

1,103,496 TOTAL ARRIVALS TO EUROPE 2015/2016

55,652 TOTAL ARRIVALS TO EUROPE in 2016

18,871 TOTAL ARRIVALS TO EUROPE 21 - 27 Jan

Contents

- [Highlights](#)
- [Cumulative arrivals and weekly overview](#)
- [Overview maps](#)
- [Turkey](#)
- [Bulgaria](#)
- [Greece](#)
- [former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia](#)
- [Serbia](#)
- [Hungary](#)
- [Croatia](#)
- [Slovenia](#)
- [Italy](#)
- [Fatalities in the Mediterranean & Aegan](#)
- [Flow Monitoring Analysis](#)
- [The Northern Route](#)
- [Annex: About this report](#)




Visit IOM's interactive map to view data on flows: migration.iom.int/europe/

1. Highlights


- **Flow Monitoring:** As of 25 January 2016 IOM field staff in Greece, fYROM, Croatia, and Slovenia had amassed interviews with over 3,180 migrants and asylum seekers, of which 482 people were interviewed over the week from 18-25 January. Individuals of Syrian, Afghan, Iraqi, Iranian and Pakistani nationalities comprised 94% of all respondents.
- See sections on [Greece](#) and [Italy](#) for an update on the EU's **Relocations Plan**.
- For numbers of fatalities and missing persons in the Mediterranean and Aegan seas, go to [page 35](#).
- See the Northern Route section for developments in the news about the [route to Finland and Norway](#) from Russia.
- Read the Advanced Notifications from Turkey, Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia, and Hungary for highlights from the latest report by FRONTEX, the EU's external border management agency.
- See the sections for Greece, fYROM, Serbia, Croatia, and Slovenia for maps showing the transport and logistics used between entry, transit, and exit points.
- On 06 January 2016 **Germany's** Ministry of Interior announced that it had begun using a new system to count arrivals in 2015, rather than the asylum application system. The new numbers indicate that there may have been a larger overall number of arrivals to Europe in 2015 than has to date been detected in countries of transit. For a fuller explanation of this difference, please see [page 48](#).

2. Cumulative arrivals and weekly overview


2.1. Aggregate cumulative arrivals to Europe



2.1.1. Nationalities of aggregate cumulative arrivals to Europe




2.2. Cumulative arrivals by reporting date grouped by country (countries of first arrival)



Country name ▲	Bulgaria	Cyprus	Greece	Italy	Malta	Spain	Total
Report_Date ▲	Arrivals_cumulative	Arrivals_cumulative	Arrivals_cumulative	Arrivals_cumulative	Arrivals_cumulative	Arrivals_cumulative	Arrivals_cumulative
21Jan2016	31,530	269	898,010	154,449	106	3,845	1,088,209
22Jan2016	31,530	269	902,427	154,449	106	3,845	1,092,626
23Jan2016	31,530	269	903,551	154,729	106	3,845	1,094,030
24Jan2016	31,530	269	903,969	155,571	106	3,845	1,095,290
25Jan2016	31,530	269	905,261	155,571	106	3,845	1,096,582
26Jan2016	31,530	269	907,549	155,710	106	3,845	1,099,009
27Jan2016	31,530	269	910,663	157,083	106	3,845	1,103,496

2.2.1. Cumulative arrivals by reporting date grouped by country (other countries)



Country name ▲	Croatia	Hungary	Macedonia	Serbia	Slovenia
Report_Date ▲	Arrivals_cumulative	Arrivals_cumulative	Arrivals_cumulative	Arrivals_cumulative	Arrivals_cumulative
21Jan2016	601,618	391,645	425,037	608,703	423,032
22Jan2016	603,217	391,692	426,068	609,771	424,487
23Jan2016	604,611	391,702	427,276	610,765	424,901
24Jan2016	605,557	391,717	429,460	612,534	426,465
25Jan2016	607,404	391,722	432,295	615,363	428,188
26Jan2016	609,583	391,726	435,203	618,330	428,514
27Jan2016	611,972	391,762	436,607	619,847	431,449

2.3. Weekly trends

There was an increase of 36% in total arrivals to countries of first arrival (Greece, Italy, Malta, Spain, Bulgaria) for the period of 07/01/2016 - 13/01/2016, compared to the week before.

2.3.1. Weekly trends: countries of first arrival

Country ▲	Greece		Italy		Total arrivals	
Period ▲	Arrivals	% change	Arrivals	% change	Arrivals	% change
14 Jan 2016 to 20 Jan 2016	12,647		245		13,117	
21 Jan 2016 to 27 Jan 2016	16,106	27.35%	2,634	975.10%	18,871	43.87%

2.3.2. Weekly trends: other countries

Country ▲	Croatia		Hungary		Macedonia		Serbia		Slovenia	
Period ▲	Arrivals	% change	Arrivals	% change	Arrivals	% change	Arrivals	% change	Arrivals	% change
14 Jan 2016 to 20 Jan 2016	13,213		142		8,737		12,573		13,559	
21 Jan 2016 to 27 Jan 2016	12,220	-7.52%	130	-8.45%	12,457	42.58%	11,408	-9.27%	10,204	-24.74%

2.4. Daily arrivals by reporting date grouped by country (countries of first arrival)

Country name ▲	Greece	Italy	Total
Report_Date ▲	Daily arrivals	Daily arrivals	Daily arrivals
21Jan2016	3,453	0	3,453
22Jan2016	4,417	0	4,417
23Jan2016	1,124	280	1,404
24Jan2016	418	842	1,260
25Jan2016	1,292	0	1,292
26Jan2016	2,288	139	2,427
27Jan2016	3,114	1,373	4,487
Total	16,106	2,634	18,740


2.5. Daily arrivals by reporting date grouped by country (other countries)

Country name ▲	Croatia	Hungary	Macedonia	Serbia	Slovenia
Report_Date ▲	Daily arrivals	Daily arrivals	Daily arrivals	Daily arrivals	Daily arrivals
21Jan2016	1,865	13	887	264	1,787
22Jan2016	1,599	47	1,031	1,068	1,455
23Jan2016	1,394	10	1,208	994	414
24Jan2016	946	15	2,184	1,769	1,564
25Jan2016	1,847	5	2,835	2,829	1,723
26Jan2016	2,179	4	2,908	2,967	326
27Jan2016	2,389	36	1,404	1,517	2,935
Total	12,219	130	12,457	11,408	10,204

OVERVIEW: MIGRANT FLOWS TO EUROPE

Registered and reported arrivals to Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Malta and Spain  From 01 January 2015 to 27 January 2016


Disclaimer: Base Map Source: ESRI. This map is for illustration purposes only. Names and boundaries on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM.



OVERVIEW: MIGRANT FLOWS TO EUROPE

Registered and reported arrivals to Macedonia, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia and Hungary 🌐 From 01 January 2015 to 27 January 2016

Disclaimer: Base Map Source: ESRI. This map is for illustration purposes only. Names and boundaries on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM.



3. Turkey



3.1. Advanced Notifications

21 January 2016 – In Turkey the systems for thorough data collection have not yet been established, with the only available information being provided by the Turkish Coast Guard. As of 21 January 2016, The Turkish Coast Guard had apprehended 85 irregular migrants and 40 fatalities had been recorded for 2016.

The Turkish Coast Guard detected a total of 91,611 migrants entering the country over 2015. This represents a 512% increase on 2014, during which 14,961 irregular migrants were apprehended. The number of fatalities also saw an increase of over 300% from 2014 to 2015, with 69 recorded deaths in 2014, and 279 in 2015. However, these figures only include those apprehended and rescued by the Coast Guard; actual numbers of migrants and asylum seekers departing Turkey by sea are in fact much higher than this.

Highlights from [FRONTEX Q3 2015 report](#)— “Compared to one year ago, the relative importance of particular migration routes has clearly shifted. In Q3 2015, most migrants were detected on the Eastern Mediterranean and Western Balkan routes. Indeed, most migrants who had entered the EU from Turkey were reported for a second time when they passed through the Western Balkans and then crossed the external EU border from Serbia to Croatia”.

“Information obtained during debriefing activities indicates that Iraqi migrants manage to obtain Turkish visas without difficulty and then travel legally to Turkey, even flying from Baghdad to Istanbul. Older information also indicates that Iraqi migrants who choose to illegally cross into Turkey employ locals familiar with the terrain to guide them across the land border in the area of Zakho/Silopi. Moreover, despite the fact that Iraqis need a visa to enter Turkey, in 2014 there were almost twice as many regular passengers reported at Şırnak-Habur, the main BCP of Turkey with Iraq (3.74 million), as those at the main BCP with Greece (1.98 million). Furthermore, in terms of the entry/ exit ratio of Iraqis, which could be indicative of the risk of overstaying or transit, there were 61 000 more entries to Turkey during 2014. Considering this, the visa obligation is not a major obstacle for Iraqis to enter Turkey when they need to. Likewise, the entry/exit ratio suggests that Turkey is treated as a transit country on route to Greece. Public transport is used to travel across Turkey, with Istanbul and Izmir being the main hubs where deals with facilitators for the onwards journey to Europe are made. Generally, the cost of crossing the Aegean Sea to the Greek islands is around EUR 1,500, while the facilitators who guide people across Turkey’s land borders to Bulgaria charge around EUR 1,000

3.2. Cumulative Rescues and Apprehensions

Mediterranean Developments-Rescues/Apprehensions by Turkish Coast Guard Statistics for 2016 *As of 21 January 2016				
Months	Number of Cases	Number of irregular migrants	Number of deaths	Number of facilitators
January*	85	3,931	40	4

Mediterranean Developments-Rescues/Apprehensions by Turkish Coast Guard Statistics for 2014 and 2015				
Year	Number of Cases	Number of Irregular migrants	Number of deaths	Number of facilitators
2014	574	14,961	69	106
2015	2,430	91,611	279	190
Percentage increase				
2014 to 2015	323.34%	512.33%	304.35%	79.25%



3.3. Entry and exit points

Irregular entry points by land: Hatay, Kilis, Şanlıurfa (from Syria), Silopi, Çukurca (from Iraq), Şemdinli, Yüksekova, Başkale, Ağrı, Doğubeyazıt (from Iran)

Irregular exit locations by sea: Kaş, Datça, Bodrum, Kuşadası, Didim Çeşme, Dikili, Ayvacık (Çanakkale), Balıkesir (Ayvalık) (to Greece)

Irregular exit locations by land: Edirne (to Greece and Bulgaria), Kırklareli (to Bulgaria)

Irregular entry by air: Istanbul Ataturk, Istanbul Sabiha Gokçen, Antalya, Esenboğa Ankara (from third countries)

Irregular exit by air: Istanbul Ataturk, Istanbul Sabiha Gokçen (to certain EU MS)

4. Bulgaria



4.1. Advanced Notifications

Over the whole year of 2015 Bulgarian authorities apprehended a total of 31,174 migrants and refugees entering, exiting, and within the country. The most prominent nationalities in descending order were Iraqis, Syrians, Afghans, Pakistanis and Iranians (data from January to November 2015).

Over the period 01 to 21 January 2016, Bulgarian authorities apprehended 356 irregular migrants and asylum seekers.

Unlike other Balkan states, Bulgaria does not have a policy to facilitate the migration flow to Western Europe. Therefore, numbers from Bulgaria are not of registered arrivals but rather of apprehensions by the Bulgarian authorities of irregular migrants on entry, within the country, and on exit. This makes dating the exact entry of arrivals difficult, as someone apprehended in 2016 might have entered the country in 2015. As such, IOM has decided to account for flows into the country in the following manner: The figure for arrivals in 2015 includes apprehensions on entry, in country, and on exit. The figure for arrivals from 01 Jan 2016 – 01 March 2016 includes only apprehensions on entry. The figure for arrivals from 01 March 2016 – 01 April 2016 includes only apprehensions on entry and in country. The figure for arrivals from 01 April 2016 – 01 May 2016 includes all three data sets: entry, in country, and on exit. Furthermore, only apprehensions on entry from the Turkish-Bulgarian border are counted.

Highlights from [FRONTEX Q3 2015 report](#)— *“The influx of migrants from Turkey leads to intensified secondary movements across the Western Balkans. Many irregular migrants who had arrived in Greece or Bulgaria decided to continue their journey across Western Balkan countries towards Western and Northern Europe...most detections of clandestine entry were once again made by Bulgaria, through which a large share of the migratory flow transiting Turkey is channelled. The Bulgarian BCPs most affected by clandestine entries were Kapitan Andreevo and Lesovo, and 93% of all detections were related to Syrian, Afghan and Iraqi nationals. Illegal border-crossing through BCPs was an option used by migrants who had previously attempted to cross the green border from Turkey to Greece or Bulgaria unsuccessfully or had been deterred by these countries’ intensified police operations and surveillance of their external EU borders. The number of detected clandestine entrants is likely to stay at the current high level or even to rise in the future, as Bulgaria is implementing its plan to significantly extend the length of the existing technical obstacle along its border with Turkey by another 130 km in addition to the already existing 30 km.”*



4.2. Entry and exit points

Main known entry points: border checkpoints Kapitan Andreevo, Lesovo, Malko Tarnovo and territories nearby on the green border between Turkey and Bulgaria, Petrich region and green border near Kulata-Promahon checkpoint on border between Greece and Bulgaria.

Main known exit points: border checkpoints Kalotina, Vrashka Chuka, Bregovo and territories nearby on the green border between Bulgaria and Serbia; green border nearby Gyueshevo border checkpoint on border between FYROM and Bulgaria.

4.3. Transportation and logistics

Most illegal migrants enter Bulgaria from green border on foot. Migrants coming from border checkpoints usually enter by hiding in buses or other vehicles. Undetected migrants continue their journey via taxis and private transportation to external borders or to big cities to find a means of onward transportation out of the country.





4.4. Open reception centers

Migrants accommodated in the open reception centers under SAR (SAR provided data)		Banya	Pastrogor	Ovcha kupel (Sofia)	Vrazhdebna (Sofia)	Voenna rampa (Sofia)	Harmanli	Total
Capacity		70	320	860	370	800	2710	5130
Accommodated migrants	Total	59	120	213	0	135	190	717
	% of used capacity	84%	38%	25%	0%	17%	7%	14%
	Syrian Nationals	31	105	3	0	39	106	284
Accommodated migrants with granted refugee status		0	32	4	0	20	2	58

5. Greece



5.1. Key Findings and Advanced Notifications

As of 27 January 2016, the cumulative arrivals to Greece over sea stands at 910,663 since the start of 2015, and 52,055 since the start of 2016. Over 21-27 January it is estimated that 16,106 migrants entered Greece via the blue borders. This is up from the previous reporting period, which saw 12,647 arrivals by sea.

27 January – According to the Hellenic Coast Guard, between 21 and 27 January 2016 there were 42 incidents off the coasts of Lesbos, Chios, Symi, Samos, Agathonisi, Kalolymnos, and Megisti, requiring the Hellenic Coast Guard (HCG) to search and rescue 1,757 migrants and asylum seekers. During these rescue operations, 18 children and 28 adults died or were found dead. Their nationalities and ages had not been identified at the time of writing.

Since 19 January new procedures agreed between Greece and fYROM have stipulated that migrants must declare their country of intended destination to the Greek authorities before crossing the border.

21 January – The Greek-fYROM borders were closed from 19 January at 19:00 to 21 January at 11:00.

27 January--borders remained closed on 27 January from 12:45 until 23:00. The authorities from both Greece and fYROM stated this was due to overcrowding on the fYROM-Serbian borders. About 1,200 migrants were held up on the Greek side at the Idomeni-Gevgelija border crossing, while another 2,500 waited at the petrol station 20 km from the border.

27 January—The National Seafarer's Union (PNO) began a strike from 06:00 due to continue until 29 January 06:00. No arrivals to the ports from the islands were expected during these two days.


27 January—Since the border's closure for two days last week (19-21 January), growing numbers of migrants have been evading the authorities and making their own way from the petrol station located 20 km from the Idomeni border crossing. This has put migrants at risk of violence and theft.

27 January—The Greek Minister for Migration visited the camp on 27 January at 01:30 (late night/early morning). He was informed regarding the inadequate accommodation currently available for unaccompanied children of nationalities not permitted entry to fYROM and promised to help. A coordination meeting in Athens regarding

Highlights from FRONTEX Q3 2015 report— *“Illegal border-crossings detected at the EU external borders with Turkey have substantially increased reaching the highest level in FRAN data collection history. The increase was mostly reported from the Eastern Aegean Sea, where Lesbos, Chios and Samos were among the most targeted islands. One year ago, the month of October had already indicated the upcoming winter low in the Eastern Aegean Sea. This year, however, the rise in the number of detections on this route continued unabated.”*

unaccompanied children was planned for the next day, with the minister's attendance.

5.2. Cumulative arrivals by reporting date in Greece





5.3. Flow Monitoring: Since November 2015, IOM staff in Greece have collected data from interviews with 287 migrants and asylum seekers.

5.4. Relocations: 26 January – To date, 416 individuals have been relocated, of which 157 individuals have been relocated from Greece (30 to Luxembourg, 44 to Finland, 10 to Germany, 4 to Lithuania, 16 to Portugal, 10 to Ireland and 43 to France). The European Commission has made available an overview of Member States' support to the EU relocation mechanism. To date, 18 out of the 31 participating countries have pledged to make places available, namely Belgium (30), Bulgaria (1,302), Cyprus (30), Finland (150), France (900), Germany (40), Ireland (20), Latvia (481), Lithuania (40), Luxembourg (90), Malta (131), the Netherlands (100), Poland (100), Portugal (130), Romania (300), Spain (50), Sweden (300) and Liechtenstein (43), with an overall number of only 4,237 places. You can find the overview [here](#).


5.5. Entry and exit points

Main departure country: Turkey

Main landing points: The islands of Lesbos, Kos, Samos, Rhodes, Kalymnos, Megisti, Leros and Chios.

Main known exit points: Idomeni (borders between Greece and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)

5.6. Transport and logistics





5.7. Cumulative arrivals by nationality of origin 2015 (from 1 Jan to 31 Dec 2015)

OVERVIEW: MIGRANT FLOWS TO EUROPE

Cumulative arrivals to Greece by nationality of origin From 01 January 2015 to 31 December 2015

Disclaimer: Base Map Source: ESRI. This map is for illustration purposes only. Names and boundaries on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by IOM.




ARRIVALS BY SEA TO GREECE - MAIN COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN			
Main Countries of Origin	Total	Main Countries of Origin	Total
Syria	56.1%	Palestine	0.7%
Afghanistan	24.3%	Somalia	0.5%
Iraq	10.3%	Bangladesh	0.4%
Pakistan	2.7%	Lebanon	0.2%
Iran	2.6%	Other (67 Countries)	1.2%
Morocco	0.9%	Total	100.0%



ARRIVALS BY SEA TO GREECE JANUARY – DECEMBER 2014/2015		
2014	2015	Differential
72,632	853,650	+ 1075.3 %

5.8. Cumulative arrivals by nationality of origin 2016 (from 1 Jan to 25 Jan)






5.9. Weekly data


5.9.1. Cumulative arrivals

Period	Arrivals	Cumulative arrivals	Percent cumulative
Jan 1, 2015 – Dec 16, 2015	806,175	806,175	89%
Dec 16 - Dec 23	22,727	828,902	91%
Dec 23 - Dec 30	21,206	850,108	93%
Dec 30, 2015 – Jan 6, 2016	18,430	868,538	95%
Jan 6 – Jan 13	13,372	881,910	97%
Jan 13 – Jan 20	12,647	894,557	98%
Jan 20 – Jan 27	16,106	910,663	100%




5.9.2. Demographics of weekly departures from Greece (exit point, Idomeni) for the period of 21 to 27 Jan 2016

Age group	Departures	Percentage	Percentage
Men adult	5,005	40%	62%
Women adult	2,745	22%	
Accompanied children	4,677	38%	38%
Unaccompanied children	2	0%	
Total	12,429	100%	100%



Nationality	Departures	Percentage
Syrians	6,338	51%
Afghans	3,673	30%
Iraqis	2,418	19%
Other	0	0%
Total	12,429	100%





5.10. Daily arrivals for 27 Jan 2016

Point of Arrival	*Numbers – Ad hoc communication between IOM Regional staff and the Hellenic Police in the	Numbers – HQs/ Hellenic Coast Guard Identification and Rescue operations
Lesvos island	1,858	350
Samos island	236	33
Chios island	869	51
A' Dodecanese		
Rhodes	18	-
Symi	-	-
Tilos	-	-
Megisti	80	-
Chalki	-	-
B' Dodecanese		
Kos	53	-
Kalymnos	-	-
Patmos	-	-
Farmakonisi	-	-
Leros	-	-
Lipsos		
Lipsoi	-	-
Pserimos	-	-
Mithimna	-	-
Crete	-	-
Ikaria	-	-
TOTAL	3,114	434

6. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (fYROM)




6.1. Key Findings and Advanced Notifications

From 21-27 January 2016 a total of 12,457 migrants and asylum seekers were registered arriving in fYROM, up from 8,737 in the previous week. This brings the total number of migrants and asylum seekers who have entered the country since the start of the crisis on 19 June 2015 to 436,607. Since the beginning of 2016, a total of 48,374 migrants and asylum seekers have entered the country.

Since 18 November 2015, migrants and asylum seekers who are not Syrian, Afghan, or Iraqi nationals have been refused entry.

6.2. Flow Monitoring: Since December 2015, IOM staff in fYROM have collected data from interviews with 716 migrants and asylum seekers.

6.3. Cumulative arrivals by reporting date in fYROM




6.4. Entry and exit points

Main known entry points: Gevgelija (southern border with Greece - entry point): Transit reception center - where registration of persons who have expressed intention to seek asylum in the country is completed. Migrants spend up to several hours on registration before taking the train or other transportation to the northern border.

Main known exit points: Tabanovce near the city of Kumanovo (at the northern border with Serbia - exit point). Again the persons in this center stay for a short period of time (up to two hours) before continuing their journey.

Both points are open/active. The Sector for Border Affairs and Migration is present both at the Centre in Gevgelija and in Tabanovce (to a lesser extent, as it is an exit point).

6.5. Transportation and logistics




6.6. Accommodation centers



Centre	Capacity	Nationalities
Vinojug Transit Centre – Gevgelija (GRC\MKD border)	1,100 - 1,200	This is a transit camp, usually migrants stay a few hours before continuing their travel
Tabanovce Transit Centre – (MKD\SRB border)	600 - 700	This is a transit camp, usually migrants stay for few hours before continuing their travel. Only those migrants of nationalities prohibited from crossing the border to Serbia remain in the camp for 2-3 days. As of 27 January 2016 only six of these migrants were staying in the camp: five migrants of Moroccan nationality and one of Burmese nationality.

6.7. Demographic information on arrivals: Overview 19/06/2015 – 12/01/2016 (Source: MoI)

Age group	Arrivals	Percentage	Percentage
Men adult	229,040	52%	70%
Women adult	76,302	17%	
Accompanied children	113,040	26%	30%
Unaccompanied children	18,225	4%	
Total	436,607	100%	100%



6.8. Cumulative arrivals to FYROM by nationality of origin (from 19 Jun 2015 to 20 Jan 2016)



Arrivals - Main Countries of Origin, as per registered caseload 19 June 2015 – 13 January, 2016

Main Countries of Origin	2016
Syria	55.1%
Afghanistan	25.4%
Iraq	14.6%
Iran	1.4%
Pakistan	1.2%
Palestine	0.5%
Morocco	0.3%
Somalia	0.3%
Bangladesh	0.3%
Democratic Republic of Congo	0.1%
Algiers	0.1%
Lebanon	0.1%
Nigeria	0.1%
Other countries	0.5%
Tot. All Countries of Origin	100.0%

7. Serbia




7.1. Key Findings and Advanced Notifications

27 January - Over the period 21-27 January 2016 a total of 11,408 migrants and asylum seekers were registered arriving in Serbia, down from 12,573 in the previous week. This brings the total number of migrants that have entered the country since the start of 2015 to 619,847, and 48,669 since the start of 2016. Over the reporting period, there was an average of 1,629 daily arrivals, compared to an average of 1,796 in the previous week.

Highlights from FRONTEX Q3 2015 report— “The numbers of persons detected illegally crossing the EU’s external border from Serbia increased 25-fold compared with the same period of 2014 and by 566% compared to the previous quarter, reaching the highest level since FRAN data collection began in 2007.”

7.2. Cumulative arrivals by reporting date in Serbia






7.3. Entry and exit points

Main known entry points: Presevo (border with FYR Macedonia); Dimitrovgrad and Zaječar (border with Bulgaria)

Main known exit points: Sid (border with Croatia)

7.4. Transport and logistics







7.5. Accommodation centers

Centre	Capacity
Miratovac Transit Entry Point (border with FYROM)	300 - 500
One Stop Center Presevo (registration center, approx. 13 km from border with FYROM)	1,500
Dimitrovgrad Registration Center (near border with Bulgaria)	140
One Stop Centre Sid Point (at train station in Sid, near border with Croatia)	800
Principovac Transit Reception Center (near border with Croatia)	250-300
One stop center Adasevci (near border with Croatia)	500

7.6. Flow Monitoring Updates



8. Hungary



8.1. Key Findings and Advanced Notifications


From 01 January 2015 to 27 January 2016, a total of 391,762 migrants and asylum seekers were registered arriving in Hungary. Due to the barbed-wire fence in place along the Serbian and Croatian borders, there have been reduced numbers of arrivals since 17 October 2015. From 21 to 27 January 2016, 130 new arrivals were registered by the authorities, bringing the total for this year to 378 registered arrivals.

The most common countries of origin in descending order are: Syria, Afghanistan Pakistan, and Iraq.

Main known entry points: Croatian border (Zákány, Beremend, Letenye); Serbian border (Röszke and Horgos).

Main known exit points: There are currently no transit movements crossing Hungary.

8.2. Cumulative arrivals by reporting date in Hungary



9. Croatia



9.1. Key Findings and Advanced Notifications


From 21-27 January 2016 a total of 12,219 migrants and asylum seekers were registered arriving in Croatia, down from 13,214 the previous week. This brought the daily average down to 1,745 from 1,887 in the previous period. The total number of migrants and asylum seekers that have been registered since the start of the crisis on 16 September, now totals 611,972, while since the start of 2016 a further 56,181 migrants and asylum seekers have entered the country.

Flow Monitoring: Since October 2015, IOM staff in Croatia have collected data from interviews with 1,949 migrants and asylum seekers.


Main known entry points from Serbia: Trains operate from Serbia to the Slavonski Brod. Winterized Transit Center, Croatia. When leaving, migrants are taken by bus to Sibinj (village near Slavonski Brod) where they board trains for Dobova, Slovenia.

Main known exit points to Slovenia: Dobova (by train).

9.2. Cumulative arrivals by reporting date in Croatia



9.3. Transportation and logistics



10. Slovenia



10.1. Key Findings and Advanced Notifications

27 January– Since the start of the crisis on 16 October 2015, 431,449 migrants and asylum seekers have been registered entering Slovenia. From 21-27 January, there were 10,204 registered arrivals, down from 13,559 the previous week. The daily average of registered arrivals over the reporting period was to this week, down from 1,937 in the previous week. This brings the cumulative total for 2016 to 52,845 registered arrivals.

Flow Monitoring: Since November 2015, IOM staff in Slovenia have collected data from interviews with 228 migrants and asylum seekers.

From the Press

20 January-The Slovenian Police released a statement on their website stating that:

“Austrian security bodies are still receiving migrants in the agreed way, and have not limited their intake yet. Today, the Slovenian police have sent the first 500 foreigners to the entry point in Šentilj after registering them, where Austrian security bodies have begun to take in foreigners again. Reception procedures are still being carried out, and there has not been anything unusual so far.


Based on the agreement with Austria, the handing over still takes place at Karavanke and in Podrožca, and, from today, also in Šentilj, where migrants are accommodated in the new reception centre. From Dobova centre, migrants will travel by train to the makeshift railway stop in Šentilj, which is very close to the accommodation centre. From there, the Slovenian police will hand them over to Austrian police officers. Civil protection services and humanitarian organisations will take care of migrants while they are waiting.

All migrants that will be denied entry by Austrian security bodies will be registered again, and handed over to Austria again. If they request asylum here, the relevant procedure will be initiated in accordance with the International Protection Act. If Austria reduces the influx of migrants, we foresee the same measure at our external Schengen border”
<http://policija.si/eng/index.php/component/content/article/13-news/1825-we-are-still-handing-over-migrants-to-austrians-as-usual>

Main known entry points: Dobova, Dobova train station, Gornja Radgona.

Main known exit points: The border crossings with Austria (Gornja Radgona/Bad Radkersburg, Šentilj/Spielfeld and Jesenice

10.2. Cumulative arrivals by reporting date in Slovenia





10.3. Information on occupancy of registration centers and accommodation facilities for foreigners


The table shows the latest numbers of foreigners undergoing registration across Slovenia on 28 January, noon:

Reception centres	No of migrants undergoing registration
Brežice	0
Dobova Livarna	469
Dobovec	0
Gruškovje	0
Središče ob Dravi	0
Petišovci	0
Dolga vas	0
Bistrica ob Sotli	0
Total	469

The table shows the latest numbers of foreigners staying in accommodation facilities across Slovenia on 21 January 2016, noon:

Accommodation centres	No of migrants accommodated
Tent camp – car park at former Šentilj border crossing, Šentilj	461
Fairgrounds, Gornja Radgona	0
Tent camp at former Integral's parking lot, Lendava	0
Celje fairgrounds	0
Former 26 October Barracks, Vrhnika	0
Logatec Facility	0
Centre for Foreigners, Postojna	51
Total	512

10.4. Transportation and logistics



11. Italy



11.1. Key Findings and Advanced Notifications


From 01 January 2015 to 20 January 2016, an estimated 157,083 migrants and asylum seekers were registered arriving in Italy. These figures are reached by adding numbers circulated by the Ministry of Interior, which go up to 31 December 2015, to numbers of arrivals from 1 January 2016 onwards, which are estimated by IOM staff in the landing areas. From 21-27 January 2016, IOM staff in the landing areas estimated that 2,634 migrants and asylum seekers had arrived in Italy, up from 235 in the previous week. This brings the cumulative total for this year to 3,241 estimated arrivals.

Relocations: 26 January – To date, 416 individuals have been relocated, of which 259 from Italy (96 to Finland, 19 to France, 41 to Sweden, 12 to Spain, 11 to Germany, 14 to Belgium, 10 to Portugal, 6 to Spain, 50 to the Netherlands). . To date, 18 out of the 31 participating countries have pledged to make places available, namely Belgium (30), Bulgaria (1,302), Cyprus (30), Finland (150), France (900), Germany (40), Ireland (20), Latvia (481), Lithuania (40), Luxembourg (90), Malta (131), the Netherlands (100), Poland (100), Portugal (130), Romania (300), Spain (50), Sweden (300) and Liechtenstein (43), with an overall number of only 4,237 places. You can find the overview [here](#).

Main known entry points: In the Channel of Sicily migrants are usually rescued in international waters and brought to the ports of Lampedusa, Sicily (Catania, Augusta, Pozzallo, Porto Empedocle, Trapani, Messina, Palermo) Calabria (Crotone, Reggio Calabria, Vibo, and others) or Apulia (mainly Taranto). Sometimes migrants are also brought to Sardinia (Cagliari), or Campania (Salerno).


Main known exit points: Exit points are irregular and therefore little is known about them. IOM Italy estimates that most Syrians and Eritreans and many Sudanese tend to move on to other European countries within 24-48 hours after reaching Italy, while most Sub-Saharan Africans remain in Italy.

11.2. Cumulative arrivals by reporting date in Italy






11.3. Cumulative arrivals to Italy by nationality of origin 2015 (from 1 Jan to 31 Dec)



11.3.1. Reference - Cumulative arrivals to Italy by nationality of origin 2014





11.3.2. Table: Arrivals in Italy by country of origin 2015 (from 1 Jan to 30 Nov)


Arrivals by sea to Italy - Main Countries of Origin (January - October 2015)							
Main Countries of Origin	2015	Main Countries of Origin	2015	Main Countries of Origin	2015	Main Countries of Origin	2015
Eritrea	39,162	Ghana	4,431	Libya	563	Niger	154
Nigeria	22,237	Ivory Coast	3,772	Burkina Faso	470	Liberia	137
Somalia	12,433	Ethiopia	2,631	Guinea Bissau	456	Iran	119
Sudan	8,932	Guinea	2,629	Benin	396	Afghanistan	117
Gambia	8,454	Egypt	2,610	Togo	360	Other (26 countries)	393
Syria	7,448	Pakistan	1,982	Algeria	343	Unidentified	7,138
Senegal	5,981	Occ. Palestinian T.	1,673	Sierra Leone	250		
Mali	5,826	Iraq	996	Comoros	192		
Bangladesh	5,040	Tunisia	880	Chad	174		
Morocco	4,647	Cameroon	662	Congo	154	TOTAL	153,842

11.3.3 Map: Arrivals in Italy by country of origin 2015 (from 1 Jan to 31 Dec)

OVERVIEW: MIGRANT FLOWS TO EUROPE




Cumulative arrivals to Italy by nationality of origin 🌐 From 01 January 2015 to 31 December 2015






11.4. Monthly Arrivals to Italy comparison 2014 and 2015




11.4.1. Monthly Cumulative Arrivals to Italy comparison 2014 and 2015




11.5. Demographic information for arrivals in Italy (from 1 Jan to 31 Dec)*

Age group	Arrivals	Percentage	Percentage
Men adult	115,947	75%	89%
Women adult	21,434	14%	
Accompanied children	4,117	3%	11%
Unaccompanied children	12,344	8%	
Total	153,842	100%	100%



*Source: National Authorities

12. Missing Migrants: Fatalities and missing persons




13.1. Flow Monitoring Data Analysis

Flow Monitoring Survey Results

Between 8 October 2015 and 25 January 2016, IOM staff in Croatia, FYROM, Greece and Slovenia collected data from interviews with 3,180 migrants and asylum seekers. Individuals of Syrian, Afghan, Iraqi, Iranian and Pakistani nationalities comprised 94% of all respondents. The analysis of these five nationalities is presented below.

The resulting analysis is intended to provide an overview of basic trends and profiles of migrants with respect to demographics, countries of origin, levels of education, and intended destination. Interviews were not conducted in a randomized manner; therefore, the conclusions from the surveys should not yet be used to extrapolate broader trends, but can be used as a preliminary indication of migrant profiles.




SYRIAN NATIONALS

Between 8 October 2015 and 25 January 2016, 1,493 respondents of Syrian nationality were surveyed in Greece, Croatia, FYROM and Slovenia. This constitutes 47% of the total number of individuals surveyed.


Demographics: Syrians

The average Syrian respondent was 28 years old. The majority of respondents were male (74%), although it should be noted that the sample was not taken randomly, which partly explains this gender imbalance. The majority of respondents (86%), were travelling with a group, while only 12% reported travelling alone. The remaining 2% of respondents did not report who they were travelling with. Out of 86% of individuals travelling with a group, 72% reported travelling with families, while 28% reported travelling with non-families.




Levels of Education: Syrians

43% of respondents reported having obtained tertiary education, while 42% reported having obtained a high school education, 12% reported having obtained primary school level education, and 4% reporting not having received any formal education.




Countries of Departure: Syrians

The predominant majority of respondents (98%) reported that they had not resided in a refugee or IDP camp prior to departure. The majority of Syrian respondents (88%) reported departing from Syria.




Countries of Destination: Syrians

Germany was the most popular intended country of destination, with 72% or 1079 individuals reporting Germany as the intended country of destination, followed by Sweden (8% or 119 individuals). The breakdown is presented in the chart and a map below.



Furthermore, 34% of the respondents reported having no relatives in the country of their destination. 64% of the respondents reported having family and relatives in the country of intended destination, including 36% who reported having non-first-line relatives and 28% who reported having first-line relatives in the country of destination. The remaining 2% did not provide an answer. Almost half of the respondents who had relatives at the destination country reported that their relatives had been living in the destination country for more than a year.




Afghan Nationals

Between 8 October 2015 and 25 January 2016, 782 respondents of Afghan nationality were surveyed in Greece, Croatia, FYROM and Slovenia, which constitutes 25% of the total number of individuals surveyed.


Demographics: Afghans

The average Afghan respondent was 24 years old. The predominant majority of this sample was male (86%). The majority of Afghan respondents (86%) were travelling with a group, while only 14% reported travelling alone. Furthermore, out of 86% of the individuals travelling with a group, 56% of the individuals travelling with a group, 56% of respondents reported travelling with family, while 44% reported travelling with non-family.




Levels of Education: Afghans

21% of Afghans reported having obtained tertiary education, against 50% reported having obtained a high school education, 23% reported having obtained a primary school level education, and 6% reported not having received any formal education.




Countries of Departure: Afghans

The predominant majority of Afghan respondents (98%) had not stayed in a refugee camp prior to departure. 91% of the respondents reported departing from Afghanistan.




Countries of Intended Destination: Afghans

55% Afghan individuals reported Germany as the intended country of destination, followed by Sweden (12%).



Furthermore, 58% of Afghan respondents reported having no relatives in the country of their destination. 42% of the respondents reported having family and relatives in the country of intended destination, including 13% who reported having non-first-line relatives and 29% who reported having first-line relatives in the country of destination.




Iraqi Nationals

Between 8 October 2015 and 25 January 2016, 491 respondents of Iraqi nationality were surveyed in Greece, FYROM, Croatia and Slovenia. Iraqis comprised 15% of the total number of individuals surveyed.


Demographics: Iraqis

The average Iraqi respondent was 29 years old. The predominant majority of respondents were male (85%), although it should be noted that the sample was not taken randomly, which partly explains this gender imbalance. The majority of respondents (87%), were travelling with a group, while only 13% reported travelling alone. Out of 85% of the respondents travelling with a group, 73% reported travelling with a family, while 27% reported travelling with non-family.




Levels of Education: Iraqis

27% of respondents reported having obtained tertiary education, while 56% reported having obtained a high school education, 13% reported having obtained a primary school level education, and 3% reported not having received any formal education.




Countries of Departure: Iraqis

The predominant majority of respondents (94%) reported that they had not resided in a refugee or IDP camp prior to departure. The majority respondents (93%) reported departing from Iraq.




Countries of Destination: Iraqis

Germany was the most popular intended country of destination, with 64% or 315 individuals reporting Germany as the intended country of destination, followed by Sweden (8% or 40 individuals).



Furthermore, 40% of the respondents reported having no relatives in the country of their intended destination. 60% of the respondents reported having family and relatives in the country of intended destination, including 38% who reported having non-first-line relatives and 22% who reported having first-line relatives in the country of destination.




Iranian Nationals

Between 8 October 2015 and 25 January 2016, 108 respondents of Iranian nationality were surveyed in Greece, FYROM, Croatia and Slovenia. This constitutes 3% of the total number of individuals surveyed.


Demographics: Iranians

The average Iranian respondent was 27 years old. The predominant majority of respondents were male (88%), although it should be noted that the sample was not taken randomly, which partly explains this gender imbalance. The majority of respondents (68%), were travelling with a group, while 31% reported travelling alone. Of the 68% travelling in a group, 51% reported to be travelling with family members while 49% reported to be travelling with non-family members.




Levels of Education: Iranians

35% of respondents reported having obtained tertiary education, while 34% reported having obtained a high school education, 20% a primary school level education, and 10% reporting not having received any formal education.



Countries of Departure: Iranians

The predominant majority of respondents (96%) reported that they had not resided in a refugee or IDP camp prior to departure. The majority respondents (92%) reported departing from Iran.



Countries of Destination: Iranians


Germany was the most popular intended country of destination, with 39% or 41 individuals reporting Germany as the intended country of destination.

Pakistani Nationals

Between 8 October 2015 and 27 January 2016, 104 respondents of Iranian nationality were surveyed in Greece, FYROM, Croatia and Slovenia. This constitutes 4% of the total number of individuals surveyed.


Demographics: Pakistanis

The average Pakistani respondent was 26 years old. The predominant majority of respondents were male (98%), although it should be noted that the sample was not taken randomly, which partly explains this gender imbalance. The majority of respondents (56%), were travelling with a group, while 43% reported travelling alone. Of the 56% travelling in a group, 17% reported to be travelling with family members while 83% reported to be travelling with non-family members.




Levels of Education: Pakistanis

12% of respondents reported having obtained tertiary education, while 48% reported having obtained a high school education, 35% a primary school level education, and 6% reporting not having received any formal education.




Countries of Departure: Pakistanis

The predominant majority of respondents (97%) reported that they had not resided in a refugee or IDP camp prior to departure. The majority respondents (95%) reported departing from Pakistan



Countries of Destination: Pakistanis

Germany was the most popular intended country of destination, with 20% reporting Germany as the intended country of destination, followed by Italy (19%).




African Nationals

Between 8 October 2015 and 25 January 2016, 142 respondents of African nationality were surveyed in Greece, Croatia and FYROM. This constitutes 4% of the total number of individuals surveyed.


Demographics: Africans

The average African respondent was 27 years old. The predominant majority of respondents were male (96%), although it should be noted that the sample was not taken randomly, which partly explains this gender imbalance. The majority of respondents (63%) were travelling alone, while 37% reported travelling with a group. Of the 37% travelling in a group, 38% reported to be travelling with family members while 60% reported to be travelling with non-family members.



Levels of Education: Africans

16% of respondents reported having obtained tertiary education, while 55% reported having obtained a high school education, 21% a primary school level education, and 8% reporting not having received any formal education.




Countries of Departure: Africans

The predominant majority of respondents (78%) reported that they had not resided in a refugee or IDP camp prior to departure. The majority of respondents (56%) reported departing from Morocco.



Countries of Destination: Africans

Germany was the most popular intended country of destination, with 39% of individuals reporting Germany as the intended country of destination, followed by Italy (14%) and France (13%).



12.2. Special Feature: The Northern Route

Norway



Last week there were several reports in the Norwegian and international press this week relating to the Norwegian government's decision to send back over 5,500 migrants and asylum seekers who entered the country irregularly from the Russian borders on bicycles. Human rights activists have expressed concern about the fact that people will be obliged to cycle back to Russia in weather conditions of -20°C.

26 January— Reuters reports that Russia announced it would only allow entry to migrants with a valid visa or residency permit for Russia and that “Norway sent a bus to Russia last week carrying 13 people from Syria, Afghanistan, Yemen and Pakistan.” (<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-lavrov-norway-refugees-idUSKCN0V41DN>)

24 January—Norwegian authorities have suspended the deportation of asylum seekers to Russia (<https://www.rt.com/news/329951-norway-russia-deportation-refugees/>).

Numbers: About 31,000 migrants arrived in Norway last year across all borders” (<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-lavrov-norway-refugees-idUSKCN0V41DN>).

Entry points: The Arctic Circle border crossing of Storskog, on the Russian-Norwegian border, has become a popular point of entry for would-be asylum-seekers who obtain Russian visas and then fly to Moscow where they make the journey by train near the Norwegian border, crossing by bicycle (<http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/01/26/for-finland-and-norway-the-refugee-crisis-heats-up-along-the-russian-arctic/>)

Finland



Finnish border guards expect that up to 7,500 asylum-seekers will go through the checkpoints at the border between Russia and Finland this year (<http://regnum.ru/news/society/2055276.html>)

27 January—Finland and Russia have agreed to step up cooperation on their shared 833-mile (1,340 km) border, although specific measures have not been outlined yet. According to the Finnish border guard, about 400 asylum seekers have come from Russia to Finland this month, compared with about 700 in the whole of 2015 (<http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-europe-migrants-finland-russia-idUKKCN0V50YI>)

Numbers: “Only 700 asylum-seekers crossed from Russia in 2015, but a recent report by the Finnish Border Guard said that number could swell to more than 7,500 for 2016 at the current rate. According to the same report, nearly half of the arrivals from Russia in 2015 were Afghan citizens, with many living in Russia for months or even years before crossing into Finland. In total, some 32,000 asylum-seekers arrived in Finland in 2015” (<http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/01/26/for-finland-and-norway-the-refugee-crisis-heats-up-along-the-russian-arctic/>).

Entry points: The Russian border town of Alakurtti is a growing conduit into Lapland, Finland's northernmost region, where many asylum-seekers have entered by car.

Iraq



At the end of this report we are annexing the preliminary results of the survey that was conducted among Iraqi emigrants who left Iraq during 2015 and are currently residing in Europe. It gathers information about the migrants' personal profile, journey, planning and decision-making process, journey, completion, current life in the country of destination and intentions for the future.

12.3. About this report: DTM in the Mediterranean and beyond

In October 2015, IOM launched its **Early Warning Information Sharing Network** to commence sharing data between IOM, government agencies, and other humanitarian actors in affected countries of arrival and transit. IOM seeks to identify vulnerabilities and needs among the mobile population to inform all concerned parties about the type of assistance required. The information provided by IOM seeks to inform national authorities and partners in their daily work to enable a better targeted response.

To enable this information sharing, IOM is utilizing its **Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM)**, a suite of tools and methodologies designed to track and analyse human mobility in different displacement contexts, in a continuous manner. A **Flow Monitoring System** was set up to provide a better understanding of mixed migration flows across the Central Mediterranean and Western Balkans routes. The Flow Monitoring System includes this weekly flows compilation, which provides an overview of migration flows in countries of first arrival and “transit countries” in Europe, and analysis of trends across the affected region. The data on registered arrivals is collated by IOM through consultations with ministries of interior, coast guards, police forces, and other relevant national authorities.

The system also includes **flow monitoring surveys** to capture additional and more in-depth data on the people on the move, including age, sex, areas of origin, levels of education, key transit points on their route, motives, and intentions. This data has been captured by IOM field staff in Croatia since October 2015, with survey more recently also covering Greece, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), and Slovenia. As of 20 January 2016 IOM had interviewed over 2,700 migrants and asylum seekers. Flow monitoring data collected by IOM field staff in multiple countries along the migratory route is analysed in the “special features” section.

12.4. About the numbers

As mentioned above, the data on registered arrivals in this report is collated by IOM through consultations with ministries of interior, coast guards, police forces, and other relevant national authorities.

As such, the German Ministry of Interior’s announcement on 06 January 2016 that arrivals for 2015 had exceeded 1 million for Germany alone is unsurprising. The Ministry explained that the total number of asylum applications filed in 2015 no longer adequately represents the total number of arrivals, due to delays in the asylum application system. Instead, the Ministry referred to the number of arrivals as captured through the EASY-System, which is used to record new entrants upon arrival and determine to which federal state asylum seekers are referred. According to the EASY-System, the numbers of arrivals in 2015 as published on the BAMF (Ministry for Migration and Asylum) website were, as of January 2016, higher than 1 million for Germany alone. These numbers indicate that there may have been a larger overall number of arrivals to Europe in 2015 than has to date been detected in countries of transit. However, it should be taken into consideration that some people might have already entered Europe in 2014 and then entered Germany in 2015; and that the Ministry and BAMF highlight that there may have been some duplications in the EASY-System. Read more [here](#).

Numbers of registered arrivals to Greece and Italy have been shown to match the data IOM has available for other countries further along the route. Nevertheless, certain types of arrival are hard to capture by date: for example, some people might have flown directly to Germany on student, tourist, or work visas, and subsequently decided to stay. Others may have travelled to Germany via Russia and northern Europe, or otherwise avoided detection along the Mediterranean and Balkans routes.

PURPOSE

This dashboard presents the preliminary findings of a survey conducted by IOM/DTM Iraq during the months of November and December 2015 in the framework of the DFID-funded project “Understanding complex migration flows from Iraq to Europe through movement tracking and awareness campaigns”.

The survey was conducted among Iraqi emigrants who left Iraq during 2015 and are currently residing in Europe. It gathers information about the migrants’ personal profile, journey planning and decision-making process, journey completion, current life in the country of destination and intentions for the future.

METHODOLOGY

A structured questionnaire was designed, translated in Kurdish and Arabic, and administered to Iraqis who left Iraq during 2015 and are currently living in Europe.

Respondents were identified using a snowball sampling technique, also known as chain-referral. This method identifies respondents through the referral of the group’s initial members. The process continues until a sample of predetermined size has been reached. The snowball sampling technique is a non-probability sampling technique that is used to identify research subjects where subjects are hard to locate or to reach, rare or in hiding.

IOM governorate field teams (RARTs) were asked to identify a convenience sample of 30 people who migrated from their governorate of responsibility, and who agreed to be interviewed; interviews were conducted by IOM RARTs over the phone or Skype in English, Arabic and Kurdish, and the data entered through ODK to the DTM database.

Migrants were therefore identified and contacted thanks to the RARTs’ personal

network of friends, family and acquaintances, and through the network of those who migrated. This may constitute a selection bias, because persons most likely to participate in this survey are those who have pre-existing connections with IOM staff.

The sample obtained with this technique is not statistically representative of the migrant population because the population of reference is not known, and the researcher does not know the true distribution of the population and of the sample. Therefore the results cannot be generalized to the entire population of migrants who left Iraq in 2015.

This, however, allowed DTM to reach a very high number of caseloads, which even though cannot be considered statistically representative, allows casting light on the phenomenon and spotting interesting factors worth a further investigation in the next phase.

SAMPLE SIZE

A total of 503 questionnaires have been collected. Of these, 474 have been used for this analysis, while 29 have been excluded after a quality check because they did not meet the eligibility criteria or showed a low quality of data.


The questionnaire is articulated as follows:

1. Migrants’ personal life and profile in Iraq before departure (demographics, family background, employment and education);
2. Preparation and organization of the journey (decision-making and planning, choice of country of destination, expectations, information gathering);
3. Journey (costs, routes, itinerary);
4. Country of destination (current conditions and intentions for the future).


Each panel in this dashboard corresponds to a section in the questionnaire.

1. MIGRANTS’ PROFILE BEFORE DEPARTURE

SEX




AGE




MARITAL STATUS



DEPENDANTS



COMPLETED EDUCATION




KNOWLEDGE OF LANGUAGE OF INTENDED DESTINATION COUNTRY



EMPLOYMENT STATUS




PERSONAL INCOME




2. PREPARATION AND ORGANISATION OF THE JOURNEY


PRIMARY REASON FOR DEPARTURE



SECONDARY REASON FOR DEPARTURE



MAIN SOURCE OF INFORMATION USED TO PLAN THE JOURNEY



KNOWLEDGE OF VISA AND ASYLUM ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA



EXPECTED SUPPORT UPON ARRIVAL FROM THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE COUNTRY OF INTENDED DESTINATION




REASON FOR CHOOSING THE COUNTRY OF INTENDED DESTINATION




3. JOURNEY


JOURNEY DURATION




TOTAL COST OF JOURNEY IN USD




EXIT POINTS FORM IRAQ



4. COUNTRY OF ACTUAL DESTINATION



INTENTIONS OF RETURN TO IRAQ



WAS THE MIGRANT GRANTED ASYLUM?



DID THE MIGRANT BELIEVE TO MEET THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR THE REFUGEE STATUS?

