Brazil.

Non-EU(-25) nationals exceeded 2.6 million in **Italy** in 2006, with the number of other EU(-25) nationals being significantly less at 252 000 (10% of non-national population). On the basis of issued residence permits, the most significant, amounting to almost half of the foreign population, were nationals of Romania (271 000), Albania (257 000), Morocco (240 000), Ukraine (115 000) and China (114 000). These figures, however, are considered to be widely underestimated because they do not include minors under 14 years of age who have not been issued an individual residence permit (562 696 in 2006) and all foreign nationals waiting for the renewal of their residence permits (at the beginning of 2008 the Ministry of the Interior estimated there was a backlog of approximately one million files).

Whilst data are not available for the beginning of 2006 in **Poland**, at the end of 2006, there were 32 206 third-country nationals ('permanent residents'), which constituted 0.1% of the total population. Nationals of Ukraine (5 182) accounted for 16.1% of all third country nationals, followed by Russia (3 291, 10.2%), Vietnam (1 906, 5.9%), Belarus (1 535, 4.8%) and nationals of other former Soviet Union countries (1 318, 4.1%).

The number (352 958) of third country nationals in **Portugal** in 2006 constituted 82% of the total non-national population, a slight decrease from 2005 when it was 84% (or 391 974) owing to the fact that some of the holders of a permanent resident permit did not extend them. Like for 2005, the largest group, in keeping with the historical, linguistic and cultural affinities between the two countries, were nationals of Brazil, totalling 70 300, although a -10.2% decrease from 2005. This decrease is probably owing to the regularisation programme which started in 2003 known as the [*Lula Agreement*](#).¹⁷ The next largest group were nationals of Cape Verde, totalling 68 700 and an

¹⁷ Details available at http://www.sef.pt/portal/v10/EN/asp/noticias/Noticias_Detalhe.aspx?id_linha=4702.

increase of +6.3% from 2005, and then of Ukraine (44 900), a substantial -33% decrease from 2005, which is attributed to the reason given above on the non-extension of permanent residence permits.

For the **Slovak Republic**, it is nationals of Ukraine (3 703), Russia (1 246), Vietnam (848), USA (634) and **Bulgaria** (552) who constitute the largest group of third country nationals in 2006, together amounting to 60.6% of the total third country national population of 11 522. A notable increase in the number of nationals of China (485 in 2006 from 375 in 2005) and Korea (447 in 2006) was observed.

In both 2005 and 2006, the majority of third country nationals residing in **Slovenia** came from other successor states of ex-Yugoslav Republics, i.e. nationals of Bosnia and Herzegovina (21 943, 47.3% of the total third country national population), Serbia and Montenegro (9 279, 20%), Croatia (6 955, 15%) and FYR Macedonia (5 122, 11%). Together constituting 93.3% of the total. The main reason for the presence of these nationalities (other than formerly being part of the same State, the geographical vicinity, similar languages and good economic co-operation) was to satisfy Slovenia's need for workers, which could not be satisfied nationally.

The number of third country nationals in **Spain** has been increasing steadily over the last few years, from 1 488 132 on 1st January 2002 to 3 521 276 on 1st January 2007 . The annual rate increased significantly in 2003 (to 27.8%) and then fell back slightly in 2004 and 2005 (to just under 20%) and decreased in 2006, when the lowest annual increase was registered (11.2%). In January 2006, third country nationals accounted for 79.1% of all non-nationals living in Spain. Few changes have occurred in the main third country nationalities between 2005 and 2007, with the top nine main nationalities continuing to be the same, although some changes have occurred in their relative rankings. Nationals of Morocco continue to be highest (542 969 in 2006), followed by Ecuador (459 993), Romania (388 422), Colombia (266 548) and Argentina (155 680). The largest increases from 2005 were from nationals of Romania (+ 151 085 or a +38.9% increase) and Bolivia (+74 200, +57%). Other significant increases, in percentage terms, were observed for nationals of Brazil (+30.1%) and **Bulgaria** (+22.6%), whilst decreases occurred in the number of nationals from Argentina (-7.8%), Ecuador (-5.9%) and Colombia (-0.3%). These decreases were primarily owing to these nationalities obtaining citizenship of Spain rather than increased emigration.

There were 56 162 000 nationals of the **United Kingdom** (94%) and 3 594 000 non-UK nationals (6%), of which third country nationals made up 61% (or 2 191 000), during 2006. Although the number of third country nationals increased by +10% compared to 2005 (when it was 2 000 000),

the proportion of the total non-UK national population decreased slightly from 2005 when it was 63%. Nationals of India and the USA remain the highest over the period 2004 to 2006, with the number of nationals of India continuing to increase, by +18% in 2006 to 263 000 (222 000 in 2005). There was a more modest increase in the number of USA nationals, of +1% to 119 000 (118 000 in 2005). The largest percentage increases amongst the top ten main countries in 2006 were in the number of nationals from China (+19%, from 63 000 in 2005 to 75 000 in 2006) and Bangladesh (+18%, from 71 000 in 2005 to 84 000 in 2006).

6. RESIDENCE PERMITS

[Table 5](#) summarises the issuing of residence permits, including, where available, which category of entry for the period 2004 to 2006 inclusive. Caution, as previously reported for the 2004 and 2005 Synthesis Report, should still be applied with these data as there may still be differences in the definitions used between the Member States and may not be sufficiently reliable.¹⁸ In some cases (e.g. Austria), there have been changes in definition owing to the entry into force of new legislation. For these reasons, it is difficult to make observations on trends within some Member States and thus to make comparisons with others.

At a qualitative level at least, it is observed that residence permits issued for the purpose of *family formation/reunification* are the main reason in **Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Spain and Sweden**; for the purpose of *study* in **Bulgaria** and the **United Kingdom**; for the purpose of *employment* in **Czech Republic**, again **Finland** and **Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Portugal and Slovenia**; and "*other*" in **Estonia** (international agreements) and again **Sweden** (asylum permits issued under temporary law).

¹⁸ With the entry into force of [Regulation 862/2007](#) on Community statistics on migration and international protection (see <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32007R0862:EN:NOT>), data on residency should become more comparable from 2008 onwards.

Table 5: Overview of Residence Permits issued over the period 2004 to 2006 inclusive

	2004					2005					2006				
	Family formation/ reunification	Study	Employment	Other	Total	Family formation/ reunification	Study	Employment	Other	Total	Family formation/ reunification	Study	Employment	Other	Total
BELGIUM	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	88 261	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	93 948	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	94 515
CZECH REPUBLIC	91 407	7 767	87 008	68 112	254 294	97 432	6 015	110 076	64 789	278 312	99 541	7 208	127 131	87 576	321 456
DENMARK	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3 599	6 588	2 239	10 757	23 183	3 558	4 638	2 814	8 861	19 871
GERMANY	65 935	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	53 213	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ESTONIA	787	576	1 133	1 872	4 368	899	494	1 316	2 721	5 430	1 227	294	1 139	2 406	5 066
IRELAND	N/A	N/A	34 710	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	28 909	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	26 611	N/A	N/A
GREECE	6 167	N/A	N/A	N/A	50 101	15 670	1 425	41 431	2 147	60 673	25 579	2 100	28 989	1 745	58 413
SPAIN	123 976	48 341	166 718	122 300	461 335	142 700	40 652	661 770	74 453	919 575	150 050	41 639	107 746	71 488	370 923
FRANCE	94 384	49 305	11 298	36 863	191 850	92 568	46 294	11 097	37 175	187 134	95 973	44 943	10 713	31 632	183 261
ITALY	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	76 909	14 290	54 040	27 572	172 811	60 784	12 855	30 119	18 840	122 598
CYPRUS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Nil	5 530	25 338	13 688	44 556	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
LATVIA	2 365	656	1 935	450	5 406	2 346	667	2 025	371	5 409	739	405	1 421	363	2 928
LITHUANIA	1 518	561	828	2 153	5 060	2 899	704	1 797	259	5 659	3 576	867	2 440	258	7 141
LUXEMBOURG	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
HUNGARY	7 012	8 359	53 857	19 905	89 133	8 030	7 620	44 221	19 817	79 688	9 147	8 680	47 653	17 893	83 373
MALTA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NETHERLANDS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	70 059	17 695	11 868	9 570	109 192	69 315	15 850	12 430	22 371	119 966
AUSTRIA	28 563	5 383	27 485	2 623	64 044	29 735	4 375	17 703	1 553	53 366	16 139	3 198	3 192	437	22 966
POLAND	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6 221	4 369	9 502	10 399	30 491	7 663	4 298	6 401	Nil	18 362
PORTUGAL	7 584	3 280	15 635	1 175	27 674	9 002	4 051	10 908	48	24 009	27 592	4 817	51 361	2 356	86 126
SLOVENIA	6 338	1 272	27 695	1 016	36 321	6 343	1 171	29 546	1 334	38 394	5 637	1 419	27 015	759	34 830
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	225	284	1 011	4 409	5 929	742	263	1 135	941	3 081	1 121	214	1 650	2 596	5 581
FINLAND	5 335	2 872	5 444	3 151	16 802	5 281	3 107	3 066	2 270	13 724	5 573	3 196	2 929	2 554	14 252
SWEDEN	12 785	9 372	7 431	76	29 664	17 664	14 745	16 067	61	48 537	24 396	6 309	6 093	25 053	61 851
UNITED KINGDOM	112 000	294 000	185 000	117 000	707 000	127 000	284 000	183 000	135 000	729 000	145 000	309 000	179 000	136 000	769 000
BULGARIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5 429	3 942	1 020	201	10 592
ROMANIA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ICELAND	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NORWAY	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Notes:

1. For **Belgium**, data corresponds to new residence permits issued to newly-arrived foreigners (both EU + third country nationals).
2. For **Denmark**, Nordic citizens do not need any permission to reside, therefore immigration from these countries not included in these figures. Data on "Employment" includes permissions valid for less than 12 months, therefore seasonal workers may be included. Data on "other categories" excludes EU citizens.
3. For **Germany**, data are for persons who are non-EU citizens. Data for 2006 refer to residence permits and settlement permits issued to persons who entered Germany in 2006. If all residence permits and settlement permits issued in 2006 were counted, including those issued to persons who entered Germany in previous years, the figures would be significantly higher and would not reflect the actual quantitative trends in immigration. Data for 2004 and 2005, apart from family reunification/family formation, are not available due to legislative changes and the introduction of new residence titles in 2005.
4. For **Greece**, Data includes EU nationals also.
5. For **Spain**, data reflects all permits issued during the year: both first-time issued, as well as renewals. Others comprises (in 2005) 3rd country nationals with residence permits only (259 095), 3rd country nationals with long-term (>5 years of residence) residence permit (87 717), Other EU-26 nationals and their 3rd country relatives (240 057) and others categories not determined (52 479).
6. For **Ireland**, data represent the number of employment permits (work permits, work visas plus work authorisations) issued in the reference year. Renewals are included. Groups work permits are excluded therefore one permit = 1 person.
7. For **Italy**, permit figures refer to persons (1 permit = 1 person). Minors under 14 are recorded in the same document than one of their parents. 2004 data is for other EU(-14) nationals whilst 2005 data is for other EU(-24) nationals.
8. For **Netherlands**, data for 2004 or earlier are not available, owing to a change in administration of these applications. Data relates to non-EU nationals only and to decisions (i.e. persons) not cases. Permits allowing long-term (5 years or more) or permanent residence are not included, nor are asylum related figures and visa short stay or visa long stay. no distinction between school pupils and students is made, likewise for Employment there is no distinction made between self-employed, employed and highly skilled persons.
9. For **Austria**, data have been provided by the AT EMN NCP (own calculations based on the statistics published by the Austrian Ministry of Interior) and thus do not represent official data. The data refer to first issued permits only (not renewals) and include settlement permits (within quota and quota-free) as well as residence permits. The category "family formation/family reunification" also includes settlement permits issued to (third country national) dependants of Austrian nationals. The category "employment" includes various categories of work such as employed key professionals, self-employment, temporary employment, commuting or business delegates. The category "other" comprises e.g. permits for humanitarian reasons and permits which do not grant access to the labour market.
10. For **Finland**, data corresponds only to new residence permits issued to newly-arrived foreigners (both EU + third country nationals) in a particular year. Data on "Employment" includes permissions valid for less than 12 months, therefore seasonal workers may be included. Data on "other categories" excludes EU citizens.
11. For **Sweden**, data includes EU nationals also. "Employment" includes permits valid for less than 12 months, therefore may include also data on seasonal workers.
12. For **United Kingdom**, data are based on number of grants rather than number of persons. Figures are rounded to the nearest 1 000 and exclude EEA plus CH nationals. Figures also exclude EU-10 nationals from 1st May 2004 onwards. Since the United Kingdom does not publish information on residence permits, the information provided is mainly based on passengers given leave to enter, extension of leave to remain and settlement in the United Kingdom in selected categories. Data are provisional and due to be revised.
13. For **Czech Republic**, data are stock of valid residence permits, including renewals and first-issued. "Other" includes also "Business based on trade licence."
14. For **Cyprus**, "Employment" includes permits valid for less than 12 months, therefore may include also data on seasonal workers. No data detailed data on employment sub-categories available for non-EU citizens. Therefore data on self-employed and employed persons only refers to EU-citizens. "Study" category, as well as the "other" category, only includes data for non-EU citizens.
15. For **Latvia**, data includes all temporary residence permits that have been issued in 2004 & 2005, including first issuing of residence permits.
16. For **Hungary**, data refers to visa applications submitted by third country nationals (i.e. excludes EU nationals) and for residence permits which authorise the holder for a limited, duly defined period of time to stay in the territory of Hungary. Data on "Employment" includes permissions valid for less than 12 months, therefore seasonal workers may be included.
17. For **Poland**, data on "Others" excludes EU nationals.
18. For **Slovenia**, data is for third country nationals only and refers to both new residence permits issued in a particular year, as well as renewals in the same year. The number of permanent residence permits issued in 2004 was 4 019 and in 2005 was 4 710.
19. For **Slovak Republic**, data excludes other EU nationals
20. For **United Kingdom**, the data are based on passengers given leave to enter the United Kingdom in selected categories, since the United Kingdom does not publish information on residence permits. Also data is based on number of grants rather than number of persons.

Austria issued a total of 22 966 *residence and settlement permits*¹⁹ in 2006, of which 16 353 were first settlement permits. Compared to 2005, when the total was 53 366, this is a decrease of more than -57%. Similarly, the number of first settlement permits has almost halved compared to 2005 (when it was 32 166). The main reason for the significant change is attributed to the introduction of the *Aliens' Act Package 2005*, which also includes a new *Settlement and Residence Act*, which entered into force during 2006. Given that the majority of settlement permits are issued for reasons of family reunification (88%; 14 395 in 2006), the family reunification provisions in these new legislations, particularly the requirement for family dependants of nationals of Austria residing in the country to provide proof of sufficient financial resources, were considered to constitute a particularly harsh burden for their (third country national) dependents and thus led to the observed decreases. With respect to residence permits, a total of 6 613 were issued in 2006, also representing a significant drop (2005: 21 200) of more than two thirds (-69%). Most residence permits were issued for the “purpose of studies” (39%; 2 596) and “specific cases of employment” (30%; 1 988). This decrease in issued residence permits continues a trend since 2003.

At the end of 2006 in **Bulgaria** there were 55 684 non-nationals with permanent residence, concentrated mainly in the big cities, with 35% residing in Sofia. Some 20 % more persons received permission for long stay in 2006 compared to 2005. The main reasons for granting long stay permission in 2006 were for education; commerce; family reunification; and for specialists entering under international agreements. Permanent stay in 2006 was granted for marriage to a national of Bulgaria (or to a permanently staying non-national); to a returning national of Bulgaria; to persons born on the territory of Bulgaria; to children of a national of Bulgaria (or of a permanently staying foreigner); and for five years of uninterrupted legal residence.

No data are available in the **Czech Republic** for the number of first-time issuing of residence permits, only data on the stock of non-nationals holding a residence permit are available. From these data it is observed that the number of permanent resident permits has increased significantly in recent years, with a 26% increase in 2006 compared to 2005. Part of the reason for this increase is owing to a change from 10 years to 5 years, in order to satisfy the conditions of the *Long-term Residence Directive (2003/109/EC)*, in the required length of residence. Comparing the number of long-term residence permits granted with the number of permanent residence permits granted, it is observed that 75% (or 77 186) of the total number of nationals of Ukraine have a long-term

¹⁹ **Austria** distinguishes between *residence permits* (Aufenthaltserlaubnis) which are granted for temporary stay in Austria (e.g. students, pupils, temporary employees) and *settlement permits* (Niederlassungsbewilligung) which are issued for the purpose of permanent settlement in Austria.

residence permit. By contrast, 75% (30 538) of the nationals of Vietnam have a permanent residence permit. The main reason for the issuing of residence permits are for the purposes of employment (39.5% of the total), followed by family reunification (31%).

There were in total 4 370 temporary first-time residence permits issued in **Estonia** in 2006. This was less than in 2005 when a total of 5 430 were issued, primarily extensions or replacements of residence permits following a large-scale campaign, previously reported in the 2004/2005 Synthesis Report. The main reasons for issuing these permits in 2006 were international agreements (2 363), family reunification (1 185), employment (565) and for study (207) and were issued primarily to nationals of Russia, to non-citizens of Estonia and nationals of Ukraine.

There were no major changes in the total number of residence permits issued in **Finland** in 2006 (14 252) compared to previous year (13 724), with the slight increase occurring in the permits issued for the purpose of family formation/reunification (5 573), study (3 196) and employment (approximately 5 000). Most residence permits for the purpose of study were granted to nationals of Russia (692), China (548), USA (233), Turkey (143) and Japan (100). The majority of employment-based residence permit applications came from citizens of Russia, India and Ukraine.

First-time residence permits issued in metropolitan **France** to foreign nationals from non-EU(-27) countries and required to hold a residence permit decreased, compared to 2005, by -2.1% in 2006 to 183 261. This despite the impact of exceptional measures to regularise the situation of parents of children enrolled in school in France. Permits issued for the purpose of family formation/reunification amounted to 95 973, or 52.4% of the total, which was nine times more than for employment purposes (10 713). Breaking this down further and comparing to 2005, it was observed that number of permits issued to family members of French nationals, which with 43 128 permits issued in 2006 still represents the largest group for family formation/reunification, dropped by -1.6% and for family members of non-nationals (family reunification) by -15.5 % to 19 419 issued permits. These decreases did not, however, offset the exceptional rise (+55.4 %) in the number of "personal and family ties"²⁰ permits issued (totalling 22 064) as a result of the aforementioned exceptional operation to regularise the situation of parents of children enrolled in school in France, conducted during the summer of 2006. Permits issued to family members of French nationals were primarily to nationals of Algeria (23.6 % of the total), Morocco (17%),

²⁰ Permits granted to foreign nationals who do not fit into other categories of family formation/reunification but of whom the "personal and family ties in France are such that refusal to grant residency would disproportionately damage their right to respect of their private and family life in relation to the reasons for refusal" according to article L. 313-11-7 of the CESEDA.

Tunisia (7.6%), Turkey (6.7%), Cameroon (3.5%) and China (3.2 %). Most were to women (56.5% in 2006 compared with 63% in 2005), likewise for family reunification where 82.2% of the permits were issued to women.

Some 58 400 new residence permits were issued in **Greece** in 2006, a -3.7% decrease compared to 2005 and reversing an increase from 2004 to 2005 of +20%. The decrease in 2006 was more as a result of residence permits issued for employment purposes dropping from 41 300 in 2005 to 29 000 in 2006. By contrast, permits issued for the purpose of family reunification increased remarkably (from 15 700 in 2005 to 25 500 in 2006) primarily as a result of a drastic increase in the number of incoming children (from 3 800 in 2005 to 17 000 in 2006) and a significant decline in the number of spouses (from 11 300 in 2005 to 7 600 in 2006). There was also a small but rising number of residence permits issued to students.

Italy initially doubled its annual quota of permits for the purpose of employment (to 170 000) in 2006 and then increased it further by 350 000 in light of the 540 000 applications actually received. This demonstrated both a clear need for new workers from abroad, especially in specific sectors, and, on the other hand, a difficulty in matching supply and demand. Most applications were for domestic care (almost 49% of the applications), followed by construction (almost 18%). Only 1 200 requests for highly-skilled professionals were made. The highest concentration of requests came from the regions of Lombardy, Veneto, Emilia Romagna, Lazio and Campania. In terms of the nationalities of those who made applications, these were primarily nationals of Romania (more than 130 000 applications), followed by Morocco (50 000 applications), Ukraine and Moldavia (35 000 applications each), Albania (30 000), China (27 000), Bangladesh (20 000), India (13 000) and Sri Lanka and Tunisia (about 10 000 applications each). In terms of the number of residence permits granted, and taking in consideration also minors under 24 years of age who have not been issued an individual residence permit, most were granted to nationals of Albania (346 000), followed by Morocco (331 000) and then Romania (323 000).

The number of first time issued residence permits in **Latvia** in 2006 amounted to 2 928, continuing an increase observed since a minimum of 1 896 in 2003. The cause of this trend is attributed to the economic development of Latvia, its membership of the EU and the needs of the labour market, which made it necessary for businesses to employ non-nationals. Permits granted for the purpose of employment amounted to 47% of the total, followed by family reunification (25%) and then for study purposes (14%).

For **Poland**, the total number of *resident permits for a fixed period* (22 376) in 2006 was more-or-less similar to 2005 (22 625), which might be explained by the fact that these permits could be issued for the maximum period of two years. The holders of such permits were usually nationals of Ukraine, Belarus, Russia, Vietnam and Armenia. Similarly, the number of *permits to settle* issued in 2006 (3 255) decreased only slightly compared to the figure of 2005 (3 589), which might be a result of a change in conditions for granting such permits, which was introduced in 2005.²¹ The main nationalities to which this type of permit was issued was the same (i.e. Ukraine, Belarus, Russia, Vietnam and Armenia). With regard to long-term resident permits, issued in accordance with the long-term residents directive, some 995 were issued in 2006. Taking all the types of residence permits together, in 2005, permits granted for the purpose of employment was the dominating category. The situation changed in 2006 – the category of family formation and reunification (7 663) became the dominating category, then employment (6 401) and study (4 298). In every category, permits granted to nationals of Ukraine were at the top (45%, 24% and 31% respectively). Belarus held the second position regarding permits issued for family formation and study and Vietnam held the second position regarding permits issued for the purpose of employment.

The total number of first-time residence permits *lato sensu* issued in **Portugal** to third country nationals in 2006 was 86 126. Although this represents a growth of 259% compared to the number in 2005 (when it was 24 009), it has no direct comparison as the change is primarily an effect of legislation, namely the provision that established that five successive prorogations of a permanence permit would result in a residence permit. Between 2001 and 2004 about 180 000 permanence permits were issued and in 2006 they started to be traded in for residence permits, hence the large number of the latter. Whilst in 2005 the number of residence permits issued for employment corresponded to 45% (10 908) of the total, in 2006 it reached 60% (51 361, excluding seasonal workers). Ninety three per cent of working visas were issued to wage earners (47 525) and only 7% were granted to self-employed persons (3 836). There were 27 592 residence permits issued for the purpose of family reunification purposes in 2006, three times more than in 2005 (9 002), although the proportion of the total number of residence permits decreased from 38% to 32%. This increase in the issuing of residence permits for family reunification is connected with the conversion of permanence permits and temporary stay visas into residence permits. Even though the absolute number of residence permits for study purposes increased 19% between 2005 (4 051) and 2006

²¹ Via Act of 22 April 2005 r. on amendment to the Act on foreigners and to the Act on granting protection to aliens on the territory of the Republic of Poland and to certain other acts [Dziennik Ustaw (Journal of Law) of 2005, Nr 94, item 788, Art. 1]

(4.817), given the great increase of the total number of residence permits issued, its proportion of the total decreased from 17% in 2005 to 6% in 2006.

The **Slovak Republic** granted 2 009 residence permits in 2006, of which 1 345 were for first-time applicants. This was a substantial increase of 262% compared to 2005 when 512 first-time permits were issued. Within the group of first-time applicants, the majority were issued in 2006 to nationals of Ukraine (240 or 17.9%), Vietnam (215 or 16%) and Russia (183 or 13.6%) which, taken together, constitute 47.4% of all first-time applicants. A notable increase occurred in the number of permits issued to nationals of South Korea (11 in 2005 and 105 in 2006) owing to their economic investments in the Slovak Republic. Of the total number (8 983) of residence permits in 2006, a significant amount were for EU/EEA citizens (5 047), followed by third country nationals (2 995) and then for Slovak nationals living abroad (941) who can be considered an independent category with respect to their status. In 2006, the most common reasons for granting a resident permit to third country nationals were for the purpose of family reunification (1 121), employment (1 650) and for study (214).

There was a more modest but still significant increase by 27.9% in the number of first-time residence permits issued in **Slovenia** in 2006 to 18 949 from 14 819 in 2005 and continuing a trend since 2004. In particular the number of permits issued for the purpose of employment increased by 38.3% to 15 609 from 11 290 in 2005. Conversely, there was a decrease in the number of permits issued for the purpose of family reunification (2 717, and 196 less than in 2005). This was a consequence of the harmonisation of national legislation (*Aliens Act RS*) with the EU acquis, namely *Council Directive 2003/86/EC* (on the right to family reunification). Owing to this harmonisation, the *Aliens Act* now contains a new requirement: non-nationals who live in Slovenia on the basis of a temporary residence permit are allowed to reunite with their family after one year and no longer immediately after acquiring the temporary residence permit, which was possible before the harmonisation of the *Aliens Act* with the EU acquis.

The number of first-time residence permits issued in **Spain** has shown a growing, though uneven, trend since 2003. The number of permits issued in 2004 (461 335) was double those of 2003, and in turn the number issued in 2005 (919 575) was double the numbers issued in 2004. There was then a substantial drop to 370 923 in 2006. This evolution is the result of the migration policies put into place by the government, such as regularisation in 2005 and the promotion of hiring at origin. The dynamics of 2006 do not correspond to the adoption of restrictive measures, therefore, but to a “return to normalcy” after the exceptional situation of 2005. The difference of 550 000 residence

permits issued between 2005 and 2006 was absorbed by the difference of the work permits issued in both years. Permits issued for the purpose of family reunification/formation exhibited an upward trend from 49 324 in 2003 to 150 050, or 40.5% of all permits issued, in 2006. After the significant rise seen in 2004 (from 32 654 in 2003 to 48 341 in 2004), there was a decline in the number of permits issued for educational reasons, remaining steady at around 40 000 in both 2005 and 2006 and accounting for 11.2% of all permits issued in 2006. The main component of “Other Categories” corresponds to the non-lucrative residence permits, which authorise holders to live in Spain but not to work as long as they can prove they have sufficient means to live without carrying out any work activity. In 2006 there were 44 818 such permits, accounting for 12.1% of the total. At the end of 2006, most residence permits were held by nationals of Morocco (543 721 permits), Ecuador (376 233), Colombia (225 504), Romania (211 325) and **United Kingdom** (175 870), accounting for 50.7% of the total number of valid residence permits in Spain.

There were a total of 61 851 residence permits for third-country nationals in **Sweden** in 2006. Of these, 24 396 were issued for the purpose of family formation, a major increase from 2005 when it was 17 664, and 30% were for nationals of Iraq, Thailand and Somalia. There were some 25 053 residence permits issued under “other categories,” which refers to asylum permits issued under the temporary law, included, and this group increased significantly from the previous year. Nationals of Iraq, Serbia and Montenegro and Somalia represented just over 50% of the permits for this category.

The **United Kingdom** issued an estimated 771 000 first-time authorisations to reside in 2006, 2% more than in 2005 (759 000). The number of authorisations granted for the purpose of family formation/reunification, study and employment all increased in 2006, respectively by 15% to 53 000; by 10% to 326 000; and by 6% to 169 000. However, the proportions of each category remained broadly similar. Authorisation to reside for the purpose of study made up 42% of the total, a slightly larger proportion than in 2005 (when it was 39%); followed by employment at 22% (21% in 2005) and then family formation/reunification at 7% (6% in 2005).

7. REFUSALS, APPREHENSIONS AND REMOVALS

The data presented in this Section needs to be treated with *utmost caution*, since they might, for example, reflect more Member State priorities in law enforcement and administrative procedures. Also the very nature of illegal entry and illegal residence in a Member State by definition avoids any recording, to a sufficient level of reliability, of data and it is not possible to establish accurately what the proportion of the data recorded is to the overall total. The sometimes short-term nature of illegal immigration (e.g. seasonal workers) and the wide diversity of the motivations for and reasons for illegality (e.g. asylum applicants who have gone into hiding, the illegal reunification of families) also contribute to reduced reliability of the data. Given these caveats, the data available can at least give an indication of any trends or marked changes in illegal immigration.

[Table 6](#) gives an overview of the number of refusals, of apprehensions of illegally-resident migrants and of removals for the period 2004 to 2006 inclusive ordered, for each category, by the total (highest first) over this period.

Table 6: Overview of number of Refusals, of Apprehensions of illegally-resident migrants and of Removals over the period 2004 to 2006 inclusive (ordered, for each category, by the total (highest first) over this period)

	Refusals					Apprehended					Removed			
	2004	2005	2006	Total		2004	2005	2006	Total		2004	2005	2006	Total
SPAIN	599 040	628 463	630 305	1 857 808	ITALY	61 024	83 809	92 029	236 862	UNITED KINGDOM	61 160	58 215	63 865	183 240
POLAND	65 403	41 296	40 282	146 981	SPAIN	77 017	62 812	95 765	235 594	GREECE	39 842	51 079	54 756	145 677
FRANCE	33 232	35 921	34 127	103 280	GREECE	44 987	66 351	95 239	206 577	SPAIN	26 432	25 370	33 235	85 037
UNITED KINGDOM	38 390	30 010	29 945	98 345	FRANCE	44 545	63 681	67 130	175 356	ITALY	27 402	24 001	16 597	68 000
SLOVENIA	34 714	32 521	23 518	90 753	AUSTRIA	36 879	37 934	38 162	112 975	GERMANY	26 807	19 988	15 407	62 202
AUSTRIA	24 803	23 295	29 128	77 226	GERMANY	22 558	20 270	21 635	64 463	FRANCE	16 850	19 841	23 831	60 522
HUNGARY	24 600	20 197	23 015	67 812	PORTUGAL	16 025	17 223	23 564	56 812	NETHERLANDS	17 775	12 386	12 823	42 984
GERMANY	30 785	15 043	20 329	66 157	SWEDEN	20 003	14 528	20 926	55 457	BELGIUM	9 647	10 302	9 264	29 213
ITALY	24 003	19 336	20 267	63 606	BELGIUM	20 606	18 400	15 670	54 676	SWEDEN	12 489	8 599	3 793	24 881
GREECE	14 584	11 399	10 729	36 712	CZECH REPUBLIC	17 655	10 789	7 536	35 980	POLAND	6 042	5 141	9 066	20 249
CZECH REPUBLIC	23 872	5 553	3 072	32 497	NETHERLANDS	10 883	10 803	11 634	33 320	AUSTRIA	9 408	5 239	4 904	19 551
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	19 896	7 428	2 955	30 279	SLOVAK REPUBLIC	10 778	7 970	7 620	26 368	PORTUGAL	3 505	6 162	1 079	10 746
NETHERLANDS	7 331	6 622	4 126	18 079	HUNGARY	5 651	9 780	9 961	25 392	SLOVENIA	2 632	3 133	3 173	8 938
IRELAND	4 763	4 807	5 885	15 455	POLAND	8 191	7 045	6 452	21 688	SLOVAK REPUBLIC	2 528	2 569	2 712	7 809
PORTUGAL	4 323	4 146	3 598	12 067	SLOVENIA	5 646	5 890	4 331	15 867	DENMARK	3 093	2 225	1 986	7 304
LITHUANIA	4 777	3 657	3 151	11 585	FINLAND	2 949	2 757	1 689	7 395	FINLAND	2 775	1 900	1 410	6 085
ESTONIA	2 308	1 924	2 669	6 901	MALTA	1 723	2 416	2 338	6 477	CYPRUS	2 982	3 015	N/A	N/A
BELGIUM	2 030	1 661	1 868	5 559	ESTONIA	1 549	2 703	2 069	6 321	CZECH REPUBLIC	2 157	2 479	1 228	5 864
CYPRUS	2 540	2 018	N/A	N/A	CYPRUS	2 535	1 281	N/A	N/A	MALTA	680	962	780	2 422
FINLAND	1 533	1 185	1 407	4 125	DENMARK	1 414	1 064	867	3 345	HUNGARY	619	720	741	2 080
LATVIA	2 024	783	1 017	3 824	LITHUANIA	406	863	1 227	2 496	IRELAND	599	396	302	1 297
SWEDEN	1 293	846	668	2 807	LATVIA	399	307	247	953	LUXEMBOURG	381	310	295	986
MALTA	607	262	265	1 134	IRELAND	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	LATVIA	244	190	139	573
DENMARK	367	333	210	910	LUXEMBOURG	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	LITHUANIA	206	189	149	544
LUXEMBOURG	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	UNITED KINGDOM	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	ESTONIA	101	60	91	252
BULGARIA	6 395	6 561	5 765	18 721	BULGARIA	877	1 190	1 238	3 305	BULGARIA	1 271	1 608	1 501	4 380
ROMANIA	61 818	51 082	N/A	N/A	ROMANIA	4 981	4 940	N/A	N/A	ROMANIA	650	616	N/A	N/A
ICELAND	71	55	N/A	N/A	ICELAND	63	50	N/A	N/A	ICELAND	18	16	N/A	N/A
NORWAY	1 105	585	N/A	N/A	NORWAY	979	902	N/A	N/A	NORWAY	5 439	3 080	N/A	N/A

Notes:

1. For **Belgium**, *Apprehended* data includes also EU-10 Nationals (particularly from Poland) who were mainly intercepted while working without the necessary labour and/or residence documents. *Removals* data includes assisted voluntary departures (IOM).
2. For **Hungary**, apprehensions data before 2005 contained only the number of persons apprehended for breaching ban on entry and residence. However, after a revision in the definitions, the numbers of third country nationals apprehended for some contravention of alien policy rules (such as overstayers, etc.) was also included. This resulted in the large increase when compared with previous years. For Removals, data contain the number of removals by air and by land actually implemented by the Police and not the number of removal decisions issued.
3. For **Italy**, these data may undergo slight changes depending on the date on which the data are extracted from the archives.
4. For **Netherlands**, the data on Refusals only includes refused aliens at the Schiphol Airport in Amsterdam. Aliens refused at other airports or harbours are not included in the data as these airports and ports do not use centralised systems. The definition used for Removals is as given in Council Regulation 862/2007 ("Migration Statistics Regulation").
5. For **Spain**, data on Refusals includes refusals of entry at the two Spanish cities located on the African continent: Ceuta and Melilla. Data on Apprehensions include: a) number of foreigners found to be illegally present on the territory, plus b) number of foreigners found whilst trying to cross illegally the external borders.
6. Data on Apprehensions are not recorded in **Ireland** and **United Kingdom**.
7. For **Ireland**, data on Removals refers to "Deportation Orders Effectuated", i.e. persons who have been refused refugee status and to persons whose removal would, in the opinion of the Minister, be conducive to the common good.
8. For **United Kingdom**, data are rounded to the nearest five. Removals and voluntary departures includes persons who departed voluntarily after notifying the UK Border Agency of their intention to leave prior to their departure and also those persons who left under Assisted Voluntary Return Programmes run by the IOM, as well as persons who it has been established left the UK without informing the immigration authorities. Prior to 2005, data are not directly comparable.

7.1 Refusals

The number of refusals by the Member States in 2006 ranged from 630 305 (including refusals of entry at the two Spanish cities located on the African continent: Ceuta and Melilla) for **Spain**, which was by far the largest, the next being **Poland** with 40 282, down to 210 for Denmark. Compared to 2005, an *increase* in the number of refusals, in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, was observed for **Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland** and **Latvia**, whilst a *decrease*, again in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, occurred for **Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Greece, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia** and **Sweden**.

With regard to the main nationalities refused entry, it was nationals of ***Bulgaria*** trying to enter **Greece** (4 423), **Austria** (3 610), **Slovenia** (3 313) and **Italy** (2 083); and nationals of ***Romania*** trying to enter **Austria** (17 774), **Hungary** (9 614), **Italy** (6 254), **Slovenia** (4 413), **France** (3 499), **Greece** (1 890), **Czech Republic** (392) and **Sweden** (102). In addition, other main groups were nationals of ***Brazil*** (for **United Kingdom** (5 260), **Portugal** (1 749) and **France** (1 135)); of ***Bolivia*** (for **Spain** (5 616), **France** (1 552) and **Portugal** (329)); ***Serbia and Montenegro*** (for **Germany** (4 676), **Slovenia** (2 855), **Hungary** (1 355), **Austria** (1 095) and **Sweden** (105)); ***Russia*** (for **Poland** (3 853), **Finland** (1 051), **Latvia** (450) and **Estonia** (261)); ***Turkey*** (for **Germany** (2 148), **Bulgaria** (1 412) and **Czech Republic** (468)) and ***Ukraine*** (for **Poland** (20 410), **Hungary** (4 618), **Slovak Republic** (1 273) and **Czech Republic** (385)). For **Spain**, the most significant group refused entry by far were nationals of ***Morocco*** (615 394).

A total of 29 128 refusals were recorded at the borders of **Austria** in 2006, a 25% increase from 2005. Among the most important reasons for refusals, according to the Austrian Ministry of the Interior, and to the same extent as in 2005, were alerts from the Schengen Information System (SIS), attempts to enter without a passport or a valid visa and threats to public security. The main countries of nationality of those refused entry were Romania (17 774; 61% of total and a +40% increase compared to 2005), **Bulgaria** (3 610; 12.4% of total and a -16% decrease compared to 2005), Switzerland (1 307; 4.5% of total and a -20% decrease from 2005), Serbia and Montenegro (1 095; 3.8% of total and a +48% from 2005) and Croatia (550; 1.9% of total and a -23% decrease from 2005). Among the other decreases observed was in nationals of Moldova who were no longer represented among the main ten countries of nationality in 2006.

The number of refusals by the **Czech Republic** is decreasing steadily. In 2000, there were 48 301 refusals, whereas in 2006 this number had dropped significantly to 3 072. The largest decrease

occurred in 2005 (by 77% compared to 2004) and in 2006 (by 45% compared to 2005) and is considered to be as a result of the accession to the EU. In terms of nationalities, the only increase was observed in 206 for nationals of Romania, which more than doubled from 181 in 2005 to 392 in 2006.

Estonia had an increase in the number of refusals to 2 669 compared to 2005 when there were 1 924, which was also higher than in 2004, when there were 2 308 refusals. This increase in 2006 is primarily owing to crews of cargo ships visiting Estonia having more persons without a valid visa. The highest number of persons refused entry remained as for previous years, namely from India (1 017), the Philippines (301) and Russia (261).

The overwhelming majority of refusals at the border of **Finland** were nationals of Russia, which correlates with the fact that the majority of refusals were made at the Finland-Russia border crossing points. The main reasons for refusal of entry were failure to produce the correct documentation at the border (visas and/or travel documents) and reasonable grounds to suspect that third country national may earn income through dishonest means while staying in Finland. The traffic over the Finnish-Russian border has increased continuously for many years with, in 2006, 6.8 million border crossings. Also traffic from third countries to Finland via Helsinki-Vantaa airport has increased and, in 2006, there were 3.7 million border crossings at this airport.

Following a steady increase in the number of refusals since 2003, **France** observed a slight decrease in 2006 to 34 127 from 35 921 in 2005. This decrease is primarily attributed to a significant drop in the number of non-admissions and readmissions.²² Most refusals were for nationals of Romania (3 499, of whom three quarters were through simplified readmission), China (3 454, almost all of whom were cases of non-admission), Morocco (2 675), Bolivia (1 552, mostly cases of non-admission), Algeria (1 167), and Brazil (1 135, mostly cases of non-admission). Compared to 2005, the number of nationals of China refused entry at the border dropped sharply by a third, while nationals of Romania increased by two thirds, becoming the most common nationality in 2006. The number of nationals of Algeria and Turkey refused entry dropped in both cases by 28%.

Whilst the number of persons refused entry to **Germany** has fallen continually since 1997, and in the period 2001 to 2006 the figure fell from 51 054 persons to 19 857 in 2006 (-61.1%), there was,

²² In **France**, "Non-admission" is a notice issued at the border declaring that the migrant is not permitted entry, whereas "readmission" refers to Schengen readmission, Dublin readmission, and simplified readmission of migrant apprehended illegally just before he/she illegally cross the border.

however, an increase in 2006 by +32.3% in comparison to 2005 (15 012). This increase is accounted for by refusals of entry now being in accordance with Section 15 of the *Residence Act*. Nationals of Serbia and Montenegro were the most frequently refused, being, in 2006, 4 641 and corresponding to 23.4% of all refusals (2004: 11.5%, 2005: 20.8%), followed by nationals of Turkey (2 124 or 10.7% of total) and then Romania (1 927; 9.7%).

The total number of refusals by **Greece** in 2006 continued its downward trend that started in 2002 but at a higher rate. There were 12 283 refusals in 2006 compared to 14 067 in 2005 and 14 338 in 2004. The vast majority of refusals (almost 85%) were systematically for those coming from neighbouring (non-EU(-25)) countries. There was a sharp decline in the proportion of nationals of Albania refused entry (from 27% in 2005 to 13% in 2006), while it increased for nationals of Romania.

The increase of 13% compared to 2005 in the number of refusals to 23 015 by **Hungary** in 2006 might be a result of the reinforcement of border monitoring. However, compared to the three years preceding 2005, the number of refusals in 2006 is not that dissimilar. The dip in 2005 might be a result of the conclusion of bilateral agreements for visas with Ukraine and with Serbia-Montenegro. Most refusals were for nationals of Romania (41% of total and a -25% decrease from the number of 2005), Ukraine (20%, a -10% decrease in the number from 2005), Macedonia (7.4%, an increase from 304 in 2005 to 1 704 in 2006) Serbia and Montenegro (5.8%), ex Yugoslavia (4.1%) and 2% of refusals were of stateless persons.

Refusals in **Italy** have continuously decreased from 1997, being of the order of 20 000 in both 2005 and 2006. This negative trend is considered to demonstrate that the most frequent means by which a person becomes illegally-resident is as a result of remaining in the country beyond the permitted period (so called “overstayers”). Refusals are primarily of nationals of Romania and **Bulgaria**, and between 2004 and 2006, nationals from these two countries constantly exceeded one-third of the total of all refusals. There was a marked decrease in the number of refusals of nationals of Albania (from 1 339 in 2004 to 675 in 2006), which is attributed to the intense collaboration between the respective governments against illegal immigration. The same decreasing trend was also observed for nationals of Nigeria, Croatia and Turkey, whereas for nationals of Serbia and Montenegro, this increased from 861 in 2005 to 956 in 2006.

A slight increase to 1 017 in the number of refusals by **Latvia** occurred in 2006 from the 783 in 2005, although this was still 51% less than in 2004 (2 024). The radical decrease in 2005 is

attributed to EU accession, whilst the 23% increase in 2006 is attributed to giving false information, on the entry visa in Latvia, i.e. the purpose stated on the visa is different from that given in an interview at the border. Like for other Baltic states, nationals of Russia (44% of total) were the main group of those refused entry, followed by Belarus (14%) and Ukraine (12%). A notable development was a comparatively large number of nationals of India arriving but giving false information about the stated aim of their entry.

Entry to **Poland** was refused in 40 282 cases in 2006, a decrease of 2.5% compared to 2005, when there were 41 296. The main reasons for refusal were, and similar to 2005: lack of valid visa (12 289 or 30.5% of the total); lack of sufficient funds (11 816, 29.3%) and discrepancy between real and declared reason for migration (9 645, 23.9%). The main groups refused entry, together constituting 88.7% of the total, were nationals of Ukraine (20 410, in 2005 it was 19 950), Belarus (11 464, in 2005 it was 10 548), and Russia (3 853, in 2005 it was 4 742). Other notable nationalities were Moldova (1 268), Romania (322), Kazakhstan (236), Turkey (209), **Bulgaria** (139), Nigeria (111), China (111), Armenia (105) and Serbia and Montenegro (103).

A total of 3 598 third-country nationals were refused entry by **Portugal** in 2006, a 13% decrease from 2005, when it was 4 146. Nationals of South American countries – namely Brazil, Venezuela and Bolivia – were, in both years, the three main nationalities refused entry. Taken together they constituted more than 70% of all refusals, with nationals of Brazil alone consistently representing about half of all refusals. It should be noted, however, that both the absolute and relative numbers of refusals of nationals of these three countries have decreased, namely from 3 107 to 2 513 and from 75% to 70% of the total refusals, respectively. The pronounced drop in the refusal of nationals of Bolivia in particular, is a result of the new EU policy which now requires nationals of Bolivia to hold a Schengen uniform short-stay visa in order to enter the EU. One group that has increased are nationals of Venezuela, increasing from 329 refusals in 2005 to 435 in 2006. The vast majority of refusals in 2006 (3 334, corresponding to 92% of the total) took place in Lisbon Airport. The main reasons for refusal of admission were, in order of descending numbers: the lack of a visa or its expiration; the absence of motives which justify the entry; false or forged documents; and the lack of subsistence means.

The significant decrease in the number of refusals by the **Slovak Republic** to 2 955 in 2006 compared to 7 428 in 2005 is directly related to EU accession and the consequent implementation of EU acquis. The main reasons for refusal were travelling without valid visa (830) and the lack of financial means (143). A significant change occurred with nationals of Ukraine, with refusals

decreasing from 4 301 in 2005 to 1 273 in 2006, following the removal of the requirement for them to pay a fee for a visa. This resulted in an increase in the number of visas granted and a consequent decrease in the number of refusals. Nationals of Ukraine still, however, constituted the largest group with 43% of all refusals.

The overall number of refusals by **Slovenia** in 2006 was 23 518, a -27.7% decrease from 2005 (when it was 32 521) and continuing a trend since 2002, although the decrease was larger in 2006. Whilst most refusals were for nationals of Croatia (5 524 and a slight increase from 2005 when it was 5 433), most notable changes occurred with nationals of Turkey (-33.3% to 901 in 2006), **Bulgaria** (-33,1% to 3 313 in 2006), Ukraine (-32.8% to 439 in 2006) and Romania (+14.4 % to 4 413 in 2006).

The number of refusals by **Spain** in 2006 was 630 305, including refusals at the two Spanish cities located on the African continent: Ceuta and Melilla, representing an increase of 0.29% with respect to 2005 (628 463 refusals). Nationals of Morocco continued to be by far the largest group (615 394 in 2006, 97.6% of the total number of refusals, and 617 531 in 2005, 98.3%), followed by of Bolivia (5 616 refusals in 2006, an increase of 69.2% from 2005). A notable change was in refusals of nationals of Brazil and Venezuela, which decreased in relation to 2005 by -31.7% to 1 370 and -31.1% to 575 respectively.

Sweden saw a decrease in the number of refusals from 813 in 2005 to 668 in 2006. The largest groups refused entry were nationals of Serbia and Montenegro, Romania and Iraq, a change from 2005 when it was nationals of again Serbia and Montenegro, plus Romania and Russia. The main reason for refusal was owing to the lack of proper documentation.

A total of 30 360 persons were initially refused leave to enter the **United Kingdom** in 2006, a decrease of -1% compared to 2005, when there were 30 550 refusals and a decrease of -22% compared to 2004 (39 020). The top ten nationalities made up 55% of all refusals, with nationals of Brazil (5 260, representing 17% of all refusals) first, followed by nationals of Nigeria (2 250, 7% of all refusals). Increases occurred in refusals for nationals of USA, Malaysia, Pakistan (by +37%), India (by +42%) and Canada and decreased for Brazil, Nigeria (by -15%), South Africa, Romania (by -11%) and Bolivia.

7.2 Apprehension of illegally-resident migrants

The caveats outlined at the beginning of this Chapter are perhaps most relevant to this section. Note also that no data on apprehensions are available from **Ireland** or the **United Kingdom**.

The number of apprehensions by the other Member States in 2006 ranged from 95 765 for **Spain**, and note they were also the highest for refusals but not by as large a margin compared to other Member States as the next highest was **Greece** with 95 239, down to 247 for **Latvia**. Compared to 2005, an *increase* in the number of apprehensions, in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, was observed for **Greece, France, Germany, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain** and **Sweden**, whilst a *decrease*, again in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, occurred for **Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Poland** and **Slovenia**. For **Austria, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands** and **Slovak Republic** the number of apprehensions remained more-or-less *stable*.

With regard to the main nationalities apprehended, for nationals of **Bulgaria** they constituted one of the main groups in **Netherlands** (1 111), **Poland** (572), **Slovenia** (547) and **Finland** (309); and nationals of **Romania** were one of the main groups in **Austria** (21 430), **Spain** (12 554), **Hungary** (7 847), **France** (5 881), **Portugal** (2 972) and **Germany** (1 246). In addition, other main groups apprehended were nationals of **Iraq** (for **Sweden** (8 189), **Greece** (8 157) and **Finland** (207)), of **Serbia and Montenegro** (for **Austria** (2 719), **Sweden** (1 812), **Slovenia** (1 403) and **Germany** (1 325)), and **Ukraine** (for **Czech Republic** (4 925), **Portugal** (3 008), **Poland** (2 690), **Germany** (1 685), **Hungary** (1 343), **Slovak Republic** (1 326)). For **Germany**, the largest group apprehended were nationals of **Turkey** (2 276), whilst for **Greece** the most significant group apprehended were nationals of **Albania** (57 466) and for **Portugal** it was nationals of **Brazil** (10 075).

Austria apprehended 38 162 illegally-resident migrants in 2006, a slight increase by 1% compared to 2005. The principal apprehensions were of nationals of Romania (56% of total), Serbia and Montenegro (7%), Russia (4%), Moldova (4%) and **Bulgaria** (4%). The most significant increase compared to 2005 occurred in the apprehension of nationals of Romania by +76%, which offset the decrease of apprehension of other nationalities. For example, again compared to 2005, the numbers of apprehended nationals of India decreased by -59%, of Russia by -55%, of Georgia by -34% and of Ukraine by -32%.

Migrants in **Bulgaria** become illegally-resident as a result of illegally crossing the “green border,” or illegally passing through border check-points using false documents or hiding in vehicles.

Another mechanism leading to illegal stay is entry with a legal visa and undertaking illegal activities for prolonging the stay. In 2006, there were no significant differences compared to previous years in the main nationalities, principally of Iraq, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, India, China, Algeria and Tunis. There was an increasing number of nationals of Russia, Moldova and Ukraine. In 2006 a total of 672 trespassers of the “green border” were apprehended, which was 35% less than in 2005, in part owing to the detention of some of the main traffickers in human beings. Thirty-eight traffickers were apprehended in 2006, most of them nationals of Bulgaria, and 129 persons prosecuted, an increase from 63 in 2005. The main migratory routes through Bulgaria were the same as for previous years: Turkey – Bulgaria – Greece; Turkey – Bulgaria – Romania; Romania – Bulgaria – Greece.

Like for refusals, the **Czech Republic** has also observed a steady decrease in the number of apprehensions since 2003 when there were 23 142 apprehensions. In 2006 there were 7 536 apprehensions. The majority of apprehensions were of nationals of Ukraine, constituting over 60% of all apprehensions in last three years. This is related to the fact that they also form one of the largest groups of non-nationals in the Czech Republic and are mainly detected by police bodies when violating the conditions of their stay. Most of the other apprehensions were for nationals of Vietnam, Russia, China, Belarus and Moldova.

A decrease in the number of apprehensions occurred in **Estonia** from 2 703 in 2005 to 2 069 in 2006. Like for 2005, the largest number was of stateless persons (considered to be persons with undefined citizenship): 1 439 (2 029 in 2005), then nationals of Russia: 489 (556 in 2005) and of Ukraine: 47 (38 in 2005). The overall decrease can be understood in the context of a legal basis introduced in 2004 for the activities of the migration inspectors in the area of administration of the Citizenship and Migration Board. Previously they were not involved in looking for illegally-resident migrants, which, at that time, was undertaken only by the border guards and police. The involvement also of migration inspectors led to the increase in apprehensions. Furthermore, the campaign for the extension of residence permits, which started already in 2004, continued and for a number of persons it was discovered that the validity of their residence permit had expired before they had submitted an application for extension. Thus the person was staying illegally in Estonia and was counted amongst the number of apprehensions, even though they had not entered illegally.

The number of apprehensions in **Finland** decreased from 2 757 in 2005 by approximately 39% to 1 689 in 2006 as a result of a simultaneous fall in the number of asylum applicants (approximately 33 %). The largest group of apprehensions corresponds to asylum applicants whose application is

filed only inside the country and whose travel route can not be established owing to the lack of documents. It also includes those sentenced for violation of the Aliens Act (residing without the required travel document, visa or residence permit) and those smuggled into the country.

There has been a significant increase since 2004 in apprehensions in **France**, with, in 2006, a total of 67 130 and notable increases of nationals of Pakistan (8 264) and Iran (5 782), replacing those of Afghanistan and Iraq in 2005. The six main nationalities of those apprehended (nationals of Pakistan, Romania, Iran, Morocco, Somalia and Algeria totalling 32 769) represented almost half of all apprehensions. Operations by the Border Police were largely focussed in the northern areas of France in 2006 with 28 086 illegally-staying third country nationals apprehended, i.e. 41.84 % of the total for metropolitan France, of which 23 445 took place in the Département of Pas-de-Calais (a preferred transit area for migrants trying to enter the **United Kingdom**) alone.

A total of 64 605 persons were registered in 2006 by all police forces in **Germany** as illegally-resident. This was virtually unchanged from 2005 when it was 64 747. Apprehensions by the Federal Police, which largely contains apprehensions at the borders, has increased by 15.7% in 2006 to 17 992 compared to 2005 (when it was 15 551). The three most frequent groups are nationals of Romania (2 459, 13.7% of all apprehensions); Ukraine (1 640, 9.1%) and Serbia and Montenegro (1 598, 8.9%). The latter two nationalities also figure prominently in the number of removals performed in 2006 (Serbia and Montenegro: 2 565, 13.8% of total; Turkey: 2 216, 11.9%; Ukraine: 1 196, 6.4%).

Greece observed a significant increase by 43.5% in its apprehensions in 2006 (when there were 95 239) compared to 2005 (when there were 66 351). This increase occurred for many nationalities, in particular nationals of Afghanistan (1 771 in 2005 to 5 260 in 2006), Iraq (from 1 064 in 2005 to 8 157 in 2006), Palestine (from 799 in 2005 to 2 847 in 2006) and Georgia (from 796 in 2005 to 1 708 in 2006). As a result, the share of apprehensions of migrants from neighbouring countries, even though still high, declined significantly in 2006. Whilst, in 2005, 4 out of every 5 apprehensions were nationals of Albania, in 2006 this ratio declined to 3 out of 5. The change in the composition of nationalities of those apprehended is apparently related to the then socio-political and economic instability in the main countries of origin and it is worthwhile to note that these are approximately the same as those of asylum applicants, suggesting that many illegally-residing migrants apply for asylum upon their apprehension. Another factor to take into account was the implementation of the Third Regularisation Programme, involving more scrutiny by the police and at border controls.

In **Italy** the total amount of apprehensions in 2006 exceeded 90 000, with the nationalities of those apprehended essentially reflecting where the majority of immigrants come from. Nationals of Romania were most prominent with 29 000 apprehensions, followed by Morocco (13 000) and then Albania (4 900). This ranking was the same during the period 2004-2006, closely followed by Tunisia (from 2 100 cases in 2004 to 4 600 in 2006), Moldova (3 500 cases), China (3 100), Egypt (2 900), Nigeria and Senegal (2 700), and Ukraine (2 600).

A total of 247 apprehensions were made in **Latvia** during 2006, 20% less than in 2005 and 38% less than in 2004. This is again attributed to EU accession, since before this time, nationals from other EU-25 Member States, particularly from Lithuania, made up more than 50% of all apprehensions. Like for refusals, the main group apprehended were nationals of Russia (84 or 34% of total), Moldova (40, 16%) and Ukraine 36, 15%). The number of apprehensions of nationals of Moldova increased by 33%. The primary reason for apprehensions is for staying in Latvia after the date of expiration of an entry visa, as well as working without a valid residence and work permit.

There was also a decrease in the number of apprehensions made in **Poland**, with 6 452 in 2006 and 7 045 in 2005. Most apprehensions were of nationals of the Ukraine (2 690 in 2006 and 3 111 in 2005), Belarus (602 in 2006 and 800 in 2005), **Bulgaria** (572 in 2006 and 378 in 2005) and Vietnam (490 in 2006 and 500 in 2005). The decrease observed in apprehensions might have been an effect of various actions of the Polish Border Guard introduced in the previous years in order to better control the legality of residence of non-nationals in Poland. As these actions often appeared in the media, they might have had a certain 'preventive effect'.

Portugal registered an increase of +37% in the total number of apprehensions made between 2005 (17 223) and 2006 (23 564), although there were no changes in the main nationality groups, these remaining nationals of Brazil, Ukraine and Romania, accounting for 70% and 68% of the total in 2005 and 2006 respectively.

The number of apprehensions made in the **Slovak Republic** in 2006 totalled 7 620, a decrease of 350 compared to 2005, and comprised of those detained whilst attempting illegal entry (4 129, a -20% decrease from 2005) and those illegally-staying (3 491, an increase of +21.9% from 2005). The decrease in the former (especially at the border with Ukraine) is attributed to a change of migration flows, which occurred due to the increased protection of the border and preparation for admission into the Schengen area. The majority of those detained whilst attempting illegal entry were nationals of Moldova (1 251, a +10% increase from 2005), Russia (544, a -58% decrease from

2005) and India (464). Of those detained for illegally-staying, most were nationals of Ukraine (1 062), India (721) and Moldova (604).

The 4 331 apprehensions made in **Slovenia** during 2006 was a -26.5% decrease compared to 2005 (5 890) with nationals of Serbia and Montenegro (1 403, but a -18.5% decrease from 2005), Albania (762, but a -23.4% decrease from 2005) and Bulgaria (547) making up 62.6% of the total. The most significant decrease was in the apprehension of nationals of Moldova (-83.6% to 70) and Turkey (-69.3% to 235), with decreases also of nationals of FYR of Macedonia (-32% to 295), and Serbia and Montenegro (-18.5% to 1 403). Increases were observed for nationals of Romania (+135.6% to 205) and Croatia (+62.2% to 266). Nationals of Bangladesh, who represented a substantial portion of apprehensions in 2005, were not significantly noted in 2006.

Compared to 2005, there was a 52% increase in the number of apprehensions made in **Spain** to 95 765 during 2006. Nationals of Morocco were the largest group apprehended amounting to 19 350 in 2006 (20 754 in 2005), though their proportion of the total (20.2%) is not as high as that for refusals. In fact, only nationals Morocco and Algeria out of the ten main nationality groups have seen a decrease in the number of apprehensions, whilst increases were observed for nationals of Romania, Brazil, Mali, Gambia and Bolivia. Nationals of Senegal have become the second largest group of apprehensions with 16 224 in 2006.

Whilst its number of refusals decreased, **Sweden** saw an increase in 2006 in the number of apprehensions to 20 926 compared to 14 447 in 2005. The largest groups apprehended were nationals of Iraq, Serbia and Montenegro and Somalia.

7.3 Removals²³

The number of removals by the Member States in 2006 ranged from 63 865 for the **United Kingdom**, down to 91 for **Estonia**. Compared to 2005, an *increase* in the number of removals, in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, was observed for **Estonia** (to a level similar to 2004 following a decrease in 2005), **Greece**, **France**, **Poland** (a dramatic increase) and **United Kingdom**, whilst a *decrease*, again in some cases continuing a trend since 2004, occurred for **Austria**, **Belgium** (to a level similar to 2004 following a decrease in 2005), **Bulgaria**, **Czech Republic**, **Denmark**, **Finland**, **Germany**, **Ireland**, **Latvia**, **Lithuania**, **Malta** (to a level similar to 2004 following a decrease in 2005), **Portugal** and **Sweden** (for the latter two a dramatic decrease).

²³ A comprehensive overview on this topic is given in the EMN study on *Return Migration*. The EMN is also undertaking (in 2009) a study on *Assisted Return*.

For **Hungary, Netherlands, Slovak Republic** and **Slovenia**, the number of removals remained more-or-less *stable*.

With regard to the main nationalities removed, for nationals of **Bulgaria** they constituted one of the main groups in **Netherlands** (1 334), **Greece** (1 227), **France** (1 201), **Belgium** (828), **Sweden** (398) and **Finland** (183); and nationals of **Romania** were one of the main groups removed in **France** (5 041), **Spain** (4 450), **Belgium** (1 188), **Austria** (1 038), **Greece** (929), **Netherlands** (584), **Hungary** (432), **Slovak Republic** (210), **Portugal** (153) and **Ireland** (96). In addition, other main groups removed were nationals of **Brazil** (**United Kingdom** (6 360), **Belgium** (1 319) and **Portugal** (491)); of **Moldova** (**Slovak Republic** (705), **Poland** (516), **Austria** (438), **Bulgaria** (150), **Lithuania** (46), **Latvia** (42) and **Estonia** (16)); of **Morocco** (**Spain** (15 168), **France** (2 062), **Netherlands** (502) and **Malta** (120)); of **Russia** (**Poland** (414), **Sweden** (310), **Finland** (287), **Latvia** (39), **Estonia** (37) and **Lithuania** (32)); of **Serbia and Montenegro** (for **Germany** (2 139), **Slovenia** (1 116), **Austria** (623), **Sweden** (543), **Denmark** (262) and **Hungary** (119)); of **Turkey** (**France** (2 052), **Germany** (2 002), **Netherlands** (1 164) and **Bulgaria** (212)); and of **Ukraine** (for **Poland** (6 353), **Slovak Republic** (1 501), **Germany** (1 127), **Czech Republic** (701), **Austria** (455), **Hungary** (93) and **Latvia** (20)). For **Greece**, the largest group removed by far were nationals of **Albania** (50 437), who were also a significant group removed in **Slovenia** (760), whilst nationals of **Nigeria** featured prominently in the number of removals from **Ireland** (80) and the **United Kingdom** (3 640), with, for the latter, significant removals also of nationals of **Pakistan** (4 250) and **India** (3 125).

Trends in the number of removals in **Austria** have shown a further decrease: whereas 5 239 non-nationals were removed in 2005, in 2006 the number was 4 904, a slight decrease of -6%. In terms of nationalities, these were mainly nationals of **Romania** (21% of total; 1 038), followed by nationals of **Serbia and Montenegro** (13%; 623), **Ukraine** (9%; 455); **Moldova** (9%; 438) and **Bulgaria** (5%; 239). Compared to 2005, there has been a decrease in numbers with the exception of removals of nationals of **Georgia**. There were 1 939 assisted returns in 2006 (a 27% increase from 2005 when it was 1 406) with **Serbia and Montenegro** (mostly returning to **Kosovo**) the main destination with 551 returnees (28% of the total). Other main countries of return in 2005 were **Moldova** (161; 8%), **Turkey** (125; 6%), **Romania** (112; 6%) and **Mongolia** (105; 5%).

The compulsory administrative measure “expulsion” in **Bulgaria** was imposed on 220 persons in 2006, a 2% increase from 2005, and primarily to nationals of **Moldova** (55), **Turkey** (44), **FYR**

Macedonia (14) and Afghanistan (9). The compulsory administrative measure “forcefully taking to the border” was imposed on 996 persons. Most of these were for nationals of Turkey (128), Moldova (117), Afghanistan (107), China (67), and Georgia (53).

Since 2001, when the number of removals from the **Czech Republic** reached its maximum of 6 375, there has been a -81% decrease to 1 228 in 2006. With the exception of 2005, when an annual growth of +15% was recorded, this has been a steady decrease year-on-year, with the most substantial occurring in 2006, when it dropped by 50% compared to 2005. Again it is nationals of Ukraine who feature most prominently, with 701 removals in 2006, followed by nationals of Vietnam, China, Moldova, Russia and Belorussia. The number of removals of all these nationalities increased in 2005.

Like for refusals, **Estonia** also observed an increase in the number of removals to 91 persons, whereas in previous years the numbers had been decreasing (101 in 2004; 60 in 2005). There is no specific reason(s) to account for this trend, and it seems to depend more on whether the country of which an illegally-resident person has nationality is willing to co-operate in the removal process. Most removals were for nationals of Russia (37), Moldova (16) and Ukraine (10).

There is a link between the number of removals and asylum applicants in **Finland**, with, in 2006, the majority of removals (approximately 67%) being of refused asylum applicants. The total number of removals decreased by 25 % from 1 900 in 2005 to 1 420 in 2006 and can be explained by a decline in the number of asylum applicants by approximately 35% in the same period. At the same time, the number of negative asylum decisions decreased by 40%. Consequently, there were fewer refused asylum applicants to be removed in 2006. Nationals of Russia still form the largest group of those removed, although the number has decreased significantly (421 or 22% of the total in 2005; 287 or 20% of the total in 2006). Other notable groups were nationals of **Bulgaria**, Serbia and Montenegro, Iraq, Nigeria and Afghanistan, most of whom were refused asylum applicants.

The actual number of removals from metropolitan **France** was 2.5 times larger in 2006 than in 2001. During the course of 2006, 23 831 removals were performed, representing a +20.1% increase compared to 2005 (19 841 removals). There was also an increase by +9.82% in the number of removal orders issued. Nationals of Romania (5 041), Algeria (3 170), Morocco (2 062), Turkey (2 052) and **Bulgaria** (1 201) made up 56.8% of all removals.

An increase in the number of removals also occurred for **Greece**, with 54 756 in 2006 compared to 51 079 in 2005, equivalent to an increase of 7.2%. However, the increase in those removed to Albania (by 4 754 persons) outweighed the increase of all removals (by 3 677), while removals to other neighbouring countries decreased. All of the main nine countries to which removals were undertaken in 2006 are neighbouring or relatively close to Greece, whilst more distant countries are absent, as removals to these are rather few. However, taking into consideration the changing structure of apprehensions, it seems probable that this pattern of removals would change in the future. Removals to neighbouring countries, with the exception of Turkey, continue to be implemented in accordance with existing bilateral re-entry and police co-operation agreements. With Turkey, which is considered to be a country through which migrants from Asian and African transit to then enter Greece and the EU illegally, a very low percentage of those entering via Turkey are returned. The relatively lower percentage of removals compared to apprehensions from remote Asian and African countries indicate the difficulties in carrying out such removals. Such removal difficulties, in conjunction with detention inadequacies, has in the past probably discouraged apprehensions of illegally-staying migrants from these countries, since, if they are not expelled within three months, they should be released.

In **Italy**, there has been a continuous decrease in removals since 1997, when there were more than 48 292 removals, which almost halved in 2005 (to 24 001) and decreased further to one-third in 2006 (16 597). The nationalities of those removed are predominantly Europeans and Africans and in 2006 there were: Romania (7 332), Albania (2 122), Morocco (1 707), Ukraine (566) and Tunisia (505).

The trend in removals in **Latvia** follows that of its apprehensions, with, in 2006, 139 removals undertaken, 27% less than in 2005 and 43% less than in 2004 and again primarily as a result of EU accession. Most removals were for nationals of Moldova (30% of total), Russia (28%) and Ukraine (14%). A particular development in 2006, however, was the approach by some non-nationals to the Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs requesting to leave the country voluntarily, resulting in the issuing of 70 decrees to leave in this way.

A total of 9 066 non-nationals were issued with an expulsion decision or were obliged to leave by *voluntarily departure*²⁴ from **Poland** in 2006. This was a significant increase compared to 2005,

²⁴ In accordance with [Council Directive 2008/115/EC](#) (available from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008L0115:EN:NOT>), this means compliance with the obligation to Return within the time-limit fixed for that purpose in a Return Decision.

when it was 5 141. This increase, however, is also owing to changes introduced to in the methods for statistical data collection. Since 2006, unlike in the previous years and consistently with CIREFI definitions, all decisions obliging a voluntarily departure have been included in the statistics of removals. Like for refusals and apprehensions, most removals were for nationals of Ukraine (6 353 in 2006 and 2 521 in 2005), Belarus (532 and 240), Moldova (516 and 530), Russia (414 and 368), **Bulgaria** (294 and 215), Armenia (205 and 392) and Vietnam (155 and 273).

The total number of removals from **Portugal** in 2006 increased by +6% to 1 079 from 2005 (1 022 removals). The vast majority of those removed were nationals of Brazil, Romania and Ukraine. There was a significant increase for nationals of Brazil, their absolute number grew by +22%, making them 46% of all removals in 2006 (40% in 2005).

There was a slight increase (from 3 133 in 2005 to 3 173 in 2006) in the number of removals undertaken by **Slovenia** in 2006. From a peak of 9 017 in 2001, removals had been decreasing until 2004 when there were 2 632 removals, after which a steady increase has occurred. Main changes in 2006 were an increase in the removal of nationals of Romania (+49% to 149) and, constituting the second largest group, of Albania (+ 40.5% to 760). Nationals of Serbia and Montenegro remained the largest group for removals with 1 116 in 2006.

In the recent years, the number of removals from **Spain** has remained at a relatively constant level, with a slight decrease from 2003 to 2005. In 2006, the number of removals was 33 235, the highest since 1998 and +31% more than in 2005. Like for refusals and apprehensions, nationals of Morocco once again featured prominently with 15 168 removals, a decrease of 7.4% with respect to 2005, but still representing 45.6% of the total. The second largest group were nationals of Senegal with 5 357 removals. Increases were observed in the removal of nationals of Romania, Algeria, Brazil and Mali, whilst there were decreases for nationals of Ecuador, Colombia, Nigeria and Russia.

Sweden had a dramatic decrease in the number of removals in 2006, down from 8 122 in 2005 to 3 793. The largest groups removed in both 2005 and 2006 were nationals of Serbia and Montenegro, **Bulgaria** and Russia. This decrease is considered to primarily reflect the fact that the target group for the aforementioned temporary law were failed asylum applicants in the removal phase, but many of them were granted a residence permit.

There were 63 865 removals and voluntary departures²⁵ from the **United Kingdom** in 2006, an increase of +5 650 from 2005. The trend in removals and voluntary departures has followed a general pattern of increase between 1997 and 2002, followed by a decrease until 2005, after which they have increased again. The top ten countries of nationality with the highest number of nationals removed, or departing voluntarily, made up 47% of the total. Like for refusals, it is nationals of Brazil who have the highest number of removals and voluntary departures, 6 360 (or 10% of the total in 2006) down -7% from 2005. Nationals of Pakistan (4 250, 7% of total and an increase of +85% from 2005) are the second largest group. Turkey and USA (with increases of +71% and +16% respectively) replaced Serbia and Montenegro and Jamaica in the top ten countries of nationality.

7.4 Relationship between refusals, apprehensions and removals

As also explained in the 2004/2005 Synthesis Report, a relationship(s) between the statistics on refusals, apprehensions and removals may be found.

The main nationalities in **Austria** are similar for all three categories, with only minor differences in the ranking of the respective categories. As in previous years, Romania ranks first in all three categories and, to a large extent, in actual numbers. A correlation between the nationality of apprehended aliens and of asylum applicants is now recognised. In this regard, nationals of Serbia and Montenegro, who represented the largest asylum seeking group in 2006, rank second concerning the nationality of those apprehended and removed. In the category of refused entry, they still rank fourth. The statistics on apprehensions and asylum applicants are thus considered to be interrelated due to two reasons: on the one hand, asylum applicants who enter Austria illegally are automatically registered as apprehended persons and, on the other hand, there are tendencies to enter illegally and then file an asylum application upon apprehension, which is legally possible.

In the **Czech Republic**, apprehensions and removals are closely interlinked. The most frequent nationalities in these categories are mostly the same and primarily nationals of Ukraine. In general, nationals of Ukraine enter the Czech Republic legally on the basis of a residence permit. However, when the validity of their permit expires, they fail to leave and remain there illegally. Other third-country nationals frequently occurring are from Vietnam and Russia, which are, along with Ukraine, the three most numerous groups of third-country nationals.

²⁵ In the **United Kingdom**, 'Voluntary departures' include: persons departing voluntarily after notifying the UK Border Agency of their intention to leave prior to their departure; persons leaving under Assisted Voluntary Return (AVR) Programmes run by the International Organization for Migration (IOM); and persons who it has been established left the UK without informing the immigration authorities.

It is mostly nationals of Russia who are refused entry to, apprehended in, or removed from **Estonia**. The main reasons are considered to be the geographical proximity and historical background, with many nationals of Russia having relatives in Estonia. They are thus often invited by their relatives to visit on the basis of a visa but then stay after the expiry of their visa. The second main reason for illegally entering and staying in Estonia is for employment purposes.

Nationals of Romania and Morocco are among the nationalities most often connected with illegal immigration into **France** in 2006, together representing at least 10% of all the categories connected with this form of immigration (refusals, apprehensions and removals). Nationals of Algeria are also well represented in all categories, but more particularly in relation to actual removals (13% of the total). Certain nationalities are more prominent in one category only. For example, nationals of China account for 10% of all refusals but are much less present in the other categories. Nationals of Iran and Pakistan account for 9% and 12 % respectively of apprehensions, but are practically absent from the figures for actual removals.

Nationals of Albania are systematically by far the largest group among those apprehended in and removed from **Greece**, while nationals of **Bulgaria** are the largest group among those refused. In general, a very high percentage of refused, apprehended and removed migrants originate from the neighbouring Balkan countries, owing to the proximity and the easy illegal passing of land borders or points of entry. In recent years, apprehensions of migrants from remote Asian and African countries have risen.

Refusals, apprehensions and removals in **Italy** are influenced by the fact that its national and sea borders are at the junction of vast migratory flows coming from Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa. In such a context, the commitment to prevent this kind of flows is strictly linked with the fight against trafficking in human beings. Since 2000, specific projects have been launched by the Ministerial Department of Rights and Equal Opportunities, resulting in the discovery of 45 331 victims of trafficking, mostly women who were victims of sexual exploitation.

In all three categories (refusals, apprehensions, removals) for **Poland** there is a strong domination of nationals of the eastern-neighbouring states, i.e. Ukraine and Belarus. Nationals of Russia and Moldova were also prominent in regard to refusals and removals, whereas for apprehensions, it was Bulgaria and Vietnam. In general, nationals of Ukraine (despite the observed, since 1999, decrease in their apprehensions), create a continuously high level of “risk” related to illegal immigration. The

reason for such migration from Ukraine to Poland is seen in the context of the geographical proximity, as this is considered to facilitate economic and trade activities, as well as temporary migration to work often leading to overstaying. Another high risk group were asylum applicants, notably those coming from Chechnya, who, still in asylum procedure, absconded from the accommodation centre in order to try to illegally enter **Germany, Slovak Republic, Czech Republic** and other EU-(25) Member States.

Apprehensions and removals in **Sweden** usually reflect the overall composition of asylum applicants, with removals also closely linked to the possibilities to enforce removals. Asylum applicants from Iraq represent, for example, a large proportion of all asylum applicants, but a very small number are removed. Refusals are usually of people who do not apply for asylum and thus represent other categories, often from neighbouring countries in the region.
