

## Solidarity and fairness in the common European asylum system – failure or progress? | BERND PARUSEL\*

### Abstract

On the basis of harmonised statistical data on asylum applications and decisions, this paper attempts to re-examine the state of play of the Common European Asylum System (CEAS), and in particular, the two key objectives of achieving a more balanced distribution of asylum seekers across Member States (“solidarity”) and the approximation of national decision-making in asylum cases (“fairness”). It concludes that while there is evidence of unresolved challenges, such as lately with regard to the uneven reception and treatment of asylum seekers from Syria, some fragile trends of progress can be detected in terms of more uniform asylum outcomes.

**Keywords:** Common European Asylum System; asylum decisions; countries of origin; harmonisation; asylum statistics.

### Introduction: the Common European Asylum System – a history of setbacks?

“Solidarity” and “fairness” have been proclaimed as key concepts and objectives for the creation of a Common European Asylum System (CEAS) ever since the establishment of such a system was first envisaged in 1999. The term “solidarity” refers to policy-makers’ commitment to a more equitable sharing of the responsibilities associated with the arrival and reception of asylum seekers in Europe by means of a burden-sharing mechanism or by assisting those Member States that face particular pressures on their asylum systems (EC, 2008: 7; Bendel 2014: 2). “Fairness”, sometimes also labelled “responsibility” (European Council, 2014: 3), relates to more uniform decision-making across the EU on asylum cases, in the sense that applicants should have the same, or at least very similar, chances of being recognised as refugees or persons otherwise in need of protection irrespective of where they arrive (EC, 2008: 5-6; Peers, 2013).

Between 2000 and 2005, a number of EU directives were elaborated and adopted, determining minimum conditions for the reception of asylum seekers in the Member States, asylum procedures, and criteria for granting refugee status and subsidiary protection. Another key element of the harmonization of

---

\* Swedish Migration Board and European Migration Network, Sweden.  
E-mail: [bernd.parusel@migrationsverket.se](mailto:bernd.parusel@migrationsverket.se).



asylum policies was the transformation of the Dublin Convention into an EU Regulation, establishing rules for the determination of the Member States responsible for processing an asylum application (in most cases the Member State of first arrival).<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile, between 2011 and 2013, the second (directives)<sup>2</sup> or even third generation (Dublin regulation)<sup>3</sup> of legislative instruments in the asylum field have been adopted and are being implemented (Peers, 2013). In parallel, the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) in Malta has started operations with the aim of assisting the Member States in adjusting their asylum systems to the evolving EU framework and providing support to those facing pressures (Compte, 2010; Angenendt/Parkes, 2010).<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the EU funds projects regarding reception facilities, return procedures, or border control and manages policy-supporting structures such as the European Migration Network (EMN), or networks for contacts among national practitioners, such as the European Network of Asylum Reception Organisations (ENARO).

Whether these instruments and measures can be regarded, 15 years after the European Council meeting in Tampere in 1999, as the cornerstones of a true CEAS, or whether they are only fragments of a Herculean task still to be tackled, remains to be ultimately analysed well after the second generation of asylum directives will have become applicable in 2015. For the time being, Member States' representatives anticipate that more will need to be done, while also testifying of a widespread "negotiation fatigue" (Collett, 2014). The European Commission and the Council have signaled that, instead of advancing proposals for further legislation, emphasis might in the foreseeable future be placed on facilitated practical co-operation and an improved exchange of experiences (European Council, 2014: 3).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Convention determining the State responsible for examining applications for asylum lodged in one of the Member States of the European Communities was signed in Dublin in June 1990 and entered into force in September 2007. In 2003, it was replaced by Council Regulation (EC) No 343/2003 of 18 February 2003 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an asylum application lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national ("Dublin II Regulation").

<sup>2</sup> Directive 2013/32/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on common procedures for granting and withdrawing international protection ("Asylum Procedures Directive"); Directive 2013/33/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 laying down standards for the reception of applicants for international protection ("Reception Conditions Directive"); and Directive 2011/95/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on standards for the qualification of third-country nationals or stateless persons as beneficiaries of international protection, for a uniform status for refugees or for persons eligible for subsidiary protection, and for the content of the protection granted ("Qualification Directive").

<sup>3</sup> Regulation (EU) No 604/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person ("Dublin III").

<sup>4</sup> Regulation (EU) No 439/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 May 2010 establishing a European Asylum Support Office.

126

Researchers meanwhile often observe that the process of gradually establishing a CEAS has so far fallen short of its objectives. Indeed, one may ask what the noble catchwords “solidarity” and “fairness” actually mean when massive imbalances regarding the number of asylum applicants received by the Member States further deepen (Angenendt et al., 2014: 2; Bitoulas, 2014: 4; EC/EMN, 2014: 45) and migrants drown in their thousands in the Mediterranean before they can even reach the shores of the southern EU Member States (Kassar/Dourgnon, 2014; de Bruycker et al., 2013; Spijkerboer, 2007). So far, the common asylum policy of the EU has certainly not offered any remedy to the repeated tragedies at the borders, nor to the unwillingness of some Member States to receive asylum applicants, offer protection, or at least engage in resettlement (Bendel, 2014). Solidarity initiatives, such as an intra-EU measure of 2010-2011 to relocate recognized refugees from pressured Malta to other Member States, have remained without much success (EC/EMN 2014: 11, 45). It has also been observed that not only the Council but also the European Parliament and the Commission have so far contented themselves with restrictive and half-hearted asylum laws (Ripoll Servent/Trauner, 2014). Last but not least, the Dublin system is criticised both for being ineffective and for perpetuating or even aggravating imbalances regarding the number of asylum seekers received by the Member States (ECRE, 2014: 20; Angenendt et al., 2014: 4). According to the Dublin Regulation, responsibility for examining an asylum application is normally assigned to the asylum seeker’s country of first arrival, but only a small share of “take charge” or “take back” requests results in actual transfers of asylum seekers from one Member State to another (EASO, 2014: 30-32). As Guild et al. (2015: 17) have observed, the Dublin Regulation does not serve as a responsibility-sharing mechanism as it does not take into account questions of overall numbers, capacity or other criteria that might produce homogenizing outcomes.

This article aims at questioning some of these – overwhelmingly negative – assessments of the evolution of the CEAS by testing a new, in-depth analysis of Eurostat asylum data. The idea is to first look into data on asylum applications registered by the Member States to assess the realisation of the “solidarity” concept. This will be kept short since others have undertaken such analyses before (e.g. Thielemann/Armstrong, 2012; ECRE, 2014: 14). In a second step, the “fairness” aspect will be evaluated by a detailed country of origin-based analysis of national first-instance decisions over time (2008-2013). It will be argued that, on the one hand, the CEAS has indeed made some progress with regard to an approximation of national decision-making practices, but that there is, on the other hand, also unmistakable evidence of setbacks, especially regarding the recent rise of asylum seekers coming from war-riddled Syria and the reluctance of many Member States to receive and protect them.

### **Eurostat asylum statistics: explorative value and limitations**

On the basis of an EU Regulation on migration statistics,<sup>5</sup> the Member States provide harmonized asylum data to the European Union's Statistical Office (Eurostat) on a regular basis. Reporting duties include persons having submitted an application for international protection, and persons covered by first-instance decisions on granting, rejecting or withdrawing an international protection status.

Earlier evaluations of decision-making practices were mainly based on national data covering asylum decisions in selected Member States only, or on statistics collected by the UNHCR or other bodies (e.g. Neumayer, 2005; Toshkov & de Haan, 2013). Eurostat asylum data have only been available for all EU Member States since 2008. Despite their being based on uniform definitions and concepts, relatively good reliability, and transparency regarding limitations and caveats, they have not yet been used much in social research.<sup>6</sup>

The data on asylum applications and first-instance decisions used for this article were retrieved from the public Eurostat database. The statistics on decisions were then disaggregated for countries of origin of the persons affected by these decisions, as well as types of decisions and years (2008-2013). Positive decisions were then calculated as percentages of the respective total number of decisions taken by each Member State. As an alternative approach, it would also have been possible to evaluate the percentages for granted refugee status or subsidiary protection. However, since the consequences of these decisions for their beneficiaries tend to be increasingly similar with regard to the rights attached to them, especially with the on-going implementation of the revised asylum qualification directive, the question whether a positive or a negative decision is taken seems much more relevant than the actual ground for each decision.

A certain limitation of Eurostat asylum data is that they are always rounded to the nearest five. This, however, mostly limits the explanatory value of data on smaller EU Member States with very few asylum cases. For Member States with a higher overall number of applicants, rounding does not appear to be problematic. More important is the fact that decisions to transfer an asylum seeker to another Member State under the Dublin Regulation are counted as rejections (negative decisions) despite the fact that Member States do not examine the grounds for protection of such applicants in their substance. This can mean, in practice, that protection rates can appear lower than they perhaps should, mostly for those Member States that receive high numbers of applicants

---

<sup>5</sup> Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 311/76 on the compilation of statistics on foreign workers.

<sup>6</sup> The European Council on Refugees and Exiles however used Eurostat data for an analysis of asylum recognition rates across EU Member States in 2013 (ECRE, 2014: 16-20).

who have passed through another Member State before arriving at their destination.<sup>7</sup> Germany, with more than 2,600 outgoing Dublin transfers in 2013, can serve as an example for this (EASO, 2014: 31). In the analysis below, however, such Member States normally do not stand out as countries with particularly low shares of positive decisions. Thus, the outcome of the analysis below, which aims at identifying differences between Member States with particularly low, and those with very high protection rates, is not distorted by this methodological problem.

### **Solidarity in the CEAS: perpetuation of unbalanced inflows**

During the three-year period from 2011 to 2013, the number of asylum applications increased strongly in the EU. Taken together, the EU Member States received, according to Eurostat, roughly 310,000 applications in 2011, and 435,000 in 2013. When we look at the national level, however, asylum trends are far from coherent. While the number of applications increased in 15 Member States, in some cases rather strongly, it decreased in twelve. It can also be observed that, apart from Italy and Belgium, decreases were noted by those countries where the number of asylum seekers had already been comparatively low. Inversely, increases took place mostly where many asylum seekers had been received before, as for example in Germany, France and Sweden (see Table 1 below).

Further to this, there are also Member States, in which asylum is practically irrelevant as a migration phenomenon, quantitatively speaking; Ireland, the Czech Republic, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, and the Baltic countries all received less or far less than 1,000 applicants in 2013. This means that that so far, the CEAS has not contributed to a more balanced sharing of responsibilities among the EU.

### **Fair decision-making in the CEAS: overall trend**

When we want to know whether the decision-making practice of EU Member States' authorities has become more uniform, a first basic way of approaching the question is to look into the evolution of the share of positive decisions made by Member States' authorities on asylum applications over time.

In 2008, approximately 215,000 decisions were issued, 27 percent of which were positive (58,000). Five years later, in 2013, 327,000 decisions were taken, and the share of positive decisions was 34 percent. Yet, when we look at the Member States' level, the picture is extremely unbalanced, even though a slight trend towards both higher shares of positive decisions and more coherence can be detected. In 2008, four countries issued positive decisions in less than 10 percent of all cases, Ireland, Greece, Spain and Slovenia. In 2013, only two countries (Greece and Hungary) had protection rates below 10 percent.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See metadata files for Eurostat data on decisions on applications and resettlement at <http://www.ec.europa.eu/eurostat>.

<sup>8</sup> For reliability reasons, countries that issued less than 100 decisions were disregarded.

**Table 1:** Asylum applications in the European Union, 2011-2013

	2011	2012	2013
Germany (DE)	53 345	77 650	126 995
France (FR)	57 335	61 455	66 265
Sweden (SE)	29 710	43 945	54 365
United Kingdom (UK)	26 940	28 895	30 110
Italy (IT)	40 355	17 350	26 620
Belgium (BE)	32 270	28 285	21 215
Hungary (HU)	1 695	2 155	18 900
Austria (AT)	14 455	17 450	17 520
Netherlands (NL)	14 600	13 100	17 160
Poland (PL)	6 890	10 755	15 245
Greece (GR)	9 310	9 575	8 225
Denmark (DK)	3 985	6 075	7 230
Bulgaria (BG)	890	1 385	7 145
Spain (ES)	3 420	2 565	4 495
Finland (FI)	2 975	3 115	3 220
Malta (MT)	1 890	2 080	2 245
Romania (RO)	1 720	2 510	1 495
Cyprus (CY)	1 770	1 635	1 255
Croatia (HR)	:	:	1 080
Luxembourg (LU)	2 155	2 055	1 070
Ireland (IE)	1 290	955	920
Czech Republic (CZ)	755	755	710
Portugal (PT)	275	295	505
Slovakia (SK)	490	730	440
Lithuania (LT)	525	645	400
Slovenia (SI)	360	305	270
Latvia (LV)	340	205	195
Estonia (EE)	65	75	95
<b>Total (European Union)</b>	<b>309 820</b>	<b>336 015</b>	<b>435 385</b>

*Source:* Eurostat. Ranking of countries in accordance with number of asylum seekers in 2013. Shaded rows mark countries where number of asylum seekers has decreased.

On the other end of the scale, three countries (Portugal, Poland and Lithuania) issued positive decisions in more than 60 percent of all cases in 2008. In 2013, five countries were above 60 percent, and two were even above 80 percent (see Table 2).

**Table 2:** Positive decisions as % of all decisions on asylum applications

	2008	2011	2013
Bulgaria (BG)	44.0	31.4	87.5
Malta (MT)	52.5	55.1	84.3
Romania (RO)	16.3	6.9	63.8
Netherlands (NL)	51.9	43.3	61.2
Italy (IT)	48.2	29.6	61.1
Sweden (SE)	26.6	32.9	53.2
Finland (FI)	39.1	40.3	50.8
Portugal (PT)	66.7	56.5	44.3
Denmark (DK)	58.4	36.6	40.1
United Kingdom (UK)	29.8	31.5	37.8
Czech Republic (CZ)	15.4	46.7	37.5
Slovakia (SK)	24.3	53.5	36.8
Lithuania (LT)	61.9	8.2	31.4
Austria (AT)	27.2	30.8	29.6
Belgium (BE)	25.7	25.3	29.2
Germany (DE)	40.7	24.0	26.4
Poland (PL)	65.3	14.8	23.7
Spain (ES)	5.4	29.1	22.5
Cyprus (CY)	:	2.7	20.6
Ireland (IE)	8.3	5.5	17.9
Slovenia (SI)	3.1	9.3	17.9
France (FR)	16.2	10.9	17.3
Croatia (HR)	:	:	13.5
Luxembourg (LU)	38.1	3.4	10.4
Hungary (HU)	43.4	17.3	7.9
Greece (GR)	0.2	2.1	3.8
<b>Total (European Union)</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>34.0</b>

*Source: Eurostat. Ranking of countries in accordance with protection rates in 2013.*

The significance of this development with regard to any evidence of improved coherence, or divergence, between Member States' practices, is however limited. Most importantly, the analysis does not take into account which countries the asylum seekers affected by these decisions came from. A low share of positive decisions does not necessarily mean that a Member State has an overly restrictive practice; it can also be the result of many applicants not being able to assert any grounds for protection. A better way to examine whether asylum

outcomes have been affected by harmonisation is therefore to disaggregate Member States' decisions for specific countries of origin.

### Fair decision-making: country of origin-specific outcomes

Throughout the period 2008-2013, the five largest country-of-origin groups that have applied for asylum in the EU were people from Russia (143,820), Afghanistan (133,585), Iraq (101,935), Syria (96,675) and Somalia (94,640). In the following, the analysis of asylum decision data will focus on these five groups. For reliability reasons, the analysis only includes for each year those EU Member States that have taken at least 100 decisions on either country of origin.

#### Case 1: Russia

The example of Russia points towards an approximation of national decisions-making practices. While Greece issued positive decisions in only 4.3% of all decisions regarding Russian applicants in 2008, Denmark did so in more than three quarters of all cases. The divergence between the Member State with the lowest protection rate and the one with the highest share of positive decisions then gradually decreased. In 2012, the difference between the most generous and the most restrictive country was 38.7 percentage points, and in 2013, it was 38.5 percentage points (see Table 3). In that year, Germany had the lowest protection rate for asylum seekers from Russia, while the UK granted protection in 49.9 percent of their Russian cases.

**Table 3:** Minimum and maximum shares of positive decisions: **Russia**

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Min %	4.3 (GR)	11.7 (SE)	5.1 (NL)	4.3 (NL)	3.6 (NL)	2.4 (DE)
Max %	78.6 (DK)	70.0 (DK)	64.5 (DK)	44.2 (DK)	42.3 (UK)	40.9 (UK)
Max-Min	<b>74.3</b>	58.3	59.4	39.9	38.7	<b>38.5</b>

*Source:* Eurostat.

#### Case 2: Afghanistan

As compared to Russia, asylum applicants from Afghanistan have been granted protection more frequently over the entire period 2008-2013. While the average share of positive decisions taken by EU Member States was below 15 percent for Russian applicants in 2013, it was above 52 percent for Afghans. Member States' practice has however varied greatly. In 2008, Greece only issued positive decisions in 0.8 percent of their 2,500 Afghan asylum cases. Austria, by way of contrast, granted protection in 69.3 percent of their cases. Subsequently, Greece continued to exhibit extremely low protection rates while they were highest in Italy (see Table 4). The differences between the lowest and the highest shares of positive decisions have not decreased over time. In 2013, the variation was greater than in 2008.



**Table 4:** Minimum and maximum shares of positive decisions: **Afghanistan**

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Min	0.8 (GR)	1.3 (GR)	7.3 (GR)	10.9 (GR)	6.8 (GR)	10.8 (GR)
Max	69.3 (AT)	89.7 (IT)	90.5 (IT)	69.9 (IT)	93.7 (IT)	90.7 (IT)
Max-Min	68.5	<b>88.4</b>	83.2	<b>59.0</b>	86.9	79.9

*Source: Eurostat.*

### Case 3: Iraq

Asylum outcomes on Iraq, the third most relevant country of origin, are comparable to Afghanistan. The disparity between the country issuing very few positive decisions and the country issuing most positive decisions has been rather ample in all years, with the greatest difference between the lowest and the highest share of positive decisions measured in 2012, and the lowest in 2013 (see Table 5).

**Table 5:** Minimum and maximum shares of positive decisions: **Iraq**

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Min	0.3 (GR)	3.3 (GR)	10.3 (GR)	6.7 (CY)	2.9 (GR)	8.3 (GR)
Max	87.6 (IT)	90.9 (CY)	87.5 (CY)	76.3 (BE)	92.3 (IT)	72.8 (IT)
Max-Min	87.3	87.6	77.2	69.6	<b>89.4</b>	<b>64.5</b>

*Source: Eurostat.*

### Case 4: Syria

Syria has been as a symbol for a severe lack of solidarity and fairness within the CEAS. The number of asylum seekers from Syria increased massively during the period 2008-2013 due to the intensifying war. While little more than 4,200 people of Syrian origin reached the EU in 2008, more than 24,000 arrived in 2012 and over 50,000 in 2013. Sweden was the predominant receiving country in 2013, with more than 16,500 Syrian applicants, followed by Germany (approximately 12,900). Further seven Member States each received between 1,000 and 3,000 applicants, while eight Member States had less than 100.

Massive discrepancies can also be seen when we look at protection practices. Greece did not issue any positive decisions regarding Syrian applicants in 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2012. In 2013, however, Greek authorities issued positive decisions in 60 percent of their Syrian cases. In all other relevant Member States, protection rates for Syrians increased gradually over the period 2008-2013. Malta granted protection to all their Syrian applicants both in 2012 and 2013. Thus, in 2012, the difference between the country issuing least positive decisions and the one with the highest protection rate could not have been greater (see Table 6). In 2013, this difference was less than half as wide, and all Member States that issued more than 1,000 decisions on applications by Syrian nationals (Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, Bulgaria, Belgium, the United

Kingdom, Austria, Denmark and France) had protection rates between 83.5 and 99.5 percent.

It should also be noted that if Greece were excluded from this analysis, the variation between extremely low and very high protection rates in 2012 would seem rather undramatic; Romania would have had the lowest protection rate (72.7 percent), and the difference between the most restrictive and the most generous national practice would have been 27.3 percentage points.

**Table 6:** Minimum and maximum shares of positive decisions: **Syria**

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Min	0.0 (GR)	0.0 (GR)	0.0 (GR)	3.3 (GR)	0.0 (GR)	50.6 (IT)
Max	33.3 (AT)	69.2 (DK)	58.0 (DK)	69.8 (AT)	100.0 (MT)	100.0 (MT)
Max-Min	<b>33.3</b>	69.2	58.0	66.5	<b>100.0</b>	49.4

*Source: Eurostat.*

### Case 5: Somalia

Last but not least, in the case of Somalia, we can observe that Greece had the most restrictive practice in 2008 and 2009, while Hungary had the highest protection rate across the EU. After 2009, both countries each made less than 100 decisions in Somalian cases and were therefore excluded from further analysis for reliability and validity reasons. From 2010 onwards, Belgium and France had comparatively restrictive decision-making practices towards Somalia, while Italy and Malta almost only issued positive decisions (see Table 7 for details).

**Table 7:** Minimum and maximum shares of positive decisions: **Somalia**

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Min	2.8 (GR)	3.7 (GR)	42.5 (BE)	39.2 (FR)	23.9 (FR)	16.5 (FR)
Max	100.0 (HU)	95.8 (HU)	93.3 (IT)	97.6 (MT)	98.3 (IT)	96.4 (IT)
Max-Min	<b>97.2</b>	92.1	<b>50.8</b>	58.4	74.4	79.9

*Source: Eurostat.*

### Conclusion: a fragile trend towards approximation?

This article has shown that intra-EU solidarity in the sense of a more balanced distribution of asylum seekers across EU Member States still seems out of reach. Also in terms of fairness with regard to more uniform asylum outcomes, the evidence provided in this article suggests a strong need for further harmonisation, despite the fact that a fragile trend towards an approximation of national decision-making practices can already be identified. Among the examples discussed above, indications of increasing coherence are most obvious in the case of asylum seekers from Russia, a country with rather low protection rates in the EU. Also in the other cases, however, we can see that differences

between the most restrictive and the most generous countries have tended to slightly flatten over the period 2008 to 2013. Still, as late as in 2013, an asylum applicant from Syria had a 50-percent chance of being granted protection in Italy, while chances were close to 100 percent in several other Member States. Asylum outcomes for people from Afghanistan, Iraq and Somalia have shifted much over time and remained very high throughout the whole period.

The European Asylum Support Office (EASO) has so far refused to attribute divergences between Member States' decision-making practices to a lack of harmonisation. According to EASO, they rather indicate the complexity of caseloads in the sense that "multiple profiles of applicants exist even within a given country of origin" (EASO, 2014: 24-25). While it is true that some Member States may to some extent receive applicants with specific profiles (e.g. women, children, ethnic or religious minorities, or applicants with relatives in other Member States) from a given country, with others experiencing the arrival of other groups from the same country, the amplitude of variation is so massive that this explanation alone is not exhaustive, especially not when greatly different outcomes prevail over several years, and when the same Member States stand out with very low, or high, protection rates in relation to not only one, but several countries of origin. Thus, it is very likely that Member States still understand the situation in countries of origin differently, and that the willingness to grant protection varies. To address this problem, more practical cooperation among the Member States with regard to the exchange of country of origin information and common guidelines for the examination of different types of cases may be a way forward. The joint processing of applications by asylum officials from several Member States could also be worth to be explored further to encourage authorities to learn from each other.

As long as there is no real fairness in the CEAS and asylum seekers are faced with different outcomes depending on where they lodge their applications, problems such as protection gaps and secondary movements (sometimes distastefully labelled "asylum-shopping") will prevail. Further to this, it should be kept in mind that the Dublin-system of distributing responsibility for asylum seekers among the Member States is built upon the premise that they will have a fair chance of receiving protection wherever they arrive. Within the CEAS, asylum directives and the Dublin system act as communicating vessels. As long as there is neither solidarity nor fairness, the Dublin system will be rightfully contested.

## References

- Angenendt, S., Engler, M., Schneider, J. (2013). *European Refugee Policy, Pathways to Fairer Burden-Sharing*. SWP Comments 36, German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Berlin.

- Angenendt, S., Parkes, R. (2010). *A New Impulse for European Asylum Policy? The Potential of the European Asylum Support Office*. SWP Comments 21, German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Berlin.
- Bendel, P. (2014). *The Common European Asylum System: Achievements, Failures, Outlooks and Policy Learning for the EU and Canada*. CETA Policy Brief Series, May 2014, Canada-Europe Transatlantic Dialogue, Ottawa.
- Bitoulas, A. (2014). *Asylum applicants and first instance decisions on asylum applications: 2013*. Eurostat Data in focus 3/2014, Eurostat, Brussels.
- Collett, E. (2014). *Future EU policy development on immigration and asylum: Understanding the challenge*. MPI Europe Policy Brief No. 4, Migration Policy Institute Europe, Brussels.
- Compte, F. (2010). "A New Agency Is Born in the European Union: The European Asylum Support Office", *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 12 (4): 373-405.
- De Bruycker, P., di Bartolomeo, A., Fargues, P. (2013). *Migrants smuggled by sea to the EU: facts, laws and policy options*. MPC Research Report 2013/09, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute, San Domenico di Fiesole.
- European Asylum Support Office – EASO (2014). *Annual Report, Situation of Asylum in the European Union 2013*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- European Commission - EC (2008). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Policy Plan on Asylum, An Integrated Approach to Protection Across the EU*. COM (2008) 360 final, Brussels.
- European Commission – EC/European Migration Network – EMN (2014). *A Descriptive Analysis of the Impacts of the Stockholm Programme 2010-2013*. Brussels.
- European Council (2014). *Presidency Conclusions, European Council 26/27 June 2014*. Brussels.
- European Council on Refugees and Exiles – ECRE (2014). *Mind the Gap: an NGO perspective on challenges to accessing protection in the Common European Asylum System*. Annual Report 2013/2014. Brussels.
- Guild, E., Costello, C., Garlick, M., Moreno-Lax, V., Mouzourakis, M. (2015). *New Approaches, Alternative Avenues and Means of Access to Asylum Procedures for Persons Seeking International Protection*, CEPS Paper in Liberty and Security in Europe No. 77. Brussels.
- Kassar, H., Dourgnon, P. (2014). "The big crossing: illegal boat migrants in the Mediterranean", *European Journal of Public Health*, 24 (Issue suppl 1): 11-15.
- Neumayer, E. (2005). "Asylum Recognition Rates in Western Europe, Their determinants, variation, and lack of convergence", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 49 (1): 43-66.
- Peers, S. (2013). *The second phase of the Common European Asylum System: A brave new world – or lipstick on a pig?* Statewatch Analysis, 8 April 2013.
- Ripoll Servent, A., Trauner, F. (2014). "Do supranational EU institutions make a difference? EU asylum law before and after 'communitarization'", *Journal of European Public Policy*, 21 (8): 1142-1162.
- Spijkerboer, T. (2007). "The human costs of border control", *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 9: 127-139.
- Thielemann, E., Armstrong, C. (2012). *Evaluating the Prospects for Enhanced Solidarity in the Common European Asylum System*. SIEPS European Policy Analysis, Issue 2012:15, Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies, Stockholm.

## COMMON EUROPEAN ASYLUM SYSTEM

Toshkov, D., de Haan, L. (2013). “The Europeanisation of asylum policy: an assessment of the EU impact on asylum applications and recognitions rates”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20 (5): 661-683.