



EMN Ad-Hoc Query on Ad-Hoc Query on Asylum seekers from Afghanistan

Requested by FI EMN NCP on 2nd November 2015

Compilation Prepared on 22 December 2015

Summary prepared by NO EMN NCP on 05.01.2016 based on responses from Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom, Norway and Croatia

Disclaimer:

The responses were provided primarily for the purpose of information exchange among EMN NCPs in the framework of the EMN. The contributing EMN NCPs provided, to the best of their knowledge, information that was up-to-date, objective and reliable. Note, however, that the information provided did not necessarily represent the official policy of the EMN NCPs' Member State.

Background: Afghan nationals have currently been the second largest group among the asylum seekers in Finland. Therefore political interest has risen whether there are differences amongst the Member States regarding the policies concerning Afghan asylum seekers.

Questions



1. Do you grant subsidiary protection pursuant to Art. 15 lit. c of the Qualification Directive to asylum seekers from Afghanistan? Concerning which areas?
2. How many asylums and other protection status have been granted this year and how many asylum applications have been rejected (excluding dismissal of a case) to asylum seekers from Afghanistan?

Summary of responses

While 16 responses signaled that subsidiary protection had been or could be granted to asylum seekers from Afghanistan, 6 stressed that the decision would be based on an individual assessment in each case. In 6 responses it was signaled that subsidiary protection could not be granted according to the national legislation or because the country information needed for this was not available.

Five responses listed areas that were considered safe or unsafe respectively. The following areas were listed as unsafe by one or more countries: Kandahar, Helmand, Kunar, Nangarhar, Kunduz, Paktika, Paktia, Wardak, Ghazni, Faryab, Herat, Khost, Laghman, Badghis Kapisa, Logar, Nimroz, Nuristan, Uruzgan, and Zabul. The most unstable districts in Badakhshan, Baghlan, Jawzjan and Sari Pul were also listed by at least one country. As safe areas were listed by at least one response the provinces of Kabul, Panjshir, Bamyan, Daikundi, Takhar, Balkh and Samangan. In 9 responses it was stated that there are unsafe areas in Afghanistan, without naming them. Only in the NO response is it mentioned explicitly that protection had been denied with reference to internal flight alternatives being available. In 2 responses it was stated that the whole of Afghanistan was considered unsafe, while 3 responses stated that the situation in Afghanistan was not considered to meet the definition of an armed conflict.

In 2 responses it was stated that the country had had none or very few asylum seekers from Afghanistan.

Statistics on the number and type of decisions were provided in all responses except one (CY), but neither the categorizations nor the reference periods were standardized. Thus totals cannot be presented on the basis of these responses.