

© 2015 Angelina Stanojoska and Ivona Shushak
This is an open access article distributed under the CC-BY 3.0 License.
Original scientific paper
UDC 341.433(4-672EU:497.7)

LIFE IN A BACKPACK: THE EU'S ASYLUM POLICIES AND ITS IMPACT ON THE MACEDONIAN ASYLUM LEGISLATION

Angelina Stanojoska, PhD

Law Faculty, University St. Clement of Ohrid – Bitola, Macedonia

Ivona Shushak, PhD Candidate

Law Faculty, University St. Clement of Ohrid – Bitola, Macedonia

Abstract

Starting the Arab spring in 2010 and going through the latest and ongoing Syrian conflict and crises, Balkans and Macedonian railways have been and are a place where many human destinies cross their paths walking to the Member States of the European Union. On the other side, Macedonia is struggling with an influx of refugees, finding itself in a status quo position, even looking as it does not know how to solve the situation. Migrants were killed on railways every day not being able to use any kind of public transportation; their smuggling became a normal business for organized crime groups; Macedonian citizens started to earn money on refugees' misfortune. The paper using the comparative method and document analysis, gives an overview of the EU's legislation in the area, its improvement and current impact on things, all of it concluded with the Macedonian legal solutions regarding asylum and authors' recommendations.

Key words: asylum; European Union; Macedonia; migration; refugees.

INTRODUCTION: GLOBALIZATION AND MIGRATION TOWARDS THE EU USING THE BALKAN ROUTE

The definitions of globalization point to the interconnectedness of distant locations in shaping events and consequences, namely, the space-time compression due to technological innovations and cultural flows. Globalization is sometimes seen as a universalization and homogenization of culture in the American style consumer society or instead, taking form through fragmentation and localization as well as through marginalization of peripheries by the affluent centers. Along with the word “globalization,” which has become part of everyday usage, there are also terms which attempt to describe the complexity and contradictions of globalization by saying the world is going through “fragnegration” or “glocalization”. (Penttinen 2008, 3). Global mobility is:

an intensely stratified phenomenon. Global corporate travelers can move ‘in a world of safety that extends across national boundaries’. A large segment of the world population, on the other hand, has to rely on dangerous clandestine forms of travel. Global mobility is thus often marked with suspicion. In fact, an essential part of our globalizing condition is precisely the creation of mechanisms for distinguishing between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ mobilities, between what Bauman terms tourists and vagabonds. The tourists move because they find the world within their (global) reach irresistibly

attractive – the vagabonds move because they find the world within their (local) reach unbearably *inhospitable*. Freedom of movement is available to a relatively small number of highly privileged individuals, while others are doomed to various forms of clandestine and imaginary travel. (Franko Aas 2007, 31).

While globalization and losing boundaries are reality for some, localization and closing boundaries are reality for others (most of human population). Such steps culminated with political sense and securitization of migration giving Europe, USA and Australia name as “continental fortresses”, with forced borders, which was and is used by criminal groups. Seen as one of biggest moving forces of human development and progress, migration can be a result of many reasons, such as better economic possibilities, better education for their children, family reunification, protection, adventure etc. Also, migration is the main reason for language proliferation, mixing of cultures, cousins and ideas. Today, global migration is one of most important products of globalization, but exploitation of it by organized crime groups is its dark side. The term migration (in Latin: *migrare* - moving) is used to explain different kinds of mobility. In the Dictionary of the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the term migration is used to determine the movement of people or group of people through borders of a country and on its territory, regardless the distance passed, the reasons and circumstances in which it is happening. With such definition, every movement of people is defined, including the one of refugees, displaced persons, economic migrants and peoples moving because of family reunification. (Zarkovic and Mijalkovic 2012, 15). Today, the EU counts around 507 million of people, from which 20 million are non - EU citizens. Immigration to the Member States of the the EU mostly is because of work, study and research and family reunification. And those are reasons because of which someone’s immigration process is seen as a legal one.

However, although migration process to the EU countries is based on strict common legal framework, it is inevitable to mention the benefits of such a step. Seen as a two way process, by respecting the rules and values of the receiving society, immigrants get opportunity to fully participate and include them in the mentioned society. On the other side, immigrants are filling gaps in every level of labor force, especially in areas where the EU lacks workers. And of course, everything at the end is connected to the changes in demographic structure of the EU area, where according to the researches undertaken by the Migration Policy Centre, the EU Member States will lose 33 million working people in the next 20 years, the old - age dependency ratio will increase from 28% to 44%, in contrary the percentage of young workers will decrease by 25%. But, starting the Arab spring in 2010 and going through the latest and ongoing Syrian conflict and crises, Balkans and Macedonian railways have been and still are a place where many human destinies cross their paths walking to the “promised land”, in this case the Member States of the European Union. The everyday increase of the number of refugees entering the Union activated the legal mechanism resulting with changes in the Asylum Procedures Directive and the EURODAC Regulation which should now ensure a much more coherent system with a more efficient and faster actions and decisions. Using such situation, organized criminal groups opened a free market of illegality, meaning migrants can buy their illegal passage to the EU. Going through the Balkan Route (going from Turkey to Greece, Macedonia, Serbia and then to EU Member States), most of migrants’ goals are rich Western European countries where they would ask for an asylum. Eurostat numbers show an increase of 138%

in 2014 in comparison to 2013 in the number of illegal immigrants or in numbers 276.113 immigrants entered EU illegally. The irregular migration flows and in particular migration by sea, primarily along the Central and Eastern Mediterranean routes, has increased exponentially over the past year. Over 220.000 migrants reached the EU through this route in 2014, representing an increase of 310% compared to 2013. (Frontex, 2015). This unprecedented influx of migrants and the ruthlessness of the smugglers, who often expose migrants to life-threatening risks and violence, require a strong response. It is estimated that around 3000 migrants have lost their lives in the Mediterranean Sea in 2014 (UNCHR, 2015). As a result of such trends which continued in 2015 with the conflicts in many places which are mostly countries of origin of the migrants, Member States in April 2015 (the Joint Foreign and Home Affairs Council) concluded the following in a ten points Action Plan:

1. Reinforce the Joint Operations in the Mediterranean, namely Triton and Poseidon, by increasing the financial resources and the number of assets. We will also extend their operational area, allowing us to intervene further, within the mandate of Frontex;
2. A systematic effort to capture and destroy vessels used by the smugglers. The positive results obtained with the “Atalanta” operation should inspire us to similar operations against smugglers in the Mediterranean;
3. EUROPOL, FRONTEX, EASO (European Asylum Support Office) and EUROJUST will meet regularly and work closely to gather information on smugglers *modus operandi*, to trace their funds and to assist in their investigation;
4. EASO to deploy teams in Italy and Greece for joint processing of asylum applications;
5. Member States to ensure fingerprinting of all migrants;
6. Consider options for an emergency relocation mechanism;
7. A EU wide voluntary pilot project on resettlement, offering a number of places to persons in need of protection;
8. Establish a new return programme for rapid return of irregular migrants coordinated by FRONTEX from frontline Member States;
9. Engagement with countries surrounding Libya through a joined effort between the Commission and the EEAS; initiatives in Niger have to be stepped up.
10. Deploy Immigration Liaison Officers (ILO) in key third countries, to gather intelligence on migratory flows and strengthen the role of the EU Delegations. (IP/15/4813).

In the next parts of the paper, we will analyze the EU asylum system, it's improvement in times of refugees' influx and of course, an overview of the new Macedonian asylum law will be made.

IT IS THE ONLY WAY OUT: ASYLUM SEEKERS, THE EU'S ASYLUM SYSTEM AND ITS MECHANISMS

The estimated number of asylum seekers in 2014 given by the UNHCR shows an increase of 53% from 2013. Namely in 2013, 1.08 million people applied for an asylum and in 2014, 1.66 million individual applications have been recorded. In 2014, industrialized

countries were mostly the seeker destination country, with a 45% increase. (UNHCR 2014, 27). The 44 industrialized countries (28 EU Member States, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia and Kosovo (S/RES/1244 (1999)), Switzerland, the Republic of Macedonia and Turkey, as well as Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, and the United States of America) in 2014 together has 866.000 new asylum applications. The first half of 2015 does not show decrease in numbers. The 38 countries in Europe received 714,300 claims, an increase of 47% compared to 2013 (485.000 claims). The 28 Member States of the European Union (EU) registered 570.800 new asylum claims in 2014, a 44% increase compared to 2013 (396.700). These 28 States together accounted for 80% of all new asylum claims registered in Europe. Germany and Sweden accounted for 30% and 13% of all asylum claims in the EU, respectively. (UNHCR Asylum Trends 2014, 7).

Having peaked in 1992 (672.000 applications in the EU-15) and again in 2001 (424.000 applications in the EU-27), the number of asylum applications within the EU-27 fell in successive years to just below 200.000 by 2006. Focusing just on applications from citizens of non-Member States, there was a gradual increase in the number of asylum applications within the EU-27 through to 2012, after which the rate of change quickened considerably as the number of asylum seekers rose to 431.000 in 2013 and 626.000 in 2014, this was the highest number of asylum applicants within the EU since the peak in 1992.

These latest figures for 2014 marked an increase of almost 195.000 applicants in relation to the previous year, in part due to a considerably higher number of applicants from Syria, Eritrea, Kosovo (UNSCR 1244/99), Afghanistan and Ukraine and to a lesser extent from Iraq, Serbia, Nigeria and the Gambia. (see: Figure 1) (Eurostat, 2015).

Asylum applicants from Syria rose to 122 000 in the EU-28 in 2014, which equated to 20% of the total from all non-Member States. Afghani citizens accounted for 7% of the total, while Kosovars and Eritrean citizens accounted for 6% and Serbians for 5%. Among the 30 main groups of citizenship of asylum applicants in the EU-28 in 2014, by far the largest relative increase compared to 2013 was recorded for individuals from Ukraine. There were also considerable increases in relative terms in the number of applicants from several African countries (The Gambia, Eritrea, Senegal, Mali, Sudan and Nigeria), two Middle Eastern countries (Syria and Iraq) and Afghanistan, as well as Western Balkan countries (Kosovo, Albania, and Bosnia and Herzegovina), and large increases of applicants from unknown origins and Stateless applicants.

The Common European Asylum System (CEAS) exists since 1999, changed in some aspects in 2013. Using CEAS, at first a person at an EU border applies for an asylum. The procedure is covered with the Asylum Procedures Directive.

The Asylum Procedures Directive sets out rules on the whole process of claiming asylum, including: how to apply, how the application will be examined, what help the asylum seeker will be given, how to appeal and whether the appeal will allow the person to stay on the territory, what can be done if the applicant absconds or how to deal with repeated applications. (EU 2014, 4). The new Directive entered into force on July 21st 2015 and set clearer rules on how to apply for asylum, asking specific conditions and arrangements at the borders, making procedures faster and more efficient (the asylum procedure should be longer than 6 months), also specific cases and people in need of help (as result of their characteristics) will receive adequate help and time to explain why they ask for asylum.

During the application each applicant's fingerprints are taken and sent to the EU's database EURODAC. The new EURODAC regulation entered into force on 20 July 2015 and it improves the effectiveness of the database which now can also be used by national police forces and Europol to compare fingerprints linked to criminal investigations with those contained in EURODAC. This will take place under strictly controlled circumstances and only for the purpose of the prevention, detection and investigation of serious crimes and terrorism.

The fingerprints taken by the applicant are used to help identify the country which is responsible for the asylum application. This area is regulated with the Dublin regulation brought in 2003 and amended in 2014. The Dublin regulation establishes which member state is responsible for the examination of the asylum application. The criteria for establishing responsibility run, in hierarchical order, from family considerations, to recent possession of visa or residence permit in a Member State, to whether the applicant has entered the EU irregularly, or regularly.

Giving the registration after application is undertaken in no more than 3 working days, before which it should be checked whether the applicant can be qualified as refugee. When an applicant is identified as a refugee than he or she becomes eligible for asylum. During the procedure every applicant has obligations, but also enjoys certain range of human rights. Every applicant must report himself/herself to authorities in a specified time, they have to hand over documents in their possession which are important for the process, must inform authorities for his/her place of residence or changes of address. During the procedure, the applicant is given material for reception conditions (housing and food) if he/she does not have one. Those benefits are guaranteed with the Reception Conditions Directive.

Before taking the decision regarding a claim, every applicant must go to a personal interview, which takes place without any family member and should give a possibility to the applicant to clarify his/her claims regarding the asylum in the EU. The applicant is interviewed by a case worker who is trained in EU law, and he/she has the right of an interpreter. The result of the interview is to be determined if he or she is a refugee and can be given such a status or can be given a subsidiary protection. "Refugee" means:

a third-country national who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership of a particular social group, is outside the country of nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country, or a stateless person, who, being outside of the country of former habitual residence for the same reasons as mentioned above, is unable or, owing to such fear, unwilling to return to it, and to whom Article 12 does not apply. (Qualification Directive 2011, Article 2(d))

"Person eligible for subsidiary protection" means:

a third country national or a stateless person who does not qualify as a refugee but in respect of whom substantial grounds have been shown for believing that the person concerned, if returned to his or her country of origin, or in the case of a stateless person, to his or her country of former habitual residence, would face a real risk of suffering serious harm as defined in Article 15, and to whom Article 17(1) and (2) does not apply, and

is unable, or, owing to such risk, unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country. (Qualification Directive 2011, Article 2(f))

The Qualification Directive establishes common grounds to grant international protection. Its provisions also foresee a series of rights on protection from refoulement, residence permits, travel documents, access to employment, access to education, social welfare, healthcare, access to accommodation, access to integration facilities, as well as specific provisions for children and vulnerable persons. When an applicant is granted refugee status or subsidiary protection, that person has certain rights such as access to a residence permit, to the labor market and to healthcare. When asylum is not granted, the applicant has right to appeal at the court with a possibility for overturning the first instance decision. If the first instance decision is confirmed by the court, then the applicant may be returned to the country of origin or the country of transit. In 2014, close to half (45%) of EU-28 first instance asylum decisions resulted in positive outcomes, that is grants of refugee or subsidiary protection status, or an authorization to stay for humanitarian reasons; with note that all EU-28 data on decisions on asylum applications for 2014 exclude Austria. This share was considerably lower (18%) for final decisions (based on appeal or review).

For first instance decisions, some 56% of all positive decisions in the EU-28 in 2014 resulted in grants of refugee status, while for final decisions the share was somewhat higher, at 60%. In absolute numbers, a total of almost 104.000 persons were granted refugee status in the EU-28 in 2014 (first instance and final decisions), nearly 60.000 subsidiary protection status, and just over 20.000 authorization to stay for humanitarian reasons. Around 160.000 people received positive decisions at first instance in the EU-28 in 2014 (of which 90.000 were granted refugee status, 55.000 were granted subsidiary protection and 16.000 were granted humanitarian status); a further 23.000 people received positive final decisions in 2014 (of which nearly 14.000 were granted refugee status, 5000 subsidiary protection and 5000 humanitarian status).

The highest number of positive asylum decisions (first instance and final decisions) in 2014 was recorded in Germany (48.000), followed by Sweden (33.000), France and Italy (both 21.000), the United Kingdom (14.000) and the Netherlands (13.000). Altogether, these six Member States accounted for 81% of the total number of positive decisions issued in the EU-28. (see: Figure 2) (Eurostat, 2014).

LOST LIVES DOWN THE RAILWAY TRACKS: MIGRANT INFLUX IN MACEDONIA AND ITS LEGAL RESPONSE

An estimated 9 million Syrians have fled their homes since the outbreak of civil war in March 2011, taking refuge in neighboring countries or within Syria itself. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), over 3 million have fled to Syria's immediate neighbors Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq. 6.5 million are internally displaced within Syria. Meanwhile, under 150.000 Syrians have declared asylum in the European Union, while Member States have pledged to resettle a further 33 000 Syrians. The vast majority of these resettlement spots – 28.500 or 85% – are pledged by Germany (Syrian Refugees, 2015). As a result to such situation, Macedonia at one moment was struggling with an influx of refugees, finding itself in a status quo position, even looking as it does not know how to solve the situation. Migrants were victims on railways every day not being able to use any kind of public transportation; their smuggling became a

normal business for organized crime groups; Macedonian citizens started earning money on refugees' misfortune (in one case, a migrant from Iraq, for a kilo of tomatoes, two bananas, 5 liters of water, two boxes of biscuits and two chocolates, which he bought in a shop in Demir Kapija, paid 30 Euros; because bicycles are mostly used by migrants, they can be bought in prices between 100 to 300 Euros).

Table 1: Number of discovered illegal immigrants in the Republic of Macedonia (2001 - 2013) (Source: Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Macedonia)

	Total	Illegal immigrants discovered on the border line	Illegal immigrants discovered in the territory of the country
2001	12660	3033	9627
2002	1192	684	508
2003	1185	477	708
2004	1608	732	876
2005	2358	1632	726
2006	4234	1866	2368
2007	2402	1919	483
2008	1.448	1080	368
2009	1415	1111	304
2010	1103	766	337
2011	469	209	260
2012	682	251	431
2013	1132	586	546

Table 1 gives an overview of illegal border crossings of Macedonian borders in 13 years period of time, showing that measures (maybe) have given positive results in suppression of illegal migration. Another problem mentioned above, which existed long before the migrant's influx was and still is the smuggling of migrants. The increased number of migrants just made this territory a fertile soil for this crime.

Table 2: Volume and dynamics of smuggling of migrants and number of its perpetrators in the Republic of Macedonia (2004 - 2013) (Source: Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Macedonia)

Year	Smuggling of migrants (418 - b)	Perpetrators
2004	21	28
2005	35	61
2006	23	54
2007	32	64
2008	36	96
2009	26	53
2010	27	58
2011	27	44
2012	40	70
2013	52	98
2014	92	166

In 2007, 85 Macedonian citizens have been reported, 2 were Swedish and Albanian, and 1 Moldavian and Turkish citizens. They were smuggling migrants to the Macedonian - Greek border. The 2 Swedish smugglers were smuggling migrants from Kosovo to Greece through the territory of Macedonia.

In 2008 smugglers organized smuggling of 173 migrants from Serbia (the region of Kumanovo) and Albania (Ohrid Lake or Struga region), to EU destinations (Greece or other European countries). Migrants for those services had to pay from 600 to 1500 Euros.

In 2009 through the KANIS action of the SECI Center, a smuggling group was reported. 12 Macedonian citizens (1 police officer) and 1 Serbian citizen for a longer period have smuggled migrants from China, through Serbia, Macedonia and Greece to the Western European countries. Also, in December 2009, Afghanistan migrants were found in special compartment of truck on the border crossing (Bogorodica). They were taken from the Greek port Patra.

In 2010, organized crime groups were transporting migrants from Greek and Albanian border to the Western EU countries. Also, in this year for the first time migrants were originating from countries affected by the Arab Spring.

In 2011 and 2012, Macedonia is still a transit country for illegal migrants coming from countries of the Middle East and North Africa.

2013 and 2014 are years when migrants are originating mostly from Syria, and in many cases, especially in 2014, migrants were victims of railway accidents (in cases when they were not using the smugglers' services).

The ongoing problem which every day ended up either with death on the railway tracks either with shootings between police and smugglers, asked for a fast action and solution. The temporary solution was found in legal response and action, changing the Macedonian Asylum Law (Law for Asylum and Temporary Protection).

The Macedonian Asylum Law is structured in IX parts. The first one defines the terms connected to asylum, such as to whom the right to asylum is guaranteed, who can be an asylum applicant, to whom a refugee status can be recognized and who is a person under subsidiary protection.

The second part regulates the procedure in giving asylum status to an applicant. In Macedonia, a person can claim its asylum application at the border or the nearest police station. With the changes from 18 June 2015, an applicant can claim his/her right to asylum

beside the already mentioned places, also in the premises of the Department for asylum of the Center for reception of asylum applicants.

Also, the 2015 changes provide an opportunity for stating an intention for submitting an asylum claim. These changes give a migrant an opportunity at the border or at the territory of Macedonia to state his/her intention (to claim asylum) to a police officer. After such statement is given (verbally or in writing) the police officer issues a sample of the confirmation for the statement and directs the migrant to the Department for asylum to claim asylum. He/she has 72 hours to make such application.

In case of family reunification the claim can be submitted in any embassy of the Republic of Macedonia. The asylum claim is given verbally or in writing, the applicant is photographed and his/her fingerprints are taken. In 3 days from claiming asylum, to the applicant a confirmation for his/her claim will be given. Then the applicant has an obligation as soon as possible to submit every documentation he/she has regarding his/her claim.

The asylum procedure in Macedonia must end in six months counting from the day when the applicant gave his/her asylum claim.

The third chapter contains provisions regarding the ending of the right of asylum, explaining the reasons why a person cannot enjoy the right of asylum anymore.

Chapter IV regulates the kinds of documentation which can be given to an asylum applicant.

Also, the legal situation of applicants is object of this Law (part V). In this part there are provisions regarding applicants' rights and obligations.

Parts VI and VII are about the right of temporary protection and processing and protection of personal data of foreigners.

The eighth and ninth chapters contain provisions regarding which sanctions can be imposed in cases of violation of this law, and of course transitional and final provisions.

Since changes of the Asylum Law were used in practice (2nd of July) until 31 July 2015, 22.291 documents were given to migrants who claimed their intention to apply for asylum in Macedonia, although no one actually did. With such document, migrants can use public transport and they can buy tickets to Kumanovo or Tabanovce (Macedonia - Serbia border).

CONCLUSION

The trends of every day increase of migrants numbers moving towards the EU is an inevitable phenomenon knowing the level of Member States' democracy. But even with such democracy, the EU has shown its political face, especially now when Arab countries' refugees are seeking salvation up there. Not being able to reach a deal regarding the relocation of 40.000 migrants which are temporarily in Italy and Greece and 20.000 that will be resettled from countries outside the EU, once again showing the many different opinions for crucial and essential questions. On the other side, a problem of around 135.000 migrants in 2015 who have entered the EU is a 1.7 million migrants problem for Turkey which is much poorer country than EU-28. Also, the situation in Calais, France, where migrants on daily basis are trying to enter the tunnel under La Manche, also known as Eurotunnel, openly shows the EU's inability to find solution for the UK and France every day's quarrels on which side migrants should stay. And if the EU is not showing any

progress in solving this migrant crisis, Macedonia is not even close to it. Macedonian politicians are saying that “it is still good because migrants are just transiting our country, but it will be bad if they start staying”. The two articles changed in a Law are a step forward in helping these people, but it is not the end of it. Macedonia should make better connections with neighboring countries and the EU countries, especially those on the Balkan migrant route; public opinion must be changed through information, migrants should not be seen as a threat, but as an object that needs our help; a safe corridor for their passage must be made, because still they are victims of crimes (starting to property crimes, ending with trafficking in human beings). At the end, we will just conclude that migration has many faces, some are good, and some aren't. But what's most important for it is the side from which it's perceived. Perceiving it from the right side will help you see the good things it brings.

	Total (number)		Share in total (%)		Change 2013 to 2014		Ranking		
	2013	2014	2013	2014	Absolute (number)	Relative (%)	2013	2014	Change
Non-EU-28 total	431 090	625 920	100.0	100.0	194 830	45.2	-	-	-
Syria	49 980	122 115	11.6	19.5	72 135	144.3	1	1	0
Afghanistan	26 215	41 370	6.1	6.6	15 155	57.8	3	2	1
Kosovo (UNSCR 1244/99)	20 225	37 895	4.7	6.1	17 670	87.4	6	3	3
Eritrea	14 485	36 925	3.4	5.9	22 440	154.9	8	4	4
Serbia	22 360	30 840	5.2	4.9	8 480	37.9	4	5	-1
Pakistan	20 850	22 125	4.8	3.5	1 275	6.1	5	6	-1
Iraq	10 740	21 310	2.5	3.4	10 570	98.4	13	7	6
Nigeria	11 670	19 970	2.7	3.2	8 300	71.1	10	8	2
Russia	41 470	19 815	9.6	3.2	-21 655	-52.2	2	9	-7
Albania	11 065	16 825	2.6	2.7	5 760	52.1	11	10	1
Somalia	16 510	16 470	3.8	2.6	-40	-0.2	7	11	-4
Stateless	9 670	15 605	2.2	2.5	5 935	61.4	14	12	2
Ukraine	1 055	14 050	0.2	2.2	12 995	1 231.8	47	13	34
Mali	6 630	12 945	1.5	2.1	6 315	95.2	20	14	6
Bangladesh	9 140	11 680	2.1	1.9	2 540	27.8	15	15	0
Gambia, The	3 545	11 515	0.8	1.8	7 970	224.8	29	16	13
Iran	12 680	10 860	2.9	1.7	-1 820	-14.4	9	17	-8
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7 065	10 705	1.6	1.7	3 640	51.5	19	18	1
FYR of Macedonia	11 035	10 330	2.6	1.7	-705	-6.4	12	19	-7
Unknown	4 025	9 600	0.9	1.5	5 575	138.5	28	20	8
Georgia	9 090	8 560	2.1	1.4	-530	-5.8	16	21	-5
Dem. Rep. of Congo	8 390	7 340	1.9	1.2	-1 050	-12.5	17	22	-5
Algeria	7 080	6 700	1.6	1.1	-380	-5.4	18	23	-5
Senegal	2 965	6 435	0.7	1.0	3 470	117.0	32	24	8
Guinea	6 490	6 375	1.5	1.0	-115	-1.8	22	25	-3
Sudan	3 235	6 230	0.8	1.0	2 995	92.6	31	26	5
Armenia	5 235	5 700	1.2	0.9	465	8.9	26	27	-1
Sri Lanka	6 550	5 480	1.5	0.9	-1 070	-16.3	21	28	-7
China (including Hong Kong)	5 280	5 170	1.2	0.8	-110	-2.1	25	29	-4
Turkey	5 635	5 160	1.3	0.8	-475	-8.4	23	30	-7
Other non-EU-28	60 725	69 820	14.1	11.2	9 095	15.0	-	-	-

Source: Eurostat (online data code: migr_asyappctza)

Figure 1: Countries of origin of migrants entering in EU - 28 (Source: Eurostat, 2015)

	Total number of decisions	Positive decisions			Rejected	
		Total	Refugee status	Subsidiary protection		Humanitarian reasons
EU-28 (*)	132 405	23 295	13 885	4 620	4 790	109 110
Belgium	7 950	470	440	30	:	7 480
Bulgaria	20	20	5	15	:	5
Czech Republic	565	35	5	10	15	531
Denmark	1 785	290	160	130	0	1 495
Germany	44 335	6 995	4 330	935	1 730	37 340
Estonia	5	0	0	0	0	5
Ireland	210	95	90	5	:	115
Greece	7 665	1 880	805	295	775	5 785
Spain	920	15	0	0	10	905
France	37 085	5 825	4 245	1 580	:	31 260
Croatia	110	0	0	0	0	110
Italy	55	45	10	35	5	10
Cyprus	495	225	10	205	5	275
Latvia	35	0	0	0	:	35
Lithuania	15	5	0	5	0	10
Luxembourg	740	10	5	5	:	725
Hungary	840	40	20	15	5	800
Malta	260	35	10	25	0	225
Netherlands	1 445	700	260	340	100	745
Austria (*)	6 860	1 425	1 180	240	:	5 435
Poland	1 380	20	5	15	0	1 360
Portugal	95	0	0	0	:	95
Romania	170	35	5	30	0	135
Slovenia	70	0	0	0	:	65
Slovakia	60	5	0	0	0	55
Finland	210	165	75	60	30	45
Sweden	13 130	2 375	750	800	830	10 755
United Kingdom	12 750	4 015	2 645	85	1 285	8 735
Iceland	55	5	0	0	0	55
Liechtenstein	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norway	8 430	960	240	110	610	7 470
Switzerland	2 460	165	45	15	100	2 295

(*) Excluding decisions in Austria.

(*) 2013.

Source: Eurostat (online data code: migr_asydcfina)

Figure 2: Final decisions on (non-EU) asylum applications for 2014 (Source: Eurostat, 2015)

REFERENCES

1. Aas, Katja Franko. 2007. *Globalization and crime*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore: SAGE Publications;
2. Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 118/2014 of 30 January 2014 amending Regulation (EC) No 1560/2003 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national. Official Journal of the European Union 39/1;
3. Dauvergne, Catherine. 2008. *Making people illegal: What globalization means for Migration and Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press;
4. Directive 2013/32/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on common procedures for granting and withdrawing international protection (recast). Official Journal of the European Union 180/60;
5. Directive 2011/95/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on standards for the qualification of third - country nationals or stateless persons as beneficiaries of international protection, for a uniform status for refugees or for persons eligible for subsidiary protection, and for the content of the protection granted (recast). Official Journal of the European Union 337/9;
6. European Commission. 2014. *A Common European Asylum System*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union;
7. European Commission. 2015. *A European Agenda on Migration*. Brussels;
8. European Commission. 2014. *Borders and Security*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union;
9. European Commission. 2014. *Migration and asylum*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union;
10. Мијалковиќ, Саша, и Милан Жарковиќ. 2012. *Илегалне миграције и трговина људима*. Београд: Криминалистичко полицијска академија;
11. Penttinen, Elina. 2008. *Globalization, Prostitution and Sex-Trafficking*. New York: Routledge;
12. Regulation (EU) No 603/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on the establishment of 'Eurodac' for the comparison of fingerprints for the effective application of Regulation (EU) No 604/2013 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person and on requests for the comparison with Eurodac data by Member States' law enforcement authorities and Europol for law enforcement purposes, and amending Regulation (EU) No 1077/2011 establishing a European Agency for the operational management of large-scale IT systems in the area of freedom, security and justice (recast). Official Journal of the European Union 180/1;
13. Regulation (EU) No 604/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person (recast). Official Journal of the European Union 180/31;

14. Syrian Refugees: A snapshot of the crisis - in the Middle East and Europe.
<http://syrianrefugees.eu/> ;
15. UNHCR. 2014. *Global Trends: Force displacement in 2014*. Geneva: UNHCR;
16. Закон за азил и привремена заштита. Службен весник на Република Македонија
49/03, 66/07, 142/08, 146/09, 166/12, 101/15.