

Input by civil society organisations to the Asylum Report 2025

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Dear Colleagues,

The production of the Asylum Report 2025 is currently underway. The annual [Asylum Report](#) presents an overview of developments in the field of international protection in Europe.

The report includes information and perspectives from various stakeholders, including experts from EU+ countries, civil society organisations, researchers and UNHCR. To this end, we invite you, our partners from civil society, academia and research institutions, to share your reporting on developments in asylum law, policies or practices in 2024 by topic as presented in the online survey (**'Part A' of the form**).

We also invite you to share with us any publications your organisation has produced throughout 2024 on issues related to asylum in EU+ countries (**'Part B' of the form**).

These may be reports, articles, recommendations to national authorities or EU institutions, open letters and analytical outputs.

Your input can cover information for a specific EU+ country or the EU as a whole. You can complete all or only some of the sections.

Please note that the Asylum Report does not seek to describe national systems in detail but rather to present key developments of the past year, including improvements and challenges which remain.

All submissions are publicly accessible. For transparency, contributions will be published on the EUAA webpage and contributing organisations will be listed under the Acknowledgements of the report.

All contributions should be appropriately referenced. You may include links to supporting material, such as analytical studies, articles, reports, websites, press releases, position papers.

Some sources of information may be in a language other than English. In this case, please cite the original language and, if possible, provide one to two sentences describing the key messages in English.

The content of the Asylum Report is subject to terms of reference and volume limitations. Contributions from civil society organisations feed into EUAA's work in multiple ways and inform reports and analyses beyond the Asylum Report.

NB: This year's edition of the Asylum Report will be significantly revamped to achieve a leaner, more analytical report with streamlined thematic sections. The focus will be on key trends in the field of asylum rather than on individual developments. For this reason, information shared by

respondents to this call may be incorporated in the Asylum Report in a format different than in the past years.

Your input matters to us and will be much appreciated!

Please submit your contribution to the Asylum Report 2025 by Friday, 10 January 2025.

Contact details

* Name of Organisation

Safe Passage International (FRANCE)

Name and title of contact person

Amadou-Samba DIOP - France Legal Manager

* Email

a.diop@safepassage.fr



I accept the provisions of the EUAA [Legal and Privacy Statements](#)

General observations

Before sharing information by thematic area, please provide your general observations on asylum developments as indicated in the following three fields:

What areas would you highlight where important developments took place in the country/countries you cover?

What are the areas, where only few or no developments took place?

Would you have any observations to share specifically about the implementation of the Pact on Migration and Asylum in the national context of the country/ countries you cover?

PART A: Contributions by topic

Please share your reporting on developments in asylum law, policies or practices in 2024 by topic. Kindly make sure that you provide information on:

- New developments and improvements in 2024 and new or remaining challenges;
- Changes in legislation, policies or practices, or institutional changes during 2024.

1. Access to territory and access to the asylum procedure (including first arrival to territory and registration, arrival at the border, application of the non-refoulement principle, the right to first response (shelter, food, medical treatment) and issues regarding border guards)

1. Training of frontline workers in early detection of family reunion under the Dublin 3 application : Due to the emergency context in which the legal guardians find themselves in the sending countries, they do not have appropriate training on family reunification procedures or preparation of a good Take Charge Request for the destination countries. The consequences could be missing the three-month deadline to lodge an asylum claim for the unaccompanied minors and, by extension, the family reunion process.

2. Access to information and legal assistance (including counselling and representation)

1. Information session on family reunion under Dublin 3 for UAMs right after disembarkation before registration or during age assessment : Many unaccompanied minors or their legal guardians still do not know the right to family unity, and many children eligible for family reunions do not know about this process or its existence. From experience, we know that UAMs do not spontaneously express their wish to reunite with their family or declare having family members within the EU. Informative sessions are crucial right after arrival to inform them about their rights to join family members within the EU. In Safe Passage France, part of our work in promoting family reunions within the EU is organising informative sessions for the sponsors to spread the right to family reunions in plain language and to increase awareness on the topic of family reunions.

Ps: When conducting these informative sessions with UAMs, attention must also be paid to applicants' language barriers. Translators in certain languages are not always available in certain camps or Hotspots.

3. Provision of interpretation services (e.g. introduction of innovative methods for interpretation, increase/decrease in the number of languages available, change in qualifications required for interpreters)

4. Dublin procedures (including the organisational framework, practical developments, suspension of transfers to selected countries, detention in the framework of Dublin procedures)

1. Quality of Take-Charge Request sent by Dublin Units in the sending countries : Oftentimes, Legal guardians in sending countries are paltry compared to the number of unaccompanied minors who arrive in the EU entry points territories. This does not give them the time to work carefully on the family reunification procedure and to prepare the TCRs properly, so they are overstretched and do not really have the time to have regular 121 with the Unaccompanied minors for whom they are responsible. The quality of the preparation of a Take Charge Request is decisive in the Case's acceptance of the receiving state.
2. Delays in appointing a legal guardian for UAMs to lodge their application on family reunion : Unaccompanied minors can't start any process without a legal representative being appointed. From experience in the field, guardians are not appointed soon after the arrival of the unaccompanied minors in sending countries. This has detrimental consequences on the family reunification procedure, which takes time to initiate. This can be explained by the overload of administrative courts in most sending countries and the time authorities take to do an age assessment.
3. Lack of trust from the receiving states on TCRs sent by sending states : Experiences in the field also show substantial discrepancies between Dublin units. Receiving countries can oftentimes question TCRs sent by sending countries. Most doubts relate to age assessment reports, identity documents, and birth certificates. Mutual trust should be a primary consideration between member states in order to secure Unaccompanied minors best interest.
4. Capacity issues in sending countries facing a huge wave of arrivals: Delays in sending TCRs to receiving countries: Due to their vulnerability, special attention must be paid to UAM applicants. In the context of a few EU entry points, we have noticed a lack of capacity in the whole ecosystem. We also notice a very limited capacity within these countries' asylum offices. Indeed, the number of TCRs that must be sent, and interviews undertaken by caseworkers for UAM cases, for example, represent significant work. There are not enough human resources available for the growing needs of the Dublin Units. Frontline workers in hotspots, camps and social services are experiencing the same situation.
5. Lack of digital solutions and internet issues in few camps and reception centers : we noticed that a few hotspots and centers could not access the internet. Sometimes, UAMs are also deprived of using the internet or do not have any means to reach their relatives to get the necessary documents for a TCR. This is problematic regarding family tracing and/or sending the necessary evidence to build a TCR. Most of the UAMs we support use social media to reach their relatives and ask them for documents for their TCRs. Another issue is that when an unaccompanied minor is transferred from one camp to another, the change of legal guardian and often the loss of documents causes additional delays in the sending of the TCR by the national authorities. Indeed, the documents are not computerised, which often leads to the loss of documents.
6. Enhance and strengthen cooperation with non-governmental organisations, such as Safe Passage International, whose core work is family reunification. Such cooperation is extremely valuable for vulnerable cases such as UAMs. The essence of the Dublin 3 regulation is ultimately cooperation, not only between EU countries but also with civil society organisations. This type of cooperation must be encouraged throughout the EU as it is vital in the Dublin 3 regulation.

5. Special procedures (including border procedures, procedures in transit zones, accelerated procedures, admissibility procedures, prioritised procedures or any special procedure for selected caseloads)

6. Reception of applicants for international protection (including information on reception capacities – increase/decrease/stable, material reception conditions - housing, food, clothing and financial support, contingency planning in reception, access to the labour market and vocational training, medical care, schooling and education, residence and freedom of movement)

7. Detention of applicants for international protection (including detention capacity – increase /decrease/stable, practices regarding detention, grounds for detention, alternatives to detention, time limit for detention)

8. Procedures at first instance (including relevant changes in: the authority in charge, organisation of the process, interviews, evidence assessment, determination of international protection status, decisionmaking, timeframes, case management - including backlog management)

9. Procedures at second instance (including organisation of the process, hearings, written procedures, timeframes, case management -including backlog management)

10. Issues of statelessness in the context of asylum (including identification and registration)

11. Children and applicants with special needs (special reception facilities, identification mechanisms/referrals, procedural standards, provision of information, age assessment, legal guardianship and foster care for unaccompanied and separated children)

1. The importance of having a trained case officer on UAMs in sending and receiving countries : It is essential to have a caseworker within the Dublin Units specialising in unaccompanied minors. This allows a better understanding of the problems encountered by UAMs and helps to provide an adequate response to the TCRs sent by sending countries.

For example, in the French context, having a trained case officer has helped to reduce the caseload of UAMs within the French Dublin Unit and respect the delays of the 2-month time frame to make a decision. Having a dedicated person working on the issue of UAMs and being in constant link with civil society organisations could be a great asset.

2. Avoiding excessive use of DNA tests: example of France : In France, the use of DNA tests is regulated and very strict. We can only use them when a court decision is rendered. The French Dublin Unit never requests a DNA test to confirm the family link between applicants and sponsors and relies exclusively on the documents sent by the sending state to make its decision. When TCR applications do not fully prove the family link, the Dublin unit liaises with the prefectures to process interviews with the family members in France or get in touch with us when we are following the cases in order to get more information either from the applicant or the sponsors.

A good practice we have seen from the UK Home Office (before Brexit) is that they are looking at the sponsor's asylum files to gain more insights into family links. Often, sponsors declare their relatives when claiming asylum, asking for a resident permit or citizenship.

3. Presumption of minority: example of France : The French Dublin Unit does not request medical age assessments when processing Take Charge Requests sent by EU member states. There is a presumption of minority and mutual trust between France and other member states in documents representing the TCR. In our experience with the French Dublin Unit, medical age assessment was never asked to sending countries.

12. Content of protection (including access to social security, social assistance, healthcare, housing and other basic services; integration into the labour market; measures to enhance language skills; measures to improve attainment in schooling and/or the education system and/or vocational training)

13. Return of former applicants for international protection

14. Resettlement and humanitarian admission programmes (including EU Joint Resettlement Programme, national resettlement programme (UNHCR), National Humanitarian Admission Programme, private sponsorship programmes/schemes and ad hoc special programmes)

15. National jurisprudence on international protection in 2024 (please include a link to the relevant case law and/or submit cases to the [EUAA Case Law Database](#))

16. Other important developments in 2024

PART B: Publications

1. If available online, please provide links to relevant publications produced by your organisation in 2024

2. If not available online, please share your publications with us at: Asylum.Report@euaa.europa.eu or upload your file using the functionality below (max. file size 1MB).

Please upload your file

The maximum file size is 1 MB

3. For publications that due to copyright issues cannot be easily shared, please provide references using the table below.

	Title of publication	Name of author	Publisher/Organisation	Date
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

Useful links

[EUAA Asylum Report 2024 \(https://euaa.europa.eu/asylum-report-2024\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/asylum-report-2024)

[Executive Summary -Asylum Report 2024 \(https://euaa.europa.eu/asylum-report-2024/executive-summary\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/asylum-report-2024/executive-summary)

[Sources on Asylum 2024 \(https://euaa.europa.eu/publications/sources-asylum-2024\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/publications/sources-asylum-2024)

[National asylum developments database \(https://euaa.europa.eu/national-asylum-developments-database\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/national-asylum-developments-database)

[International Protection in Europe: 2023 in Review \(https://euaa.europa.eu/international-protection-europe-2023-review\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/international-protection-europe-2023-review)

Background Documents

[Word template to submit input](#)

Contact

[Contact Form](#)