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1. Introduction

1.1 Context

Despite numerous migrant waves in the past two centuries, the current influx of refugees into Europe has been framed by very specific narratives. From humanitarian calls for action to warnings of impending collapse, Europe thinks of itself under a crisis, at a political breaking point that justifies extreme discourses and measures.

Refugee Spaces is an open platform that aims to stimulate debate and demystify the phenomena through examining the evidence rather than speculating on the so-called crisis. Through the mapping and analysis of the openly available data provided by institutional and governmental sources, the platform attempts to create a platform for spatialising the political and security measures designed to contain migration and the mobility of refugees.

Migration and displacement are a constant worldwide phenomenon. Although European governments have portrayed the recent wave of arrivals to the continent as an onslaught, Europe currently hosts only 158% of displaced migrants, with none of its countries being close to the top-hosting countries in the world.

However, Europe remains a highly sought destination, particularly for asylum-seekers. Different countries have different approaches though, which has created a complex dynamic across the continent. Local politics influence larger transnational agreements, while regional treaties are adapted or rejected according to political calculations.

At the continental level, there are a series of agreements and treaties that operate in parallel. These have been superseded or rejected by member states, particularly when negotiating refugee quotas and border control politics. Official statistical analyses have settled on large scale territorial data, with indicators being descriptors per country but rarely per city or urban regions. The visual narrative of the “crisis” is pan-continental, rarely specific or nuanced.

1.2 Place

Migration is transformative and disturbs –through movement and presence– the fabrics of space. And although people are in constant displacement, the urban environments adapt and shift to accommodate these fluxes. Migration leaves a series of legacies, economies of place that become part of a city’s template.

The study argues that gathering evidence to extract the characteristics of these economies is fundamental. With a combination of urban data analysis and localised studies of spatial phenomena, this project aims to uncover the consequences of migration at different urban scales, measuring and visualising its impact on local economies. Although flows and migration data seem to be available, these usually focus on movement trends rather than on the material transformation of space.

Researching distinct economies can help contextualise the legacy of migration, and reframe the logic of analysis. Observing what is transformed at the urban level, what new processes have emerged, what interests acquire importance and what new networks are being built. This should contribute to an informed, evidenced reconstruction of migratory discourses and an opening for further contributions to map the multiple transformations taking place in European cities.

To better understand the impacts of refugees in local urban environments, there should be a constant feedback between larger policies and city-level indicators. This should contribute to open up alternative perspectives on the social, territorial and economic transactions between local citizens, transient populations and policy makers, suggesting to reshape the ways in which the refugee crisis is currently represented and narrated.

It is understood that migration and refuge are in a permanent state of flux, so this platform can only represent a snapshot of a specific period, in part constrained by reliability and availability of the data. Since we started this project, migration has played a more influential impact on political issue across Europe and the rest of the world, becoming sometimes the centrepiece of polarising campaigns and radical partisanship.

Brexit, the surprising success of populist agendas in some important elections across Europe and elsewhere are just a few examples of how migratory issues have been used, and manipulated, for radical
change. Security borders and sovereign intromission have expanded to Africa and Asia; the policing of the Mediterranean is now an established security regime; and humanitarian initiatives, to help refugees in peril, have been often criminalised.

1.3 Scales

The narrative shift about the impact of migration is, necessarily, a simultaneous zooming exercise. It needs to consider the larger continental implications while acknowledging the particularities of a specific city, a specific place. To understand the local scale, we need to frame the larger political contexts.

In the maps of this platform, the project attempts to demonstrate some analysis of the spatial responses and administrative infrastructure to deal with migration and refugees. The maps and analyses emphasise the territorial relationships that link mass movement with urban hotspots in four selected countries: France, Germany, Greece and Italy. Further countries can be added to the platform in the future. At the urban scale, the project identifies urban clusters/regions that are integral to current migration influxes, exploring their different strategies for reception and control.

Refugee Spaces has been funded by The Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG). The project is a collaboration between the Development Planning Unit (DPU), Space Syntax Laboratory (the Bartlett School of Architecture), and the Centre for Advanced Spatial Analysis (CASA). The information presented on this report is not intended to be a conclusion, but a departing point, in an effort to track the spatial and economic impact of migration on European territories. We hope and anticipate that the output of this project could be used as a base for further research and collaborative work on European refugee and migration.
2. Methodology

Starting from a series of questions around the local economies and spatial forms caused by migration, the research attempts to collate fragmented data (contained in official reports, statistical databases, etc.) into a composite analysis. The purpose is to develop a systemic appraisal of information, where different data indicators are selected and turned into visualisations, trying to make sense of some of the larger impacts of migration while attempting to gauge what is actually happening through more specific case-study analysis. The research wishes to help counter misinformation and stereotypes around number of arrivals, asylum requests and refugees in the European cities, as well as around the cost of assistance, hospitality, rescue and securitisation.

Some of the underlying questions and research motivations that have driven the data mapping are related to:

- finding reliable numbers measuring the migration crisis (opposing false counting on one side, without diminishing the importance and relevance of the phenomenon) (RQ1);
- mapping the actual spaces of migration (tracking the phenomenon beyond spatial narratives linked to emergency responses to the crisis –hotspots, camps, etc.– by profiling and comparing the various reception systems in European countries) (RQ2);
- revealing the actual costs of migration (opposing false myth of cost, by showing the investments in the local economy/welfare, as well as unpacking existing hidden costs) (RQ3).

All processed information are freely accessible on a web platform that aims to contribute discussions about current migratory perceptions, while also acting as an analytical source for local policy makers and planners, NGOs, and citizens’ science.

2.1 Output: The platform

Digital data visualisation is certainly becoming an integral dimension of research, offering an opportunity to develop complementary, engaging syntheses of analysis. The frequent use of digital information to describe social, economic and spatial dimensions confirms not only its value, but also its ease of access and open-ended nature. Interactive graphics and data-based sites are constantly shared through multiple social media platforms, spreading information outside of the academic realm and into wider audiences.

There is, however, a risk of diluting the analytical strength of research in lieu of producing reductive visuals that are aesthetically driven. For this reason, this platform should be considered the culmination of what aims to be a comprehensive research rather than an end. Some provocative examples, albeit with different objectives and limitations, can be seen at The Refugee Project or The Migrant Files, where broad research initiatives found in platforms a powerful medium to share their respective findings and conclusions.

Considering the limitations of time and budget, the present research is not aimed at the creation of a new database based on first hand research; it is rather aimed at collating and re-representing existing data currently fragmented in several disparate sources. As stated, the platform will attempt to be a systematic repository of information made available by governments and NGOs. As means of context, the research has reviewed a set of existing web platforms that map migration –however, most of them rely on single-sourced data mapping (ie UNCHR historical dataset on migration flows). Additionally, many platforms show the location and distribution of camps, but none shows the location of the premises where refugees and asylum seekers are accommodated, detained, or in transit.

Some of the differentiating factors around this platform would be:

- putting together cross-country data, so far never shown together beyond national boundaries;
- exploring a continental perspective over the national one to overcome administrative limits within which the refugee crisis has been managed so far;
- focusing on the urban scale, as most existing data at the national level are disaggregated at the urban
(or regional) level. This is a deliberate and intentional effort to move away from abstract centralised representations that can be easily manipulated, and instead get closer to the ‘lived and perceived’ situation offering urban stakeholders a useful tool to inform urban understanding and policy;

- contesting assured ‘facts’, particularly those related to the numbers and costs of the refugee crisis (i.e. the counting of arrivals/border-crossings);

- informing policy on migration through a spectrum of evidence, particularly in relation to how budgets are spent.

In general terms, the platform offers the basis for understanding migration within cities. Rather than simply following the trail of migration, our approach is to look at the impact the phenomenon has on the city. Data can show military, financial and political agreements at the larger continental scale, but it is equally valuable to consider the story of the political legacies in space in these small cities suddenly at the forefront of the migratory discourses and debates.

### 2.2 Input: Data collection

**Data analytics. Relevance and limits**

Counting the bodies and mapping the flows have so far been the main response in terms of knowledge production, in NGO campaigns and policy-relevant research. Data analytics are used by governments and large organisations (Frontex, UNCHR, IOM, etc) to monitor and control movements, arrivals, border crossings and violation, asylum seekers requests and transfers. Media frequently uses data to frame narratives around migration, influencing circuits of power and political discourses, which in turn either raise compassion or exacerbate xenophobia. How data is used and represented influences public perceptions of migration in Europe; hence the need to monitor its collection, aggregation and interpretation.

Considering how central data has become for policy making, its manipulation remains challenging; it reveals only partial aspects of what is a complex reality and promotes quantitative analyses over qualitative ones. As Tazzioli (2015) reminds us, grounding the government of migration on politics of numbers might dehumanise migration and render it a normalised spectacle. By questioning data analytics as a biopolitical tool, this research aims to expose the reality of what EU policy on migration generates.

**Data coverage**

Data and analyses presented in the platform cover different periods of time, depending on data availability and sources. In visualisations that examine the phenomenon looking at Europe by using national data (main sources: Eurostat, UNHCR), the datasets extend from 2010 to 2017. In visualisations that focus on the regional and/or urban level of analysis and which refer to country-specific data for Germany, Greece, France and Italy, the periods covered by the datasets vary and are case-specific.

For the reception systems of Germany, France and Italy the most complete dataset is collected for years 2015 and 2017. The period covered captures the year in which the refugee crisis became a phenomenon in EU. Data from 2015 and 2017 are far more consistent, accurate and complete compared to either 2014 and 2016 – for different reasons. Yearly country data for 2018 are not yet available, and therefore have not been considered at all. As the refugee ‘crisis’ peak was in 2015, data before 2014 in some countries are not available/relevant. For reception in Greece, the most complete dataset available is for year 2017.

The demographic data shown in this report and in the platform include refugees and asylum seekers only. The source for this dataset is UNHCR®. The platform does not offer specific data on origin, age and gender of the refugees. The definitions of reception, detention and expulsion centres are different according to each country and reflect each country’s nomenclature and policy as explained in the case study analysis section. Given the diversity of administrative devices and technical and humanitarian measures aimed at containing migrants, the research wishes to comprehensively include all premises where refugees and asylum seekers are accommodated, detained or in transit. So-called reception centres appear to be designed to aid and shelter, although their “residents” – migrants and asylum seekers – obviously have no option other than remaining there. Most of the centres shown in the platform are permanent ones, open and operative at the time of the research. As a fundamental decision within the scope of the research, the platform does not look at the deaths on the border.

The wider geographical scope of the platform is shown in Figure 2.1 below. Data were collected at four scales (continental, national, regional and urban). At continental, national and regional level, have been a mixture of wider databases and specialised sources; at local scale, information was developed from experiences by citizens, aid workers, local authorities, was obtained through fieldwork observation and interviews. This data was collected in Calais (France),

---
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Figure 2.1. Geographical scope of platform. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.

Figure 2.2. European countries where information has been collected. Source: Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team.
Mannheim (Germany), Athens (Greece), and Brescia (Italy).

This research highlights the urban scale as an important point of view to analyse migration issue, to overcome limitations of regional and state-level data – which currently appear to be the norm for statistical units analysed by Eurostat, states, and other organisations who collect data for policy-making. The Brookings report reminds us, “dominant focus of EU decision has largely been on the immigration policies and perspectives of host countries. As priorities shift to longer-term economic and social integration, there is equal pressing need to focus on the role and actions of host cities. The reality is that refugees disproportionately settle in large cities, where they have better job prospects and social connections. Ultimately, it is in those communities rather than national government that will grapple with accommodating and integrating new arrivals.” (Katz et al. 2016)

Sources

The research is based on a composite multi-source analysis. The information stored in the database is taken from diverse sources: official reports from Interior Ministries, the European Commission and international bodies including the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), reports by civil society (at the international, regional, national or local level), field investigations (interviews, visits, etc.), press articles, etc.

Our main sources for statistical datasets are, so far, Eurostat and UNHCR. The use of different sources to analyse a single variable can present difficulties, for the coherence of calculations done based on data registered to develop the maps. For example, in relation to the same variable, the figures published by the Eurostat agency on the number of refusals of entry per year for a given country sometimes differ from those provided by the Interior Ministry of that country or those gathered by an NGO. While it is sometimes difficult to harmonise different sources, we have agreed on a hierarchy of sources for the database. Regarding the information recorded on the "country" data-sheets (annual figures on arrivals, refugees/ asylum seekers in the centres, etc.), the first sources are figures from European bodies (Eurostat, European Commission, etc.), since in principle efforts to harmonise data have already been undertaken by these bodies. Where these are not available or enough, we use the figures provided by national bodies (interior ministries, etc.).

Data sourcing/collection in Greece, Italy, France and Germany demonstrated that in general:

- Governmental agencies and media use Frontex’ data on border crossings to calculate yearly arrival figures – leading to miscalculations, which in turn leads to the perpetuation of the myth of a “migratory invasion” of the EU. As Sigona and AEDH, amongst others, point out, Frontex figures should be interpreted with much caution for at least two reasons. The first one is that border crossings can be multiple, and therefore it is not a reliable way to account for arrivals; the second one is that the refusals to entry can be multiple, and therefore, again, cannot be a reliable way of capturing numbers of refugees and migrants attempting to entry Europe;

- There is little consistency on the data nature, sampling and collection process in each country, as well as on where the information is stored and the level of accessibility. Data on arrivals are collected at border; data on asylum requests and number of refugees are collected at the border and in the centres. Overall, the level of reliability is low. Data have different time periods; they are used to interpret patterns in migration but they can actually refer to change in border policy. Double counting is possible, as well as undercounting. All the information for each entry in the platform can be traced to its original official source;

- Easiest documents to be accessed are national governments or NGOs statistics on asylum requests and number of refugees per centre, because they are of public records; however, data are not consistent amongst countries. France has the most accurate compilation of information regarding location and governance of the centres – around 700 within the national borders. In Italy we mapped a bit less than 300 centres. Available official data are incomplete, particularly because the centres denominated CAS (around 3,000) do not show in any list, document or report. In Germany we mapped some 100 centres; despite wide accessibility of data, information available proved difficult to be compiled as migration management is highly decentralised (each of the 16 federal states has different measures and diverging policies on how to collect and publish data on reception centres) Thus, across the country there is no comparable information available on reception arrangements (see also country profiles for more details);

- There is a general lack of comprehensive updated
maps that show the location of centres and their evolution over time; while on the contrary there are quite several platforms showing camps, detention centres, flows of migrants and deaths in the Med⁹.

**Mapping phases and indicators**

The mapping process consisted of two stages: a first round of data collection (location, distribution, typology and demographics of centres) in four countries, its collation, systematisation, and spatialisation; and a second round of data collection (national and international budgets for migration, and ‘refugee crisis’; international cost of securitisation; hidden costs) in the same four countries.

Some of the indicators that have been considered so far are:

a) Number of asylum seekers and refugees in EU and in each EU country between 2010-2017 against resident population (sources: UNCHR; OECD; Eurostat);

b) (urban/rural) location, distribution and typology of detention/reception/expulsion centres in four countries (composite sources);

c) demographics - size of the centres by numbers of asylum seekers and refugees in each centre; percentage of refugees in each city, against the % of local population (Eurostat for resident population numbers for regions/departments, multifarious country-specific sources for asylum seekers/refugees numbers at regional/department/urban level);

d) governance of the centres - whether they are run by government or NGOs (multifarious country-specific sources).

In terms of demographics, we have also considered the number of arrivals per year (by sea, land or airport if known); although, as mentioned above, this counting has proved misleading (data gathered by Frontex from each country is unreliable as border-crossings are multiple).

The second round of data collection included indicators around national, international and EU funding for migration and/or refugee crisis per state/region, including humanitarian intervention and emergency, relocation, border policy, integration/hospitality (spending or budget of each reception/detention centre; overall figure per year and per capita/per refugee if known – the latter is particularly relevant to show much goes to the municipality and how much goes to the refugees, as there is a return in the local economy/welfare); European and state funds allocated to border surveillance (patrol, training, creation of border camps and extraterritorial camps), protection and relief (rescue, humanitarian aid, etc).

We acknowledge the above list of metrics implies a level of simplification, as each indicator opens several different issues and questions, particularly given the heterogeneity of migration management in each country. Not all the data gathered is suitable to be spatialized at the urban level – either due to sensitivity of the information (and related ethical implications¹⁰) as well as inherent complexity of disaggregating national data at the small scale (due to limit of research capacity and timeframe allocated to the project).

Fundamental choices have been made on what to represent and what not. To prepare a product as consistent as possible, we decided to represent only data related to asylum seekers, as there exist actual numbers, costs and location. For this reason, where there is a lack of data or inconsistency between sources (in each country), these has been highlighted and gaps were appropriately represented when relevant.

A third round of data collection was planned to cover the local scale and focus on measuring potential indicators which are harder to determine in larger scales (land uses, housing markets, tourism rate variation, flow of donations, job market and unemployment rates, crime rates). The limitations of the project’s budget limited the capacity to analyse fieldwork findings, although preliminary collection of data was done in four localities:

1. Calais-Dunkirk (January 2016)
2. Brescia (February 2016 and 2017)
4. Athens (August 2017)

**Challenges encountered during data collection and ethical concerns**

As already mentioned above, the overall aim of the project is not to create new data based on primary research but rather recombine and manipulate existing one. This has proved difficult under several aspects. Beside the inherent fragmentation of data sources and the heterogeneity of the systems of classification, these type of data sets are in constant flux, and such oscillations are not easily captured.

Selecting the most relevant indicators has allowed us not only to map the phenomenon, but also to generate statistics and compare different situations across countries. However, this synthesis and mapping have limitations. Quantitative work might simplify urban realities and technical criteria not always matches the complexity of practices carried out in smaller scales. For this reason,
the website considers essential to include descriptive and qualitative documents that allow, as far as possible, to add information layer that is often missing in maps and graphs. Furthermore, the use of data analytics raises several questions related to the responsible management of personal information, especially of vulnerable groups, such as refugees.

- Data overlooks singularity and specificity. Showing data around numbers of refugees at the border or in the centres bears the risk to normalise a phenomenon, decreasing its political relevance. For this reason, data analysis should be complemented by fieldwork and analysis of qualitative data;

- Tracking down the location of the centres for reception or detention, can expose refugees to risk of being persecuted. To avoid this, and as a fundamental measure, the exact address of the centre is not disclosed in any maps shown in the platform.

**Visible and invisible economies**

One of the more sensitive challenges of establishing a transparent methodological approach and data collection strategy for the project - and eventually, for an open access digital platform - has been to consider the ethical implications of the use of ‘visible’ and ‘invisible’ data sources. The comparative analysis of ‘visible’ and ‘invisible’ data has led to the observation that there may be a range of criteria which officialise or discount a crossing/settlement status, some of which are stated below:

- The provision of fake identification documents;

- Involvement of smuggling cartels in the flow of migrants;

- Multiple counting of the same asylum seeker while crossing more than one European border as multiple entries into the EU zone;

- Circumventing border control and application procedures upon arriving at the first point of entry into the EU zone.

The fear of being registered by border control officers in a country which may not constitute as the destination of migrants has led to certain data, such as the ones covering the population and density of the Jungle refugee camp in Calais, France, to be inaccurate. In circumstances such as these, grassroots organisations and charities have had higher success rate at gaining trust within the refugee communities and thus, have been able to collect more accurate data regarding a closer approximation of population, age and gender, educational background, aspirations and finally, experiences of violence in the host countries. This is data which we have tried to reflect on considering the research, despite not confirming the validity of either datasets or sources.
Refugees: Persons recognized as refugees under the 1951 UN Convention/1969 Protocol, the 1969 OAU Convention, the 1951 Statute, and the 1969 OAU Convention, in accordance with the UNHCR Statute, persons granted a complementary form of protection and those granted temporary protection. In the absence of Government figures, UNHCR has estimated the refugee population in 24 industrialized countries based on 10 years of individual refugee recognition.

Asylum seekers: Persons whose application for asylum or refugee status is pending at any stage in the asylum procedure. An asylum-seeker is someone whose request for sanctuary has yet to be processed.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. How many refugees are ‘officially’ hosted in our cities? What is the percentage against the local population? What is the percentage against the ‘arrival’ numbers? How are they accounted for? What is the actual cost of protection? and of securitisation? who is paying for it? how is the bill split and what is the impact on local economy? how does it impact on the urban territory and its accessibility? are local businesses and land values changing? what is it the effect on space? how is it reflected in urban planning?

2. www.therefugeeproject.org

3. www.themigrantsfiles.com


5. The platform also follows UNHCR definitions:

Refugees: total number of refugees and people in refugee-like situations, where:

• Refugees: Persons recognized as refugees under the 1951 UN Convention/1969 Protocol, the 1969 OAU Convention, in accordance with the UNHCR Statute, persons granted a complementary form of protection and those granted temporary protection. In the absence of Government figures, UNHCR has estimated the refugee population in 24 industrialized countries based on 10 years of individual refugee recognition.

• People in refugee-like situations: This category is descriptive in nature and includes groups of persons who are outside their country or territory of origin and who face protection risks similar to those of refugees, but for whom refugee status has, for practical or other reasons, not been ascertained.

Asylum seekers: Persons whose application for asylum or refugee status is pending at any stage in the asylum procedure. An asylum-seeker is someone whose request for sanctuary has yet to be processed.


“Thus, for 2016, Frontex indicates that migratory pressure on the EU external borders remained important, with the detection of over half a million irregular border-crossing (511,371). This is admittedly a decrease of 72% compared to 2015 (1,8 million), but for the Agency, the level of risk is still high, and superior to that of 2010 (104,060) or 2014 (282,933)…. However, such data overestimates the number of migrants concerned, as Frontex itself acknowledges when it states that the 511,371 irregular border-crossing correspond, in reality, to the arrival of around 382,000 migrants on the European soil (which is somewhat higher than the International Organisation for Migration’s estimate: about 364,401 in 2016[1]). This number is indeed misleading as it does not represent persons, but border crossings. Therefore, the same person may be counted several times, for example if he or she has been detected as arriving on the Greek islands, and then another time as entering Hungary or Croatia. Thus, Frontex continues to base all its analysis on the number of border crossings, rather than that of arrivals…..”

8. Furthermore, since last year, “the accounting of attempts to ‘irregularly’ enter the EU no longer focuses on the number of persons refused entry, but on the number of refusals of entry issued at the external borders. A better way of ‘capturing’ the number representing the workload for border control authorities”, according to Frontex. However, the same person may be refused entry several times, at different borders, or even at the same border when migrants are Obstinate in their projects… Accordingly, the figure put forward by Frontex of 206,656 refusals of entry issued by Member States in 2016, which would represent an official increase of 49% compared to 2015 is, here again, overstated – but without us being able to measure of how much!“

9. Few examples:


10. See for instance the disclosure of addresses of centres. See controversy around the mapping of emergency shelters in Germany from 2015. It was a map apparently created by a group of neo-Nazi, eventually deleted by Google, as activist feared that this could lead to more attacks on the homes of asylum seekers. http://www.dw.com/en/google-pulls-controversial-map-showing-german-refugee-homes/a-18592310 http://www.dw.com/en/google-pulls-controversial-map-displaying-refugee-homes-causes-a-stir-in-germany/a-18595749. Same in UK, there were attacks on homes of resettled refugees because their doors were red and fairly identifiable https://www.google.co.uk/amp/s/amp.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jan/20/asylum-seekers-north-east-claim-identifiable-red-doors-houses
3. Reframing the initial hypothesis

The first months of data collection, mapping and analysis have shown the disparate means European governments use to measure migratory trends. Having identified some of the main sources of valuable data, some initial conclusions can be drawn:

**RQ 1) finding reliable numbers measuring the migration crisis (opposing false counting on one side, without diminishing the importance and relevance of the phenomenon);**

1. Looking at the data on asylum seekers in Europe, Middle East and North Africa, there is an exponential increase between 2010-15. Germany, Sweden and Italy are the European countries with the highest number of asylum seekers in 2015. Sweden – with 157,000 asylum seekers in 2015, around 15 per 1000 residents - is a highly sought-after destination. Germany has practiced an open borders policy between 2015 and 2016, with a consequent peak of asylum requests (in 2015 around 420,600). Italy is a port of entry and usually a transit country, which justifies the relatively lower numbers (60,000 in 2015) but suffers from any changes in the border policy of other EU member states. Curiously enough, Greece has seen the number of asylum seekers halving between 2010 and 2015.

2. Looking at the data on refugees in Europe, there is an increase between 2010-15; though, if calculated against countries such as Lebanon and Jordan, the increase is rather small. The relative number is increasingly smaller if calculated against the resident population, especially comparing European and Middle East countries. Between 2010-15 Italy has seen an increase of refugee population of around 122%; while Turkey of around 32,200 % (the period is before the EU-Turkey deal).

3. Frontex acts as the official body currently providing overall figures on arrivals. Frontex data sets are collected from single EU member states and are based on ‘illegal border crossings’ or rejections to entry (by land and sea). As multiple border crossings in Europe are common, we assume multiple counting over one individual occurs repeatedly; therefore, the overall figure of “yearly arrivals” offered by Frontex is not necessarily accurate.

**RQ 2) mapping the actual spaces of migration (tracking the phenomenon beyond spatial narratives linked to emergency responses to the crisis by comparing reception systems in European countries);**

4. The EU system of reception, detention, and expulsion is a complex system of humanitarianism and control. Detention and reception centres alike are systems for the containment and control of refugees and asylum seekers. The very definition of reception and detention is not consistent across countries nor within the same states. The four countries analysed present great diversity of administrative devices and technical and humanitarian measures aimed at containing migrants; the research has attempted to comprehensively include all premises where refugees and asylum seekers are accommodated, detained or in transit, without clear cut distinction between detention or reception.

5. France has the most accurate compilation of information regarding location and governance of the centres – around 700 within the national borders. In Italy we mapped a bit less than 300 centres. Available official data are incomplete, particularly because the centres denominated CAS (around 3,000) do not show in any list, document or report. In Germany we mapped some 188 centres; despite wide accessibility of data, information available proved difficult to be compiled as migration management is highly decentralised.

6. The EU system of detention is not limited to EU territory and funding has gradually shifted from humanitarian response to border securitisation and externalisation. Large sums have been allocated to Libya and Turkey following agreements in 2016 and 2017 to set up and manage centres to intercept and detain migrants along the main migration routes outside the geographical territory of Europe. Accordingly, the mapping of the existing centres should not be limited to the European ones.

7. The distribution of the centres across urban and rural areas shows different trends in each country. Generally, hotspots, detention or expulsion centres are located close to (land or sea) border. The reception system in France, Germany and Italy is a “diffused” one with a high number of facilities located outside large urban zones (with the exception of Paris).
Figure 3.1. Number of asylum seekers: increase/decrease in 2010 and 2015. Source: UNHCR; Basemap: GISCO Eurostat (http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/gisco/geodata). Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.

Figure 3.2. Number of refugees: increase/decrease in 2010 and 2015. Source: UNHCR; Basemap: GISCO Eurostat. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.
8. The system of governance and management of the reception and detention system in the four countries shows a high degree of heterogeneity. Majority of the centres in France, where we have the most complete information, are run by the Immigration office (OFII) and Prefecture; and a significant number by local government and NGOs. Conversely, in Italy most locations are managed by Prefecture, local municipality and NGOs, while only a small number is run directly by the Ministry of Interior (hotspots and detention centres). In Greece most locations are run by the Hellenic Army and Ministry of Migration Policy (MoMP). In Germany, most of the mapped centres are run by the Department of Interior and Sport; initial reception centres are managed by federal states, while decentralised accommodations are run by the municipality.

9. The reception system counts on multifarious solutions for the accommodation of refugees and asylum seekers, not all of which are part of the "official" system of reception run by Ministries, prefectures and NGOs - from the occupied buildings in Athens and Rome to Airbnb shared accommodations for refugees. It is not uncommon that the profitability of the hospitality business (Abrogast, 2016) results in human right abuse; cases are documented in Italy (Amnesty International, 2016) and Germany. Both in Germany and Italy, the information about who runs the centres remains opaque and there is no nationwide data on the way centres are operationalised.

RQ 3) revealing the actual costs of migration (opposing false myth of cost, by showing the investments in the local economy/welfare, as well as unpacking existing hidden costs);

1. Securitisation and externalisation of borders and related military operation have the highest relative impact on the cost of migration – highly exceeding resources allocated to humanitarian response. Since its creation in 2005, the Frontex’ budget has been steadily increasing. From 20 million euros in 2006, its annual budget reached 90 million euros in 2010, and 143 million in 2015. Today, it is of 300 million euros. Last September EU decided to substantially increase the resources allocated to Frontex by its integration into the new European Corps of Border Guards. Thus, its workforce has been doubled and a new intervention force of 1,500 border guards, capable of being rapidly deployed in the event of an “emergency” at the EU external borders, made available. The spectacular growth in budget and
staff of the agency runs in parallel with an increase of the death toll at the borders (Perkowski, 2012).

2. According to a study from the Transnational Institute, the business of border security - estimated of 15 billion euros in 2015, should be doubled by 2022 (Akkerman, 2016). The funds provided by the EU to member States to manage returns reached 674 million Euros between 2008-13 (The Migrant Files). The cost of detention is calculated differently in each country. For instance, Italy between 2005-11 spent 1 billion on detention (Lunaria, 2013). Comparing the public funds for reception and social integration with those for securitisation, the ratio is 1:2.

3. One of the inconsistent aspects of migration which affect the cost and economy around migration and seems to differ in quantity from one European space to the other, is the privatisation of refugee related services. This is one of the ways in which a state can reduce its costs in providing housing, security, detention or legal aid to asylum seekers. Instead, for-profit companies are invited to bid on the jobs, providing lower cost alternatives, and naturally averting higher costs which are incurred to the state if public servants perform the same tasks and duties of care.

4. The economic contribution of volunteers, small donors remains an essential part of a diffuse system of solidarity (or small-scale humanitarian intervention) that is hard to quantify. Some organisations started small and eventually grew during the “crisis”. Helprefugee is a charity that operated/s in Calais and Lesvos (Athens). It raised over £2 million in funding and provide £1m of new donated goods. The group has also provided significant funding and support to other volunteer groups working in France and Greece, including MDM.

5. Looking at refugees’ per capita budgets, housing, food and welfare cost around 12,000 euros per refugee per year (with slight variation according to each country). The budget spent by each government is somebody else’s income (from construction companies building refugee shelters, to language schools delivering classes and private landlords renting flats) which means there is a return in terms of income.

6. Governments have poor information in terms of how much they are paying out in benefits for refugees on the one hand and receiving by way of taxes and VAT on the other. Recent studies are demonstrating how refugees provide a net contribution to the economy through the taxes they pay over time, countering the notion that they are a drag on the economy due to a reliance on social benefits.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

Number and type of mapped locations

Italy, 874 locations mapped, c.2017
- Centre for identification and expulsion (Cie)
- Emergency reception centre (CAS)
- First reception centre (CPA)
- Hotspot
- System for the Protection of Asylum Seekers and Refugees (SPRAR)

Greece, 54 locations mapped, c.2017
- Accommodation site for Asylum Seekers
- Collective Shelter
- Emergency response site
- N/A
- RIC
- Transit Site

Germany, 180 locations mapped, c.2016
- BAMF (Ministry for Migration and Refugees) Reception Centres (Ankunftszentren)
- First reception (Erstaufnahmeeinrichtungen, EAE)
- Refugee/Asylum seekers housing
- Refugee/Asylum seekers integration

France, 775 locations mapped, c.2015
- Administrative Detention Center (CRA)
- Administrative Detention Facilities
- Emergency Accommodation for Asylum Seekers (HUDA)
- Employment and integration center
- First reception
- Information and Orientation Office
- Integration
- Legal assistance for detainees
- One-stop asylum seeker service (GUDA)
- Provisional Center for Reception and Insertion (CPAI)
- Reception Center for Asylum Seekers (CADA)
- Reception Center for Asylum Seekers (CADA) and Temporary Accommodation Center (CPH)
- Reception and Orientation Center (CAO)
- Reception facility for isolated foreign minors (Dispositif MIE)
- Reception for asylum seekers
- Reception for asylum seekers, housing, integration
- Reception for asylum seekers, housing, integration, RELOREF
- Reception for asylum seekers, temporary accommodation
- Reception for asylum seekers, temporary accommodation, housing
- Reception for asylum seekers, temporary accommodation, integration
- Reception for asylum seekers, temporary accommodation, integration, RELOREF
- Reception for asylum seekers, temporary accommodation, transit, integration
- Temporary accommodation
- Transit center

Figure 3.4. Number and type of mapped locations in Germany (2015), France (2015), Italy (2015) and Greece (2017). Note: detention centres in Greece (7) are not included. CAO in France opened in 2015, to support the evacuation process of asylum seekers from Calais. Hotspots in Italy were introduced in 2015, and opened in 2016. Arrival Centres (Ankunftszentren) in Germany opened in 2015; Special reception centres (besondere Aufnahmeeinrichtungen) were introduced in 2016. Source: Multifarious (see table for centres); Basemap: GiSCO Eurostat. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.
Number and type of mapped locations

Italy, 874 locations mapped, c.2017
- Centre for identification and expulsion (Cie)
- Emergency reception centre (CAS)
- First reception centre (CPA)
- Hotspot
- System for the Protection of Asylum Seekers and Refugees (SPRAR)

Greece, 54 locations mapped, c.2017
- Accommodation site for Asylum Seekers
- Collective Shelter
- Emergency response site
- N/A
- RIC
- Transit Site

Germany, 180 locations mapped, c.2016
- BAMF (Ministry for Migration and Refugees) Reception Centres (Ankunftszentren)
- First reception (Erstaufnahmeeinrichtungen, EAE)
- Refugee/Asylum seekers housing
- Refugee/Asylum seekers integration

France, 775 locations mapped, c.2015
- Administrative Detention Center (CRA)
- Administrative Detention Facilities
- Emergency Accommodation for Asylum Seekers (HUDA)
- Employment and integration center
- First reception
- Information and Orientation Office
- Integration
- Legal assistance for detainees
- One-stop asylum seeker service (GUDA)
- Provisional Center for Reception and Insertion (CPAI)
- Reception Center for Asylum Seekers (CADA)
- Reception Center for Asylum Seekers (CADA) and Temporary Accommodation Center (CPH)
- Reception and Orientation Center (CAO)
- Reception facility for isolated foreign minors (Dispositif MIE)
- Reception for asylum seekers
- Reception for asylum seekers, housing, integration
- Reception for asylum seekers, housing, integration, RELOREF
- Reception for asylum seekers, integration
- Reception for asylum seekers, temporary accommodation
- Reception for asylum seekers, temporary accommodation, housing
- Reception for asylum seekers, temporary accommodation, integration
- Reception for asylum seekers, temporary accommodation, integration, RELOREF
- Reception for asylum seekers, temporary accommodation, transit, integration
- Temporary accommodation
- Transit center

Detention centres in Greece (7) are not included. CAO in France opened in 2015, to support the evacuation process of asylum seekers from Calais. Hotspots in Italy were introduced in 2015, and opened in 2016. Arrival Centres (Ankunftszentren) in Germany opened in 2015; Special reception centres (besondere Aufnahmeeinrichtungen) were introduced in 2016. Source: Multifarious (see table for centres); Basemap: GISCO Eurostat. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.
Total number of mapped locations = 1,883
urban centres = 663
large urban zones = 299
rural areas = 921

Spatial units:
- urban centres (cities and greater cities)
- large urban zones (functional urban areas)
- rural areas

Figure 3.5. Locations of centres in urban centres, large urban zones, and rural areas. Source: Multifarious (different for each country); Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.
Total number of mapped locations = 1,883
urban centres = 663
large urban zones = 299
rural areas = 921

Spatial units
- urban centres (cities and greater cities)
- large urban zones (functional urban areas)
- rural areas
Figure 3.6. Authority/governance in mapped reception/detention locations. Red to blue is based on the number of locations that a governance body is appearing to manage (the higher the number of centres associated with a name, the warmer the colour). Hotspots in Italy are run by "officials of the EU Border Agency (Frontex), the EU Police Cooperation Agency (Europol), the EU Juridical Cooperation A golden network of hotspots for the European Commission/Asylum Support Office (EASO) besides other bodies indicated in the map. Source: Multifarious; Basemap: GISCO Eurostat. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.
Mapped reception locations: Authority & governance

Italy, 874 locations mapped, c.2017
- Police
- Police & NGO
- Regional authority & NGO
- State authority
- multifarious

Greece, 54 locations mapped, c.2017
- NGO
- Private
- Regional authority
- Regional authority & NGO
- State authority & NGO
- State military
- State military & NGO
- multifarious
- not available

Germany, 180 locations mapped, c.2016
- NGO
- Private
- Regional authority
- State & Regional authority
- State authority
- not available

France, 775 locations mapped, c.2015
- Police & NGO
- Regional authority & NGO
- State & Regional authority
- State and Regional authority & NGO
- not available

Governance body is appearing to manage (the higher the number of centres associated with a name, the warmer the colour). Hotspots in Agency (Eurojust), and the European Asylum Support Office (EASO)** (Tazzioli, 2015) besides other bodies indicated in the map. Source:
Declared capacity for mapped locations
Italy, Greece, Germany, France
Information not available
1 - 100
101 - 500
501 - 1,500
1,501 - 2,000
2,001 - 3,500
3,501 - 5,073

Figure 3.7. Capacities of mapped location. Source: Multifarious; Basemap: GiSCO Eurostat. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team.
Declared capacity for mapped locations

Italy, Greece, Germany, France

- Information not available
- 1 - 100
- 101 - 500
- 501 - 1,500
- 1,501 - 2,000
- 2,001 - 3,500
- 3,501 - 5,073

Figure 3.7. Capacities of mapped location. Source: Multifarious; Basemap: GISCO Eurostat. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.
Annex 1. Case study profiles

Key points

**Italy**
Multifarious system of reception and detention: a variety of centres, dormitories, and shared accommodations;
Different spatial arrangements, living conditions, temporal and legal requirements and governance;
Set up to respond to short-term emergencies, not to refugee situations that drag on for years and decades;
Fragmented, dysfunctional, poorly integrated;
Fragmentation leads to informality and illegality;
Informational opacity;
Privatisation and economisation of refuge;
Diffused hospitality: SPRAR (System for Protection of Asylum Seekers and Refugees).

**France**
Local charities such as L’Auberge des Migrants aiding the operation and goods distribution to informal settlements along the coast (Jungle in Calais, Liniere refugee camp in Dunkirk);
Infrastructure ramified to cater for various age groups, collective and individual application cases for emergency cases and long-terms livelihoods;
Dispute regarding the cost of border security and control, and reception of migrants/ asylum seekers between FR and UK;
Informal settlements established along the ports of Calais and Dunkirk;
Difference of approach on local level from various prefectures towards the establishment of informal settlements, such as the legality of the Dunkirk Liniere camp and the illegality of the Calais jungle with direct support/ lack of from local mayors.

**Germany**
Since 2015 new laws, essentially immobilising asylum seekers;
Shortfall of the distribution (quota) system: burden on city-states;
No coherence between the Federal States leads to unequal treatment of asylum seekers;
Without common policy around reception centres, it is not possible to generalise the actual reception situations, especially regarding the number of facilities, capacity and occupancy;
Privatisation of management of reception centres;
Federal system makes it extremely difficult to access coherent data; across the country there is no comparable information available on the specific conditions of reception.

**Greece**
Since 2012: patterns of arrivals and entry into the European Union have shifted from the Greek-Turkish land borders to the sea borders;
In 2011 Greece’s asylum system diagnosed of ‘systemic deficiencies’, due to non-existent pre-established reception and accommodation facilities;
During the unprecedented influx in summer 2015 and beginning of 2016 numerous emergency responses centres are opened (many are temporary);
In 2015 a systemic recording, reporting and monitoring of site profiles was difficult;
Close the camps by end of 2018 (‘urbanisation of refuge’);
Squatting - supported by the Greek anarchist movement – provides shelter and services.
Figure 3.8. Italy First and second line of reception. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.

First Aid and Assistance → CPSA Since 2006 First Aid Reception Centres → HOTSPOTS 2015

First line reception regional hubs → CARA CDA Centres for the Reception of Asylum Seekers → CAS Since 2013 Emergency Accommodation Centres

Second line reception → SPRAR Since 2002 System for the Protection of Asylum Seekers and Refugees

Figure 3.9. France Asylum procedure. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.

Stage 1
Pre-reception

Stage 2
Identification - Registration

Stage 3
Orientation

Stage 2A
Identification & control

Stage 2B
Fingerprint for Dublin Procedure

Stage 2C
Qualification for Procedure

Information for asylum seekers
Appointment with Prefecture
Information on application form
Help in completing the application
Domiciliation

Recovery of identity details
Creation of personal record
Control check
Creation of AGDREF number (management of foreign nationals in France)

Asylum Seekers details
Collection of fingerprints
DUBLIN interview
Referral to the responsible Member state via DUBLINET

Asylum Seekers details
Qualifications for the procedure
Issuing of certificate for asylum application
Update of records of AGDREF

Reception of Asylum Seekers
Verification of the Offer of Accommodation (OPC)
Acceptance/rejection of OPC
Search for accommodation in CADA/HUDA

Figure 3.10. Germany Reception system. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.

Federal State

Municipality

Initial Reception

Provisional Accommodation
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Max 6 months

Until the end of the asylum procedure

As far and as long as necessary

Initial reception centres (LEA and BEA)

Accommodation in communal facilities

Independence from social housing benefits
Italy
The assistance and reception system in Italy is multifarious and in constant transformation due to (often contradictory) law reforms, economic factors (lack of funds) and oscillating political consensus. It has been conceived as a system to cope with emergency; it is therefore poorly integrated, and overly inadequate to respond to real needs. Although it has been defined as a system that produces legality and informality, there are some positive aspects, particularly related to the programme called SPRAR (Sistema Protezione Richiedenti Asilo e Rifugiati, System for Protection and Integration of Asylum Seekers and Refugees).

There exist different generations of centres for reception, detention and expulsion; nomenclature is not particularly clear due to changes across time; one centre might have changed function and target multiple times, and as a consequence also its name. The same physical building can appear in different documents under a different name, making not an easy task to track back its evolution. Data are fragmented into different sources; there is no one single official document that offers a holistic overview and mapping of the whole reception system in the country. Such lack of data, might be either due to deliberate non-disclosure policy and informational opacity or simply lack of resources to allocate to data management. Not only the system of assistance and reception in Italy is a very old one, it is also currently witnessing a booming in terms of new structures due to the budgets for refugees that are attracting new ‘refugee businesses’.

**First and second line of reception**

- **First assistance facilities: former CPSA and Hotspots** - run by government, local and international NGOs. They are centres for preemptive detention, located close to the arrival route (central Mediterranean route);

- **First-line reception facilities** - including first reception centres (CPA), regional hubs (CARA) and temporary centres (CAS)- run by government and local cooperatives/charities/private sector;

- **Second-line reception facilities** (SPRAR) - run by the National Association of Italian Municipalities (ANCI), local NGOs and cooperatives. This system is called ‘diffused hospitality’. Instead of being concentrated in few overcrowded centres, small groups of refugees are accommodated in urban and peri-urban areas;

- **Persons remain in first assistance centres and hotspots only for the purposes of undergoing identification and fingerprinting procedures, before being transferred to first-line or second-line reception centres**;

- **If no places are available in first-line or second-line reception centres, persons are accommodated in temporary facilities, also known as emergency reception centres, or CAS. Majority of refugees and asylum seekers are hosted in CAS**;

- **The system includes also expulsion centres (CIE).**

---

**Figure AI.1 Reception, detention and expulsion centres. Italy. Source: Ministry of Interior, ANCI, UNCHR, Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.**
In 2015 there were: six hotspots (two of them were never opened), and around 44 government-run centres, including:

- 13 CARA (Centri Accoglienza Richiedenti Asilo / Centre for the Reception of Asylum Seekers);
- 24 CPA (Centri di Prima Accoglienza / Centre for First Reception);
- one CPSA (Centro Accoglienza Primo Soccorso / First Aid and Reception Centre); and
- five CIE (Centri Identificazione ed Espulsione / Identification and Expulsion Centre).

They were almost homogeneously distributed on the national territory – with a clear prevalence for the southern part of the country (closer to the Mediterranean route) and the large urban areas (such as Milan and Rome). Following the 'Italian Roadmap' (p.4) Some of these centres will be slowly replaced by 'regional hubs'.

The number of CIE (expulsion centres) has been slowly reduced over time due to inhumane conditions. According to the last approved reform, CIE will be replaced by CPT (Centro di Permanenza per il Rimpatrio / Centre for Deportation).

Starting from 2013, a number of temporary centres have been opened. In 2017 there were around 3090 CAS (Centri Accoglienza Straordinario / Emergency Accommodation Centre) according to official counting. However, there is no one single complete list of where these CAS are located nor how many guests they accommodate. Interestingly enough, there is no obligation by law to disclose information around the CAS.

Since 2002, SPRAR (Sistema Protezione Richiedenti Asilo e Rifugiati / System of Protection for Asylum Seekers and Refugees) host small groups of asylum seekers in shared accommodations. It is currently present in 95 cities and towns. There is political consensus around the possibility to transform the SPRAR into a national policy in order to replace all other existing reception systems.

Several reports, including Amnesty International report (2016), highlight that the condition in most of the government-run centres are not good. Overcrowding, long waiting, lack of services, and human rights violations are well documented.

Figure AI.2. Reception, detention and expulsion centres, Italy. 2015. Source: Ministry of Interior, ANCI, UNCHR. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.
According to MSF (2016), the Italian hosting system is highly insufficient and ultimately a system that produces expulsion, illegality and informality. Despite for many refugees Italy is a transit country, the MSF report reveals that every 100,000 refugees and asylum seekers who are hosted in government-run structures, there are almost 10,000 who live in precarious informal settlements close to urban areas without any access to basic health care. Squatted buildings and makeshifts camps of refugees are around 18 in an equivalent number of cities and towns, according to the survey conducted by MSF. These people are either awaiting to submit the asylum request, or have just been rejected their request, or have never applied because they are not willing to remain in Italy but they have not yet found enough resources to leave. Also those who are currently hosted in the centres or part of protection schemes could potentially end up in the informal settlements, if the asylum request is unsuccessful or they cannot afford a house in the market.

**Authority/ Governance**

**Key points:**

- Majority of centres are run by the prefecture, local municipality and NGOs; central government-run centres are expulsion centres and the first line reception system;
- Hotspots are run by officials of the EU Border Agency (Frontex), the EU Police Cooperation Agency (Europol), the EU Juridical Cooperation Agency (Eurojust), and the European Asylum Support Office (EASO);
- Privatisation trend in the management of the centres, also common to other countries in Europe; multinational companies such as GESPA (Gestion Etablissements Pénitentiers Services Auxiliaires) run centres in France and Italy;
- Hospitality has become a profitable business, leading to low standards and exploitation. Local charities such as Ecofficina Educational Onlus running at least three reception centres (hosting 3000 people) with an income of 10 ml euros/year, are currently investigated for human right abuse;

**Conditional hospitality**

Currently, the only system that has the potential to promote integration and inclusivity, is the SPRAR. Elements of innovation include:

a) policy shift (the SPRAR could potentially replace government-run temporary reception centres);

---

**Table AI.1** Reception, detention and expulsion centres. Italy. 2015. Number of structures and capacity. Source: Ministry of Interior, ANCI. Bartlett Materialisation Grant (BMG) team Elaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> ANCI 2016; Min Int 2015, <em>from 2016</em>*</td>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> ANCI 2016; Hotspot and CPA start in 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARA Centro Accoglienza Richiedenti Asilo / Centre for the Reception of Asylum Seekers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS Centro Accoglienza Straordinario / Emergency centre</td>
<td>3090</td>
<td>76683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE Centro Identificazione Espulsione / Identification and Expulsion Centre</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA Centro Prima Accoglienza / Centre for First Reception</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTSPOT</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRAR Sistema Protezione Richiedenti Asilo e Rifugiati / System for the Protection of Asylum Seekers and Refugees</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>30345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3769</td>
<td>114706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) wide urban implications as it builds upon an idea of ‘diffused hospitality’ where small groups of refugees and asylum seekers are hosted in flats and houses in close contact with local communities and encouraged to interact with them and with the city as a whole;

c) large impact on the local economy, as the ‘budget for refugees’ covers for rent, language classes, social care, therefore creating employment to sustain the local community;

d) decentralisation, as the implementation is delegated to the municipalities (which in turn have to create political and civic consensus around the implementation).

However, the programme lacks of integration with other existing policy and other reception systems. As highlight by MSF (2016), it creates expulsion, illegality and informalty; finally, it might generate double standards as it pursue services exclusive to refugees. Critique to urban dispersal policy is well documented in the literature.

**Timeline major events:**

2013, 3rd October: 368 people die close to Lampedusa shores

2013: the discourse of “illegal immigration” is abandoned; the “illegal migrant” becomes “refugee”;

2013: Mare nostrum (humanitarian and military operation run by Italy) is launched; “the scene of rescue” starts;

2014: Triton (military operation run by EU/Frontex) replaces Mare Nostrum

2014: The charter of Lampedusa is written and signed www.lacartadilampedusa.org

2015, 18th April: at least 700 people die in the Med attempting to reach Italy

[2015, 2nd September: Alan Kurdi is found dead on the shore of Bodrum, in Turkey]

2015: Operation Sophia (EU/Frontex) is launched

2016, November: NGOs accused of collusion with smugglers in rescue operations in the Med

2017, February: EU-Libya deal signed

2017: ENI (Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi) attempts to reopen oil wells in Libya

2017, February: New Immigration Law on CIE (Centro Identificazione Espulsioni);

2017, August: new policy on search and rescue in SAR area; NGOs forced to sign over threat by Libya coast guard

2017, August: new Italian ambassador in Egypt (was called back after Regeni’s death)

**Sources and References**

**Reports**


Commissione Straordinaria per la tutela e la promozione diritti umani (2016) Rapporto sui CIE in Italia (Feb 2016) [http://www.asylumineurope.org/sites/default/files/resources/36](http://www.asylumineurope.org/sites/default/files/resources/36)
Websites (accessed 04/06/2017)


http://www.interno.gov.it/it/temi/immigrazione-e-asilo

http://www.libertacivilimmigrazione.dlci.interno.gov.it/it

http://www.sprar.it/

http://www.libertacivilimmigrazione.dlci.interno.gov.it/it/documentazione/statistica/i-numeri-dellasilo (sea arrivals)

http://www.libertacivilimmigrazione.dlci.interno.gov.it/it/documentazione/statistica/cruscotto-statistico-giornaliero


Maps


Policy documents (selection)


http://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/eli/id/2017/04/18/17G00059/sg

http://www.interno.gov.it/it/notizie/e-legge-discreto-minniti-sul-contrast-immigrazione-illegale

NOTES

2. See Legge 13 aprile 2017, n.46 - Conversione in legge, con modificazioni, del decreto-legge 17 febbraio 2017, n.13
4. See Report “Hotspot Italia. Come le politiche dell’Unione Europea portano a violazione dei diritti di rifugiati e migranti”
France
Reception process and centres

The efforts to mobilize and establish an organised system for the reception of migrants in France began in response to the influx of refugees due to the coup d’état in Chile in September 1973.1 The national reception system (Dispositif National d’Accueil - DNA) for asylum seekers operates with two processes:

- **Le dispositif de premier accueil**: A network of information, guidance and support services for asylum seekers which is managed by the French Immigration and Integration Office (OFII) since 2010, or by operators (private or public organisations) liaising with OFII under the supervision of the Ministry of Interior.

- **Le dispositif d’hébergement**: Accommodation arrangements for asylum seekers in reception centres (CADA). Complementary to this process, is the provision for emergency accommodation for asylum seekers (les dispositifs d’urgence) in emergency centres (AT-SA and HUDA).

Between 2008 and 2012, the number of asylum seekers in France increased by 73%, putting pressure on a reform process of the French asylum policy. The first meeting of the national consultative committee took place on 15 July 2013 and led to the adoption of Act No. 2015-925 of 29 July 2015.3 This Act provisioned the strengthening of the national reception system (DNA) network by increasing the significantly accommodation capacities of both regular and emergency reception centres.4 Since the reform, CADAs have created their own management and quality control tools, with a view to improve their service and track their costs through budget reports. The policy of increasing the accommodation capacity for asylum seekers continued in 2016 at unprecedented pace. As of December 31 2016, the cumulative capacity of CADA, AT-SA and HUDA was 54,145 compared to 43,895 on the same date in 2015.5

The Code on the Entry and Residence of Foreigners and Asylum Seekers (Le Code de l’Entrée et du Séjour des Étrangers et des Demandeurs d’Asile - CESEDA) (adopted in 2004) outlines the reception process for all foreigners over 18 years of age who are admitted for the first time to stay in France. ‘Refugee’ and ‘stateless person’ status is granted by the French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons (OFPRa), under the judicial control of the National Asylum Court (Cour nationale de droit d’asile – CND4). Both legal and illegal immigrants can seek asylum by submitting an application to OFPRa. In order to be eligible for submitting an application, asylum seekers are required to register themselves at the ‘one-stop asylum seeker welcome service’ (GUDA). GUIDAs were established as part of the reform process. Since January 1 2016, there are 39 GUIDAs. The application is reviewed by a prefecture officer and then assessed by an OFII officer. The Prefecture carries out a process of identifying the country responsible for considering the asylum application in accordance with Regulation no. 604/2013 of the European Parliament and Council of 26 June 2013, called the Dublin III Regulation. In the case whereby France is identified as responsible country to process the application, then a confirmation of asylum application is issued (the asylum seeker attestation or ‘Attestation pour Demandeur d’Asile’) and asylum seekers are granted a one-month permission to stay in France. The confirmation is renewed until the application is processed and a decision has been made. After the first renewal, the second confirmation of the asylum application is valid for 6-9 months. Unlike asylum seekers, foreign nationals seeking ‘stateless person’ status do not have the right to remain on French territory during their application process.6,7

Once being offered and allocated material reception conditions by OFII (an ‘Offre de Prise en Charge’ document), asylum seekers receive a care packages linked to the ‘asylum seeker status’ which offers financial, administrative and social support as follow-up to their confirmation of asylum application. Under this official status, asylum seekers have access to monthly financial assistance ‘asylum seeker allowance’ (ADA) and, subject to availability, to a place in a CADA or in emergency accommodation (CADA/AT-ST/HUDA). Financial support is financed and coordinated by the State, whereas accommodation is usually managed by the associations and NGOs. The ‘asylum seeker’s allowance’ (ADA) was established by the Act No. 2015-925 of 29 July 2015, as a replacement of the ‘temporary waiting allowance’ (ATA) and the ‘monthly subsistence allowance’ (AMS). Based on Article L.744-9 of the CESEDA a budget allocation for this is assigned to OFII. For the payment of the ADA, OFII has conducted an agreement with the Service and Payment Agency (ASP) and has developed a method of payment of the ADA by withdrawal card given to asylum seekers during their registration with a GUDA.

**Plateforme d’Accueil pour Demandeurs d’Asile (PADA):** These reception and orientation platforms which are managed by NGOs. They provide information for the application process for asylum seeker status, assistance with the registration form, and arrangements for appointments at the one-stop asylum seeker welcome service (GUDA) within three days (and relevant coveting letters).

**Guichets Uniques pour Demandeurs d’Asile (GUDA):** These are centres that offer the one-stop asylum seeker welcome services and process the asylum seekers’ procedures, and where both Prefecture and OFII services operate. In order to facilitate these official procedures, OFII has set up a network of operators (PADA) to assist asylum seekers in accessing the one-stop-shops and to accompany those who are not housed by the national system for the reception of asylum seekers.
Centres d’Accueil des Demandeurs d’Asile (CADA): These are reception centers for asylum seekers who have been registered with a GUDA. CADAs refer both to collective and individual accommodation places which are found either in the same building or scattered in various locations. According to the 2015 report of the OFII missions, the average duration of stay in CADAs in 2015 was 528 days, rounding approximately to a year and a half. These centres do not receive asylum seekers who are under a Dublin procedure.

Those responsible for operationalizing the CADAs are:

- For the Ile-de-France, the Regional and Interdepartmental Department of Accommodation and Housing (la Direction régionale et interdépartementale de l’hébergement et du logement – DRIHL) and its departmental units/divisions.
- For the rest of the country, the Departmental Directorates of Cohesion (les Directions Départementales de la Cohésion Sociale – DDCS); the Departmental Directorates of Social Cohesion and Protection of Populations (les Directions Départementales de la Cohésion Sociale et de la Protection des Populations – DDCSPP); or directly the Immigration and Integration Services of the Prefectures (les Services de l’Immigration et de l’Intégration des Préfectures).

Les centres d’accueil pour mineurs isolés étrangers:

These are reception centres for unaccompanied foreign minors. There is a national centre for reception and guidance of unaccompanied minors who are asylum seekers (le Centre d’Accueil et d’Orientation des Mineurs Isolés Demandeurs d’Asile – CAOMIDA) which is managed by France Terre d’Asile and located in the region Val-de-Marne; and a regional centre in Côtes-d’Armor region which is managed by Coallia (le Service d’Accueil des Mineurs Isolés Demandeurs d’Asile – SAMIDA). The national centre CAOMIDA has a capacity of only 33 places, far too less to cater for an approximate number of 600 applications per year. Thus specific local management processes have been developed which are operated by the County Councils and the voluntary sector. These specific arrangements for receiving unaccompanied minors fall in the jurisdiction of the general framework of child protection and social welfare system in France.

Accueil Temporaire Service de l’Asile (AT-SA): The ATSA is a Temporary Home Asylum Service which was established in 2000 as an emergency hosting system for asylum seekers operating at national level. It was implemented by Adoma under the coordination of OFII, following the guidance of the Asylum Service of the Ministry of the Interior.

Figure AII.1. Source: Ministry of Interior/Ministre de l’Intérieur, available at: https://etat-a-calais.fr/laccueil-en-france/
Hébergement d’Urgence des Demandeurs d’Asile (HUDA): These are decentralised emergency accommodation centres which operate at regional level. HUDAs consist of varying accommodation forms, such as collective housing, individual housing in apartments, hotels, etc. The services of the prefectures (les Services de l’Immigration et de l’Intégration des Prefectures) are responsible for the opening and closing of emergency centres for accommodation operating on an ad-hoc basis, as well as for the management of accommodation places in hotels.

Le centres de transit: There are two transit centres in France, one in Villeurbanne managed by Forum Réfugiés-Cosi, and one in Créteil which is run by France Terre d’Asile. In addition, Adoma manages 32 transit places in the area of Beauvais.

Centres d’Accueil et d’Orientation (CAO): These reception and orientations centres are decentralised reception facilities which have been created, upon the ministerial instruction of November 9 2015, to support the evacuation process of asylum seekers from Calais. CAOs offer similar services to GUDAs: they provide temporary accommodation, social and material assistance, as well as administrative assistance with submitting an asylum seeker status application for receiving a care package.

Centres Provisoires d’Hébergement (CPH): These are provisional accommodation centres. There are about 27 CPH as part of the national reception system (DNA), with an overall capacity of 1,023 places. Refugees admitted to these centres receive socio-professional support for a period of 6 months which can be renewable, in principle, once.

Timeline major events

1994 Sangatte protocol (the Camp opens in 1999)
2002 UK home office removes right to work for asylum seekers
2002 Sangatte is demolished
2003 Toquet treaty (on cooperative deterrence between France and UK)
2004 - 2014 Slow formation of the Jungle around the Jules Ferry centre; tolerated by local authority
2015 Jungle population raise from 3000 people in June to 6000 in October
2015 September - first forced eviction of the Jungle; January/March 2016 - second eviction; October 2016 - third (final) eviction

Case study: Jungle refugee camp, Calais, France

The largest informal settlement in France was established near the Port of Calais, at the nearest point of the English Channel to the UK. The historical roots of the settlement go back to year 2002, when a refugee camp with the name of ‘Sans-gate’ (Lit. without gate) was ordered shut by Nicolas Sarkozy, then Minister of the Interior of France.

As of January 2015, migrants started gathering near the former Sans-gate site, on an abandoned industrial land of 51.2 hectares and were estimated at approx. 6500 individuals. This soon became a unique ‘city-camp’ which had its own hierarchical arrangement, high-street, industries, religious quarters and information centres, along with smuggling groups to aid migrants across to channel to Dover.

The creation of a micro-economy within the city of Calais was the consequence of the establishment of the camp from January 2015 to October 2016. The growth of the ‘Jungle Camp’ was concurrent with the increasing popularity of right-wing French groups which caused added tensions in the region between the camp and host-city, heightened policing and security control and violence/ discrimination against race.

After two executed orders of partial demolition in September 2015 and then March 2016, which saw the re-appearance of the camp at even bigger scale, both UK and French government shared the full cost of demolishing the camp and the cost of eviction/- dispersal of asylum seekers in various regions of France. The ill-managed process of relocating asylum seekers is continuing to this point and has resulted in the slippage of a large number of minor migrants from the system who are now either homeless in the Pas-de-Calais region or Paris.

Within the UK, the parliament has debated the acceptance of a large number of child-asylum seekers who have relatives in the UK according to the European law named Dublin III regulation or Dubs Amendment. However, the debate has been prolonged as minors have crossed the legal age and now need be treated as adults, with lack of information regarding their status, rights and progress of applications.

Best practices of inclusion, integration, policy making

In the context of European migration, some of the best practices of inclusion, integration and policy-making have been in situations where a bottom-up organisation has been complimentary to governmental planning of settlements. The involvement of asylum seekers in the physical processes of building camps has been the
most prominent and necessary collaboration, particularly in informal settlements across Greece, France and Italy; however, young volunteering organisations are increasingly finding participatory design methods, public consultations and skills-hunting in refugee communities as a tool for empowering and increasing livelihoods.

Whilst European governments provide integration tools such as language courses, aid with seeking jobs, educational prospect and shelter for asylum seekers and refugees, the highest crisis has been in locations where migrants have not yet been granted asylum and have no legal status whatsoever.

A prominent case study of self-organisation and self-integration on a refugee-refugee aid basis has been the setting up and building of L’Ecole Laique Chemin des Dunes which was functional throughout the duration of Jungle Camp’s operation from January 2015 to October 2016. The initiative of the school construction and operation had ‘Zimako Jones’ at heart, who himself as a refugee had been through the processes of seeking asylum in France.

The school was built with the help of volunteers and mostly, refugees from the camp, with materials from donations and was maintained operational and secure through a collaboration of migrants and non-migrant professionals who had set up a tailor-made curriculum for the specific case of Calais (i.e. English and French language lessons; normal curriculum classes for children, with higher focus on languages; specific classes on refugee rights and legislation regarding their asylum application).

### Privatisation of refuge in the European Union: France and United Kingdom

One of the inconsistent aspects of migration which affect the cost and economy around migration and seems to differ in quantity from one European space to the other, is the privatisation of refugee related services. This is considered to be one of the ways in which a state can reduce its costs in providing housing, security, detention or legal aid to asylum seekers. Instead, for-profit companies are invited to bid on the jobs, providing lower cost alternatives, and naturally averting higher costs which are incurred to the state if public servants perform the same tasks and duties of care.

Migreurop expand on the privatisation of detention in France in their report entitled ‘Migrant Detention in the European Union: a thriving business’ and suggest an increase in the privatisation of migrant services over the past three decades throughout the European Union, with the United Kingdom as the spearheading country to outsource migrant detention to private companies.

As stated elsewhere in the report, the level of European funding which is utilised by private companies to develop security and border control devices under the European Commission Framework Programme FP7 can be categorised under investment in private research.

### NOTES

12. Invisible economy of smuggling, purchase of goods from local hypermarkets for re-sale at the shops in the camp, black market operation within the camp (sale of donated goods at high prices).
Germany
Policy framework

The reception conditions of refugees in Germany are determined by the legal framework shaping the asylum process (Asylverfahrensgesetz). While the national government holds responsibilities for providing the overall legislation and the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, BAMF) oversees the asylum procedure, the 16 Federal States (Länder) are exclusively in charge of implementing the Asylum Seekers Benefits Act (Asylbewerberleistungsgesetz). That is, the Federal States hold the competences in providing accommodation and coverage of basic needs. As they have traditionally resolved the issues of new arrivals through different measures (e.g. accommodation standards, support on site), the circumstances and capacities of reception facilities can vary significantly. Consequently, there has been no common policy around reception centres and it is not possible to generalise the actual reception situations, especially regarding the number of facilities, capacity and occupancy. Further, the different Federal States have diverging policies on how to collect and publish data on reception centres. Consequently, across the country there is no comparable information available on the specific conditions of reception.

Figure AIII.1. Königsteiner Schlüssel distribution in 2015. Source: Katz et al., 2016

Tightening Asylum Policies since 2015

Since 2015 policy is changing at a fast pace, whereby the German state is introducing new laws, essentially immobilising asylum seekers. With regards to reception centre, the following measures are important to mention.

In October 2015 the so called Asylum Package I (Asylverfahrensbeschleunigungsgesetz, or short: Asylpaket I) was passed. The new policies essentially reintroduced the deterrence measures applied in the 1990s, when Germany experienced its last substantial increase of asylum seekers, following the civil war in Ex-Yugoslavia. Instead of formally three months, now asylum seekers have to spend up to six months in initial reception centres (Erstaufnahmeeinrichtungen, EAEs). Refugees from so-called ‘safe countries of origins’ can be required to spend the duration of their entire asylum procedure at an EAE.

During the stay in the EAEs, asylum seekers are not allowed to work, and only receive non-cash benefits in many federal states, which hinders a self-determined way of life. It is usually not possible to be accommodated outside an EAE. If asylum seekers already have family members living in Germany, they may not move into proximity with them. Further, victims of abuse or particularly vulnerable people, like women or children, are equally obliged to stay in EAEs.

In addition, the immobility of asylum seekers is enhanced through an extension of the so-called residence obligation (Residenzpflicht), which can now also last up to six months. The Residenzpflicht requires asylum seekers to remain in an assigned district (Landkreis). This denial of freedom of movement had previously been abolished in 2014, but has now been re-introduced. In case the asylum seeker leaves the assigned district without authorisation, a fine of 2,500 Euros can be charged. In case of a second offence, a one-year prison sentence is possible.

Furthermore, following the new Integration Act (Integrationsgesetz), which was issued in July 2016, the so-called domicile requirement (Wohnsitzauflage) was introduced. It is linked with social benefits, meaning that those asylum seekers, or even already recognised refugees who are on social benefits, cannot chose their place of residence, e.g. if they do not have a job offer at the preferred place of residence. At the moment, the domicile requirement is only implemented by the state of Baden-Württemberg and Bavaria.

Lastly, in February 2016, the Asylum Package II (Einführung beschleunigter Asylverfahren, or short: Asylpaket II) was passed, further tightening asylum
legislation. It introduced so-called 'special reception centres' (besondere Aufnahmeeinrichtungen) in which asylum seekers from ‘safe countries of origin’, asylum seekers who file a second application and refugees who either destroyed their documents, or are assumed to have done so, can be kept in order to accelerate their asylum procedure. Only two of them have been established in 2016 in Bamberg and Manching/Ingoldstadt.⁸

**Description about reception and detention system**

**Initial Distribution**

Upon arrival via land or air, refugees are registered at any of the closest reception centre and subsequently proportionately distributed across the Federal States following a specific quota system (known as Königssteiner Schlüssel) for allocating refugees according to tax revenues and total population of the respective Federal State.⁹ This has not been without criticism. The Königssteiner Schlüssel had initially been an instrument for the distribution funds of research institutions between the national government and the Federal States and thus has been declared unsuitable as mechanism of reception for refugees.¹⁰ For example, due to the nature of this distribution system, large cities experience a higher burden, as it does not consider factors such as higher population densities, particular housing conditions or secondary migration patterns.¹¹ Inside the Federal States it is possible to distinguish between the following types of accommodation.¹²

**Figure AIII.3.** Diagram showing Reception Process. Source: Katz et al., 2016

**Categorising Reception Centres**

Generally, reception centres can be categorised following a two-tire system. Firstly, asylum seekers are accommodated in initial reception centres, managed by the federal states. Secondly, they are transferred to communal centres or decentralised accommodation, which are in turn administered by municipalities. The state of Bavaria provides an exceptional case, where the different administrative regions oversee the second stage of accommodation, and not the municipalities. The city states of Berlin and Hamburg form another exception, where a one-tire system is in place, and the administration of the federal state is in charge of all accommodation.¹³

1. **Initial Reception Centres** (Erstaufnahmeeinrichtungen, EAE): regional centres created and managed by the federal states. The initial reception centre is usually the place where the asylum application is filed. Officially, asylum seekers live there for up to six weeks, but no longer than six months. They constitute mass accommodations with at least several hundred places, usually 1-5 in each of the Federal States, depending on the capacities of available sites, legislation and intake. Many of the initial reception centres have been created in former army barracks. Their locations can vary significantly. Some of them are in proximity to big cities (e.g. Berlin, Munich, Brunswick/Braunschweig, Bielefeld, Dortmund, Karlsruhe), others are situated in smaller cities (Eisenhüttenstadt, Neumünster, Halberstadt), or in small towns, more distant to urban areas (Eisenberg near Jena, Lebach near Saarbrücken). One initial reception
centres (Nostorf-Horst in the state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern) is located in an isolated rural area, approx. 10 km away from the next town.

2. There are no common standard for initial reception centres. Where there are standards, they show considerable variety in terms of required living space and use. For example, in Baden-Württemberg, the Refugee Reception Act requires that an asylum seeker should have 4.5 m² living space, while other regulations provide 6 or 7 m² per person. Additionally, restricted living conditions apply. As a report by Pro Asyl reveals, most of the time food is catered and individual cooking is prohibited, entry to the site is strictly controlled and public space is scarce. Asylum seekers are allowed to leave the premises at any time, but in many initial reception centres they have to report to security personnel upon leaving and re-entering.

3. Communal accommodation (Gemeinschaftsunterkünfte) or decentralised housing (dezentrale Unterkünfte): housing at the level of municipalities (Kommunen). After registration and a first stay at the initial reception centre, asylum seekers are distributed to municipalities within the state, according to other quota systems, differing in each state. Accordingly, the types of accommodation can also vary greatly and can range from large communal accommodations to rented flats. This has been criticised in a report for the Robert Bosch Foundation, calling for a common, transparent and accountable distribution system in municipalities across the Federal States.

Emergency Shelters: Since the peak of migration in the summer of 2015, many EAEs as well as communal accommodations have been created almost from scratch. Due to the large influx and lack of capacities, use was made of gyms and vacant residential buildings. In addition, tents and lightweight construction halls were erected to accommodate the asylum seekers. According to an investigation by Spiegel in March 2017, in the city states of Berlin and Hamburg 17,100 people still live in such improvised emergency shelters.

Since 2015, it is further important to note two other category of centres:

Arrival Centres (Ankunftszentren): A total of 25 centres was initiated by the BAMF across the 16 federal states since 2015. By working closely with each of the respective federal state, the aim is to speed up the asylum process by combining all necessary steps under one roof (accommodation, medical examination, collection of personal information, filing of application, decision on asylum).

Special Reception Centres (*besondere Aufnahmeeinrichtungen*): In February 2016, the Asylum Package II (Einführung beschleunigter Asylverfahren, or short: Asylpaket I) was passed, further tightening asylum legislation. It introduced so-called ‘special reception centres’ (besondere Aufnahmeeinrichtungen) in which asylum seekers from ‘safe countries of origin’, asylum seekers who file a second application and refugees who either destroyed their documents, or are assumed to have done so, can be kept in in order to accelerate their asylum procedure. Only two of them have been established in 2016 in Bamberg and Manching/Ingoldstadt.

Detention Centres in Germany

The Federal States are responsible for detention, including detention pending deportation (Abschiebungshaft). In accordance with German law, detention is only ordered once an asylum application has been rejected. National law merely provides basic rules for detention facilities. Consequently, the conditions vary greatly.

Importantly, in July 2014 the CJEU ruled that detention for the purpose of removal of illegally staying third-country nationals needs to be carried out in specialised detention facilities in all Federal States of Germany. This is significant, as it meant an end to the practice of carrying out detention for deportation in regular prisons, which had often been the case until then. Many Federal States who did not have such facilities declared that they would establish them, while sending the deportees to other Federal States in the meantime. E.g. in North Rhine-Westphalia, the prison of Büren, used before as detention facility deportees and for criminal convicts, was transformed into a specialised detention facility uniquely for deportees.

### Table AIII.1. Source: Kalkmann, M. 2017. Country Report: Germany, p. 78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal State</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Maximum capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baden-Württemberg</td>
<td>Pforzheim</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>Mühldorf am Inn</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandenburg</td>
<td>Eisenhüttenstadt</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Saxony</td>
<td>Hannover (Lannenauen)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rhine Westphalia</td>
<td>Büren</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhineland-Palatinate</td>
<td>Ingelheim am Rhein</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to the CJEU ruling, the number of detainees in ‘detention pending deportation’ apparently dropped significantly in the same year. However, country-wide information is not available, but reports suggest that the number held in facilities for detention pending deportation has risen:

- A report from Pro Asyl in July 2016 shows that 55 former asylum seekers were held in detention pending deportation in the Federal State of Hessen between January and April 2016, compared to only five cases during the same period in 2015.
- In August 2016, the Refugee Council of Baden-Württemberg reported that a newly established detention facility in Pforzheim (with 21 places) was increasingly used, with 18 deportees being held in the facility at that time.
- By contrast, only five people were detained in the facility at Eisenhüttenstadt in Brandenburg in November 2016.

At the end of 2016, facilities for detention pending deportation existed in seven Federal States:

- Pforzheim (Baden-Württemberg) is expected to increase its capacity from 21 places at the time of the opening in April 2016 to 80 places until 2018. Equally, Hannover (Langenhagen) is expected to expand its capacity from 30 to 116 places.

Asylum seekers can be held in the transit zone of airports for a max. period of nineteen days in the course of airport procedure. This stay in transit zones, however, is not considered to constitute detention in terms of law.

### Governance system

#### Costs

The costs of accommodation and care of refugees on the municipal level is covered by the federal states. The way costs are being covered varies significantly from one state to another and can range from a lump sum compensation per refugee to the coverage of all occurring costs.

#### Privatisation Trend

Generally, there are three operational models for the running of reception centres: they are either operated by the public authorities themselves, welfare organisations or private organisations. However, a common tendency is the privatisation and economisation of reception centres. This is particularly the case in communal accommodations, where private operators are increasingly recruited. According to a report by the Robert Bosch Foundation, this is due to the fact that often the public bodies or welfare organisation are not able to invest into facilities and that the contracting authorities are interested in negotiating a cost-efficient price. Private companies usually provide cheaper services, as they often compromise over staffing or social and pedagogical care, rendering the reception of asylum seekers a lucrative business.

In particular, the role of private security companies has been criticised. For example, in 2014, a case in North Rhine-Westphalia was revealed where the staff members of a private security firm had right-wing, extremist backgrounds and were abusing the residents of the reception centre where they were working.

It is important to emphasise though, that the information about who runs the centres remains opaque and there is no nation-wide data on the way centres are operationalised.

#### Access to NGOs

Access to NGOs is highly dependent on the place of residence. In some reception centres, welfare organisations or refugee councils have regular office hours or are located close to the centres so asylum seekers can easily access the offices of such organisations. However, offices of NGOs do not exist in all relevant locations and in any case, access to such services is not systematically ensured.

- In many ‘arrival centres’ access to NGOs is even more difficult, as there are not always established structures of NGOs that exist in the town or region where the new offices are located.
- The state of Baden-Württemberg forms an exception, where a law from 2014 (Flüchtlingsaufnahmegesetz, FlüGA), outlining the guidelines of initial reception, states that every asylum seekers is entitled to qualified social- and procedural counselling at initial reception centres.

#### Trends and processes

- Shortfall of the distribution system: burden on city-states
- No coherence between the Federal States leads to unequal treatment of asylum seekers
- Privatisation of management of reception centres
Federal system makes it extremely difficult to access coherent data

Research methodology: challenges and issues

The very nature of Germany’s reception system renders generating nation-wide data about reception centres very difficult: Federal States hold the competences in providing accommodation and coverage of basic needs. As they have traditionally resolved the management of new arrivals through different measures, the circumstances and capacities of reception facilities can vary significantly. Further, the different Federal States have diverging policies on how to collect and publish data on reception centres. Thus, across the country there is no comparable information available on reception arrangements.

Information about the EAEs was generated through the consultation of the Länder’s website or in direct correspondence with the respective press offices during May and June 2017. However, this information only generates a partial overview, as it was not possible to obtain data from all Federal States.
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1. A note on terminology: Here, I distinguish between refugees, asylum seekers and migrants. Refugees, according to the definition of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), are those who flee their home countries due to conflict or persecution. Asylum seekers are those who actually submit an asylum application, which is not the case for all refugees, as some might choose not to do so. Migrants technically also include refugees; in this brief, however, migrants refer to those who enter a country with a visa or work/study permit and do not have the intention to seek asylum. (see also: Katz et al., 2016)


4. Officially aimed at ‘speeding up’ the asylum process, as the German term indicates.

5. Pichl, 2016. p. 163
6. Ibid.
7. For more information see: http://www.anwalt.org/asylrecht-migrationsrecht/wohnzitzauflage/ (accessed on 24/08/2017)
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Greece
Country policy, legal framework & situation

Greece as a first country of entry pursuant to the Dublin Regulation (EU Regulation No. 604/2013) and due to its geographic location has experienced many migrants attempting to enter the EU. The European Court of Human Rights and Court of Justice of the EU in 2011 “found that Greece’s asylum system suffers from ‘systemic deficiencies’, including lack of reception centers, poor detention conditions, and the lack of an effective remedy.”¹ The Greek Ministry of Public Order and Citizen Protection submitted to plans to the European Commission and the Council of the EU, in order to address the above ‘systemic deficiencies’ related to asylum, including actions for creating first-reception centers, establishing screening procedures, addressing detention conditions, and improving facilities for families with children and vulnerable groups.

In 2011, the adoption of the Law 3907/2011² was achieved as part of the first Action Plan on Asylum and Migration Management (submitted in 2010):

- First Reception Service was created. The First Reception Service aims at integrated management of irregular migrants through screening procedures, to register them, to provide medical and psychological support, to inform on obligations and rights (especially on the right to asylum and international protection).

- Asylum Service was established, composed of a Central Office located in the capital Athens and regional asylum offices. The Asylum Service operation was established with the cooperation of UNHCR and EASO. The Regional Asylum Office of Attica started its operation and the reformed asylum-procedure as of June 2013.

- Appeals Authority was created. The Appeals Authority aims at applying the national legislation and to abide by the country’s international obligations regarding the recognition of refugee status and granting international protection to third-country nationals who have fled their country due to fear of being persecuted for the reasons specifies in the 1951 Geneva Convention, or to reasons justifying subsidiary or temporary protection.³

Since the adoption of the above Law, several Presidential Decrees and Ministerial Decisions have added to the clarification of legal procedures and amendment of existing ones, to define the establishment of organization and operation of First Reception Services, Asylum Service and the operation of Accommodation Facilities for third-country nationals (Δμές Φιλοξενίας υπηκόων τρίτων χωρών), which operate under the provision of the First Reception Service. In regards to the additional laws that formulate the current legal framework in Greece, for on the ground operation of the Centers, two are considered noteworthy:

- The Ministerial Decision No. 7001/2/1454-η of 26th January 2012: General Regulation on the operation of First Reception regional services.

Figure AIV.1. UNHCR, Mediterranean Situation as of 2017. Source: http://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/mediterranean

Figure AIV.2. UNHCR, Country Situation as of 870. Source: http://data871.unhcr.org/en/situations/mediterranean/location/872
• The Ministerial Decision No. 11.1/6343 of 9th December 2014 (3295/2014): General Regulation in the operation of Accommodation Facilities for third-country nationals (Δομές Φιλοξενίας υπηρέτων τρίτων χωρών), which operate under the provision of the First Reception Service.

The above two concern the regulations regarding the internal structure and operation of regional first reception services (accommodation and reception facilities), those including first reception procedures, obligation of third-country nationals, and duties of the centers/ accommodation facilities’ staff. In 2014, the regulation of 2012 was complemented by including conditions of hospitality of third-country nationals, their integration procedures to the centers/accommodation facilities, not only duties but also obligations of the centers’ staff, and lastly but equally important the establishment and safeguarding of minimum standards of the overall operation of Accommodation Facilities, as well as quality of the adjacent provided services. Therefore, within those two Ministerial Decisions there are several articles which define technical and building standards of the centers.

The Ministerial Decision of December 2014 was established after the submission in January 2013 of a revised Action Plan on Asylum and Migration Management to the European Commission, which had two basic aspects:

• to ensure access to international protection through opening of new reception centers; and
• to establish an effective system of border management and returns.

An overview of the legal framework presenting main legislative acts regarding asylum procedures, reception condition and detention, can be found in the Aida “Country Report: Greece, 2016 Update” (pg. 10-12), produced by members of GCR (Greek Refugee Council).

Since August 2012, patterns of arrivals and entry into the European Union have shifted from the Greek-Turkish land borders to the sea borders. Official statistics approximately 3223 persons were arrested for illegal entry in Lesvos, Samos, Chios and generally the Dodecanese region, only during the first five months of 2013, showing a significant increase to arrivals at the islands when compared to 188 persons arrested at the islands for the same period in 2012. While the number of arrests was increased in the islands, the same number was significantly decreasing at the Evros region highlight the aforementioned shift and raised the concerns on the dangerous passage of persons arriving by the sea which has been marked by deaths (please see following figures for arrivals and estimated deaths and missing persons for the present year).

In 2015, during the ‘refugee crisis’ Greece experienced unprecedented migratory flow, since a shift in the migration route was observed coming to Greece through Turkey. This resulted in the creation of new centers (reception, detention and host facilities) both in the islands and mainland of Greece. According to UNHCR profiling of sites as of January 2017 the operating centers in Greece were 54. However, the number of operating centers (those including Reception and Identification Centers RIC, Transit sites and Emergency Response Sites) has been varying and changing due to the temporality of the sites’ operational status. As of 21 February 2017 and according to data published by the Coordination Body for the Management of Refugee Crisis, the number of Temporary Refugee Accommodation sites to the whole Greece was 32 (excluding RIC, transit sites and detention centers).

### Description of reception/detention system- centers

As of January 2017, 64 reception facilities run by Ministry of Migration Policy, Ministry of Defence, Hellenic Army and Hellenic Navy and supported by NGOs provided a total 1896 places dedicated to asylum seekers under the coordination of the National Center for Social Solidarity (EKKA). The vast majority of the spaces were dedicated to unaccompanied minors, that as of January 2017 were either accommodated in long-term and transit shelters, some were in closed reception facilities (RIC), while some were detained in police stations (protective custody). The reception capacity was increased due to the Accommodation for Relocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amygdaleza</td>
<td>Anica</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavros</td>
<td>Anica</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinth</td>
<td>Peloponese, Southern Greece</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>Thrace, North-Eastern Greece</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthi</td>
<td>Thrace, North-Eastern Greece</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orestiada</td>
<td>Thrace, North-Eastern Greece</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5,215</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project (UNHCR in cooperation with municipalities and other NGOs) since additional 20000 accommodation places were made gradually available, dedicated initially to relocation candidates and since July 2016 extended to Dublin family reunification candidates and applicants belonging to vulnerable groups.

The reception capacity of the 64 reception facilities was enhanced by the creation of temporary accommodation sites (mainly in the mainland).

The reception centers (hotspots) on the islands, accommodate individuals subject to the EU-Turkey statement. Most of them suffer from overcrowding, insufficient security and tensions between nationalities.

**Reception and Identification Centers (RICs), operating in the islands, and also closed reception facilities:**

- June 2017 (3): Samos -Vathy, Chios - Vial, Kos - Pyli
- January 2017 (5): Kos – Pyli, Leros – Lepida, Samos – Vathy (screening center), Chios – Vial (screening center), Lesvos – Moria (First Reception Center)

(Screening reception centers: are operated by the police, but have a mobile unit of First Reception Service that register non-citizens and make referrals)

First reception centers (KEPY): are run by the First Reception Service and are used for detention of up to 25 days⁵.

In RICs fast-track border procedure apples to arrivals after 20 March 2016, in order for the entire asylum registration procedure to be completed within 14 days).

**Temporary Accommodation Sites (Emergency Response Sites and Collective Shelters), mainly operating in the mainland of Greece:**

- January 2017 (54)

(These sites in the Ministry of Migration Policy are defined as temporary and permanent. Temporary sites are planned to be operating for a short period of time and according to MoMPs financial planning should be closing soon. This ‘closing soon’ aspect however is not officially and publicly declared. The permanent sites are planned to be operating for a longer period of time with an end goal of all site to have closed by end of 2018, since both Accommodation for Relocation Project and urbanization project are presently implemented, driven by UNHCR, Municipalities of Athens, Thessaloniki, Livadia, and several other NGOs most of which are local partners, such as Praskis, Arsis, Nostos, Solidarity Now, Iliaktida, Crs, Intersos, Faros, Metadrasi, Save The Children, Doctors Of The World⁷).

- **Transit Sites, operating in the island of Lesvos:**

  - January 2017 (4): Lesvos – Pikpa, Lesvos – Mantamados, Lesvos - Skala Sykaminea, Lesvos – Apanemo (transit sites are the ones that a person might stay upon first arrival, prior to transfer to RIC site).

- **Accommodation Site for Asylum Seekers, operating in Attica region:**

  - January 2017 (1): Lavrio Accommodation Facility for Asylum Seekers, established in 1947 (this site is the only one not considered temporary Accommodation Facility).

- **Pre-removal Detention Facilities (7): Amygdaleza, Tavros (Petrou Ralli), Corinth, Xanthi, Paranesti Dramas, Orestiada, Kos** (these facilities are operated by the Police. Asylum seekers are also detained in pre-removal detention centers together with third-country nationals under removal procedures. Pre-removal detention facilities, although operational since 2012, were officially established through Ministerial Decision of January 2015).

Kos opened in March 2017 with a total capacity of 150 persons.

In a simplified manner, at RICs the fast-track border procedure is applied. If the person is considered eligible for Asylum registration then, according to the case (i.e. priority to Dublin family and vulnerable cases), the person is relocated to the mainland to either Temporary Accommodation Sites, or through the UNHCR accommodation relocation scheme to apartments (this is a long run procedure and only if the case is considered of high priority vulnerable case, a person, family, unaccompanied minor might be directly transferred to an apartment). If the person is not eligible for Asylum registration procedure, since the application may be dismissed on the grounds that Turkey is a ‘safe third country’ or ‘first country of asylum’ following the EU-Turkey agreement, the person will stay at pre-removal detention facility. According to the Decree 113/2013, a person may be kept in detention no more than three months. However, at the pre-removal detention facilities a person may be obligated to stay for a longer period of time (i.e. in the islands), in the grounds of ‘geographical restriction’ (after 20 March 2016 and the EU-Turkey statement).

Moreover, detention can be applied on ‘law-breaking conduct’ grounds. As of June 2016 (Police Circular), if a third-country national residing at the island may be transferred to the mainland pre-removal detention centers in accordance to ‘law-breaking conduct’ and is
applied on the basis of the decision of the local Director of the Police (approved by the Directorate of the Police), and will remain detained.

Research challenges and issues

The excel sheet when developed was presenting typology and capacity as of January 2017. Since the migratory influx in Greece with increasing arrival numbers was observed in 2015, a large number of refugee accommodation sites, all of those defined as temporary, opened and operated for a short period of time (approximately from three months to a year and a half) and then closed. The refugee accommodation sites, operating as emergency response sites by the end of December 2016 were counted 46 (according to UNHCR December 2016 Factsheet & UNHCR Site Profiles of April 2016). At the beginning of 2017, February, the number of refugee accommodation centers was 32 (according to Coordination Body for the Management of Refugee Crisis), while in June 2017 the number has decreased to 29 excluding RICs (according to UNHCR Site Profiles of June 2017).

During the unprecedented influx in summer 2015 and beginning of 2016, a systemic recording, reporting and monitoring of site profiles was difficult. This has to do with the fact that not only several emergency response sites opened so as to meet the increasing needs of refugees and migrant accommodation, first reception services, but also in most cases the sites operated under poor conditions, quality of services provided, extreme density conditions (overcrowding), as well as limited capacity and number of staff on the ground. During the same period, and due to the lack of available spaces for accommodation of new arrivals several informal sites and settlements were established in strategic locations in Greece (Idomeni camp and EKO Gas station/Polykastro in Northen Greece, Pireus Port and Victoria Square in Athens), which operated for short period and reporting of capacity was rendered impossible. The above settlements were established during the time of closure of the Greek border in Macedonia (March 2016), which compelled an additional challenge at the Greek state. According to the Amnesty International Annual Report Greece of 2016-2017, the camps, most of the official ones providing tented shelter, or established in abandoned warehouses, poor building facilities, non-operating summer-camp facilities, far from hospitals and other services hosted around 20000.

Therefore, from the research conducted it appears the documentation has been more comprehensive and systematic by mid 2016 till present, that the informal sites (evacuated in May 2016) and poor condition temporary facilities (such as Elliniko I, II, III camps evacuated in June 2017) have closed and the situation can be considered more stable. As a result, documenting operational centers for the year of 2015 was considered inappropriate for the Greek case and the decision was made to map centers at the beginning of 2017, that public data were available in a further extend, and the situation presented shows a peak of the established temporary accommodation sites operating in Greece.

Governance System

Accommodation Facilities (site level):

- Site Management: Ministry of Migration Policy or Hellenic Navy or Ministry of Defence or Hellenic Army (site management therefore is under official Governmental Authorities, that should have daily presence on site. Site Management is responsible for persons registration, allocation of accommodation within the site, etc.)

- Site Management Support: this is the role of other actors, mainly iNGOs, such as NRC, DRC, IFRC, IRC, IOM, Oxfam, till recently UNHCR (that now is driving under the coordination and supervision of MoMP the urbanization process), with the support of the European Commission-Humanitarian Aid (ECHO).

- Other supporting activities on site: other actors, either local or international NGOs provide supporting facilities at the sites, such as health care, protection, legal aid services, children activities, informal education, such as Hellenic Red Cross, Solidarity Now, Praksis, Metadrasi, Save the Children, GCR, Elpida Home, British Council, and others. At the same, the Ministry of Education in several camps (i.e. Skaramagkas, Rafina) will start at providing formal education to the children of adequate age that are registered.

Inclusion and integration policy/practice

In Greece, and especially at the two main cities, Athens and Thessaloniki, finding shelter and accommodation for refugees in dignified housing (collectives, apartments, etc) has been render crucial. In several cases squatting and occupation of buildings, those most of the time supported by the Greek anarchist movement, have provided shelter for persons in the main urban areas of the city, allowing for access both to services, transportation, as well as educational and language lessons, in order to promote integration (for a list of squats in Athens last updated in June 2016 please follow: http://moving-europe.org/24-06-2016-refugee-squats-in-athens/). Several squats since 2016 have either closed, been evacuated or failed to adhere to their goals.

One of the squats in Athens, however, that has been publicized widely as a successful squatting collective and best practice, is the “Refugee Accommodation and Solidarity Space City Plaza” [AP6] (see: http://solidarity2refugees.gr/support-city-plaza-refugee-
On April 2016, City Plaza, a non-operating 7 stories hotel building, was unlocked and occupied by autonomous movements, group of activists and academics, in order to be squatted and provide shelter space for refugees. City Plaza is presented as a "self-organized housing project for homeless refugees in the center of Athens that accommodates approximately 400 people, among them 180 children". The space is self-managed by the community, has a vibrant presence in the area and is funded either by internal activities and private donations and not through governmental or NGO funding. As an accommodation facility City Plaza manages to contribute in the making of a vibrant community within the center of the urban fabric of Athens, thus allowing access to services, formal market, transport, language lessons etc. City Plaza also operates within a network of self-organized spaces which provide services such as community kitchens, language lessons, such as Chora, a fact that also strengthens the role of this collective shelter within the urban fabric. The above suggest that this kind of autonomous, self-organized practices in central locations within the city can provide the space and networks that strengthen the livelihood of refugees and therefore might by more successful towards integration.

On the other hand, when considering the country's policy in regards to integration what is considered important is access to education (Language) and Labour. Therefore, in order to identify a 'best practice' in regards to governmental policy, several aspects should be taken into consideration on what could be successful integration practice.

NOTES

6. Global Detention Project, Greece Immigration Detention. Available at: [https://www.globaldetentionproject.org/countries/europe/greece#gdp-detention-infrastructure]
8. For further information on the Grounds for Detention system, please follow: [http://www.asylumineurope.org/reports/country/greece/detention-grounds-detention]
10. UNHCR, Greece Site Profiles, April 2016. Available at: [https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/47624]
11. UNHCR, Greece Site Profiles, June 2017. Available at: [https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/58471].
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maps of the refugee camps in Grande-Synthe and Calais to improve the delivery of aid and services and the safety and comfort of the residents

http://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=17/50.99611/2.28409
map of DUNKIRK camp

http://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=16/50.9699/1.9034
map of the JUNGLE

https://www.lenius.it/quantl-sono-i-rifugiati-in-italia-e-in-europa/
How many refugees in Italy and Europe?

Databases
OECD aid database
European database of Asylum law
www.asylumlawdatabase.eu

Research projects and repositories
How the refugee crisis is changing the world economy.

https://www.globaldetentionproject.org
The Global Detention Project (GDP) is a non-profit research centre based in Geneva, Switzerland, that investigates the use of immigration-related detention as a response to global migration. http://refugeerights.org.uk/

“In contrast to the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) who are responsible for demographic data collection in many of the state-run camps across Europe, our data and research are independently collected with the aim of informing public debate and contributing to a long-term resolution to the current humanitarian crisis.”
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Despite numerous migrant waves through the decades, the current influx of refugees and asylum seekers into Europe has been framed by very specific narratives. From humanitarian calls for action to warnings of impending collapse, Europe thinks of itself under a crisis, at a political breaking point that justifies extreme discourses and measures.

The Refugee Spaces data project aims to stimulate and demystify the phenomena through examining the evidence rather than speculating on the so-called crisis. Through mapping and analysis of the openly available data provided by institutional and governmental sources, the project attempts to spatialise the political and security measures designed to contain migration and the mobility of refugees.

We understand that migration and refuge are in a permanent state of flux, so the project can only represent a snapshot of a specific period, in part constrained by reliability and availability of the data. Since we started this project, migration has played a more influential impact on political issue across Europe and the rest of the world, becoming sometimes the centrepiece of polarising campaigns and radical partisanship. Brexit, the surprising success of populist agendas in some important elections across Europe and elsewhere are just a few examples of how migratory issues have been used, and manipulated, for radical change. Security borders and sovereign intromission have expanded to Africa and Asia; the policing of the Mediterranean is now an established security regime; and humanitarian initiatives, to help refugees in peril, have been often criminalised.

The project shows a cartographical analysis of spatial responses and the administrative infrastructure brought by migration and refugees, stressing on the territorial relationships that associate mass movement with urban hotspots in four selected countries: France, Germany, Greece and Italy. At the urban scale, the project identifies urban clusters/regions that are integral to current migration influxes, exploring their different strategies for reception and control.

Refugee Spaces has been funded by The Bartlett (UCL) Materialisation Grant. The project is a collaboration between the Development Planning Unit (DPU), Space Syntax Laboratory (the Bartlett School of Architecture), and the Centre for Advanced Spatial Analysis (CASA).

Visit: www.refugeespaces.org