

# Input by civil society organisations to the Asylum Report 2026

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

Dear Colleagues,

The production of the Asylum Report 2026 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 2025 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 2025 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: Similarly to last year, this year's edition of the Asylum Report will be leaner and more analytical, 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. It will also feature prominently as info boxes in the [country overviews](#).***

Your input matters to us and will be much appreciated!

**\*Please submit your contribution to the Asylum Report 2026 by Friday, 9 January 2026.\***

## Contact details

---

\* Name of organisation

Safe Passage International France

Name and title of contact person

Marie-Charlotte FABIE (Director of Safe Passage International France) / Elise DELAFONTAINE (Legal Coordinator, Safe Passage International France)

\* Email

m.fabie@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?

Despite the organisation of two consultative meetings organised by the French Ministry of Interior inviting several NGOs, at this stage clarity about the French implementation plan is still lacking.

## **PART A: Contributions by topic**

---

**Please share your reporting on developments in asylum law, policies or practices in 2025 by topic. Kindly make sure that you provide information on:**

- New developments and improvements in 2025 and new or remaining challenges;
- Changes in legislation, policies or practices, or institutional changes during 2025.

### **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)**

a. Access to territory – Focus on the issues related to Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children (UASC) access to France via family reunion under the Dublin III regulation

The adequate identification of cases in which unaccompanied minors could reunite with family members in France under the Dublin III regulation remains an ongoing challenge. It remains crucial that adequate training is delivered to professionals working with unaccompanied minors to ensure that they are aware of the possibility of initiating proceedings under the Dublin III regulation. Through our casework, it appears that capacity-building is required to ensure unaccompanied minors across Europe get effective access to this intra-European family reunification route.

=> With the upcoming implementation of the European Pact on Asylum and Migration, the impact of the “Screening Regulation” (2024/1356) on UASC’s access to the European territory will have to be monitored. While the Regulation requires children to be identified during the screening period, it does not state any specific provisions in relation to age-assessment procedures. No mention is made either about the presence of child protection services within those “screening” zones. There are significant implications for an UASC who might not be identified as procedural guarantees applicable would then not be applied to them. As such, they could be referred to the “asylum border procedure”, resulting in a fiction of non-entry on the territory, instead of being let into the territory to claim asylum. Additionally, if they are not correctly “screened” as UASC, young people would de facto be barred access to family reunification under the AMMR.

b. Access to the asylum procedure – Focus on the issues related to UASC’s within the context of the Dublin

### III regulation

Here, the issue of accessing the asylum procedure is two-fold.

First, it is necessary for UASC to be able to access this procedure in the country where they currently are. This requires their designated legal representative to have been appointed, and for the representative to have assessed that it's in the interest of the minor to claim asylum. While this assessment might be more "obvious" in certain cases, especially when UASC are able to articulate their fear of persecution (because of communication skills, available interpreting services, trusted environment...) indications are not always as clear. For instance, younger children might not always be able to express the reasons for their displacement, and professionals might not have identified any indicators. Their priority might lie in leveraging other child protection systems which are outside the remit of asylum. In such cases, unaccompanied minors might not access the asylum procedure straightforwardly. As a ripple effect, this can affect the access to family reunification procedures under the Dublin III regulation, and the forthcoming AMMR.

On the other end, if a transfer has occurred between two Member States and the UASC arrives in France to join relatives, barriers to access asylum procedures remain. At their arrival at the airport, UASCs are given a "sauf-conduit" requiring them to introduce their claim for international protection within 8 days. This is the only information which is given to reunited families. No information is provided about the access and different stages of this asylum procedure. This continues to be a challenge for families who are often understandably confused by the complexity of the Dublin procedures and therefore do not always understand the requirement for children to claim asylum on arrival. Not all families have experience and knowledge of the asylum procedures. Despite this reality, they are left to their own devices, unless NGOs support them during this transition from pre- to post-family reunification. This remains a challenge in terms of both access to information and access to the asylum procedure.

Although the very reason a child is transferred is because France acknowledged its responsibility to take charge of their asylum procedure, there is a lack of anticipation in terms of lifting administrative barriers to access this procedure. Indeed, an UASC joining relatives (not parents) will still legally be considered "unaccompanied" as their relative is not automatically considered their legal representative. When they wish to introduce their asylum claim, as per the "sauf-conduit" requirement and as provisioned by the Dublin III regulation, they are advised that this is impossible in the absence of a legal representative. Although the Préfecture has the duty to make a request for an "administrateur ad hoc" to be designated for a child who has expressed their intention to introduce an asylum claim, this is not automatically done. In practice, discrepancies prevail and lead to ongoing challenges in UASCs accessing the asylum procedure following their transfer. This remains an area of concern.

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

a. Focus on the access to information about family reunification rights for UASC under the Dublin III regulation

As indicated above, capacity-building around family reunion is required to allow for better access to information around these procedures. Frontline practitioners work in a highly demanding environment, juggling many responsibilities. In the absence of training on the matter, it can be particularly challenging to familiarise with this complex procedure amidst the workload. To address this challenge, scheduled dedicated training should be provided.

Through our casework, we have witnessed that collaboration between specialised NGOs, child protection professionals, families and legal representatives can enhance the quality of the Take Charge Requests sent in the context of family reunification proceedings under the Dublin III regulation. Collaborative case management leads to collective improvements in practice and paves the way for further cases to be taken on, with capacity being strengthened.

Beyond the access to information for practitioners, the question of UASC's access to information on their right to family reunification prevails. This challenge should be addressed by ensuring procedures are child-centered and that appropriate information is provided about their rights. However, such information cannot be delivered unless professionals themselves have an opportunity to familiarise themselves with the procedures.

Further to these challenges, there are specific concerns about the lack of information sharing at the stage of decision notification. Indeed, as the procedure is grounded in an interstate mechanism, the notification of decision is communicated between the two Dublin Units. Family members who wish to be joined by a UASC are usually not informed of the decision on the Take Charge Request. This is particularly concerning when a negative decision has been made. UASC themselves are sometimes not informed of these decisions. In the absence of a copy of the decision, the possibility for one to exercise their right of appeal is de facto hindered. Thus, this access to information related challenge raises significant concerns in terms of the access to legal assistance.

=>Article 19 of the AMMR states that Member States will have the duty to inform asylum seekers about the "provisions relating to family reunification and, in that regard, the applicable definition of family members and relatives". It is further noted that this information must be provided by Member States at latest by the date at which an application for international protection is registered. While this provision affirms the right to information, we are yet to observe how this will be implemented in each Member State. The question remains as to whether adequate forms of communication will enable effective access to this right about which information is given.

b. Focus on the access to legal assistance within the context of family reunion under the Dublin III regulation

In the countries of transit, legal assistance is essential for UASCs to access the asylum procedures and subsequent family reunification procedures. The system of legal representative appointments requires renewed attention to ensure that legal representatives have capacity to provide individual casework. Challenges related to staff turnover and high workload conjugated with the complexities of building family reunification cases make up for different challenges to appear. Within this context, Safe Passage continues to observe the positive impact of interdisciplinary collaboration with different actors across Europe to ensure legal assistance is provided and children's rights remain at the heart of the procedures. Such collaboration continues to be an example of best practice.

=>Within the AMMR, article 23(2(b)) states that a legal representative should be designated no later than 15 days after a presumed minor presents their asylum claim. While the introduction of a time-limit can be welcomed as a commitment to rationalise the provision of legal assistance, the question remains as to how unaccompanied minors will be able to even present their case to the authorities in the absence of a previously appointed legal guardian. Provisions regarding the appointment of legal representatives are disseminated throughout the EU Pact. However, the practical implementation of such provisions and their interpretation in practice remain to be seen.

The required skills and profile of the designated "legal representative" are not precisely defined within the new EU Pact, and the designation mechanism is also yet to be precised by each implementing MS. The issue of "legal representative's" capacity to provide individualised casework in the context of significant workload and responsibilities therefore remains an area of concern.

### **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)**

a. Focus on family reunification procedures under the Dublin III regulation: delays of the procedure

Unaccompanied minors who wish to reunite with family members in France through the Dublin III regulation are still facing delays in the procedures. Adding to the delays in accessing asylum procedures in their countries of transit - which is the point of entry for family reunification to be initiated under the Dublin III regulation - UASC then experience delays while their Take Charge Request (TCR) is being assessed by the requested Member State. Such delays are not neutral for UASC whose separation with family members and relatives is subsequently prolonged. UASC can be informed of a set waiting time of 2 months for a decision to be issued once the TCR is sent. This does allow for some clarity (granted this delay is respected by the requested Member State), which can facilitate stabilisation during the waiting period. However, in the case of a refusal by the requested Member State and subsequent reexamination request made by the requesting Member State, UASCs are placed in an aggravated situation of limbo. Indeed, Member States are not bound/constrained by a time limit in their assessment of a reexamination request. This continues to be a challenge which negatively impacts UASCs who are yet again subject to a period of limbo and are reduced to passivity in these procedures, with no horizons of clarity.

=> Within the EU Pact, the AMMR asserts its objective of rationalising procedures. This translates into a shortened timeframe within which the responsible Member State for an asylum claim must be determined. Article 23 and 46(1) of the AMMR explicitly states that Take Charge Requests sent on behalf of UASCs must be prioritised. Provisions in articles 39(1) and 40(1) determine the delays within which such requests must be sent and, subsequently, within which delays they must be assessed. Although such prioritisation could signify an acknowledgement of the impact of prolonged waiting times on UASCs, this raises the question of Member States' capacity to answer within shortened time frame. Within our casework, we continue to observe the prevalence of decisions by the requested Member State stating that due to an insufficient understanding of one of the elements of the case, they need to lead further investigation. Further to this, it is suggested that such investigation cannot be led within the set 2 months' timeframe and that, therefore, the request "cannot be accepted yet". The requesting Member State is invited to submit a reexamination request to allow for further investigation to be led. In the absence of strengthened capacity and a shift in practice from the requested authorities, we can anticipate an increase in the issuance of negative decisions at first instance. This would continue to be grounded in Member States' rationale of avoiding implicit acceptance by the means of sending a sort of "holding" negative decision. In such a scenario, the rationalization of the procedure would not necessarily lead to reduced waiting times for UASCs who would continue to be subject to a period of limbo after a refusal at first instance.

b. Focus on family reunification procedures under the Dublin III regulation: enhancing cooperation

We continue to observe the benefits of strengthened working relationships between NGOs, Child Protection services, legal representatives and Dublin Units. Involvement of NGOs specialising in family reunification work helps to alleviate the weight of child protection services and legal representatives' workload while also contributing to mid-to-long term capacity-building. Additionally, upstream coordination allows for enhanced quality of the submitted Take Charge Requests. Ongoing dialogue between different actors then facilitates careful monitoring of the case to ensure that the best interest of the child remains at the forefront of the procedures' course. Improved communication between Dublin Units and these actors should be further developed to address the identified challenges. While new instances of best practice have been identified, the challenge of strengthening such cooperation across Europe remains.

**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)

### a. Focus on unaccompanied minors' needs in the context of family reunification

Concerns about the anticipated impact of the new EU Screening regulation on the identification of unaccompanied children at the entry points of Europe have already been addressed in 1)a. In the interest of avoiding repetition, this will not be further developed in this paragraph.

Similarly, concerns about the access to legal representation for unaccompanied pre and post family reunification have also been mentioned in 1) b and 2) b.

Further to 4)b., the presence of a trained case officer dedicated to UASC and family reunification matters within the French Dublin Unit appears to be good practice as it allows for better understanding of UASCs' specific needs. The implementation of the AMMR should be an opportunity to renew and strengthen this practice.

The importance of trained staff at every stage of the procedure is crucial, not only to allow for vulnerabilities to be identified but to ensure that the identified vulnerabilities are adequately addressed throughout the procedures. From our casework practice in the last quarter, we have observed a surge in young unaccompanied girls' cases. This reinforces the importance of addressing specific safeguarding challenge related to gender-based violence, Female Genital Mutilation (FGM), exploitation...

A remaining challenge lays in the absence of proactive coordination between French child protection services and French authorities in the anticipation of an UASCs arrival. While family members or relatives have indeed accepted their responsibility in taking care of the child, this should not be the only guarantee for the child's best interest to be protected post family reunification. There is still a gap in adopting a multidimensional approach in family reunification under the Dublin III procedure.

As the best interest of the child is mentioned as a primary consideration, it could be argued that this consideration is not solely bound by the timeline of the legal procedure alone. Therefore, considerations of post family reunification matters should be anticipated. This does not require taking a restrictive and limiting approach to the assessment of family reunification case, nor falling into the pitfalls of misinterpreting the Regulation to apply fictitious maintenance and accommodation requirements. Instead, it should mean better coordination between child protection services of the locality, "services départementales" and Dublin authorities ahead of the arrival, to ensure that local services are notified of the presence of the child and can be alert to any referrals. It could also allow for tailored social support to be provided for the families on arrival. Such cooperation is currently still lacking and prevents a preventative safeguarding framework to be implemented beyond the "legal ending point" of the procedure. Such coordination could also be extended to address the issue of access to legal representation in the asylum procedure, which has already been identified as a

remaining challenge.

**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 2025 (please include a link to the relevant case law and/or submit cases to the [EUAA Case Law Database](#))**

CNDA, 11 juillet 2025, Mme H., n° 24035619, R [Link here : <https://www.refworld.org/jurisprudence/caselaw/fracnda/2025/fr/150298>] : By a decision of 11 July 2025, the National Court on the Right to Asylum (CNDA) held that, considering the nature of warfare methods used by the IDF, Palestinian nationals from the Gaza Strip (regardless of whether or not they are under the mandate of UNRWA) are directly and personally persecuted based on their nationality. This conclusion led to a Palestinian mother and her child to be recognised as refugees in application of the 1951 Geneva Convention.

Cour administrative d'appel de Nantes, 5ème chambre, 19 décembre 2025, n° 25NT02148 | Doctrine [Link here : <https://www.doctrine.fr/d/CAA/Nantes/2025/CAADEFE69E08894BE58B2C>] : This decision from the Administrative Court of Appeal concerns the cases of Afghan nationals from a same family who are residing in Iran and made a Visa application to claim asylum in France.

Following the negative decision from the French consular authority in Tehran on their Visa applications, and the subsequent pre-appeal stage, the claimants lodged an appeal at the administrative tribunal.

By a decision of 16 June 2025, the administrative tribunal annulled the decision and enjoined the Ministry of Interior to deliver Visas.

On 7 August 2025, the Ministry of Interior lodged an appeal against the administrative tribunal's decision. The Ministry of Interior's appeal was based on the grounds that the consular authorities' initial decision was not illegal, that it was not vitiated by a failure to carry out a proper examination of the specific circumstances of the case, nor vitiated by a manifest error of assessment on the part of the authorities.

Considering the characterised circumstances in which the claimants are and the specific facts of the case, the Administrative Court of Appeal stated that the Ministry of Interior is not justified in claiming that the administrative tribunal was wrong in grounding its decision on the basis of a manifest error of assessment on the part of the authorities.

This decision implies that although the act of granting Visas allowing third-country nationals to travel to France for the purpose of lodging an asylum claim is a discretionary power of the authorities, decision-making must be grounded in a fair appreciation of the specific facts of the case.

## 16. Other important developments in 2025

On 28 October 2025, the Socialist group at the Assemblée Nationale introduced a Parliament Bill provisioning that age-disputed unaccompanied young people who are appealing the decision of their age-assessment should benefit from the "presumption of minority" while their appeal is ongoing. In practice, this would mean that age-disputed young people would be maintained in temporary accommodation and provided support while their age-assessment appeal is ongoing. The provided support should be maintained until the Court issues a decision on the age-assessment.

On 11 December 2025, the Assemblée Nationale MPs voted in favor of the adoption of this bill. Amendments were also suggested for the bill to enshrine age-disputed young people's right to access education and for the use of forensic medical examinations to be banned for the purposes of age-assessment. The bill, including these amendments, were adopted after first reading by the Assemblée Nationale.

The Bill has now been sent to the "second room of Parliament" to the Sénat and will be subject to discussion and vote there.

If this bill is adopted and enacted, it will have huge implications for age-disputed unaccompanied young people as it will guarantee their rights during this period of administrative limbo.

## PART B: Publications

---

### 1. If available online, please provide links to relevant publications produced by your organisation in 2025.

### 2. If not available online, please share your publications with us at: [Asylum.Report@euaa.europa.eu](mailto: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.**

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

## **Useful links**

[EUAA Asylum Report 2025 \(https://euaa.europa.eu/asylum-report-2025\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/asylum-report-2025)

[Executive Summary -Asylum Report 2025 \(https://euaa.europa.eu/asylum-report-2025-executive-summary\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/asylum-report-2025-executive-summary)

[Sources on Asylum 2025 \(https://euaa.europa.eu/publications/sources-asylum-2025\)](https://euaa.europa.eu/publications/sources-asylum-2025)

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

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

## **Background Documents**

[Word template to submit input to the 2026 Asylum Report.docx](#)

## **Contact**

[Contact Form](#)