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Context

• 1951: signature of Geneva Convention

• Evolution of asylum system:
  – *Destination countries*: low recognition rates, development of other statuses and greater link with immigration control
  – *Origin countries*: Internally displaced persons and “safe” countries

• Consequences:
  – “break-down” of refugee status
  – persons fleeing their countries and seeking asylum who are NOT recognized as REFUGEES by destination countries
Research objective and methodology of this paper

• **Research objective:** understand what becomes of persons who file for asylum
  – How many are recognized as refugees?
  – What becomes of the rejected asylum seekers?

• **Methodology:** combine data on asylum seekers at different stages of administrative trajectories in order to estimate % and timing of legal admission
  – Entries of asylum seekers: OFPRA (aggregate)
  – Admissions to stay: ELIPA (survey)
Asylum system in France

• Signatory of the Geneva Convention

• Law of 25 July 1952:
  – French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless people (OFPRA)
  – Refugee Appeal Commission (CRR)

• Ministry in charge:
  – Until 2007: Foreign Affairs
  – 2007-2010: Ministry of Immigration
  – Since 2010: Ministry of Interior

• Asylum procedures:
  – 1990s: development of territorial asylum (temporary status) processed by prefectures
  – Law of 10 December 2003: all asylum applications are processed by OFPRA

• Recent developments:
  – Law of 20 November 2007: National Court of Asylum (CNDA) (appeal)
  – Law of 25 July 2015: Reception of asylum seekers
First asylum applications, 1998-2016
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Focus of this paper
Administrative trajectories of asylum seekers in France

**Arrival in France**
- Asylum application
- Acceptance
- Refusal

**International protection**
- Refugee / stateless
- Subsidiary protection

**Other motives**
- Family ties
- Work
- Humanitarian

**Admission to stay**
- Leave territory
  - Voluntary return
  - Expulsion
  - Onward migration
Existing evidence on outcomes of former asylum seekers

- **Subsidiary protection**: increase of asylum seekers granted temporary protection (source: Ministry of Interior, metropolitan France, TCN)
  - 1% of “humanitarian” residence permits in 2003 (out of 11400)
  - 17% of “humanitarian” residence permits in 2015 (out of 15000)

- **Admission to stay for other motives**: among migrants admitted for “permanent” stay in 2009 (around 100 000), 27% had filed an asylum application in France (source: ELIPA survey, Ministry of Interior)
  - 11% granted international protection
  - 15% admitted for other motives (work, personal and family ties)

- **Voluntary return programs**: low numbers of participants among former asylum seekers (source: OFII)

- **Expulsions of migrants in irregular situation** (source: report to Parliament):
  - Concern the most numerous nationalities of migrants in France: Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Turkey
  - Asylum seekers are not identified
Data sources
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Longitudinal Survey on Newly Arrived Migrants (ELIPA)
Longitudinal Survey on Newly Arrived Migrants (Elipa)

• Statistical Service of the Directorate General of Foreigners in France (DSED)

• Third-country nationals admitted for “permanent” stay in 2009 (signature of reception and integration contract, CAI)
  – 6,107 respondents representative of 97,736 migrants
  – Exclusion of students and some groups of workers
  – Received a residence permit September 2009 – February 2010

• Longitudinal survey with 3 waves (2010 – 2011 – 2013)
  – 1st wave: March – June 2010

• Information on ASYLUM
  – Detailed category of admission: refugee/stateless, subsidiary protection, other (Source: residence permit database)
  – Having filed an asylum application / appeal in France (Source: self-declared)
Methodology

- **General approach**: combine information on entries (OFPRA) and admissions to stay (ELIPA) of asylum seekers in order to estimate % and timing of legal admission

- **Target population**: adult migrants seeking asylum in France in 1998-2009 (see table)

- **Analyses**:
  - Timing of legal admission to stay: synthetic life table
  - Profiles of asylum seekers admitted in different admission categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification of asylum applicants</th>
<th>OFPRA</th>
<th>ELIPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>Self-declared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>OFPRA</th>
<th>ELIPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of first asylum application</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year of arrival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult applicant</th>
<th>OFPRA</th>
<th>ELIPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 or older at time of arrival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of 1° asylum applicants / Sample size</th>
<th>OFPRA</th>
<th>ELIPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>434 097</td>
<td></td>
<td>N obs.: 1 575 N (W): 23 253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction of life table (1): estimation of observed rates of admission to stay

\[
m_x = \frac{\text{Persons admitted to permanent stay (ELIPA)}^{2009}}{\text{Number of first asylum applications}^{2009-t}}
\]

\[
m_3 = \frac{2400}{26268} = 9\%
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First Asylum Applications (OFPRA)</th>
<th>Persons Admitted to Permanent Stay (ELIPA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>17405</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>21416</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>22375</td>
<td>1147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>30907</td>
<td>2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>38747</td>
<td>2874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>47291</td>
<td>1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>51087</td>
<td>1302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>52204</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>50547</td>
<td>1527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>42578</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>26268</td>
<td>3355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>23801</td>
<td>2878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27601</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21231</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction of life table (2): estimation of life table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>x</th>
<th>Rates ($mx$)</th>
<th>Asylum seekers ($Sx$)</th>
<th>Admissions to stay ($Ex$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction of life table (3): estimation of types of admission

We reassign the estimated number of admissions to stay (Ex) to the two categories:

• **International protection:** refugee / stateless, subsidiary protection

• **Other motives:** family ties, work

using the observed distribution of admissions for each cohort
Findings (1): % of asylum seekers admitted to stay

- 24% refugee / stateless
Findings (2): % of asylum seekers admitted to stay by sex
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Findings (3): % of asylum seekers admitted to stay by nationality (after 12 years)

- Total
- Algeria
- other Europe
- China
- America
- ex-Soviet Union
- Turkey
- other Africa
- PASAF (exc. Mali)
- Other Asia
- Sri Lanka

The chart shows the percentage of asylum seekers admitted to stay by nationality, categorized into international protection and other motives.
Findings (3): % of asylum seekers admitted to stay by nationality (after 12 years)
Admissions for other motives

Categories of admission

- Work
- Family of French
- Personal and family ties
- Humanitarian
- Other

Profiles

- **38% of women:** 14% of workers, 53% among PFT
- **PASAF:** work
- **Maghreb and Europe:** family

Length of stay in France (years)

- Work
- Personal and family ties
- Humanitarian
- Other
- International protection
Discussion (1): outcomes of rejected asylum seekers in France in the 2000s

• Around ¼ of rejected asylum applicants were admitted to stay for other motives, often after many years of residence in the country
  – similar to proportion of asylum applicants having received international protection

• For the largest proportion of asylum applicants we don’t know their situation from existing data sources: left territory? Remained in irregular situation?

• Contribution of a demographic approach: taking into account different cohort sizes, length of stay in destination country

• Categorization of migrants and refugees: persons go through a number of stages in their migration / asylum process and are categorized differently
  – Do not simply adopt bureaucratic labels
  – Importance of a life-course approach

• Broader implications: understanding the migration / integration process
  – ‘Years since migration’
Discussion (2): data issues

Integration of multiple data sources: administrative data and surveys
- Depends on research questions, availability and accessibility of data sources
- Macro versus micro approach

MACRO approach (this paper):
- Principal issue: definition / identification of a comparable target group
- Limitations:
  - Gap between year of arrival and year of first asylum application -> problems for specific groups
- Possible improvements:
  - include more detailed information on asylum application (yes/no and year) in statistical surveys
  - distinguish former asylum seekers and others among persons in published statistics (for example removals from territory)

MICRO approach (individual level):
- Exists in some countries, being implemented in others
- Accessibility to administrative data (residence permits, data sources of administrations in charge of asylum seekers)
Thank you for your attention!
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