

Input by civil society to the 2022 Asylum Report

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

D e a r

C o l l e a g u e s ,

The production of the *Asylum Report 2022* is currently underway. The annual [Asylum Report series](#) present a comprehensive overview of developments in the field of asylum at the regional and national levels.

The report includes information and perspectives from various stakeholders, including experts from EU+ countries, civil society organisations, UNHCR and researchers. To this end, we invite you, our partners from civil society, academia and research institutions, to share with us your reporting on developments in asylum law, policy or practice in 2021 (and early 2022) by topic as presented in the online survey.

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

All submissions are publicly accessible. For transparency, 2022 contributions will be published on the EUAA webpage. For reference, contributions to the 2021 Asylum Report by civil society organisations can be accessed [here](#), under 'Acknowledgements'. All contributions should be appropriately referenced. You may include links to supporting material, such as analytical studies, articles, reports, websites, press releases or position papers. If your organisation does not produce any publications, please make reference to other published materials, such as joint statements issued with other organisations. 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.

Your input matters to us and will be much appreciated!

*Please complete the online survey and submit your contribution to the 2022 Asylum Report by **Monday, 21 February 2022**.*

[Instructions](#)

Before completing the survey, please review the list of topics and types of information that should be included in your submission.

For each response, only include the following type of information:

- New developments and improvements in 2021 and new or remaining challenges; and
- Changes in policies or practices, transposition of legislation or institutional changes during 2021.

Please ensure that your responses remain within the scope of each section.

Contributions by topic

1. Access to territory and access to asylum procedures (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)

We are concerned that the border patrol, particularly at the Swiss-Italian border, does return asylum seekers to neighboring countries without giving them the opportunity to ask for asylum. We were able to document certain such cases, in one of which an asylum seeker was even returned to Italy after several days in Switzerland, during which he was illegally detained. The right to ask for asylum at the border has been restricted even more due to (allegedly) Covid-related measures.

Moreover, newspaper articles revealed that Swiss authorities offered asylum seekers train tickets to reach other countries, instead of offering them the opportunity to ask for asylum in Switzerland.

Overall, we are highly concerned about the handling of asylum applications at the Swiss borders, particularly at the southern border. In our view, access to the asylum procedure is not guaranteed, asylum seekers are at some instances detained at an unknown place close to the Italian border without a valid detention order before being returned to Italy. No documentation is available about this detention, and it is even unclear which authorities are responsible for it.

Regarding the non-refoulement principle, we are concerned that Afghan asylum seekers with negative asylum decisions in Bulgaria are still sent back even if it's not certain what exactly will happen to them and if they will not be in detention.

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

We appreciate the general right to legal representation in the Swiss asylum procedure. Nevertheless we are concerned about the practical implementation of it, since it still leaves uncountable asylum seekers without representation in those moments when representation would be needed the most.

The core of the problem is the compensation model of the governmentally mandated legal representation: The providers of these services get lump sum payments per asylum seeker they represent - regardless of the amount of work a case entails and regardless of whether they write an appeal.

In addition, it lies in their full discretion whether they write an appeal or not - they may also resign from their mandate just after receiving a negative decision. Noting the extremely short appeal deadlines (5 to 7 working days [meanwhile extended to 30 days due to Covid] in the accelerated asylum procedure), the resignation of the mandate normally means that the asylum seeker is not in a position to find another legal representation. With a 30 days deadline for material asylum decisions, this problem could be reduced significantly. We, therefore, strongly recommend applying a 30 day appeal period for material asylum decisions also in the accelerated asylum procedure, in order to allow a realistic chance for access to justice.

Even more problematic is the access to justice in other areas - namely in cases of violence against asylum seekers by the police or security staff, of domestic violence, of a negative or no-entry decision or when coercive measures, including detention, are ordered: In these situations, the mandated legal representatives are not in a situation to support the asylum seekers who therefore often times remain without any legal support.

Regarding the access to information it is, in our view, highly problematic that the welcoming videos at the Federal Asylum Centers do provide information about return assistance, but no information about the asylum procedure or rights and obligations during such procedure. Of course such information should be provided in the first meeting with the mandated legal representative, but nevertheless it is not understandable why information about return assistance should be more important than information about the procedure upon asking for asylum.

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)

Even though we acknowledge that most translators are qualified and trustworthy, we see significant deficiencies on a regular basis. We therefore highly recommend that asylum interviews are to be audio recorded, in order to have the possibility to double check statements and to have evidence (on both sides) for what has actually been said.

Since such audio recordings are common in other fields e.g. in criminal proceedings, and they also reduce the work required to re-translate a word protocol after each hearing, we do not see any major obstacles for the introduction of it in asylum proceedings.

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

We are highly concerned about the lack of consideration given by the Swiss authorities and the Swiss courts to each single case, in particular in situations with vulnerable asylum seekers. Dublin procedures are executed at an extremely fast pace which hardly allows the identification of highly vulnerable asylum seekers, especially if serious mental health issues are concerned. Even the Federal Administrative Court approves such swift procedures though, since in its view all member states bound by the Dublin-III Regulation are also bound by certain human rights obligations, including the European Convention on Human Rights, and that therefore returns are per se allowed by law, regardless of the applicant's individual situation.

Various interim decisions by international bodies, namely UN committees (CEDAW, CAT, CRC), clearly revealed that the Federal Administrative Court (as highest and only judicial review body in asylum matters) has not sufficiently reviewed the case at hand and simply relied on the other country's international obligations, without checking whether such obligations are implemented in practice. We are, therefore, highly concerned about the lacking assessment of the individual (medical) situation within the Dublin procedure. Moreover, we are concerned about the re-introduction of returns of vulnerable applicants and families to Italy, since in our practical experience we still see serious deficiencies in the reception conditions. The same holds true for returns to Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia, Lithuania, Malta, Greece, Hungary and certain other countries in special situations, e.g. in cases of torture or human trafficking which took place in such countries.

We are furthermore concerned about the return conditions in Dublin cases. We are aware of several clients of ours whose health condition was miserable at the time of the forced return. By way of example, one client was highly suicidal and tried to commit suicide several times in administrative detention. Nevertheless, he did not get the required medical treatment and without the intervention of the legal representative, the Swiss authorities would have returned him to Bulgaria, where he would have no protection and medical support whatsoever (see decision by the Federal Administrative court of 25 January 2022, F-5395/2021; the proceedings about the detention conditions are still pending before the Federal Supreme Court). In another case, the Swiss authorities deported a vulnerable family with a level 4 flight (i.e. special flight with police, full shackling) to Slovenia. The mother was severely ill and just left the psychiatric clinic, the child was about one year old. Both parents were shackled (feet and hands), the father was tied to a chair with a helmet fixating his head. The child was separated from the parents and held by a police officer, out of the parents' sight, during the entire return procedure. The mother was highly suicidal and did not - as anticipated - get any support in Slovenia until now.

Regarding the detention in the context of Dublin procedures, we are highly concerned about the high share of Dublin returnees who are detained. We are of the opinion that alternatives to detention are insufficiently used and detention is ordered in too many cases. Moreover, detention is often approved beyond the maximum amount of six weeks (article 28 Dublin-III-Regulation). AsyLex brought one case of such violation of the Dublin-III-Regulation to the Swiss Supreme Court, where the issue is still pending at the time of this response.

Finally, AsyLex is of the view that the extension of the return time limits (article 29 (2) Dublin-III-Regulation) is triggered in cases where the EU law does not allow for this. The Swiss authorities and courts misinterpret the concept of "absconding" and view any situation where an applicant has not been in the center for several hours or days and did, therefore, not submit a daily signature, for example, as absconding. Such interpretation is protected by the Federal Administrative Court, even though it stands in clear contrast to the interpretation by the courts of other Dublin member states.

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

Regarding the problematic situation at the border and especially pushbacks at the Swiss-Italian border (southern border), see comments to question No. 1.

AsyLex welcomes the ongoing extension of the deadlines for appeals in the accelerated procedure from 7 working days to 30 days. We recommend keeping this temporary change also in the long run in order to guarantee access to justice.

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)

AsyLex is concerned about the strict conditions in the federal asylum centers (e.g. restrictions on food that can be brought inside, duty to be present in the evenings). While asylum seekers already before faced various restrictions in federal asylum centers as well as in other accommodation facilities, the situation has been particularly worrying since the Covid-19 crisis: In various asylum centers situations occurred, where quarantine measures were ordered which went beyond the ones for non-asylum seeking people and which restricted the freedom of movement in an overly strict way. It is unheard of that barbed-wire was installed for the quarantine of non-asylum seeking people, or that compliance with the quarantine measures is monitored 24/7 by police officers - as it was the case in various shelters for asylum seekers.

Particularly concerning is the increasing number of reports about violence against asylum seekers in federal asylum centers by security personnel (noting that these services are provided by private security companies). Since civil society cannot access these centers, such incidents happen within a blackbox. We have cases where the police refused to accept criminal complaints submitted by asylum seekers, and investigations started only upon the intervention by an attorney-at-law. Moreover, video footage of the relevant time slots are not available anymore for unknown reasons. Most concerningly though, the security staff is, in the view of the prosecutors, protected by the law through the concept of immunity and proceedings to lift such protection have to be done before criminal proceedings may be launched. This is, in our view, an incorrect interpretation of the law. We furthermore know of employees in federal asylum centers who reported such incidents of violence and who were then threatened with counter measures by their employers or by the security staff.

Certain federal reception centers lack proper access to mental health support. The only possibility to get medical or mental health support is by an appointment with the medic help center within the reception center. Depending on the place, the quality of services vary significantly and the rejection rates of requests are, in certain centers, very high. In particular for women and victims of sexual and gender-based violence it is difficult, since they might not be in a position to talk about their issues in the presence of male medical staff or translators. AsyLex intervened in certain situations, where, for example, a 12-year old girl who suffers from cancer and serious mental health issues did not get any treatment, with the explanation that they would be deported soon anyways (Dublin case). After arranging for medical treatment outside of the center, the authorities tried to make AsyLex liable for the costs incurred - even though such costs would, of course, be covered by the health insurance. Generally, we are concerned that medical and most notably mental health treatments are denied in too many cases, even more so for asylum seekers which are placed in federal asylum centers without procedural functions in very remote areas.

In 2021, the Swiss legislative bodies accepted a new legal provision that gives the right to the State Secretariat for Migration to have access to asylum seekers' phones in order to determine their identity. In our view, the new legal provision that enables the authorities to practically force asylum seekers to provide access to their electronic devices is an intervention in a person's private sphere which is not proportionate.

We furthermore cannot agree with the policy applied in various areas of Switzerland where asylum seekers are criminalized for asking for asylum. Generally, such criminalization happens by way of criminal orders, i.e. without any court even reviewing the decision, and (in the large majority of cases) without any legal support. Criminal convictions furthermore often occur in violation of the EU Return Directive, since Swiss prosecutors and courts are not aware of the obligations laid down in this Directive.

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)

Generally, we are concerned that alternatives to detention are in many cases not assessed properly. We furthermore had to realize that in various cantons the requirements for administrative detention, namely those set out by the EU law, are not met. In various instances, our clients were detained in criminal detention facilities and not separated from criminal detainees.

Furthermore, in our view, the detention conditions for people with serious mental health issues violate art. 2 and 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights. We do not know of any administrative detention facility where detainees have access to mental health support (apart from medication). Counseling by psychologists is not provided at all, and the mental health situation of detainees generally deteriorates even more during detention, namely for the lacking treatment of mental health issues. Due to the lack of such mental health support, various incidents of suicide attempts in administrative detention are known to us, several even committed by our clients. The authorities' reaction to such attempts violate national as well as international law : Instead of placing highly suicidal persons in a specialized clinic or hospital, our clients were put in solitary confinement, in some cases with no possibility to contact their legal representative and without proper clothing.

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)

There have not been significant improvements since our previous annual report (2020).

While we welcome the accelerated procedures in principle, in our view they do not sufficiently take into account specific vulnerabilities, in particular in situations where applicants suffer from serious mental health issues. Since also the Federal Administrative Court disregards the individual constellations to a large extent by simply referring to the international obligations by which the other country is bound, such cases are currently not corrected by the court.

Even though the rate of cases returned from the Federal Administrative Court to the State Secretariat for Migration decreased over time since the introduction of the accelerated procedure, we do not see a significant improvement when it comes to taking the individual situation of an applicant into account - be it by State Secretariat for Migration or by the court.

The general challenges of the new asylum procedure - such as the short deadlines, the non-consideration of the legal representatives' feedback on the draft decisions, the issues of lacking legal representation after a negative decision - remain the same as in previous years.

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

Our observations from last year (2020) continue to apply:

- In many cases, the legal representatives provided do not appeal against the asylum decision, but resign unjustifiably their mandate at this very critical time, when the asylum seeker would be in urgent need of help.
 - The time limit for filing an appeal is extremely tight at 5-7 working days. This is especially true in cases where assigned legal representatives refuse to submit an appeal. The legal representatives normally inform the client about their resignation only after the asylum decision, meaning that only a few days are left for the asylum seeker to find another lawyer and file the appeal.
 - Thankfully, certain deadlines for appeals were extended during the Covid-19 pandemic. In particular, the deadline for appeals against material asylum decisions in the accelerated procedure was extended from 7 working days to 30 days. We suggest turning this exceptional rule made during the pandemic into law in order to improve access to justice, particularly for those asylum seekers whose legal representative resigned from their mandate.
 - Through the lump sum payments per case, the organisations providing legal representation to asylum seekers during their asylum procedure receive the same payment regardless of whether they file an appeal or not. Consequently, the defined incentives have the effect of ensuring that as few appeals as possible are filed.
 - The procedures before the Federal Administrative Court under the amended asylum act are extremely quick. This is itself generally to be welcomed - however, the quality of the court's rulings is, in our view, reduced due to the high time pressure. Since there is no second instance to appeal in asylum cases (which in itself is highly worrying), there is no mechanism of control for the quality of the Federal Administrative Court's decisions.
- Also under the revised asylum law, no oral hearings take place before the second instance. In our view, this is problematic in many cases, since the written files do not provide the same comprehensive impression of a person, and notably their credibility, as a personal hearing.

10. Availability and use of country of origin information (including organisation, methodology, products, databases, fact-finding missions, cooperation between stakeholders)

EUAA remains the principal source of information on these topics. Also, the Swiss Refugee Council provides data and summary on the situation in some countries of origin. Oftentimes we would wish for a more detailed or up-to-date analysis for specific countries or regions. Moreover, sometimes certain reports seem to have a certain political background, which affects their value as objective evidence.

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

In our perception, severe deficiencies remain for vulnerable applications. There is, for example, no special housing for vulnerable people, women or families. The current situation in federal asylum centers also leads to the fact that children and vulnerable people are regularly faced with the police coming into the sleeping rooms at night to deport applicants forcibly. Many clients of ours reported that these situations are detrimental to their own mental health.

Moreover, we observed a lack of referrals to specialized medical staff, in particular for applicants in the Dublin procedure. In particular, victims of torture, human trafficking or sexual and gender based violence (SGBV) are on paper identified as such, but hardly any special protection measures are put in place - namely referrals to specialized mental health support or other support services is very limited if not inexistent. By way of example, it might be noted that one of our clients who is a victim of human trafficking was required to explain her issues to the medical staff in the asylum center with a male translator. Since she was not able to talk in the presence of a man, the medical staff considered her issues as not proven and therefore any access to mental health support was denied.

As mentioned before, the living conditions in the federal asylum centers (general tension, violence episodes, freedom restrictions, material insufficiencies e.g. not enough space) have a detrimental effect on vulnerable asylum seekers.

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)

Switzerland distinguishes between refugee admission and temporary admission.

Especially for people with temporary admission, various barriers remain (e.g. territorial restrictions, limited recognition of qualifications). Social assistance for people with temporary admission is, furthermore, extremely limited and the amounts paid (which depend on the canton) oftentimes are insufficient. Currently, legal proceedings about this issue are pending.

As of 2022, people temporarily admitted to Switzerland (permit F) are subject to very strict conditions to travel outside the country, making it almost impossible to travel. If people with a F permit travel to another state, their temporary admission can be revoked and they can be prohibited from a residence permit for 10 years. AsyLex is concerned about the disproportionate restriction to the human right to freedom of movement and the right to family life as asylum seekers and refugees are often separated from their families in different countries.

13. Return of former applicants for international protection

Regarding the returns, we are concerned about the procedures of forced returns as well as about the threats returnees may face upon arrival in the other country (be it returns to other Dublin member states, a “safe” third country or the country of origin).

First of all, we oppose the current policy of “surprise returns”, where especially in cases of Dublin returns neither the applicants nor we as legal representatives are informed upfront about the date of return. Such knowledge would allow us to arrange for a humane welcoming situation upon arrival, particularly in countries where the human rights situation is critical.

We hear from various returnees that they faced police violence during the removal procedure. The responsibilities during the return procedures are unclear (in particular between local, regional police and migration office). As legal representatives in most cases we are not even given access to the reports about the forced returns. We welcome the fact the the Federal Commission for the Prevention of Torture is present in all level-4 removal flights. However, we understand from our clients’ reports that severe violence is applied also on level-2 and 3 removal flights, which are in most instances not accompanied by the Commission. Generally, we would appreciate having more transparency in terms of planning and in terms of incidents during removal.

Another concerning aspect is the medical assessment made by the private company OSEARA which gives approval to (forcibly) remove people with medical issues. In our perspective, the assessments are not sufficient and oftentimes biased - namely when severely ill people’s condition is being assessed based on existing medical certificates only, without even talking to the person concerned. We are particularly concerned about the situation of people with severe mental health issues, children and victims of sex and gender based violence (SGBV).

When it comes to the countries to which returns took place in the year 2021, we are particularly concerned about the returns to Ethiopia, Sri Lanka and Turkey, where it is well known that returnees face a significant risk of persecution. We welcome the Swiss government’s decision to suspend returns to Afghanistan, noting that up until a few days before the Taliban took over Kabul, returns of various Afghan asylum applicants were being planned. We, therefore, generally ask for a more prudent and forward-looking approach when deciding whether a return can take place or not.

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)

Numbers show that Switzerland's contribution to global resettlement remains modest. For 2020/2021, the Federal Council approved the admission of up to 1,600 particularly vulnerable refugees: at least 80% of the quota will cover groups of persons from the crises in the Middle East and along the Central Mediterranean migration route; the remainder of the quota – no more than 20% – is intended for refugees from humanitarian emergency situations.

In theory, Switzerland has the instrument of humanitarian visa to offer a legal pathway to safety in situations of a crisis. However, in practice it is almost impossible to get a humanitarian visa - namely since the requirements are insurmountable (e.g. close connection to Switzerland, evidence for immediate threat to life). Moreover, the procedure is such that applicants must attend an interview at a Swiss embassy in person - noting that in the most critical countries such as Afghanistan, Eritrea or Libya there is no Swiss embassy at all. In most cases where a person then managed to get to a third country and got an interview appointment there, they were told that they are in a safe third country now and their application was therefore rejected. We urgently call on the Swiss government to make use of the instrument of humanitarian visa in a fair and transparent manner in order to allow for legal pathways for those people who are in fact directly at risk. The UNHCR has called on Switzerland among other countries to accept more resettlement refugees, especially as the asylum application figures are very low in the Covid-19 closed borders context. Switzerland evacuated 387 people from Afghanistan after the Taliban took over in the summer of 2021. 219 of these people were employees of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. These people are considered refugees under the resettlement quota program, namely 219 cases out of the 1600 cases planned by the Swiss government in 2020/2021. As such, not only the support for the local population is lacking, the number of people evacuated is used to increase the percentage of people admitted under the resettlement program. The resettlement program has fallen behind on its objectives by SEM's own admission. We are concerned about the lack of support for Afghan nationals from the Swiss government even though it's 2020/2021 quota has not been reached and emergency support is needed.

15. Relocation (ad hoc, emergency relocation; developments in activities organised under national schemes or on a bilateral basis)

There is no update since our report from last year (2020). We therefore refer to our comments from last year's comments.

We regret that Switzerland is not actively involved in any relocation schemes. It would be appreciated if Switzerland accepts applicants who currently stay in other countries, be it within or outside Europe - noting that in fact it is impossible for (hardly) any asylum seeker to arrive in Switzerland by legal ways.

16. National jurisprudence on international protection in 2020 (please include a link to the relevant case law and/or submit cases to the [EUAA Case Law Database](#))

17. Other important developments in 2021

References and sources

18. Please provide links to references and sources and/or upload the related material in PDF format

- Push-Back report by Asylex:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XO2PzHeTejpBdTqauuVgFAlzcLMScD3n/view?usp=sharing>

- Report about paid train tickets to France:

<https://www.20min.ch/story/hat-die-schweiz-afghanischen-migranten-tgv-tickets-bezahlt-786890064488>

- Report about the introduction of audio recording during interviews:

<https://blogs.letemps.ch/jasmine-caye/2020/04/08/enregistrement-audio-des-auditions-dasile-le-sem-considerere-la-chose/>

- Sources about the international proceedings against Switzerland regarding the lacking case-by-case assessment before a return to another Dublin country:

<https://centre-csdm.org/la-suisse-epinglee-pour-10-violations-de-la-convention-relative-aux-droits-de-lenfant-dans-le-cas-de-lexpulsion-dun-refugie-mineur-vers-la-bulgarie/>

<https://www.humanrights.ch/de/ueber-uns/migrationsbehoerden-interim-measures>

- Evaluation of the legal representation in the new asylum procedures:

<https://www.skmr.ch/de/themenbereiche/migration/publikationen/schlussbericht-evaluation-peru.html>

- Reports about violence against asylum seekers in federal asylum centers:

<https://www.sem.admin.ch/dam/sem/de/data/asyl/verfahren/ber-oberholzer-sicherheit-baz-d.pdf>

https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CERD/Shared%20Documents/CHE/INT_CERD_NGO_CHE_47077_E.pdf

<https://bit.ly/3cQJj7k>

<https://www.amnesty.ch/de/laender/europa-zentralasien/schweiz/dok/2021/amnesty-fordert-ende-von-menschenrechtsverletzungen-in-bundesasylzentren>

- Situation in Federal Asylum Centers

Stettler, Neustrukturierung des Asylbereichs – Asylsuchende mit besonderen Bedürfnissen im neuen schweizerischen Asylverfahren. Problemaufriss und erste Empfehlungen, August 2020, available at: <https://bit.ly/35YrIG4>

- Reduced social aid for people with temporary admission

<https://www.aargauerzeitung.ch/aargau/kanton-aargau/asylpolitik-verstoss-gegen-die-menschenwuerde-fluechtlingsfamilie-verklagt-aargauer-gesundheitsdepartement-ld.2248028?reduced=true>

- General hurdles to integration

'Fortress' Switzerland? Challenges to Integrating Migrants, Refugees and Asylum-Seekers, Maria M. Mexi / Paula Moreno Russi / Eva Fernández Guzman, available at https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-67284-3_11#Sec9

- Restrictions to movement for people with temporary admission:

<https://www.unhcr.org/dach/ch-fr/71845-le-hcr-deploire-linterdiction-strict-de-voyager-pour-les-personnes-admises-a-titre-provisoire.html>

- Medical assessments before forced removals:

<https://www.watson.ch/schweiz/migration/616971855-oseara-begleitet-ausschaffungsfluege-weiter>

- Resettlement program and Afghanistan:

<https://www.sem.admin.ch/sem/en/home/asyl/resettlement/programme.html>

<https://www.sem.admin.ch/sem/fr/home/asyl/afghanistan.html#-896259128>

<https://www.sem.admin.ch/sem/en/home/asyl/afghanistan.html>

19. Feedback or suggestions about the process or format for submissions to the Asylum Report

N/A

Please upload your file

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Contact details

* Name of organisation

AsyLex

Name and title of contact person

Caroline Widmer

* Email

international@asylex.ch

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

Useful links

[EASO Asylum Report 2021 \(https://euaa.europa.eu/easo-asylum-report-2021\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/easo-asylum-report-2021)

[Executive Summary -EASO Asylum Report 2021 \(https://euaa.europa.eu/executive-summary-asylum-report-2021\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/executive-summary-asylum-report-2021)

[Bibliography for the EASO Asylum Report 2021 \(https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/EASO_Asylum_Report_2021-Bibliography.pdf\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/EASO_Asylum_Report_2021-Bibliography.pdf)

[Summary of legislative, institutional and policy developments in asylum in EU+ countries in 2019 \(https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/easo-asylum-report-eu-developments.pdf\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/easo-asylum-report-eu-developments.pdf)

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

[EASO Asylum Report 2021 Key Findings \(https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/key_findings.pdf\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/key_findings.pdf)

[EU+ and Country Data \(https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/europe-country-data-2020.pdf\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/europe-country-data-2020.pdf)

Background Documents

[Input by civil society to the 2022 Asylum Report.docx](#)

Contact

[Contact Form](#)