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A. Issues concerning forms of discrimination on the grounds of religious affiliation

1. Introduction

Various UN provisions have clearly stated in the past that discrimination based on racial and ethnic origin in combination with religious affiliation shall be eliminated.

Art. 1 of ICERD states that “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.” constitutes racial discrimination.

The CCPR in its General Comment No. 22 paragraph 8 states “that the concept of morals derives from many social, philosophical and religious traditions; consequently, limitations on the freedom to manifest a religion or belief for the purpose of protecting morals must be based on principles not deriving exclusively from a single tradition”. CCPR furthermore outlines in paragraph 9 that the ‘[…] eligibility for government service to members of the predominant religion or giving economic privileges to them or imposing special restrictions on the practice of other faiths, are not in accordance with the prohibition of discrimination based on religion or belief [...]”.

The Declaration and Programme of Action as agreed at the World Conference against Racism in 2001 in Durban states that “measures for effective action, including social measures, should aim at correcting the conditions that impair the enjoyment of rights and the introduction of special measures to encourage equal participation of all racial and cultural, linguistic and religious groups in all sectors of society and to bring all onto an equal footing”.

Such freedoms and rights appear not to be fully implemented at the states party level.

In its 19th to 22nd reports about Germany presented on the 18th of October 2013, the government covers issues concerning migrant communities with non-Christian backgrounds such as the Jewish and Muslim community. Solely in Paragraph 41 (page 11) does the report indicate that ‘Muslims are not only threatened or discriminated against as migrants’, which the majority of them are, but also ‘on the basis of religious affiliation’. The report fails to point out that non-Christians also experience discrimination when applying for access to employment, education or even to goods and services.

The governmental report furthermore fails to mention an institutionalised form of exclusion based on religious affiliation. Church-based organisations (Catholic and Protestant) form a
substantial sector of the employment market. Such employers categorically require a formal church membership from their staff. This arrangement is rooted in the re-structuring of the post-World War II social welfare system in Germany, which still prevails until today. As long as the country was largely inhabited by long-established German residents this did not generate (societal) social imbalances. Increased immigration to Germany since the 1970s has caused the population to become ethnically and religiously more diverse, which is not reflected in today’s recruitment of staff by confessional employers as outlined in this shadow report.

Society at large and political decision-makers have not given the situation consideration, since it is an understood practise. Therefore we believe this issue has not been brought to your attention by the state party or by German NGOs, since Christian organisations play a very active part in the anti-racist movement in Germany.

2. The ethnic composition of the German population

In 2013 the total German population consisted of 80.8 million people. Of those registered, 24.17 million persons or 29.9% were Catholic and 23.36 million people or 28.9 % of the total population were Protestant (see Appendix 1). A decrease in membership in both the Catholic and the Protestant churches had become evident since 1990 (see Appendix 2 and 3). Furthermore, only 27% of the Catholics considered themselves highly religious, 57 % were religious and 16 % not religious at all (see Appendix 4).

In contrast, 4 million people, 4.9 % of the total population, were Muslim, 110.000 people belonged to the Jewish faith, 270.000 people considered themselves Buddhist and 120.000 Hindu (see Appendix 1). Non-Christian believers therefore constituted 6% of the total population.

In 2013 the population not bound to any confession formed 36.6 % of the total population in Germany (see Appendix 5).

Official sources indicate the number of Muslims living in Germany is increasing. During the year 2000 there were 3.000.000 Muslims living in Germany as compared to 4.250.000 Muslims in 2009 (see Appendix 6).

As a result of the arrival of considerable numbers of migrant workers in the 1960s and 1970s, today’s religious minorities correlate with people of migrant background or ethnic minorities. According to figures published by the Ministry of Interior in 2009, 2.5 to 2.7 million people having immigrated from Turkey, make up the largest group amongst the Muslim community⁴. This is followed by 550.000 Muslims from Southeast Europe and 330.000 Muslims from the Middle East.⁵ About 45 % of those Muslims have acquired German citizenship³.

---

¹ http://www.bmi.bund.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/566008/publicationFile/31710/vollversion_studie_muslim_leben_deutschland.pdf (last access 23.02.2015)
² http://www.bpb.de/nachschlagen/zahlen-und-fakten/soziale-situation-in-deutschland/145148/religionszugehoerigkeit (last access 23.02.2015)
The age distribution of the non-German population is on the average younger and consequently consists of more people of working age in comparison to the German population (see Appendix 7).

At the same time, people of foreign origin (migration background), to a large extent of non-Christian faith, are particularly affected by unemployment. In 2012 figures indicated that 4.7 % Germans faced unemployment while 8.9 % of persons with foreign backgrounds were unemployed (see Appendix 8). Muslim women seem to be even more affected by unemployment than their male counterparts. Since the unemployment rate dropped in 2013 and 2014, figures today are slightly more optimistic for all groups.

3. Social services provided by church-based organisations

Social services provided in Germany are decreasingly offered by the State itself but rather outsourced and offered by non-state actors such as welfare associations, semi-commercial service providers or confessional organisations. It is a particular German characteristic that such services are predominantly provided by church-based welfare organisation with affiliations to the catholic (Caritas) and protestant church (Diakonie).

Social services delivered by Caritas/Diakonie range from

a) education (e.g. colleges, primary and secondary schools, kindergartens),

b) health (e.g. hospitals, hospice care, domestic care),

c) counselling (e.g. parenting, addiction, youth, migrants, asylum seekers, refugees),

d) social welfare (homeless shelters, children’s homes, elderly homes) to

e) children and youth work

and many more besides regular parish work (see Appendix 9). Services provided in church-based institutions are largely open to the wider public, independent of the religious affiliation of their clients.

With all these welfare and social activities at the local, regional and federal level, church organisations make up the second largest employer with approx. 1.3 million employees in 2011 - right after the state itself and before the German car industry (719,535 in the same year). Since the 1970s, the number of employees in confessional welfare organisations is steadily rising. While in 1970 the Caritas counted less than 130,000 and Diakonie less than 170,000 employees, these were 590,401 and 452,244 employees in 2010, with 24,248 and 28,132 facilities and services respectively.

---

6 http://www.bmi.bund.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/566008/publicationFile/31710/vollversion_studie_muslim_leben_deutschland_.pdf (last access 23.02.2015)
7 http://www.caritas.de/diecaritas/wofuerwirstehen/millionenfache-hilfe (last access 23.02.2015)
8 http://www.diakonie.de/zahlen-und-fakten-9056.html (last access 23.02.2015)
9 http://www.caritas.de/diecaritas/wofuerwirstehen/millionenfache-hilfe (last access 23.02.2015)
In some rural areas of Germany church-based social and welfare services constitute a monopoly. Such services can be used by anyone but are offered along Christian principles and standards. State run social and welfare services in those places are not available.

With the growth of these organisations an additional internal administrative structure has been established such as specific pension programmes, banks and building firms. Therefore, confessional welfare organisations also have a significant number of administrative positions in their workforce.

4. The legal framework of Christian churches and their organisations

a) Self-determination of the Christian churches in Germany

The Christian churches possess the right to self-determination which is codified in art. 137 (3) of the Weimar constitution saying that “each religious body regulates and administers its affairs independently within the limits of general laws. It appoints its officials without the cooperation of the state, or of the civil community”. This regulation has been integrated into Art. 140 of the current German Constitution, while the state itself is bound to ideological neutrality via Art. 4 (1) and (2) of the Constitution. The state leaves the task of managing the exercise of the Christian religions solely to the Catholic and Protestant churches and the facilities assigned to them. Employment in a church-based organisation is further based on the principle of a ‘service community’ (Dienstgemeinschaft)\(^\text{10}\). This gives the Christian welfare organisations the special right to determine internal labour regulations concerning collective bargaining, the representation of employees and employment regulations including recruitment, labour rules and termination of employment contracts.

In the context of recruiting employees for positions in church-based organisations – as outlined below in para 5. – the Christian employers predominantly claim that staff members be a registered member of a Christian church until today.

b) The EU Employment Directive

In the EU Directive 2000/78/EC, adopted in 2000, the fundamental principle of equal treatment was formulated for religious communities particularly in the employment sector. However art. 4 (2) allows an exception giving churches and other public or private organisations with a faith based ethos the possibility to make “a difference of treatment based on a person's religion or belief. [This] shall not constitute discrimination where, by reason of the nature of these activities or of the context in which they are carried out, a person's religion or belief, constitute a genuine, legitimate and justified occupational requirement, [...]”.

This EU principle therefore focusses on the nature of the work to be performed and whether the required religious ethos is a substantial and genuine requirement for the position in question (or not). It makes a distinction between positions performing clerical work, religious services or pastoral care functions (“verkündungsnah”) for which a proven faith is required

\(^{10}\) Richardi, Arbeitsrecht in der Kirche, § 6 marginal no. 21.
and non-missionary positions (“verkündungsfremd”) for social, administrative and other tasks within church-based organisations.

c) The General Equal Treatment Act (AGG)

Section 8 (1) of the AGG in general outlines that “a difference of treatment on any of the grounds referred to under Section 1 shall not constitute discrimination, where, by reason of the nature of the particular occupational activities or of the context in which they are carried out, such grounds constitute a genuine and determining occupational requirement, provided that the objective is legitimate and the requirement is proportionate.”

As provided by the EU Directive 2000/78 the self-determination of Christian churches is specifically incorporated into section 9 (1) AGG which forms an exemption for confessional employers. The selection of employees “shall not constitute discrimination where such grounds constitute a justified occupational requirement for a particular religion or belief, having regard to the ethos of the religious community or organisation in question and by reason of their right to self-determination or by the nature of the particular activity.”

5. Employment requirements by church-based employers

Church-based welfare organisations in Germany demand ‘loyalty requirements’ from their employees. One of those requirements is to be a registered member of the respective church. The vast majority of vacancies announced by confessional welfare organisations indicate that the proven membership to the respective church or an affiliation to Christian principles is a prerequisite to be hired (see Appendix 10 and 11). This membership (or no membership) is demonstrated by the ‘tax certificate’, which every employee in Germany needs to provide to the employer.

Whereas in the case of Catholic employers a membership in the Catholic Church constitutes a requirement to work there, Protestant employers require a membership to any Christian church. This results in a systematic exclusion of non-members of the Catholic or Protestant church. Therefore large employment sectors such as social work and care are practically not accessible for non-members of Christian churches. In some occasions Christians connected to the Orthodox Church (i.e. Russian, Serbian or Greek Orthodox Church) have been concerned. As outlined above in Chapter 2 Germany is becoming more ethnically and religiously diverse. The exemption rule as provided in Section 9 of the General Equal Treatment Act for church-based employers extensively impacts on people of migrant background coming from countries of non-Christian tradition (see Appendix 12).

Beside people applying for vacancies, this rule may also affect apprentices, interns, mini-jobbers and temporary workers. Likewise persons with no confession are equally concerned, but are not further regarded in this report.
The formulation of loyalty requirements are usually incorporated in the employment contract and need to be signed by the employee. Such clauses cannot be negotiated. Particularly in areas where jobs in social welfare work are predominantly run by confessional organisations employees of non-Christian background are disproportionally affected. As outlined above in Chapter 2 persons with migratory backgrounds are facing unemployment to a larger extent than the majority of the population.

6. State subsidised welfare work

Germany is considered to be a ‘welfare state’ that provides or subsidises social welfare work. Welfare organisations, confessionally bound or not, receive state subsidies or other financial coverage for their activities, as long as they have the required structural status. Hospitals for example, are fully funded through public or private health-care funds, regardless of whether they are run by a commercial company, the state or a church-based institution. Likewise kindergartens can be managed by local public authorities, private associations or church-based organisations. Such child-care services are subsidised up to 80% with public funds. Parents are requested to make an additional financial contribution.

The Federal Government of Germany published its ‘24th subsidy report’\(^{11}\) covering the period from 2011 to 2014 in which it indicated on page 74 that in 2011 3.040.000.000 € were invested in ‘subsidies to registered religious associations and facilities equated to them for religious and socio-political reasons’ (Begünstigung anerkannter Religionsgesellschaften und ihnen gleichgestellter Religionsgemeinschaften aus kirchen- und sozialpolitischen Erwägungen). The report also indicated that for 2014 an amount of 3.380.000.000 € for the same religious sector was foreseen. This amount must be distinguished from the church tax that every registered member of a Christian church automatically pays when filing taxes.

Muslim organisations and most other non-Christian religious groups do not hold the required official title allowing registered status as an ‘institution of public law’ (Körperschaft des öffentlichen Rechts). These religious groups cannot fulfil the requirements to achieve this status and therefore this particular type of public funding is unavailable to them.

7. Proposals for a more detailed assessment of Germany’s country report

BUG highly appreciates the work of the CERD Committee that aims to ensure that ICERD is fully acknowledged and put into practise at states level. With this in mind, we are submitting our proposals to the Committee for further consideration.

Even though the Government of Germany has taken up the struggle against discrimination in general and, especially against racial discrimination, since its last report in front of the CERD Committee, we are convinced that the German Government must increase its efforts to minimise all forms of racial discrimination.

In this regard, we invite the Committee to:

1. Request further information from the German delegation concerning possible racial disparities caused by the Christian churches practising their right to self-determination.

2. Further solicit information from representatives of the German Government if there is a plan for closing the gap which exists in employment between the majority of the German population and Muslims with a migratory background, especially Muslim women.

3. Ask the German delegation whether it considers the exemption rule for church-based structures as formulated in section 9 (1) of the Equal Treatment Act (AGG) to be in conformity with art. 4 (2) of the EU Directive 2000/78/EC.

4. Invite the German delegation to assess section 9 of the General Equal Treatment Act. Ask why or why not they think section 9 should be adapted to accommodate the multi-religious and diversified population of German society today.

5. Ask the German delegation if data concerning religious affiliation and ethnic decent will be collected in the near future in order to document possible forms of religious and ethnic discrimination in employment, particularly considering church-based employment practices. If so, would the delegation outline how this could be done?

Furthermore BUG would highly welcome the formulation of the following recommendations by the Committee:

1. The German government considers steps to counter Muslim exclusion in employment within Christian church-based institutions whenever being a Christian is not a genuine, legitimate and justified occupational requirement.

2. The German Government undertakes measures aiming to lower the unemployment rate of persons with a migratory background.

3. The German Government reviews the collection of religious and ethnic data in order to be in a better position to recognise forms of religious and racial discrimination in the society.
B. The legal framework does not prohibit racial discrimination by state institutions

1. The AGG does not apply to state institutions

Art. 2 (1c) of ICERD requests states parties to “take effective measures to review governmental, national and local policies, and to amend, rescind or nullify any laws and regulations which have the effect of creating or perpetuating racial discrimination wherever it exists”.

Furthermore it is emphasised in art. 6 that signatory states ensure “effective protection and remedies, through the competent national tribunals and other State institutions, against any acts of racial discrimination which violate [...] human rights and fundamental freedoms”.

As the Committee is well aware the General Equal Treatment Act was introduced in 2006. The Bureau for the Implementation of Equal Treatment is an NGO that offers legal assistance to victims of discrimination within the framework of this law. It aims to create precedence and fosters the implementation of the AGG. In this regard BUG is in a position to assess the strengths and weaknesses of this Act.

While the AGG offers victims of discrimination a suitable tool to counter discrimination perpetrated by individuals within the area of civil law, it remains silent in cases of discrimination performed by state institutions.

In January 2014 a family of West-African origin was undertaking an excursion from Mainz to Bonn. The family was stopped and searched by the Federal Police in a regional train. Each family member was in the possession of a German passport. Nonetheless the officers requested their documents and checked the validity of the passports with the central office. No other travellers were checked. The Federal Police performed this check on the basis of art. 22 (1a) of the Federal Police Code that provides the possibility for personal checks without initial suspicion. Anecdotal evidence indicates – since no official statistics are available – particularly people of colour, visible minorities or people being categorised ‘migrant’ (Ausländer) are overproportionally stopped and searched. Several court cases are currently pending at various levels of administrative courts.

Since the scope of the AGG excludes state institutions such as the police forces, the public administration and public schools, ‘racial profiling’ as a form of racial discrimination cannot be litigated with the present law. Victims of stop-and-search measures only can protect themselves against such measures by applying administrative law in this case in German ‘Fortsetzungsfeststellungsklage’ (the legal claim that the stop-and-search should not
repeated). Possible racial connotations are almost completely disregarded within this type of legal framework.

2. Proposals to strengthen legal protection against racial and ethnic discrimination performed by state institutions

Current legal protection against racism does not comply with CERD standards and needs to be changed.

Therefore BUG recommends the Committee to ask the German Government:

1. Why statistical material concerning ‘racial profiling’ is not collected by the Federal or State police forces?

2. If a reform of art. 22 1(a) of the Federal Police Act can be expected to ensure that people belonging to ethnic minorities or people of colour will not over-proportionally be stopped without initial suspicion?

3. When is the German Government planning to develop a legal framework to pose a sanction on racial and ethnic discriminatory practices among state institutions?

BUG would like to invite the Committee to formulate the following recommendations:

1. The German Government provides a legal basis ensuring that the Federal and State police forces perform their duties without racial or ethnic profiling.

2. The German Government should introduce laws to penalise racial or ethnic discrimination performed by any state institution.

BUG highly appreciates the endeavours of the CERD Committee in tackling racial discrimination. We are prepared to support the Committee and the German Government towards further progress in their attempts to achieve a society free of racial discrimination.
C. Appendices

Appendix 1: Numbers of members from religious communities in Germany in 2013 (in million)

Anzahl der Mitglieder in Religionsgemeinschaften in Deutschland im Jahr 2013* (in Millionen)

- Römisch-Katholische Kirche (2013): 24,17
- Evangelische Landeskirchen (2012): 23,86
- Islam (2010): 4
- Orthodoxe, orientalische oder unirter Kirchen (2012): 1,48
- Buddhisten (2012): 0,27
- Hindus (2011): 0,12
- Judentum (2011): 0,11
Appendix 2: Number of Catholic Church members in Germany from 1950 to 2013 (in million)
Appendix 3: Number of members in the Protestant Church in Germany from 2003 to 2012 (in million)
Appendix 4: Religiousness according to religious denomination in 2008

Religiös = religious
Hochreligiös = highly religious
Appendix 5: Religious affiliation in Germany 2013 (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Konfessionsfreie</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katholisch</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelisch</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslimisch</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonstige</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistisches Bundesamt, Angaben der Kirchen und weitere Informationen

Quelle: statistisches Bundesamt, Angaben der Kirchen und weitere Informationen
Appendix 6: Number of Muslims in Germany (1945-2009)

![Chart showing the development of Muslims in Germany from 1945 to 2009.](chart.png)

Quellen:
BAMF, Statista 2014

Weitere Informationen:
Deutscher Zentralarchiv Islam, Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge
Appendix 7: Age distribution of the German and foreign population (2012)
Appendix 8: Employment of people with and without a migratory background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erwerbspersonen 2012</th>
<th>People in employment 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insgesamt (in 1,000)</td>
<td>total,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erwerbstätige (in 1,000)</td>
<td>People being employed,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erwerbslose (in 1,000)</td>
<td>People being unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesamtbevölkerung</td>
<td>Total population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohne Migrationshintergrund</td>
<td>without a migratory background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mit Migrationshintergrund</td>
<td>with a migratory background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erwerbstätigkeit bei Menschen mit und ohne Migrationshintergrund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gesamtbevölkerung</th>
<th>Ohne Migrationshintergrund</th>
<th>Mit Migrationshintergrund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insgesamt (in 1,000)</td>
<td>Erwerbstätige (in %)</td>
<td>Erwerbslose (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesamtbevölkerung</td>
<td>42 477</td>
<td>40 161</td>
<td>94,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 317</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ohne Migrationshintergrund</td>
<td>34 486</td>
<td>32 880</td>
<td>95,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 606</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mit Migrationshintergrund</td>
<td>7 992</td>
<td>7 281</td>
<td>91,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>711</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>davon Deutsche</td>
<td>3 837</td>
<td>3 560</td>
<td>92,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>davon Ausländer</td>
<td>4 154</td>
<td>3 720</td>
<td>89,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>434</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quelle: Statistisches Bundesamt, Mikrozensus 2012, Auswertung von Juli 2014 auf Anfrage
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Appendix 9: Working sectors within Caritas

Selected areas in welfare services 2013*  
Indication of employees in these areas

Military, police, emergency care

Administrative, management, public relations work

Caritas, social services

*Translation provided by BUG

Religious exercises, spiritual movement

Pastoral care for foreigners, businesses, penal institutions

University, school, apprenticeship

Selected areas in welfare services 2013*

Indication of employees in these areas

Religious exercises, spiritual movement

Pastoral care for foreigners, businesses, penal institutions

University, school, apprenticeship

*Translation provided by BUG
Appendix 10: Job advertisement for the position of a counsellor

Sie verfügen über beratungssichere Kenntnisse in mehreren Fremdsprachen, wünschenswerterweise in der türkischen Sprache.

You have considerable and proven knowledge in several languages preferably in the Turkish language.

Als diakonische Einrichtung setzen wir Ihre Mitgliedschaft in einer christlichen Kirche voraus.

As a diaconic institution we expect membership in a Christian church.

Translation provided by BUG.
Appendix 11: Job advertisement for a house-keeper

Wir erwarten: christliche Grundhaltung.

We assume: Christian attitude.

Translation provided by BUG
## Appendix 12: Population in Germany according to foreign citizenship (only Muslim countries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>31.12.2013</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Percentage of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe</strong></td>
<td>6 051 796</td>
<td>3 145 468</td>
<td>2 906 328</td>
<td>48,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-Members</td>
<td>3 366 504</td>
<td>1 815 148</td>
<td>1 551 356</td>
<td>46,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-Candidates</td>
<td>1 921 411</td>
<td>992 702</td>
<td>928 709</td>
<td>48,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1 549 808</td>
<td>802 663</td>
<td>747 145</td>
<td>66,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further Europa</strong></td>
<td>718 498</td>
<td>317 563</td>
<td>400 935</td>
<td>41,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>157 455</td>
<td>81 810</td>
<td>75 645</td>
<td>52,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>170 795</td>
<td>88 526</td>
<td>82 269</td>
<td>61,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa</strong></td>
<td>318 577</td>
<td>184 015</td>
<td>134 562</td>
<td>46,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>134 137</td>
<td>81 733</td>
<td>52 404</td>
<td>44,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>17 346</td>
<td>11 688</td>
<td>5 658</td>
<td>45,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>14 682</td>
<td>10 408</td>
<td>4 274</td>
<td>54,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>65 440</td>
<td>35 447</td>
<td>29 993</td>
<td>51,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>26 030</td>
<td>17 248</td>
<td>8 782</td>
<td>47,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>86 374</td>
<td>52 204</td>
<td>34 170</td>
<td>48,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>24 790</td>
<td>12 275</td>
<td>12 515</td>
<td>60,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>24 254</td>
<td>14 752</td>
<td>9 502</td>
<td>38,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>10 025</td>
<td>5 362</td>
<td>4 663</td>
<td>38,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>32 304</td>
<td>17 749</td>
<td>14 555</td>
<td>47,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>17 023</td>
<td>9 419</td>
<td>7 604</td>
<td>48,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Democratic Republic</td>
<td>9 835</td>
<td>4 924</td>
<td>4 911</td>
<td>47,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Africa</strong></td>
<td>50 291</td>
<td>24 467</td>
<td>25 824</td>
<td>48,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>10 980</td>
<td>5 211</td>
<td>5 769</td>
<td>48,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td>957 950</td>
<td>478 392</td>
<td>479 558</td>
<td>48,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>317 065</td>
<td>178 987</td>
<td>138 078</td>
<td>57,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>15 637</td>
<td>8 137</td>
<td>7 500</td>
<td>63,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>85 469</td>
<td>49 538</td>
<td>35 931</td>
<td>42,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>60 699</td>
<td>34 022</td>
<td>26 677</td>
<td>39,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>8 836</td>
<td>5 365</td>
<td>3 471</td>
<td>39,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>34 840</td>
<td>20 563</td>
<td>14 277</td>
<td>45,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian Territories</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>33,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>56 901</td>
<td>33 356</td>
<td>23 545</td>
<td>39,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South- and Southeast Asia</strong></td>
<td>333 393</td>
<td>152 715</td>
<td>180 678</td>
<td>50,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>14 822</td>
<td>6 328</td>
<td>8 494</td>
<td>46,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>40 911</td>
<td>26 780</td>
<td>14 131</td>
<td>45,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>307 492</td>
<td>146 690</td>
<td>160 802</td>
<td>49,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>66 974</td>
<td>39 469</td>
<td>27 505</td>
<td>55,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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