

Distr.  
GENERAL

CES/SEM.42/8  
25 April 2000

ENGLISH ONLY

---

**STATISTICAL COMMISSION and  
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE  
(STAT)**

**STATISTICAL OFFICE OF THE  
EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES (EURO-  
STAT)**

**CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS**

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMISSION  
FOR WESTERN ASIA (ESCWA)**

Joint ECE-EUROSTAT-ESCWA work session  
on Migration Statistics  
(Geneva, 8-10 May 2000)

Topic 2

### **Cohort analysis in the Asylum Procedure in the Netherlands**

Invited paper by the Immigration and Naturalisation Service, Netherlands<sup>1/</sup>

#### **1. Introduction**

1. Every year, about 40 million people all over the world run away from their own countries because of war, poverty or bad economic conditions. People who do not feel safe in their own countries and look for protection in other countries are called asylum seekers. It is not easy to receive a residence permit in The Netherlands, but the Dutch government does try to be hospitable to refugees. Asylum seekers will be recognised as refugees if there are really clear reasons for them to be afraid of persecution in their own countries. The kinds of reasons for fearing persecution are defined in the Geneva Convention on Refugees.

2. In this paper a general outline is given of a new policy-information-system (so called Cohort-System) which enables the responsible authorities within the Dutch department of Justice to make a relation between the influx of groups of asylum seekers and their way through the complex procedures. The

---

1/ Prepared by Erik J. de Borst, Ton C.C. Quirijnen, Ben X.A. Spierings.

\* The documentation for this work session will be processed as for seminars.

idea is that European unification of the asylum procedures (Treaty of Maastricht and Tampere EU-meeting) start with a detailed insight in cohort-information.

3. Within the Dutch Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) an Information and Analysis Centre (INDIAC) was founded in 1995. Reason for this was the suddenly growing influx of asylum seekers in the previous year. In Parliament questions were raised whether it would have been possible to forecast this development. Main task of the INDIAC is to analyse trends and developments in the field of international migration and to forecast future developments. The last years for example human smuggling has become a topic in this field. It is very important to evaluate the execution of policy. The authorities that take the decisions for instance should perform in a way that the legislative power has meant. INDIAC has developed the mentioned Cohort-System for the State Secretary of Justice by direct order of Dutch Parliament.

## 2. The procedures and flowcharts

4. The State Secretary of Justice is responsible for the Dutch government's policy on giving aliens permission to stay in The Netherlands. That means that the State Secretary is also responsible for the decisions on whether asylum seekers may stay in The Netherlands. The INS decides on behalf of the State Secretary who to grant permission to reside in the Netherlands. To find out whether asylum seekers have the right to receive asylum, their stories are tested to see if they match the definition of refugees in the Geneva Convention on Refugees (signed in 1951) and the New York protocol added to the Geneva Convention (signed in 1967). The Netherlands was one of the countries who signed both of these international agreements. These agreements make it clear who should be considered a refugee and given protection: ***People who have good reasons to be afraid of persecution because of their race, religion, political beliefs, nationality or social group.*** This definition is also in the Dutch Aliens Act. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is responsible to ensure that the Geneva Convention on Refugees is observed. An asylum seeker may also be given permission to stay in The Netherlands if there are urgent humanitarian reasons. This happens, for example, when someone has had unusual, terrible experiences in his/her own country. It is not possible to receive asylum because of "economic reasons". Economic refugees are people who come to The Netherlands because they want to build a better (economic) future for themselves here. Aliens from "safe countries" are also refused permission to stay. When asylum seekers are given permission to stay, they have been recognised as refugees and receive the refugee status. That means that they are no longer asylum seekers.

5. Asylum seekers who want permission to stay in The Netherlands must register at the application centre (*aanmeldcentrum* or AC) at Rijsbergen or the one at Zevenaar. Or, if they came by plane, at the application centre at Schiphol Airport. Aliens who come to The Netherlands through the outside border of the harbour will also be sent to an application centre. These are the only places where asylum seekers can apply for asylum. At the application centre, a decision is made in 24 hours (until June 1999, now it is 48 hours) about whether an asylum seeker has a good chance or no chance of receiving asylum.

6. When an asylum seeker applies for asylum, he/she is asking the Dutch government:

- for recognition as a refugee
- for a residence permit that is given because of humanitarian reasons

7. The procedure in every application centre is the same. For each asylum seeker, a decision is made whether the investigation process should be short or long. When it is obvious that an asylum seeker has no chance of receiving asylum, he/she is given an answer very soon. When this is not obvious, the person

is sent directly to an Investigation and Reception Centre (*Onderzoeks- en Opvangcentrum* or OC) for more investigation.

8. Every day, many asylum seekers apply at each application centre. All asylum seekers are given a number as they enter the application centre. Then they have to wait in the waiting room until someone from the security department comes to pick them up.

### **Registration**

9. The security guards take asylum seekers to an officer who records their identity. Their bags are taken and they are bodily searched. Women are always searched by a female officer. All travel documents (passports, tickets, etc.) are taken.

10. Then, their photographs are made and their fingerprints are taken. And finally, they are given money to buy food and drink in the machines in the waiting room. All of these are steps in the registration process for asylum seekers.

### **The initial interview**

11. After registration, asylum seekers are given an interview with someone from the INS, which is part of the Ministry of Justice. A translator is present, who is only allowed to translate what the asylum seeker says and what is said to him/her. If there is no translator at the interview, then everything that is said will be translated over the telephone by a translator. For each asylum seeker, the investigation begins by trying to find out if that person came from a "safe third country". Then it is decided if that person may or may not apply for asylum. When the decision is not to allow someone to apply for asylum, then that person may no longer apply for permission to stay as a refugee. That also means that they will not be sent to any of the facilities for asylum seekers after their stay at the application centre. The person will then be automatically sent back to the safe country" where he/she could have asked for asylum and found protection against persecution.

12. When the decision is to allow an asylum seeker to apply for asylum, then the person is given a document that says that he/she must stay available for investigation during the entire time that his/her case is being evaluated. It is illegal for asylum seekers to disobey this rule.

13. Asylum seekers must sign a form that gives the *IND* permission to investigate their cases. One of the things that the *IND* investigates for each person is if he/she is known by the Dutch government. Asylum seekers must also sign forms stating: 1) that they have never committed a crime, 2) what their nationality is and 3) that they give the Ministry of Justice permission to ask for their medical files if necessary.

14. Then, asylum seekers must state that they wish to apply for asylum. If that is their wish, then they must sign a paper. If an asylum seeker would like help in making this decision, he/she may ask advice from an employee of the Council for Legal Aid (*rechtsbijstand*) at the application centre. Asylum seekers can withdraw their application any time they wish. An asylum seeker who withdraws his/her application must leave The Netherlands.

### **Phase 1: First instance**

15. Asylum seekers are informed immediately after the first decision is made if they are going to be

sent to an investigation and reception centre for the rest of the application process. Employees take them to the investigation and reception centres from the application centre.

16. Sometimes, however, a decision is made to process an asylum application more quickly in the application centre itself. When this happens, the person is given a second, in-depth interview immediately. Once again, a neutral translator will be present during this interview, and possibly also a legal advisor.

17. During the in-depth interview, it is important for asylum seekers to tell as much as possible about themselves and their reasons for asking for asylum. If they do not, then that could have a very bad influence on the decision made about their case. During the interview, they can show any documents that they think are important for their application. These documents must be authentic (not false or falsified) and must be important to the case. If an asylum seeker disobeys this rule deliberately, his/her application for asylum will be declared manifestly ill-founded. That means that the decision will be not to give that person permission to stay. It will also have a bad influence on the decision when asylum seekers deliberately throw away or destroy documents that may influence their application.

18. Directly after the in-depth interview, asylum seekers are given a report of the interview. They are given two hours to read it with help from someone from the Council for Legal Aid. The Council for Legal Aid then advises the *IND*. If an asylum seeker does not agree with anything in the report, he/she must inform an *IND* employee. The objections of the asylum seeker will have an influence on the decision.

19. Asylum seekers who are kept in the application centre for their in-depth interview are told the first decision in their cases as soon as possible. The decision may be to send the person to an investigation and reception centre after all. But that does not mean that the person has already been given asylum! The investigation of that person's reasons for asking for asylum will continue in the investigation and reception centre. Usually the person has another in-depth interview within one week. During these interviews, asylum seekers can give more information about their reasons for running away. All information will be checked by the *IND*. When asylum seekers receive permission to stay as refugees, they are given what is called the "refugee status" and sent to an asylum seeker's residence centre (*Asielzoekerscentrum*), where they are prepared for life in Dutch society.

20. Sometimes, asylum seekers are not recognised as refugees (they do not receive the refugee status), but are allowed to stay in The Netherlands on a provisional residence permit (*voorwaardelijke vergunning tot verblijf* or *VVTV*). People with this kind of residence permit can stay in the Netherlands until the situation in their own countries is safe enough to go back. If the situation has not improved within three years, then they are allowed to stay permanently in The Netherlands. But sometimes this decision is postponed. This may happen, for example, when it is unclear if the situation in someone's country is safe or if the person is waiting for a judge's decision.

21. Everyone who does not receive asylum or a provisional residence permit (*voorwaardelijke vergunning tot verblijf*) must leave The Netherlands. They are informed of the decision about their application in a letter called the Notification (*beschikking*). Some people are sent to a detention centre, which is a place where they have to stay and are not allowed to leave until they are expelled from the country. But others are told to leave independently. These people are given transportation to the nearest station.

## **Phase 2 (Review) and Phase 3 (Appeal): Fighting decisions**

22. Asylum seekers can fight a decision. The Council for Legal Aid helps asylum seekers to fight decisions. When the decision on an asylum application is negative, two things may happen:


1. The person is told to leave The Netherlands independently. In this case, he/she may ask the Minister of Justice for a new decision.
2. The person is placed in a detention centre, where he/she has to wait to be expelled. When this happens, it is not possible to ask the Minister of Justice for a new decision. But if the person wishes, he/she may fight the decision in court.

23. In both cases, the person may ask the court to forbid the Dutch government to send him/her out of the country until a second decision is made. This is called a provisional ruling (*voorlopige voorziening*). If the person does not ask the court for a provisional ruling, then he/she must leave The Netherlands immediately.

24. Asylum seekers waiting for the court to decide whether to forbid the Dutch Government to send them out of the country can stay in The Netherlands until that decision is made. But they have to find a place to stay themselves. They are informed of this decision within three weeks. If the presiding judge of the court decides in their favour, they are sent to an investigation and reception Centre.

25. The next two pages give an overview of the Dutch asylum procedure (flow charts) in average cases.

**Symbols**



Positive  
decision

Case pending

“Return” following  
negative decision

**DRAFT**

*The Dutch Asylum System - An introduction based on an average case  
- Institutions involved in the processing of the asylum case as at 1999 -*

to be  
continued

Asylum application lodged in the Netherlands  
(excl. application lodged abroad)

Preliminary asylum procedure

Asylum application – the asylum case starts

**1. Arrival**

**2. Decision whether the asylum claim is to be processed in the Netherlands**

**3. Asylum claim to be processed in the Netherlands**

Application for asylum lodged in an application centre

Immigration and Naturalisation Service:  
first interview  
Dublin Convention  
take-over/take-back or  
refusal of entry from

strong case

weak case


Immigration and Naturalisation Service:  
detailed interview including Dublin cases  
**decision on manifestly unfounded/  
inadmissible cases**

Immigration and Naturalisation Service:  
asylum seeker is placed in a reception centre

The Commissioner of the Police – responsible for the removal, monitored departure of the alien/asylum-seeker

*The Dutch Asylum System - An introduction based on an average case  
– Institutions involved in the processing of the asylum case as at 1999 -*

Refugee status is granted (Geneva Convention Status) or Residence Permit on Humanitarian Grounds and Provisional Residence Permit





### 3. Policy Information on the Dutch asylum procedure

25. In terms of policy on the asylum procedure, there are different views on the aggregated data. The asylum procedure tracking system (APTS) and cohort system, implemented in January 2000, enlarged the possible views.

#### Aggregated data on asylum influx and IND production

26. Until January 2000 the INS there were only two sources for policy information. These are the aggregated data on asylum influx (number of applications) and INS production (number of decisions). The data are provided on a monthly basis. The meaning of these data in the process of policy making is a rather basic one. The data provide an understanding of the influx in the asylum procedure (e.g. increase and decrease) and the output of the IND in terms of production. It is possible to make a differentiation by nationality.

Yearly asylum influx in The Netherlands





27. There is, however, a gap of information between the data on influx and the data on production. An individual asylum process depends on the capacity of the immigration service as well on the complexity of the case. In other words, at the time of the application (influx) one can not foresee when the decisions in first instance or review will be taken (production).

Another lack of information concerns specific groups of asylum seekers and their flow through the asylum procedure.


28. Both the APTS and the Cohortsystem offer the possibility to select a group of asylum seekers from the total group. A selection can be made by taking one or more criteria from the following list:

- year of application
- month of application
- nationality
- sex
- agegroup
- unaccompanied minor (y/n)
- Dublin claim (y/n)

29. By combining these criteria a very broad as well as very precise selection can be made. Until now the criteria 'year of application' and 'nationality' has been used many times to inform Parliament.

### Asylum Procedure Tracking system (APTS)


30. The asylum procedure tracking system provides an insight in the status of a certain group of asylum seekers at a certain reference date. For example: what is the current status of the asylum seekers coming from Iran whose application was in the 2nd quarter of 1997.



## Cohort system

31. The Cohort system shows how specific groups (cohorts) of asylum seekers flow through the asylum procedure. A group can be selected using the same criteria as in the asylum tracking system. In detail this means the following information:

- the decisions in each step of the asylum procedure (first instance, review, appeal) for a specific group of asylum seekers (using the same criteria as in the asylum tracking system).
- the percentage of the group that fights this decision in the procedure (review, appeal) per previous decision.
- the result of the reviews and appeals for the group as a whole as well as by first instance decision.



## The importance of the asylum procedure tracking system and the cohort system:

31. Both the APTS and the Cohort system were mainly developed because of questions raised by the Dutch Parliament. Members wanted to be informed whether new policy on countries of origin leads to different profiles in the decisions. Before the implementation of the systems, the ad hoc questions, often triggered by incidents, could not be answered, or not before a certain time. With the systems now available, such questions can be answered very quickly.

Especially the cohort system can be used for many more purposes:

- monitoring the effectiveness of the decision policy for certain countries of origin (see the analysis), nationalities or agegroups (unaccompanied minors),
- forecasting the capacity of the organisations dealing with the asylum procedure (reception, translation, courts, etc),
- Developing a yearly report on trends in the asylum procedure by year of application and nationality.

## The system concept:

32. Data for the asylum tracking system and cohort system are extracted from INDIS, the information system of the INS (production system in the reception centres) on a monthly basis. The extraction takes place at the same time as the production figures are aggregated. This is done because of the integrity of the data. Both systems use the same database (a SAS dataset).

The data are updated every month. Mutations in history (not only in the most recent month) are part of this update extraction.

#### **4. Analysis of the policy on the asylum procedure**

##### **Introduction**

33. In the period 1994-1998, several legal regulations were introduced with the purpose to give only those refugees permission to stay in The Netherlands who has that right. The execution of these legal regulations in the asylum procedures could be the main reason of the decisions taken. Earlier attempts to lay a direct relation between asylum influx and decisions in the procedures failed. The presented figures in this paper give more insight in this relation and are very helpful for policy makers to investigate the effectiveness of the policy.

34. At first in this chapter some law and regulation and policy rules that were introduced in the period 1994-1998 are being explained. Further on the main results of the analysed cohorts are being given.

##### **Law and regulation and policy rules in the period 1994 - 1998**

35. In this paragraph some law and regulation and policy rules that were introduced in the period 1994-1998 are being explained, because they have had an influence on the decisions taken and thereby on the numbers in this paper.

- ***Country of origin based asylum policy (January 1994)***

36. In 1994 the Dutch Alien act was updated and a country based asylum policy, at first for Bosnia-Herzegovina and later on for other countries. At the end of 1998 some major changes in this policy were introduced as announced in a letter (20-11-1998) of the State Secretary of Justice

1. Iraq: Since 1994 asylum seekers from Iraq who didn't receive a refugee status or residence permit could get a provisional residence permit. Because of the letter mentioned above they couldn't get a provisional residence permit any more. Permits already given were withdrawn or didn't get a follow up.
2. Afghanistan: Asylum seekers from Afghanistan who didn't receive a refugee status or residence permit could get a provisional residence permit. The letter didn't change the policy for this country of origin. Asylum seekers from Afghanistan with applications since 21-12-1998 who stayed for two weeks or more in a third country (as Pakistan) didn't get a provisional residence permit any more.
3. Bosnia-Herzegovina: Asylum seekers from Bosnia-Herzegovina with an application before 1-12-1995 received a refugee status. Asylum seekers with an application between 1-12-1995 and 1-6-1997 received a provisional residence permit. Since 1-6-1997 the policy on provisional residence permits was withdrawn for this country of origin.

- **AC-procedure (September 1994)**

The most important introduced regulation was the introduction in 1994 of the AC-procedure. The main purpose was to finish the procedure of asylum applications that has no chance very quickly (until June 1999 this was 24 hours, now it is 48 hours).

- **Safe countries of origin (January 1995)**

The regulation about "safe countries of origin" has been in force since January 1995. If an asylum seeker comes from a safe country of origin his/her application will not be processed because it is manifestly ill founded. With this regulation the government wants to stop asylum

seekers in other countries (of destination) to travel to The Netherlands because it is becoming more difficult in those countries to receive asylum.

Partly because of this regulation, the influx of asylum seekers from these countries of origin decreased to 1 % of the total asylum influx.

- Safe third countries (February 1995)

The regulation about “safe third countries” has been in force since February 1995.

- Schengen/Dublin convention (March 1995/September 1997)

In March 1995 the Treaty of Schengen came into operation. The Treaty provides for a dividing system as far as the responsibility of member states for the handling of asylum requests is concerned. On this basis the first of September 1997 the Dublin Agreement came into operation. In the Schengen Execution Agreement a protocol is drawn up that the Treaty of Schengen regulations are dropped on the moment the Dublin Agreement is applied.

This Agreement regulates that the country of first reception is responsible for the handling of the request.

- Country of origin-desks (July/October 1998) and language analysis

To increase the knowledge about Iraq and Afghanistan (the two most important countries of origin for The Netherlands) the INS introduced two countries of origin-desks in 1998. After that, more country of origin-desks were introduced. Also in 1998, a new regional board was founded that receives all the applications from Afghanistan.

Since the summer of 1999 the applications from Bosnia-Herzegovina and the FRY were added.

With the increased knowledge about these countries, the verifying of the stories of the asylum seekers became easier.

Language analysis is an analysis of a conversation with an asylum seeker yielding conclusive information about his linguistic and cultural community of origin. This will be applied only if the nationality verification leaves serious doubt as to the origin claimed by the asylum seeker. The effects of language analysis on the decisions can't be given yet.

## Analysis

37. For this paper 20 cohorts were analysed. On yearly basis cohorts for Iraq, Afghanistan, Bosnia-Herzegovina and the total of all countries were taken. The most important tables are given in the Appendix. The choice for these cohorts is made by the (high) asylum influx from these countries and the specific policy on these countries.

38. For the first instance decisions there is specified which percentage is followed up by the phase of review and which decision is made in this phase. This is done for all the possible decisions, except ‘refugee status’, ‘withdrawn’ and ‘no decision’ because only a small part goes further in the procedure. For the review decisions ‘residence permit’ and ‘provisional residence permit’ there is specified which percentage is followed up by the phase of appeal and which decision is made in this phase.

39. For a good interpretation and comparison of the percentages there should be taken into account that the most important countries of origin have a great influence on the percentages of the total of all countries and that the percentages are correlated as they sum up to 100 percent. The more recent the year of the cohort is, the higher the percentage of the procedures is that has no decision yet.

### **Results for the total of all countries**

- In first instance the share of 'refugee status' in the total of decisions increased from 10% to 13% and then decreased quickly to 2%.
- The share of 'residence permits' in the total of decisions in first instance decreased from 6% to 4%.
- The share of 'provisional residence permits' in the total of decisions in first instance increased from 7% to 27% but decreased in 1998 to 16%.
- The KONO-share in the total of decisions in first instance in 1998 was 57% and this was much higher than in the years before.
- In 1994, 22% of the residence permit holders (in first instance) fight this decision in review. From 1995 this percentage is around 50 %.
- In 1994, half of the provisional residence permit holders (in first instance) fight this decision in review. From 1995 the percentage is 90% or higher.
- The percentage residence permit holders (in first instance) that fight this decision in review and receive a refugee status decreased little by little from 18% to 1%.
- 5% of the residence permit holders (in review) fight this decision.
- 10% of the provisional residence permit holders (in review) fight this decision.

### **Results for Iraq**

- The share of 'refugee status' in the total of decisions in first instance in the years 1994, 1995 and 1996 was two and a half times higher than the share in the total of all the countries.
- The share of 'provisional residence permits' in the total of decisions in first instance in 1995 was three times higher and in 1996 and 1997 two and a half times higher than the share in the total of all the countries.

### **Results for Afghanistan**

- The share of 'refugee status' in the total of decisions in first instance in the period 1994-1998 was at least two times higher than the share in the total of all countries.
- In 1995, 33% of the 'residence permits' given in the review-phase was followed up by an appeal. In the general case this is (constantly) 5 %.

### **Results for Bosnia-Herzegovina**

- A relatively high percentage of the refugees gets a refugee status (1994 and 1995) or a provisional residence permit (1994-1996) in first instance.
- In the years 1997 and 1998 in approximately 75% of all the first instance procedures there is a KONO-decision (manifestly ill or inadmissible). Dublin claims are probably the most important reason for this.
- In 1994 91% of the provisional residence permits in first instance is followed up by a refugee status in review. As the most important country of origin in 1994, this has a big influence in the total of all countries.

## **5. European future of unification in the asylum procedure**

### **System developments**

40. In the future some new important functionalities will be applied to the APTS and Cohort-system:

- making the systems suitable for the New Dutch Aliens Act (01-01-2001).

41. In 2001 procedures will change for, as the new law will come into operation. Primary systems will change in accordance with the new procedures and the policy-information-systems will be adapted to

the new procedures. Main goal is to be able to compare the future situation in terms of execution-profile to the present situation.

- providing a broader view on the asylum procedure by adding data on naturalization and return.

42. It is foreseen that the reach of the systems should be broadened in the years to come. Regular migration for example will definitely become a political topic in future again. The data on return and naturalization will be extracted as well for there is a growing demand on policy-information on these subjects. Other departments involved in migration policy as the Home Office and the department of Foreign Affairs need this information as a basis for policy development. The systems will then be the tracking system for the total process chain (intake-decision-housing-return).

### **Challenges for the future**

43. Within the European Union there is an agreement on harmonization the Asylum procedures at a certain general level in the years ahead. In international meetings (CIREA and IGC) member states are working towards this by exchanging information the their specific asylumprocedures. The in chapter 2 presented IGC (Inter-Governmental Consultations on Asylum) flow charts on the Dutch procedure give a good example on this information-exchange. According to a fixed format member states have written their procedures and products out in a schedule. One of the main conclusions is that the Asylum-systems differ and that procedures within these systems differ as well. This was of course known before, but not determined to the level of the actual decision-process.

44. The comparison of the asylum procedures can only be made if the information on the regulations and execution procedures is completed. Now the procedures are described in a detailed and uniform way, the next step is to collect data on the specific steps within the Asylum-procedure of each member state.

45. Data on influx according to country of origin on one hand and production figures on first instance, review (if existing) and appeal on the other hand, can be provide for already. However there is no link between the two figures. The Cohort system supplies this need.

***The concluding thesis of this paper is: “The unification of the asylum procedures in the European Union start with a detailed insight in the cohorts within the different procedures of the member states”.***

### **Further points of decision**

- Only a detailed insight in cohorts within the Asylum procedure can provide a clear picture on the differences and the correspondence of the different procedures in the EU-member states.
- The collection of data should not be limited to influx and production but should provide information on policy execution within the procedures: cohort-studies.
- Central co-ordination on a central European level (by the European Commission or/and IGC) is needed to obtain this goal.
- Exchange of information on the executed cohort-studies in The Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland can be a first step in developing a general acknowledged useful cohort-study.

## **APPENDIX**

<b>Percentage of review per decision in first instance</b>			
<b>Year 1994, TOTAL</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	10%	2%	98%
Residence permit	6%	22%	78%
Provisional residence permit	7%	51%	49%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	41%	43%	57%
Rejection	29%	16%	84%
Others	3%	22%	78%
Withdrawn	4%	0%	100%
No decision	0%	4%	96%
<i>Total</i>	100%		
<b>Year 1995, TOTAL</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	11%	1%	99%
Residence permit	6%	44%	56%
Provisional residence permit	10%	95%	5%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	56%	63%	37%
Rejection	11%	63%	37%
Others	2%	36%	64%
Withdrawn	4%	2%	98%
No decision	0%	0%	100%
<i>Total</i>	100%		
<b>Year 1996, TOTAL</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	13%	0%	100%
Residence permit	6%	52%	48%
Provisional residence permit	16%	94%	6%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	50%	62%	38%
Rejection	9%	62%	38%
Others	2%	37%	63%
Withdrawn	3%	2%	98%
No decision	1%	1%	99%
<i>Total</i>	100%		
<b>Year 1997, TOTAL</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	8%	1%	99%
Residence permit	5%	52%	48%
Provisional residence permit	27%	98%	2%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	49%	66%	34%
Rejection	5%	75%	25%
Others	3%	67%	33%
Withdrawn	2%	3%	98%
No decision	2%	8%	92%
<i>Total</i>	100%		
<b>Year 1998, TOTAL</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	2%	1%	99%
Residence permit	4%	43%	57%
Provisional residence permit	16%	92%	8%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	57%	69%	31%
Rejection	3%	62%	38%
Others	3%	69%	31%
Withdrawn	2%	1%	99%
No decision	15%	3%	97%
<i>Total</i>	100%		



<b>Year 1994, Total of all countries</b>					
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Stop	78%		Stop	98%	
Review	22%		Appeal	2%	
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
Appeal			Appeal		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Provisional residence permit			Provisional residence permit		
Stop	49%		Stop	89%	
Review	51%		Appeal	11%	
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
Appeal			Appeal		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
KONO			KONO		
Stop	57%		Stop	84%	
Review	43%		Review	16%	
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
Appeal			Appeal		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Others			Others		
Stop	78%		Stop	84%	
Review	22%		Review	16%	
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
Appeal			Appeal		
Total			Total		

<b>Year 1995, Total of all countries</b>		
Decision first instance:	Stop	56%
Residence permit	Review	44%
	No decision	4%
	Refugee status	16%
	Residence permit	6%
	Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	7%
	Rejection	47%
	Others	2%
	Withdrawn	17%
	Appeal	0%
	Total	100%
Decision review:	Stop	98%
Residence permit	Appeal	2%
	No decision	6%
	Refugee status	36%
	Residence permit	29%
	Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	1%
	Rejection	18%
	Others	8%
	Withdrawn	3%
	Total	100%
Decision first instance:	Stop	5%
Provisional residence permit	Review	95%
	No decision	4%
	Refugee status	57%
	Residence permit	3%
	Prov. residence permit	1%
	KONO	2%
	Rejection	30%
	Others	1%
	Withdrawn	2%
	Appeal	0%
	Total	100%
Decision review:	Stop	89%
Provisional residence permit	Appeal	11%
	No decision	2%
	Refugee status	22%
	Residence permit	17%
	Prov. residence permit	4%
	KONO	0%
	Rejection	43%
	Others	5%
	Withdrawn	8%
	Total	100%
Decision first instance:	Stop	37%
KONO	Review	63%
	No decision	3%
	Refugee status	5%
	Residence permit	9%
	Prov. residence permit	9%
	KONO	4%
	Rejection	62%
	Others	2%
	Withdrawn	6%
	Appeal	0%
	Total	100%
Decision first instance:	Stop	37%
Rejection	Review	63%
	No decision	3%
	Refugee status	13%
	Residence permit	9%
	Prov. residence permit	6%
	KONO	4%
	Rejection	58%
	Others	2%
	Withdrawn	4%
	Appeal	0%
	Total	100%
Decision first instance:	Stop	64%
Others	Review	36%
	No decision	5%
	Refugee status	25%
	Residence permit	14%
	Prov. residence permit	3%
	KONO	0%
	Rejection	39%
	Others	7%
	Withdrawn	3%
	Appeal	2%
	Total	100%

<b>Year 1996 Total of all countries</b>					
Decision first instance:	Stop	48%	Decision review:	Stop	95%
Residence permit	Review	52%	Residence permit	Appeal	5%
	No decision	8%		No decision	30%
	Refugee status	13%		Refugee status	17%
	Residence permit	6%		Residence permit	11%
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	6%		KONO	0%
	Rejection	49%		Rejection	21%
	Others	2%		Others	0%
	Withdrawn	17%		Withdrawn	21%
	Appeal	0%		Total	100%
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	6%	Decision review:	Stop	91%
Provisional residence permit	Review	94%	Provisional residence permit	Appeal	9%
	No decision	6%		No decision	17%
	Refugee status	28%		Refugee status	14%
	Residence permit	6%		Residence permit	24%
	Prov. residence permit	1%		Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	3%		KONO	0%
	Rejection	52%		Rejection	41%
	Others	1%		Others	3%
	Withdrawn	2%		Withdrawn	0%
	Appeal	0%		Total	100%
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	38%			
KONO	Review	62%			
	No decision	6%			
	Refugee status	4%			
	Residence permit	7%			
	Prov. residence permit	3%			
	KONO	5%			
	Rejection	66%			
	Others	2%			
	Withdrawn	7%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	38%			
Rejection	Review	62%			
	No decision	7%			
	Refugee status	8%			
	Residence permit	7%			
	Prov. residence permit	5%			
	KONO	5%			
	Rejection	57%			
	Others	3%			
	Withdrawn	8%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	63%			
Others	Review	37%			
	No decision	11%			
	Refugee status	18%			
	Residence permit	13%			
	Prov. residence permit	1%			
	KONO	1%			
	Rejection	38%			
	Others	9%			
	Withdrawn	5%			
	Appeal	4%			
	Total	100%			

Year 1997, Total of all countries					
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	48%		Stop	98%	
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Review	52%		Appeal	2%	

<b>Year 1998, Total of all countries</b>					
Decision first instance:	Stop	57%	Decision review:	Stop	100%
Residence permit	Review	43%	Residence permit	Appeal	0%
	No decision	44%		No decision	100%
	Refugee status	1%		Refugee status	0%
	Residence permit	2%		Residence permit	0%
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	7%		KONO	0%
	Rejection	23%		Rejection	0%
	Others	1%		Others	0%
	Withdrawn	22%		Withdrwan	0%
	Appeal	0%		Total	100%
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	8%	Decision review:	Stop	100%
Provisional residence permit	Review	92%	Provisional residence permit	Appeal	0%
	No decision	58%		No decision	n/a
	Refugee status	2%		Refugee status	n/a
	Residence permit	1%		Residence permit	n/a
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	n/a
	KONO	3%		KONO	n/a
	Rejection	33%		Rejection	n/a
	Others	2%		Others	n/a
	Withdrawn	2%		Withdrwan	n/a
	Appeal	0%		Total	n/a
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	35%			
KONO	Review	65%			
	No decision	60%			
	Refugee status	1%			
	Residence permit	1%			
	Prov. residence permit	0%			
	KONO	3%			
	Rejection	28%			
	Others	2%			
	Withdrawn	5%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	38%			
Rejection	Review	62%			
	No decision	51%			
	Refugee status	2%			
	Residence permit	1%			
	Prov. residence permit	0%			
	KONO	3%			
	Rejection	32%			
	Others	4%			
	Withdrawn	6%			
	Appeal	1%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	31%			
Others	Review	69%			
	No decision	44%			
	Refugee status	3%			
	Residence permit	3%			
	Prov. residence permit	3%			
	KONO	0%			
	Rejection	23%			
	Others	20%			
	Withdrawn	3%			
	Appeal	1%			
	Total	100%			

<b>Percentage of review per decision in first instance</b>			
<b>Year 1994, Iraq</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	24%	1%	99%
Residence permit	9%	28%	72%
Provisional residence permit	6%	100%	0%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	37%	47%	53%
Rejection	20%	25%	75%
Others	2%	12%	88%
Withdrawn	1%	0%	100%
No decision	0%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1995, Iraq</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	33%	0%	100%
Residence permit	12%	61%	39%
Provisional residence permit	30%	94%	6%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	20%	71%	29%
Rejection	3%	71%	29%
Others	1%	56%	44%
Withdrawn	1%	0%	100%
No decision	0%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1996, Iraq</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	35%	0%	100%
Residence permit	8%	62%	38%
Provisional residence permit	30%	97%	3%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	20%	44%	56%
Rejection	4%	46%	54%
Others	1%	41%	59%
Withdrawn	1%	3%	97%
No decision	1%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1997, Iraq</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	13%	1%	99%
Residence permit	2%	72%	28%
Provisional residence permit	50%	98%	2%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	27%	67%	33%
Rejection	2%	88%	12%
Others	4%	88%	12%
Withdrawn	0%	0%	100%
No decision	1%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1998, Iraq</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	2%	1%	99%
Residence permit	1%	41%	59%
Provisional residence permit	18%	97%	3%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	63%	75%	25%
Rejection	2%	91%	9%
Others	2%	77%	23%
Withdrawn	1%	2%	98%
No decision	11%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		

Year 1994, Iraq					
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	72%		Stop	94%	
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Review	28%		Appeal	6%	
	No decision	10%		No decision	0%
	Refugee status	55%		Refugee status	0%
	Residence permit	5%		Residence permit	0%
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	2%		KONO	0%
	Rejection	14%		Rejection	100%
	Others	2%		Others	0%
	Withdrawn	12%		Withdrwan	0%
	Appeal	0%		Total	100%
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	0%		Stop	84%	
Provisional residence permit			Provisional residence permit		
Review	100%		Appeal	16%	
	No decision	1%		No decision	0%
	Refugee status	38%		Refugee status	31%
	Residence permit	1%		Residence permit	11%
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	0%		KONO	0%
	Rejection	45%		Rejection	46%
	Others	11%		Others	6%
	Withdrawn	2%		Withdrwan	6%
	Appeal	1%		Total	100%
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:					
Stop	53%				
KONO					
Review	47%				
	No decision	8%			
	Refugee status	29%			
	Residence permit	12%			
	Prov. residence permit	25%			
	KONO	2%			
	Rejection	18%			
	Others	2%			
	Withdrawn	3%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:					
Stop	75%				
Rejection					
Review	25%				
	No decision	11%			
	Refugee status	26%			
	Residence permit	2%			
	Prov. residence permit	17%			
	KONO	1%			
	Rejection	37%			
	Others	1%			
	Withdrawn	4%			
	Appeal	1%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:					
Stop	88%				
Others					
Review	12%				
	No decision	0%			
	Refugee status	100%			
	Residence permit	0%			
	Prov. residence permit	0%			
	KONO	0%			
	Rejection	0%			
	Others	0%			
	Withdrawn	0%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			

**Year 1995, Iraq**

Decision first instance:	Stop	39%
Residence permit	Review	61%

No decision	5%
Refugee status	29%
Residence permit	2%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	2%
Rejection	49%
Others	1%
Withdrawn	12%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision review:	Stop	92%
Residence permit	Appeal	8%

No decision	0%
Refugee status	0%
Residence permit	0%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	0%
Rejection	71%
Others	14%
Withdrawn	14%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	6%
Provisional residence permit	Review	94%

No decision	4%
Refugee status	40%
Residence permit	7%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	3%
Rejection	44%
Others	1%
Withdrawn	2%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision review:	Stop	92%
Provisional residence permit	Appeal	8%

No decision	0%
Refugee status	50%
Residence permit	25%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	0%
Rejection	25%
Others	0%
Withdrawn	0%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	29%
KONO	Review	71%

No decision	3%
Refugee status	32%
Residence permit	10%
Prov. residence permit	11%
KONO	2%
Rejection	32%
Others	3%
Withdrawn	5%
Appeal	1%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	29%
Rejection	Review	71%

No decision	8%
Refugee status	21%
Residence permit	2%
Prov. residence permit	21%
KONO	2%
Rejection	46%
Others	0%
Withdrawn	0%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	44%
Others	Review	56%

No decision	0%
Refugee status	100%
Residence permit	0%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	0%
Rejection	0%
Others	0%
Withdrawn	0%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%



Year 1996, Iraq					
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	38%		Stop	92%	
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Review	62%		Appeal	8%	
	No decision	4%		No decision	36%
	Refugee status	23%		Refugee status	9%
	Residence permit	0%		Residence permit	0%
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	8%		KONO	0%
	Rejection	50%		Rejection	55%
	Others	1%		Others	0%
	Withdrawn	14%		Withdrwan	0%
	Appeal	0%		Total	100%
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	3%		Stop	94%	
Provisional residence permit			Provisional residence permit		
Review	97%		Appeal	6%	
	No decision	6%		No decision	0%
	Refugee status	33%		Refugee status	100%
	Residence permit	7%		Residence permit	0%
	Prov. residence permit	1%		Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	3%		KONO	0%
	Rejection	46%		Rejection	0%
	Others	2%		Others	0%
	Withdrawn	1%		Withdrwan	0%
	Appeal	0%		Total	100%
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:					
Stop	56%				
KONO					
Review	44%				
	No decision	9%			
	Refugee status	6%			
	Residence permit	5%			
	Prov. residence permit	2%			
	KONO	5%			
	Rejection	63%			
	Others	2%			
	Withdrawn	8%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:					
Stop	54%				
Rejection					
Review	46%				
	No decision	8%			
	Refugee status	24%			
	Residence permit	5%			
	Prov. residence permit	0%			
	KONO	5%			
	Rejection	51%			
	Others	3%			
	Withdrawn	4%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:					
Stop	59%				
Others					
Review	41%				
	No decision	8%			
	Refugee status	0%			
	Residence permit	4%			
	Prov. residence permit	4%			
	KONO	4%			
	Rejection	42%			
	Others	23%			
	Withdrawn	8%			
	Appeal	8%			
	Total	100%			

Year 1997, Iraq					
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	28%		Stop	99%	
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Review	72%		Appeal	1%	
No decision			No decision		
	25%			0%	
Refugee status			Refugee status		
	15%			0%	
Residence permit			Residence permit		
	3%			0%	
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
	0%			0%	
KONO			KONO		
	1%			0%	
Rejection			Rejection		
	34%			100%	
Others			Others		
	4%			0%	
Withdrawn			Withdrwan		
	17%			0%	
Appeal			Total		
	0%			100%	
Total					
	100%				
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	2%		Stop	91%	
Provisional residence permit			Provisional residence permit		
Review	98%		Appeal	9%	
No decision			No decision		
	26%			25%	
Refugee status			Refugee status		
	6%			0%	
Residence permit			Residence permit		
	3%			0%	
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
	0%			0%	
KONO			KONO		
	3%			0%	
Rejection			Rejection		
	58%			75%	
Others			Others		
	2%			0%	
Withdrawn			Withdrwan		
	2%			0%	
Appeal			Total		
	0%			100%	
Total					
	100%				
Decision first instance:					
Stop	33%				
KONO					
Review	67%				
No decision					
	32%				
Refugee status					
	3%				
Residence permit					
	2%				
Prov. residence permit					
	0%				
KONO					
	5%				
Rejection					
	47%				
Others					
	4%				
Withdrawn					
	5%				
Appeal					
	0%				
Total					
	100%				
Decision first instance:					
Stop	12%				
Rejection					
Review	88%				
No decision					
	47%				
Refugee status					
	5%				
Residence permit					
	3%				
Prov. residence permit					
	1%				
KONO					
	2%				
Rejection					
	33%				
Others					
	1%				
Withdrawn					
	7%				
Appeal					
	1%				
Total					
	100%				
Decision first instance:					
Stop	12%				
Others					
Review	88%				
No decision					
	15%				
Refugee status					
	12%				
Residence permit					
	2%				
Prov. residence permit					
	8%				
KONO					
	0%				
Rejection					
	47%				
Others					
	13%				
Withdrawn					
	3%				
Appeal					
	0%				
Total					
	100%				

Year 1998, Iraq					
Decision first instance:	Stop	59%	Decision review:	Stop	100%
Residence permit	Review	41%	Residence permit	Appeal	0%
	No decision	68%		No decision	n/a
	Refugee status	0%		Refugee status	n/a
	Residence permit	0%		Residence permit	n/a
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	n/a
	KONO	4%		KONO	n/a
	Rejection	7%		Rejection	n/a
	Others	0%		Others	n/a
	Withdrawn	21%		Withdrawn	n/a
	Appeal	0%		Total	n/a
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	3%	Decision review:	Stop	100%
Provisional residence permit	Review	97%	Provisional residence permit	Appeal	0%
	No decision	48%		No decision	n/a
	Refugee status	1%		Refugee status	n/a
	Residence permit	1%		Residence permit	n/a
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	n/a
	KONO	4%		KONO	n/a
	Rejection	41%		Rejection	n/a
	Others	3%		Others	n/a
	Withdrawn	2%		Withdrawn	n/a
	Appeal	0%		Total	n/a
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	25%			
KONO	Review	75%			
	No decision	70%			
	Refugee status	0%			
	Residence permit	1%			
	Prov. residence permit	0%			
	KONO	3%			
	Rejection	23%			
	Others	1%			
	Withdrawn	2%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	9%			
Rejection	Review	91%			
	No decision	63%			
	Refugee status	0%			
	Residence permit	0%			
	Prov. residence permit	0%			
	KONO	3%			
	Rejection	33%			
	Others	1%			
	Withdrawn	1%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	23%			
Others	Review	77%			
	No decision	38%			
	Refugee status	4%			
	Residence permit	3%			
	Prov. residence permit	2%			
	KONO	0%			
	Rejection	34%			
	Others	19%			
	Withdrawn	1%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			

<b>Percentage of review per decision in first instance</b>			
<b>Year 1994, Afghanistan</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	20%	0%	100%
Residence permit	7%	41%	59%
Provisional residence permit	6%	91%	9%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	44%	41%	59%
Rejection	18%	28%	72%
Others	5%	29%	71%
Withdrawn	1%	0%	100%
No decision	0%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1995, Afghanistan</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	26%	2%	98%
Residence permit	4%	71%	29%
Provisional residence permit	33%	98%	2%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	29%	38%	62%
Rejection	7%	40%	60%
Others	1%	53%	47%
Withdrawn	1%	0%	100%
No decision	1%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1996, Afghanistan</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	30%	0%	100%
Residence permit	4%	80%	20%
Provisional residence permit	44%	94%	6%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	16%	49%	51%
Rejection	3%	41%	59%
Others	2%	59%	41%
Withdrawn	0%	0%	100%
No decision	0%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1997, Afghanistan</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	19%	1%	99%
Residence permit	2%	83%	17%
Provisional residence permit	59%	98%	2%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	16%	65%	35%
Rejection	1%	85%	15%
Others	2%	72%	28%
Withdrawn	0%	0%	100%
No decision	1%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1998, Afghanistan</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	4%	1%	99%
Residence permit	2%	57%	43%
Provisional residence permit	61%	92%	8%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	20%	44%	56%
Rejection	0%	59%	41%
Others	3%	95%	5%
Withdrawn	0%	11%	89%
No decision	10%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		

<b>Year 1994, Afghanistan</b>					
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Stop	59%		Stop	97%	
Review	41%		Appeal	3%	
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
Appeal			Total		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Provisional residence permit			Provisional residence permit		
Stop	9%		Stop	79%	
Review	91%		Appeal	21%	
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
Appeal			Total		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision first instance:		
KONO			KONO		
Stop	59%		Stop	59%	
Review	41%		Review	41%	
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
Appeal			Appeal		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision first instance:		
Rejection			Rejection		
Stop	72%		Stop	72%	
Review	28%		Review	28%	
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
Appeal			Appeal		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision first instance:		
Others			Others		
Stop	71%		Stop	71%	
Review	29%		Review	29%	
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
Appeal			Appeal		
Total			Total		

<b>Year 1995, Afghanistan</b>					
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop			Stop		
29%			67%		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Review			Appeal		
71%			33%		
No decision			No decision		
6%			15%		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
35%			85%		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
4%			0%		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
0%			0%		
KONO			KONO		
2%			0%		
Rejection			Rejection		
49%			0%		
Others			Others		
2%			0%		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
2%			0%		
Appeal			Total		
0%			100%		
Total					
100%					
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop			Stop		
2%			91%		
Provisional residence permit			Provisional residence permit		
Review			Appeal		
98%			9%		
No decision			No decision		
4%			0%		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
23%			29%		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
4%			14%		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
1%			0%		
KONO			KONO		
4%			0%		
Rejection			Rejection		
60%			57%		
Others			Others		
2%			0%		
Withdrawn			Withdrawn		
1%			0%		
Appeal			Total		
0%			100%		
Total					
100%					
Decision first instance:					
Stop					
62%					
KONO					
Review					
38%					
No decision					
4%					
Refugee status					
16%					
Residence permit					
6%					
Prov. residence permit					
27%					
KONO					
13%					
Rejection					
28%					
Others					
0%					
Withdrawn					
5%					
Appeal					
0%					
Total					
100%					
Decision first instance:					
Stop					
60%					
Rejection					
Review					
40%					
No decision					
24%					
Refugee status					
30%					
Residence permit					
4%					
Prov. residence permit					
18%					
KONO					
0%					
Rejection					
24%					
Others					
0%					
Withdrawn					
0%					
Appeal					
0%					
Total					
100%					
Decision first instance:					
Stop					
47%					
Others					
Review					
53%					
No decision					
0%					
Refugee status					
88%					
Residence permit					
0%					
Prov. residence permit					
13%					
KONO					
0%					
Rejection					
0%					
Others					
0%					
Withdrawn					
0%					
Appeal					
0%					
Total					
100%					

**Year 1996, Afghanistan**

Decision first instance:	Stop	20%
Residence permit	Review	80%

No decision	12%
Refugee status	26%
Residence permit	1%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	2%
Rejection	46%
Others	6%
Withdrawn	7%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision review:	Stop	97%
Residence permit	Appeal	3%

No decision	50%
Refugee status	0%
Residence permit	50%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	0%
Rejection	0%
Others	0%
Withdrawn	0%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	6%
Provisional residence permit	Review	94%

No decision	7%
Refugee status	36%
Residence permit	3%
Prov. residence permit	1%
KONO	2%
Rejection	49%
Others	0%
Withdrawn	1%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision review:	Stop	88%
Provisional residence permit	Appeal	13%

No decision	0%
Refugee status	75%
Residence permit	0%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	0%
Rejection	0%
Others	25%
Withdrawn	0%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	51%
KONO	Review	49%

No decision	8%
Refugee status	17%
Residence permit	6%
Prov. residence permit	6%
KONO	1%
Rejection	56%
Others	1%
Withdrawn	5%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	59%
Rejection	Review	41%

No decision	53%
Refugee status	29%
Residence permit	0%
Prov. residence permit	6%
KONO	0%
Rejection	12%
Others	0%
Withdrawn	0%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	41%
Others	Review	59%

No decision	17%
Refugee status	67%
Residence permit	3%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	0%
Rejection	7%
Others	0%
Withdrawn	7%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

<b>Year 1997, Afghanistan</b>					
Decision first instance:	Stop	17%	Decision review:	Stop	96%
Residence permit	Review	83%	Residence permit	Appeal	4%
	No decision	24%		No decision	67%
	Refugee status	17%		Refugee status	33%
	Residence permit	2%		Residence permit	0%
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	4%		KONO	0%
	Rejection	46%		Rejection	0%
	Others	5%		Others	0%
	Withdrawn	3%		Withdrawn	0%
	Appeal	0%		Total	100%
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	2%	Decision review:	Stop	96%
Provisional residence permit	Review	98%	Provisional residence permit	Appeal	4%
	No decision	20%		No decision	50%
	Refugee status	20%		Refugee status	50%
	Residence permit	2%		Residence permit	0%
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	3%		KONO	0%
	Rejection	52%		Rejection	0%
	Others	2%		Others	0%
	Withdrawn	1%		Withdrawn	0%
	Appeal	0%		Total	100%
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	35%			
KONO	Review	65%			
	No decision	17%			
	Refugee status	6%			
	Residence permit	3%			
	Prov. residence permit	3%			
	KONO	6%			
	Rejection	59%			
	Others	2%			
	Withdrawn	4%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	15%			
Rejection	Review	85%			
	No decision	27%			
	Refugee status	23%			
	Residence permit	1%			
	Prov. residence permit	20%			
	KONO	3%			
	Rejection	19%			
	Others	4%			
	Withdrawn	4%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	28%			
Others	Review	72%			
	No decision	27%			
	Refugee status	20%			
	Residence permit	1%			
	Prov. residence permit	8%			
	KONO	0%			
	Rejection	25%			
	Others	12%			
	Withdrawn	7%			
	Appeal	1%			
	Total	100%			



Year 1998, Afghanistan					
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	43%		Stop	100%	
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Review	57%		Appeal	0%	

<b>Percentage of review per decision in first instance</b>			
<b>Year 1994, Bosnia-Herzegovina</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	26%	2%	98%
Residence permit	1%	31%	69%
Provisional residence permit	37%	53%	47%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	21%	31%	69%
Rejection	9%	10%	90%
Others	3%	24%	76%
Withdrawn	4%	1%	99%
No decision	0%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1995, Bosnia-Herzegovina</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	37%	1%	99%
Residence permit	2%	67%	33%
Provisional residence permit	34%	95%	5%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	18%	48%	52%
Rejection	3%	33%	67%
Others	3%	37%	63%
Withdrawn	4%	4%	96%
No decision	0%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1996, Bosnia-Herzegovina</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	8%	1%	99%
Residence permit	5%	30%	70%
Provisional residence permit	46%	92%	8%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	30%	55%	45%
Rejection	2%	28%	72%
Others	4%	36%	64%
Withdrawn	4%	0%	100%
No decision	1%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1998, Bosnia-Herzegovina</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	2%	0%	100%
Residence permit	2%	57%	43%
Provisional residence permit	8%	92%	8%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	77%	66%	34%
Rejection	3%	84%	16%
Others	2%	43%	57%
Withdrawn	5%	0%	100%
No decision	1%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Year 1998, Bosnia-Herzegovina</b>			
<b>Decision first instance</b>	<b>Share %</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>Stop</b>
Refugee status	0%	0%	100%
Residence permit	1%	0%	100%
Provisional residence permit	0%	100%	0%
Manifestly ill-founded / Inadmissible (KONO)	79%	73%	27%
Rejection	1%	88%	12%
Others	3%	58%	42%
Withdrawn	8%	1%	99%
No decision	9%	0%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		

**Year 1994, Bosnia-Herzegovina**

Decision first instance:	Stop	69%
Residence permit	Review	31%

No decision	0%
Refugee status	44%
Residence permit	0%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	0%
Rejection	28%
Others	6%
Withdrawn	22%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision review:	Stop	100%
Residence permit	Appeal	0%

No decision	n/a
Refugee status	n/a
Residence permit	n/a
Prov. residence permit	n/a
KONO	n/a
Rejection	n/a
Others	n/a
Withdrawn	n/a
Total	n/a

Decision first instance:	Stop	47%
Provisional residence permit	Review	53%

No decision	1%
Refugee status	91%
Residence permit	2%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	0%
Rejection	2%
Others	1%
Withdrawn	2%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision review:	Stop	96%
Provisional residence permit	Appeal	4%

No decision	0%
Refugee status	100%
Residence permit	0%
Prov. residence permit	0%
KONO	0%
Rejection	0%
Others	0%
Withdrawn	0%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	69%
KONO	Review	31%

No decision	8%
Refugee status	15%
Residence permit	5%
Prov. residence permit	2%
KONO	5%
Rejection	53%
Others	1%
Withdrawn	9%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	90%
Rejection	Review	10%

No decision	0%
Refugee status	28%
Residence permit	2%
Prov. residence permit	7%
KONO	9%
Rejection	49%
Others	0%
Withdrawn	5%
Appeal	0%
Total	100%

Decision first instance:	Stop	76%
Others	Review	24%

No decision	3%
Refugee status	41%
Residence permit	0%
Prov. residence permit	16%
KONO	0%
Rejection	31%
Others	6%
Withdrawn	0%
Appeal	3%
Total	100%

<b>Year 1995, Bosnia-Herzegovina</b>		
Decision first instance:	Stop	33%
Residence permit	Review	67%
	No decision	10%
	Refugee status	31%
	Residence permit	2%
	Prov. residence permit	4%
	KONO	6%
	Rejection	29%
	Others	0%
	Withdrawn	14%
	Appeal	4%
	Total	100%
Decision review:	Stop	95%
Residence permit	Appeal	5%
	No decision	0%
	Refugee status	0%
	Residence permit	0%
	Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	0%
	Rejection	0%
	Others	100%
	Withdrawn	0%
	Total	100%
Decision first instance:	Stop	5%
Provisional residence permit	Review	95%
	No decision	3%
	Refugee status	83%
	Residence permit	1%
	Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	1%
	Rejection	10%
	Others	1%
	Withdrawn	1%
	Appeal	0%
	Total	100%
Decision review:	Stop	87%
Provisional residence permit	Appeal	13%
	No decision	0%
	Refugee status	50%
	Residence permit	0%
	Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	0%
	Rejection	0%
	Others	0%
	Withdrawn	50%
	Total	100%
Decision first instance:	Stop	52%
KONO	Review	48%
	No decision	3%
	Refugee status	15%
	Residence permit	3%
	Prov. residence permit	2%
	KONO	10%
	Rejection	46%
	Others	4%
	Withdrawn	17%
	Appeal	1%
	Total	100%
Decision first instance:	Stop	67%
Rejection	Review	33%
	No decision	8%
	Refugee status	17%
	Residence permit	22%
	Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	0%
	Rejection	44%
	Others	3%
	Withdrawn	6%
	Appeal	0%
	Total	100%
Decision first instance:	Stop	63%
Others	Review	37%
	No decision	0%
	Refugee status	54%
	Residence permit	8%
	Prov. residence permit	8%
	KONO	0%
	Rejection	21%
	Others	10%
	Withdrawn	0%
	Appeal	0%
	Total	100%

<b>Year 1996, Bosnia-Herzegovina</b>		
Decision first instance:	Stop	70%
Residence permit	Review	30%
	No decision	14%
	Refugee status	7%
	Residence permit	0%
	Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	0%
	Rejection	71%
	Others	0%
	Withdrawn	7%
	Appeal	0%
	Total	100%
Decision review:	Stop	100%
Residence permit	Appeal	0%
	No decision	n/a
	Refugee status	n/a
	Residence permit	n/a
	Prov. residence permit	n/a
	KONO	n/a
	Rejection	n/a
	Others	n/a
	Withdrawn	n/a
	Total	n/a
Decision first instance:	Stop	8%
Provisional residence permit	Review	92%
	No decision	4%
	Refugee status	11%
	Residence permit	9%
	Prov. residence permit	1%
	KONO	4%
	Rejection	66%
	Others	1%
	Withdrawn	4%
	Appeal	1%
	Total	100%
Decision review:	Stop	100%
Provisional residence permit	Appeal	0%
	No decision	n/a
	Refugee status	n/a
	Residence permit	n/a
	Prov. residence permit	n/a
	KONO	n/a
	Rejection	n/a
	Others	n/a
	Withdrawn	n/a
	Total	n/a
Decision first instance:	Stop	45%
KONO	Review	55%
	No decision	5%
	Refugee status	0%
	Residence permit	8%
	Prov. residence permit	3%
	KONO	4%
	Rejection	57%
	Others	3%
	Withdrawn	20%
	Appeal	0%
	Total	100%
Decision first instance:	Stop	72%
Rejection	Review	28%
	No decision	0%
	Refugee status	20%
	Residence permit	20%
	Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	0%
	Rejection	60%
	Others	0%
	Withdrawn	0%
	Appeal	0%
	Total	100%
Decision first instance:	Stop	64%
Others	Review	36%
	No decision	0%
	Refugee status	77%
	Residence permit	8%
	Prov. residence permit	0%
	KONO	0%
	Rejection	8%
	Others	0%
	Withdrawn	0%
	Appeal	8%
	Total	100%

Year 1997, Bosnia-Herzegovina					
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	43%		Stop	100%	
Residence permit	Review	57%	Residence permit	Appeal	0%
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrwan		
Appeal			Total		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	8%		Stop	100%	
Provisional residence permit	Review	92%	Provisional residence permit	Appeal	0%
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrwan		
Appeal			Total		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	34%		Stop	100%	
KONO	Review	66%	KONO	Appeal	0%
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrwan		
Appeal			Total		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	16%		Stop	100%	
Rejection	Review	84%	Rejection	Appeal	0%
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrwan		
Appeal			Total		
Total			Total		
Decision first instance:			Decision review:		
Stop	57%		Stop	100%	
Others	Review	43%	Others	Appeal	0%
No decision			No decision		
Refugee status			Refugee status		
Residence permit			Residence permit		
Prov. residence permit			Prov. residence permit		
KONO			KONO		
Rejection			Rejection		
Others			Others		
Withdrawn			Withdrwan		
Appeal			Total		
Total			Total		

Year 1998, Bosnia-Herzegovina					
Decision first instance:	Stop	100%	Decision review:	Stop	100%
Residence permit	Review	0%	Residence permit	Appeal	0%
	No decision	n/a		No decision	n/a
	Refugee status	n/a		Refugee status	n/a
	Residence permit	n/a		Residence permit	n/a
	Prov. residence permit	n/a		Prov. residence permit	n/a
	KONO	n/a		KONO	n/a
	Rejection	n/a		Rejection	n/a
	Others	n/a		Others	n/a
	Withdrawn	n/a		Withdrawn	n/a
	Appeal	n/a		Total	n/a
	Total	n/a			
Decision first instance:	Stop	0%	Decision review:	Stop	n/a
Provisional residence permit	Review	100%	Provisional residence permit	Appeal	n/a
	No decision	0%		No decision	n/a
	Refugee status	0%		Refugee status	n/a
	Residence permit	50%		Residence permit	n/a
	Prov. residence permit	0%		Prov. residence permit	n/a
	KONO	0%		KONO	n/a
	Rejection	50%		Rejection	n/a
	Others	0%		Others	n/a
	Withdrawn	0%		Withdrawn	n/a
	Appeal	0%		Total	n/a
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	27%			
KONO	Review	73%			
	No decision	54%			
	Refugee status	0%			
	Residence permit	1%			
	Prov. residence permit	0%			
	KONO	3%			
	Rejection	32%			
	Others	1%			
	Withdrawn	9%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	12%			
Rejection	Review	88%			
	No decision	64%			
	Refugee status	0%			
	Residence permit	0%			
	Prov. residence permit	0%			
	KONO	0%			
	Rejection	14%			
	Others	0%			
	Withdrawn	23%			
	Appeal	0%			
	Total	100%			
Decision first instance:	Stop	100%			
Others	Review	0%			
	No decision	n/a			
	Refugee status	n/a			
	Residence permit	n/a			
	Prov. residence permit	n/a			
	KONO	n/a			
	Rejection	n/a			
	Others	n/a			
	Withdrawn	n/a			
	Appeal	n/a			
	Total	n/a			