

Asylum System in Decline

APRIL 2025



Submission to the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers in the cases of M.S.S. v. Greece / H.A. v. Greece

Table of contents

Introduction	2
Asylum procedures	3
Barriers to access to the asylum process.....	3
Chronic, protracted delays in registering asylum applications	3
Blanket fee for second subsequent applications	5
Systemic deficiencies in the asylum process	5
Halt of state-provided interpretation services	6
Arbitrary use of the “safe third country” concept	6
Concerns on the effectiveness of asylum appeals	8
Concerns on the accessibility of asylum appeals	11
Living conditions for asylum seekers	13
Quality of services in camps	13
Reception of vulnerable asylum seekers	16
Protection of unaccompanied children	18
Living conditions of unaccompanied children	18
Guardianship	20
Conditions of detention	21
Conditions in pre-removal detention centres.....	21
Conditions in <i>de facto</i> detention in RIC & CCAC	21
Recommendations to the Committee	23

Introduction

1. In view of the upcoming examination of the *M.S.S. v. Greece*¹ and *H.A. v. Greece*² groups of cases at the 1531st meeting of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (hereafter “the Committee”) in June 2025, Refugee Support Aegean (RSA) and Stiftung PRO ASYL wish to submit an updated assessment of Greek asylum system pursuant to Rule 9.2. of the Rules of the Committee. Our last contribution to the Committee on this group was submitted in July 2023.³
2. The present Rule 9.2 submission draws on RSA casework and litigation at domestic and European level, documentation of the current legal framework and practice in the implementation of the Greek asylum system, analysis of official statistics supplied by the Greek government,⁴ as well as documented exchanges thereof with the Task Force Migration Management of the European Commission, “responsible for overseeing the [European] Union’s strategic, operational, legal and financial efforts in migration management”.⁵ We recall that supervision of compliance with Articles 3 and 13 of the European Convention on Human Rights (hereafter “the Convention”) in the context of execution of the *M.S.S.* and *H.A.* groups of cases is inextricably tied to respect for and implementation of binding European Union (EU) legislative standards on asylum.
3. 2024 in particular was marked by a near-total halt of basic services for asylum seekers in Greece, only partially mentioned in the government’s latest Action Plan.⁶ These include: withdrawal of state-provided **Interpretation** services in the asylum process and in reception facilities (camps); year-long arrears in **Legal Aid** payments; complete suspension of the monthly financial allowance (**Cash Assistance**) granted to asylum seekers living in camps.⁷ Chronic weaknesses in funding and programme management on the part of the Ministry of Migration and Asylum have led to “severe gaps in services due to framework contract interruptions (e.g., interpretation, transportation, and cash assistance)”,⁸ consistently highlighted by the European Commission and still persisting.

¹ App No 30696/09, 21 January 2011.

² App No 4892/18, 13 June 2023.

³ DH-DD(2023)903. See also DH-DD(2021)521; DH-DD(2020)723.

⁴ Namely, on the **asylum procedure**, Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 97157/2022, 17 February 2022, available [here](#); 156079/2023, 16 March 2023, available [here](#); 167016/2024, 10 June 2024, available [here](#); 43015/2025, 10 March 2025, available [here](#). On **reception**, Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 39780/2025, 4 March 2025, available [here](#). On **detention**, Ministry of Citizen Protection, Reply to parliamentary question, 7017/4/26670-γ', 17 April 2024, available [here](#); 7017/4/26961-γ', 27 September 2024, available [here](#); 7017/4/27283-σ', 1 April 2025, available [here](#).

⁵ European Commission, Letter on Complaint CPLT (2022) 00677 against Greece, Ares(2025)2448222, 26 March 2025. The documents in question have been obtained by RSA upon public access request.

⁶ DH-DD(2025)440, paras 16 and 18.

⁷ Namely, RSA, ‘Major deficiencies in the provision of interpretation services in Greece’, 5 November 2024, available [here](#); ‘Suspension of financial assistance to asylum seekers in Greece since May 2024’, 1 October 2024, available [here](#); ‘Persisting severe reception deficiencies in understaffed camps’, 5 September 2024, available [here](#).

⁸ European Commission, *Mission Report: Technical visit to Samos and Athens – September 2024*, Ares(2024)6443981, 11 September 2024, 2; *Communication on the status of migration management in mainland Greece*, COM(2025) 170, 4 April 2025, 6.

Asylum procedures

Barriers to access to the asylum process

4. The last Decision of the Committee reiterated longstanding concerns regarding access to the asylum procedure in Greece.⁹ These persist due to the ongoing inability of the state to ensure prompt registration of asylum applications within the deadlines set out in EU and domestic law.¹⁰ We also stress that access to the asylum process is severely, inevitably undermined by Greece' systematic practice of unlawful push backs at land and sea, covered under the **A.R.E. v. Greece** judgment of the Court.¹¹

Chronic, protracted delays in registering asylum applications

5. **Delays in screening in RIC / CCAC:** As highlighted in our previous submission to the Committee, Greece prohibits direct access to the asylum procedure for persons who have not previously undergone reception and identification ("screening") procedures, as a rule.¹² Domestic law requires people undergoing screening procedures inside Reception and Identification Centres (RIC) and Closed Controlled Access Centres (CCAC) to remain inside the facilities until screening is completed. This measure amounts to *de facto* deprivation of liberty under a "restriction of freedom" order valid for five days, subject to an extension to a total of 25 days.¹³ As many as 25,892 such extensions of "restriction on freedom" orders were issued in the course of 2024.¹⁴
6. However, even the maximum 25-day time limit for screening has been systematically exceeded in camps such as RIC Malakasa, CCAC Samos and CCAC Leros due to shortages in registration capacity and [interpretation](#). Asylum seekers thereby remain inside RIC / CCAC for periods often exceeding two months under *de facto* deprivation of liberty in unacceptable [Living Conditions](#), without documentation attesting their legal status, without access to key rights and services and without the possibility to authorise a legal representative in line with domestic law formalities.¹⁵ The assessment of those deficiencies is linked to asylum seekers' access to an effective remedy for complaints regarding reception conditions, as well as to a remedy against deprivation of liberty,

⁹ CM/Del/Dec(2023)1475/H46-15, para 2.

¹⁰ Article 6(1) Directive 2013/32/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 on common procedures for granting and withdrawing international protection (Asylum Procedures Directive) [2013] OJ L180/60; Article 69(1), (2) and (7) L 4939/2022 (Greek Asylum Code), Gov. Gazette A' 111/10.06.2022.

¹¹ App No 15783/21, 7 January 2025.

¹² DH-DD(2023)903, para 6.

¹³ Article 40(a) Greek Asylum Code. Note CPT/Inf (2024) 21, para 104.

¹⁴ Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 37902/2025, 27 February 2025, available [here](#).

¹⁵ Note the pending cases of **W.B. and others v. Greece** App No 36142/23, Communicated 21 March 2025; **Z.H. and S.T.H. v. Greece** App No 34712/23, Communicated 21 March 2025; **S.A. and others v. Greece** App No 34380/24.

the latter considered under the Committee's ongoing supervision of execution of the **M.D. v. Greece** group.¹⁶

7. **Online platform for registration appointments:** In its last Decision, the Committee made specific reference to the "online system for registration of asylum applications". We reiterate that the online platform of the Ministry of Migration and Asylum serves solely to schedule appointments for people to appear in person before RIC Malakasa and RIC Diavata. This is the only available channel for individuals wishing to access the asylum procedure in mainland Greece.
8. Access to the online platform remains problematic on account of recurrent interruptions owed to "technical errors" or to a lack of available appointments, especially for RIC Malakasa. We regret the latest Action Plan's reference to the status of the platform as "operational without interruption",¹⁷ particularly given that the Greek government has not supplied data on its exact workings e.g. number of appointment slots made available per day and language, periods during which the platform remained out of order.
9. As a result of those deficiencies, asylum seekers who resort to the only available channel for access to the asylum process in mainland Greece are left for prolonged periods without an appointment and without any information on when their claim may be registered.¹⁸ People who are unable to book online registration appointments and attempt to directly approach the mainland RIC in person continue to be arbitrarily arrested and detained by the Hellenic Police, as confirmed by recent Ombudsman interventions to the Greek government.¹⁹ This persisting practice dispels the Greek government's view that asylum seekers may in practice lodge an asylum claim by appearing directly in a mainland RIC.²⁰
10. In the meantime, the Greek authorities refuse to acknowledge that persons who do manage to obtain an appointment via the online platform and who await entry into RIC Malakasa or Diavata hold "asylum seeker" status, in breach of express provisions of EU and domestic law.²¹ This stance also runs counter to domestic case law and explicit positions of the European Commission, cited in our previous submission to the Committee.²² The European Commission has recently reiterated those legal concerns,²³ to no avail.

¹⁶ App No 60622/11, 13 November 2014. Note in particular DH-DD(2024)1235; DH-DD(2024)1329.

¹⁷ DH-DD(2025)440, para 13.

¹⁸ DH-DD(2025)159, para 1.b; Equal Rights Beyond Borders et al., 'Greece must fix its dysfunctional registration system which unlawfully detains asylum seekers and denies them access to fundamental rights', 24 October 2024, available [here](#).

¹⁹ Greek Ombudsman, 367886/20654, 7 April 2025. For earlier examples of arrest outside RIC Malakasa, DH-DD(2023)903, para 11.

²⁰ DH-DD(2025)440, para 13.


²¹ Namely, Articles 1(c) and 69(8) Greek Asylum Code.

²² DH-DD(2023)903, paras 8-9. Note also European Commission, *Operational Conclusions 16th Steering Committee Meeting for Migration Management*, Ares(2024)5158926, 22 March 2024.

²³ European Commission, *Communication on the status of migration management in mainland Greece*, COM(2025) 170, 4 April 2025, 11.

Blanket fee for second subsequent applications

11. Greece maintains legislation requiring payment a 100 € fee per person for every second or onward subsequent asylum application, without exception.²⁴ Since its entry into force, the 100 € fee rule has been applied to 1,187 applications in 2022, 852 in 2023 and 1,223 in 2024. This means that access to the asylum process has been subject to financial charges for more than 3,200 applications, many of them referring to more than one individual applicant:



Source: Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 16 Mar 2023; 10 Jun 2024; 10 Mar 2025

12. Many of the cases subject to the 100 € fee rule are subsequent asylum applications made following arbitrary dismissal of an earlier application as inadmissible based on the presumption that Türkiye qualifies as a [Safe Third Country](#) for persons originating from Afghanistan, Syria, Somalia, Pakistan and Bangladesh, as detailed below. This concerned 84 such applications in 2023 and 137 in 2024.
13. Judicial review of the 100 € fee rule has been pending before the Greek Council of State for over three years, with no indicated time by which a judgment may be expected.²⁵ We recall in this regard that the European Commission has repeatedly voiced concerns about the compatibility of the rule with EU standards²⁶ and highlighted “the need to waive such fee, in line with EU law”,²⁷ to no avail.

Systemic deficiencies in the asylum process

14. The majority of asylum applications examined on the merits are granted at first instance, as confirmed by official figures.²⁸ The Asylum Service maintains high recognition rates for the main

²⁴ Article 94(10) Greek Asylum Code; JMD 472687/2021, Gov. Gazette B' 6246/27.12.2021.

²⁵ Council of State, E493/2022, lodged on 25 February 2022, heard on 14 May 2024 and pending.

²⁶ DH-DD(2023)903, para 23.

²⁷ European Commission, *Communication on the status of migration management in mainland Greece*, COM(2025) 170, 4 April 2025, 12.

²⁸ The first-instance recognition rate in decisions examined on the merits in 2024 was 79%. Note that the latest Action Plan refers to a general rate of 51.1% at first instance: DH-DD(2025)440, para 9.

countries of origin of people seeking asylum in Greece, among which are Syria, Afghanistan, Palestine, Eritrea, Yemen and Sudan. The same countries, however, reflect the main nationalities of people targeted by Hellenic Police deportation orders. We further discuss the practice in our contributions to the Committee's supervision of the **M.D. v. Greece** group of cases.²⁹

15. In addition, a series of systemic deficiencies in the asylum process, anchored in domestic legislation and practice, consistently raise potent risks of *refoulement* and of arbitrary denial of protection contrary to Articles 3 and 13 of the Convention. This section examines selected issues in the asylum procedure at first and second instance.

Half of state-provided interpretation services

16. Persisting issues in the Ministry of Migration and Asylum's management of framework contracts with the NGO Metadrası for the provision of EU-funded interpretation services in the asylum process and in camps, including outstanding payments,³⁰ have led to severe interruption in deployment of Metadrası interpreters throughout 2023 and 2024.³¹ These gaps have not been restored and have only been partially mitigated by European Union Agency for Asylum (EUAA) interpreters on an *ad hoc* basis. As a result, crucial procedures such as **Registration** of applications, asylum interviews, notification of decisions, appointment of and contact with **Legal Aid** lawyers, still face repeated postponements across the different offices of the Asylum Service.³²

Arbitrary use of the “safe third country” concept

17. The Greek government has insisted on dismissing asylum applications without an assessment on the merits on the ground that Türkiye is a “safe third country” for applicants originating from Syria, Afghanistan, Somalia, Pakistan and Bangladesh. Following the June 2021 legislative designation of Türkiye as a “safe third country” in a national list of safe third countries, successively renewed ever since,³³ the Asylum Service has dismissed nearly 15,000 claims as inadmissible and ordered removal of the persons concerned to Türkiye:


²⁹ For details, see DH-DD(2024)1235, 4.

³⁰ European Commission, Email correspondence: 'updates mainland', Ares(2024)7851958, 30 July 2024.

³¹ For details, see DH-DD(2024)1235, 7-8.

³² Namely, RSA, 'Major deficiencies in the provision of interpretation services in Greece', 5 November 2024, available [here](#).

³³ JMD 42799/2021, Gov. Gazette B' 2425/07.06.2021; JMD 458568/2021, Gov. Gazette B' 5949/15.12.2021; JMD 734214/2022, Gov. Gazette B' 6250/06.12.2022; JMD 538595/2023, Gov. Gazette B' 7063/15.12.2023.



Source: Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 17 Feb 2022; 16 Mar 2023; 10 Jun 2024; 10 Mar 2025

18. “Safe third country” decisions of the Asylum Service are largely upheld on appeal. In 2024, for example, 1,132 second-instance decisions upheld “safe third country” decisions and only 227 overturned them and proceeded to examining the merits of the asylum claim.
19. The dismissal of asylum claims on the basis of that policy contravenes Article 3 standards as elaborated in the case law of the European Court of Human Rights,³⁴ given that the designation of Türkiye as a “safe third country” and ensuing rejection decisions have not been preceded by a thorough assessment of the adequacy of the country’s asylum system and of its capacity to offer protection against *refoulement*.³⁵ We namely recall that the Court has found critical relevant shortcomings in *Akkad v. Türkiye*,³⁶ a judgment pending execution to date.
20. On 21 March 2025, the Greek Council of State announced its decision to annul the Joint Ministerial Decision designating Türkiye as a safe third country on the ground that the Greek government had not assessed available country information against the requisite safety standards in domestic EU and legislation and had thereby not substantiated its designation.³⁷ Publication of the judgment is pending. Yet, asylum applications have continued to be arbitrarily dismissed,³⁸ while the government adopted a fresh designation³⁹ before the judgment was made public.

³⁴ *Ilias and Ahmed v. Hungary* App No 47287/15, 21 November 2019. Note also the pending case *J.B. v. Greece* App No 54796/16, Communicated 18 May 2017.

³⁵ For an analysis of domestic case law, drawing on over 160 decisions, see RSA & PRO ASYL, *The Concept of “Safe Third Country”: Legal Standards & Implementation in the Greek Asylum System*, February 2024, available [here](#). This is a recurring point of concern: DH-DD(2023)903, paras 29-32; DH-DD(2020)723, paras 32-34.

³⁶ *Akkad v. Türkiye* App No 1557/19, 21 June 2022.


³⁷ Council of State, ‘Ανακοίνωση του Προέδρου του Σ.Τ.Ε. σχετικά με το αποτέλεσμα της διάσκεψης επί υποθέσεων, οι οποίες συζητήθηκαν στην Ολομέλεια στις 7 Φεβρουαρίου 2025 και αφορούν τον χαρακτηρισμό της Τουρκίας ως ασφαλούς τρίτης χώρας.’, 21 March 2025, available [here](#).

³⁸ Namely, 9th Appeals Committee, IP/175975/2025, 24 March 2025.

³⁹ JMD 63905/2025, Gov. Gazette B’ 1727/08.04.2025.

Concerns on the effectiveness of asylum appeals

21. The last Decision of the Committee invited the Greek government to provide an assessment of the effectiveness of available remedies against shortcomings in the assessment of asylum applications.⁴⁰ We recall that Greek law foresees an administrative appeal remedy against negative decisions of the Asylum Service, examined by Independent Appeals Committees of the Appeals Authority under the Ministry of Migration and Asylum.⁴¹
22. We maintain serious concerns as to the effectiveness of said remedy, on account of a number of systemic shortcomings stemming from both domestic law and administrative practice:
23. **Refusal to conduct oral hearings, as a rule:** Domestic law provides that asylum appeals are examined by way of written procedure as a rule,⁴² and imposes a blanket prohibition on remand of cases to the first instance.⁴³ Whereas oral hearings at second instance are mandatory under certain conditions e.g. where doubts arise as to the completeness of the first-instance interview,⁴⁴ oral examination of appeals remains an extremely restricted and declining practice:⁴⁵



Source: Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 16 Mar 2023; 10 Jun 2024; 10 Mar 2025

24. Standard-setting jurisprudence of the Greek Council of State highlights that Appeals Committees must order an oral hearing where the evidence collected in the personal interview at first instance leaves gaps regarding crucial statements of the applicant or elements invoked. Accordingly, Appeals Committees may not refuse to discharge the duty of an oral hearing on the ground that the asylum seeker is able to put forward their statements through their written appeal and memo (*υπόμνημα*) before them.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ CM/Del/Dec(2023)1475/H46-15, para 2.

⁴¹ Article 97(1) Greek Asylum Code.

⁴² Article 102(1) Greek Asylum Code.

⁴³ Article 111 Greek Asylum Code.

⁴⁴ Article 102(3)(b) Greek Asylum Code.

⁴⁵ A recurring point of concern: DH-DD(2023)903, para 33; DH-DD(2021)521, para 18.

⁴⁶ Council of State, 1371/2023, 9 August 2023, paras 12 and 18.

25. Yet, Appeals Committees continue to routinely dismiss even explicit requests for oral hearings, stating that appellants have the possibility to raise their submissions in writing; these end up largely disregarded. Examples in recent case law of the Appeals Committees include denial of oral hearings requested at second instance due to:

- ❖ The conduct of first-instance interviews by non-competent personnel, namely EUAA officers instead of Asylum Service caseworkers.⁴⁷ The stance of Appeals Committees also contravenes case law of the administrative courts.⁴⁸
- ❖ Failure to afford special procedural guarantees to vulnerable applicants in the first-instance procedure, especially in the context of border procedures implemented on the Greek islands.⁴⁹ Here too, Appeals Committee practice does not comply with standards set by the case law of administrative courts.⁵⁰
- ❖ First-instance interviews on “safe third country” grounds, without any questions posed to asylum seekers on the reasons for fleeing the country of origin.⁵¹

26. **Systematic rejection of appeals on formality of in-person attendance:** Persisting concerns surround the domestic law rule requiring asylum appellants to appear in person before the Appeals Committees on the day of examination (συζήτηση) of their appeal or to submit a certificate of residence in a reception facility within highly stringent deadlines.⁵² This rule serves purely as a formality, since appellants are almost never orally heard, as explained above. In practice, when attending the examination of their case, appellants only have their personal details taken down by the Appeals Committee and are subsequently instructed to leave. Yet, failure to observe the requirement of in-person attendance before the Appeals Committees results in immediate rejection of the appeal as manifestly unfounded and in issuance of a removal order without any further examination.⁵³ This is regularly applied in practice:

⁴⁷ 4th Appeals Committee, IP/742202/2024, 15 November 2024; 5th Appeals Committee, IP/115853/2024, 19 February 2024; 7th Appeals Committee, IP/626841/2024, 4 October 2024; 11th Appeals Committee, IP/789163/2024, 3 December 2024. On the scope of permissible conduct of interviews by EUAA personnel, see Articles 82(1), (2) and 95(3)(b) Greek Asylum Code.

⁴⁸ Administrative Court of Appeal of Piraeus, A65/2023, 10 February 2023, available [here](#).


⁴⁹ 4th Appeals Committee, 79499/2023, 8 February 2023; 6th Appeals Committee, IP/312088/2023, 28 November 2023; 16th Appeals Committee, IP/94964/2024, 12 February 2024.

⁵⁰ Administrative Court of Athens, AΔ654/2024, 16 July 2024; AΔ552/2022, 13 April 2022; Administrative Court of Appeal of Piraeus, A94/2021, 25 May 2021; A54/2021, 11 February 2021, available [here](#). For analysis, see Minos Mouzourakis, 'Adjudication of Procedural Safeguards for Vulnerable Asylum Seekers in Greece: Case Law and Systemic Non-Compliance' (2023) 35:2 International Journal of Refugee Law 213.

⁵¹ 5th Appeals Committee, IP/166727/2025, 19 March 2025, dismissing a claim on the merits and ordering removal to Afghanistan without an interview of the applicant on the merits.

⁵² Article 83(3) Greek Asylum Code.

⁵³ Article 102(2) Greek Asylum Code.



Source: Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 17 Feb 2022; 16 Mar 2023; 10 Jun 2024; 10 Mar 2025

27. The compatibility of this rule with the right to an effective remedy forms the subject of a pending preliminary reference before the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). The Advocate General of said Court has already opined that Greek law sets out a disproportionate barrier on the exercise of the remedy.⁵⁴ Domestic courts have also found the rule to be excessively strictly applied in practice.⁵⁵
28. **Failure to assess *refoulement* risks prior to ordering removal:** Greek law provides that rejection of an asylum application shall be accompanied by a removal order.⁵⁶ The rule is strictly enforced by the Asylum Service and Appeals Committees in practice, without consideration of risks of treatment prohibited by Article 3 of the Convention in the event of removal from the Greek territory.⁵⁷
29. Our aforementioned concerns regarding the quality of the asylum appeal process appear to be corroborated by the steadily increasing rate of second-instance decisions quashed on points of law by the administrative courts in judicial review. The annulment rate in cases examined by the administrative courts on the merits has climbed from 10.5% in 2020 to 30.5% in 2024:⁵⁸


⁵⁴ CJEU, C-610/23 *Al Nasiria*, Opinion, 6 February 2025.

⁵⁵ Administrative Court of Athens, AΔ940/2023, 31 May 2023; Administrative Court of Thessaloniki, AΔ370/2023, 8 May 2023, available [here](#).

⁵⁶ Articles 87(8) and 100(10) Greek Asylum Code.

⁵⁷ For example, Administrative Court of Athens, AΔ1104/2024, 18 December 2024, available [here](#), quashing an Appeals Committee decision due to failure to assess Article 3 risks due to the applicant's health condition. Note also the pending case E2473/2024 before the Council of State concerning withdrawal of refugee status, heard on 7 February 2025.

⁵⁸ We note that most applications for judicial review are dismissed as inadmissible for want of compliance with admissibility rules e.g. power of attorney before a notary, payment of court fees.



Source: Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Statistics, Dec 2024, [here](#)


Concerns on the accessibility of asylum appeals

30. **Legal aid deficiencies:** The operation of the legal aid scheme implemented through an EU-funded Registry of Lawyers of the Asylum Service is riddled with obstacles, many of them stemming from deficient programme and financial management on the part of the Ministry of Migration and Asylum, as mentioned in the [Introduction](#).
31. On the one hand, we understand that asylum appeals are not assigned to Registry Lawyers in a prompt manner. The first meeting between the appellant and their appointed lawyer often takes place after the appeal has been filed, sometimes near the expiry of the deadline for submission of a memo ahead of the examination (*συζήτηση*) of the appeal. In addition, whereas domestic law foresees a total of two hours for free interpretation services to facilitate contact between Registry Lawyers and appellants,⁵⁹ lawyers regularly face pressure from authorities to keep their meetings with clients well below that limit due to the scarcity of [Interpretation](#) services in the Asylum Service.
32. On the other hand, delays in payment of Registry Lawyers for services offered under the legal aid scheme constitute a recurring concern. Arrears in payments of Registry Lawyers reached one year in November 2024, leading bar associations throughout the country to declare an abstention from duties (*αποχή*) for all Registry lawyers until back payments were made. The abstention was prolonged three times until the end of January 2025 as the Greek government had not paid the full amounts owed to the lawyers.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Article 1(6) JMD 788502/2023, Gov. Gazette B' 42/11.01.2023.

⁶⁰ RSA et al., *Struggle for Accountability: The State of the Rule of Law in Greece*, January 2025, para 77, available [here](#); DH-DD(2025)159, para 1.c.

33. Official figures of the Ministry of Migration and Asylum refer to 7,491 requests for legal aid made last year, corresponding to 62% of the total number of appeals lodged (12,039). The number of persons receiving legal aid in 2024 (7,902) is higher than the number of requests, per the data.
34. **Systematic rejection of appeals due to late submission:** Every year, Appeals Committees dismiss a significant, increasing number of asylum appeals as inadmissible due to failure to observe lodging deadlines.



Source: Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 16 Mar 2023; 10 Jun 2024; 10 Mar 2025

35. The scale of appeals dismissed due to late submission raises questions as to the accessibility of the remedy. We believe that the phenomenon is connected to the Greek authorities' persisting non-compliance with domestic law rules on notification of decisions. Specifically, the Asylum Service insists on systematically using email correspondence to notify first-instance decisions to asylum seekers residing in camps, even though domestic law expressly requires such notifications to be made in person in the camps.⁶¹ This practice persists despite opposing judgments from the administrative courts.⁶²
36. The above figures also raise questions as to the effectiveness of the state legal aid scheme in the asylum process, in view of the concerns outlined above.⁶³
37. In light of the above observations and the Committee's express request for an "overall assessment of the way of examination of asylum applications", we still deem it necessary for a thorough evaluation of the quality of the domestic legal framework and its implementation to be delivered. Concerns around the quality of the asylum process, including available remedies, have unfortunately not been sufficiently addressed in the latest Action Plan and those preceding it.

⁶¹ Article 87(4) Greek Asylum Code as *lex specialis* to Article 87(3).

⁶² Administrative Court of Thessaloniki, ΑΔ6/2025, 13 January 2025; Administrative Court of Athens, ΝΔ324/2024, 28 June 2024.


⁶³ Contra DH-DD(2024)934, para 22.

Living conditions for asylum seekers

38. Encampment in the three RIC, five CCAC and 22 Controlled Temporary Reception Facilities for asylum seekers (CTRC) managed by the Reception and Identification Service (RIS) of the Ministry of Migration and Asylum is the only form of accommodation offered to asylum-seeking adults and families with children, as conceded by the Greek government.⁶⁴

Quality of services in camps

39. Camps on both mainland and islands are underpinned by a generalised lack of access to reception conditions, owed to the combined effect of insufficient staffing, failure to disburse cash assistance to asylum seekers, poor connection of isolated facilities to urban services, and unsanitary conditions and poor maintenance.⁶⁵ Several of these issues are tied to the “severe gaps in services due to framework contract interruptions” highlighted by the European Commission, as noted in the [Introduction](#). We discuss deficiencies in the provision of different services below, drawing the attention of the Committee to their accumulated effects on asylum seekers as treatment that may in certain circumstances reach the threshold of Article 3 of the Convention.



40. **Complete halt of cash assistance:** Cash assistance is a monthly financial allowance for daily expenses, forming part of material reception conditions offered to asylum seekers.⁶⁶ However, not a single one of the asylum seekers eligible for the allowance has received cash assistance for the

⁶⁴ DH-DD(2024)934, para 45.

⁶⁵ RSA, *Refugee facilities on the Aegean islands*, December 2024, available [here](#); *Refugee camps in mainland Greece*, June 2024, available [here](#).

⁶⁶ Article 1(h) Greek Asylum Code.

past ten months due to deficient management of an EU-funded programme on the part of the Ministry of Migration and Asylum. This affects tens of thousands of individuals, bearing in mind that as many as 24,000 asylum seekers living in camps were eligible for material reception conditions and had requested the allowance at the end of 2024, per official data.⁶⁷

41. Specifically, whereas at the end of April 2024 the Ministry of Migration and Asylum “assured that there is no risk of cash interruption” when confronted by European Commission with concerns about delays in disbursement of cash assistance,⁶⁸ disbursement of the financial allowance following the April 2024 instalment was suspended for four months for all asylum seekers.⁶⁹ Following a belated disbursement of the May and June 2024 instalments, payment of all financial allowances for the months July 2024 and onwards remains fully suspended.
42. An internal August 2024 document of the EUAA states that “The cash assistance program is extremely dysfunctional the way it works”.⁷⁰ For its part, the European Commission noted in April 2025 that cash assistance “is currently facing delays”.⁷¹
43. **Constant interruption of transportation services:** The majority of camps are located at a great distance from urban centres, thereby creating difficulties in accessing goods services and generating an intense feeling of isolation among residents. Transport services are arranged by the state under another EU-funded programme. Yet, failure on the part of the Ministry of Migration and Asylum to promptly manage framework contracts causes frequent, often indefinite interruptions of transport services from camps to the cities. Transport services were halted for a large part of 2023, were reinstated in January 2024 until another suspension in February 2024,⁷² and had not been reinstated by September 2024.⁷³ They were halted again in March 2025 and remain suspended at the time of writing, to our knowledge. As a result of these repeated interruptions, asylum seekers are required to cover out of pocket the – often extensive – costs of travel to attend even necessary appointments e.g. asylum registration or interview. Barriers are compounded by the state’s protracted failure to disburse cash assistance, as described above.
44. **Chronic gaps in health & psychosocial care:** At the end of 2024, a total of 54 doctors were available for the 27,100 residents in the 30 camps throughout Greece. This amounts to one doctor for more than 500 people. Camps such as CCAC Kos, CTRC Filippiada and CTRC Pyrgos had no doctor at all.⁷⁴ The European Commission had already noted in September 2024 that “The chronic

⁶⁷ RSA, ‘2024 Statistics on Refugee Reception and Camps’, forthcoming.

⁶⁸ European Commission, Email correspondence: ‘meeting Secretary General Siarapi on 26 April’, Ares(2024)5589853, 29 April 2024.

⁶⁹ RSA, ‘Suspension of financial assistance to asylum seekers in Greece since May 2024’, 1 October 2024, available [here](#). The Greek authorities conceded to the European Commission in September 2024 that “there is no solution” on the interruption: European Commission, *Mission Report: Technical visit to Samos and Athens – September 2024*, Ares(2024)6443981, 11 September 2024, 2.

⁷⁰ Solomon, ‘Unaccompanied children sleep on the floor in shifts in Greece’s “model camps”. The EU is aware’, 31 March 2025, available [here](#).

⁷¹ European Commission, *Communication on the status of migration management in mainland Greece*, COM(2025) 170, 4 April 2025, 6.


⁷² RSA, *Refugee camps in mainland Greece*, June 2024, 14-16.

⁷³ European Commission, *Meeting with Secretary General for Reception, Ms Ligoura*, Ares(2024)6779515, 25 September 2024.

⁷⁴ RSA, ‘2024 Statistics on Refugee Reception and Camps’, forthcoming.

gaps in medical provision continue, affecting all procedures including vulnerability assessment, primary and mental healthcare and referrals as well as the holistic treatment of diseases".⁷⁵ These deficiencies are of particular relevance to the supervision of execution of the group of cases, in view of the Court's findings in cases such as **E.F. v. Greece**.⁷⁶

45. **Unsanitary conditions & poor maintenance:** Living areas in camps are consistently reported to be in disrepair and to require maintenance "almost for all the camps".⁷⁷ Still in the past two years, asylum seekers have been accommodated in common areas of camps, without access to beds, mattresses, linen or hygiene products. Infestation of rodents and insects and widespread skin conditions among camp residents are consistently reported, namely in CCAC such as Samos, Leros and Kos, as well as RIC Malakasa.⁷⁸ Recent observations from the Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT) corroborate these concerns,⁷⁹ dispelling contrary views expressed in the latest Action Plan of the Greek government.⁸⁰
46. The state of housing infrastructure is reflected to some extent in the discrepancies between the nominal and actual capacity of camps in official statistics of the Ministry of Migration and Asylum:



Source: Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 4 Mar 2025

47. The European Commission has repeatedly urged the Greek authorities to attend to pressing repair, maintenance and hygiene needs of the camps throughout 2023 and 2024.⁸¹ For its part, the EUAA

⁷⁵ European Commission, *Mission Report: Technical visit to Samos and Athens – September 2024*, Ares(2024)6443981, 11 September 2024, 2.

⁷⁶ App No 16127/20, 5 October 2023, in particular paras 34-36.

⁷⁷ Ombudsman, *The Challenge of Migratory Flows and Refugee Protection*, April 2024, 27, available [here](#).

⁷⁸ On Samos, European Commission, *Mission Report: Technical visit to Samos and Athens – September 2024*, Ares(2024)6443981, 11 September 2024, 2. On Malakasa, Administrative Court of Athens, AP2200/2024, 14 November 2024.

⁷⁹ CPT/Inf (2024) 21, paras 118-130.

⁸⁰ DH-DD(2025)440, para 25.


⁸¹ For instance, European Commission, Letter to the Minister of Migration and Asylum, Ares(2024)3545412, 16 May 2024; Email correspondence, 'meeting Secretary General Siarapi on 26 April',

has described conditions in camps such as CCAC Leros as “tremendously dangerous (lack of water in the toilets/sewages in the toilets)”.⁸² The CPT has also called for people in CCAC and RIC to be “offered decent living conditions” and “provided with the appropriate hygiene and cleaning products, and in sufficient quantities”.⁸³ The Greek authorities have not taken tangible measures to address the above concerns.

48. Drawing on the accumulation of documented deficiencies in the Greek reception system, we highlight that the abundant and steadily increasing case law of the Court on the reception conditions of asylum seekers in Greece remains pertinent to the RIC, CCAC and CTRC currently operating in the country. We recall that pending cases before the Court,⁸⁴ including cases where the Court has indicated interim measures under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court,⁸⁵ concern Article 3 claims in relation to recently established, EU-funded island camps such as CCAC Kos and Samos.

Reception of vulnerable asylum seekers

49. The number of people identified by the RIS as vulnerable in the course of screening procedures in RIC and CCAC has grown considerably in recent years:



Source: Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reception and identification statistics, Dec 2023; Dec 2024, [here](#)

50. However, there are no alternatives to encampment in the Greek reception system, even for asylum seekers with acute vulnerabilities. The Greek government has not made any progress on delivery of an anticipated “Stiriksis” programme aimed at restoring 500 accommodation places in apartments for vulnerable applicants, more than two years since its assurances to that effect.⁸⁶ No information is provided to that effect in the latest Action Plan.

Ares(2024)5590307, 26 April 2024; Email correspondence: ‘email to Director of RIS – winterization/ summarization’, Ares(2024)1610049, 1 March 2024; Email correspondence: ‘follow up on maintenance of MPRICs’, Ares(2023)2865103, 24 April 2023.

⁸² Solomon, ‘Unaccompanied children sleep on the floor in shifts in Greece’s “model camps”. The EU is aware’, 31 March 2025.

⁸³ CPT/Inf (2024) 21, paras 118-130.

⁸⁴ **M.K. v. Greece** App No 42416/23, Communicated 17 March 2025; **W.B. and others v. Greece** App No 36142/23, Communicated 21 March 2025; **Z.H. and S.T.H. v. Greece** App No 34712/23, Communicated 21 March 2025.

⁸⁵ **O.A. v. Greece** App No 2570/25.

⁸⁶ DH-DD(2023)903, para 43.

51. According to official data of the Ministry of Migration and Asylum, nearly one third of the 27,100 people accommodated in camps throughout Greece at the end of 2024 were children (8,156). Women (8,774) also accounted for nearly one third of the camp population at that time.⁸⁷
52. Official figures refer to 4,215 persons identified as belonging to at least one vulnerable group, hosted in the camps at the end of 2024. Of those, 641 resided in CCAC Samos, 608 in CCAC Lesvos, 405 in CCAC Kos, 308 in CCAC Leros and 306 in RIC Malakasa.
53. There is no known differentiation in the living conditions available to vulnerable asylum seekers compared to the conditions and [Quality of Services](#) offered to the remainder of the population, as described earlier.⁸⁸ We therefore maintain serious doubts as to the accuracy of the Greek government's view that all of the persons identified as vulnerable "received special conditions" in the camps.⁸⁹
54. We also stress that CTRC Pyrgos in particular, described in the latest Action Plan as a "monothematic accommodation for vulnerable population groups",⁹⁰ hosted only 159 of the 4,215 vulnerable persons (3.8%) accommodated in Greek camps at the end of 2024 per official data. The same data show that neither doctor nor psychologist were present in CTRC Pyrgos had at the end of 2024.⁹¹

⁸⁷ RSA, '2024 Statistics on Refugee Reception and Camps', forthcoming.

⁸⁸ Note the pending cases of **W.B. and others v. Greece** App No 36142/23, Communicated 21 March 2025; **Z.H. and S.T.H. v. Greece** App No 34712/23, Communicated 21 March 2025.

⁸⁹ Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 39780/2025, 4 March 2025, available [here](#).

⁹⁰ DH-DD(2025)440, para 27(ii).

⁹¹ Ministry of Migration and Asylum, Reply to parliamentary question, 39780/2025, 4 March 2025.

Protection of unaccompanied children

55. The European Court of Human Rights has recently delivered a series of rulings finding breach of Article 3 of the Convention in relation to the reception, detention and protection of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children on both the Greek islands and the mainland,⁹² subsequently to the closure of supervision of the **Rahimi v. Greece** group. The Committee remains seized of the supervision of important measures relating to the execution of judgments relating to:
- ❖ The placement of unaccompanied children in safe zones of island camps under unacceptable living conditions, e.g. under **C.K. v. Greece, A.G.D. v. Greece**;
 - ❖ Homeless unaccompanied children living on the streets, owing to a lack of available places in shelters, e.g. under **O.R. v. Greece, N.N. v. Greece**;
 - ❖ The appointment of guardians to unaccompanied children, e.g. under **O.R. v. Greece**.
56. In light of this, we wish to draw the attention of the Committee to current, serious Article 3 risks facing unaccompanied children on account of re-emerging challenges in reception, arbitrary detention, and guardianship. Relevant rulings such as **O.R. v. Greece**, delivered by the Court after the Committee's decision to end the supervision of the **Rahimi v. Greece** group, offer an appropriate framework for the continuation of its thorough scrutiny of these matters under enhanced supervision,⁹³ upon classification of the cited case as leading.


Living conditions of unaccompanied children

57. The capacity of the state to host unaccompanied children in dedicated accommodation has gradually receded over the past year. The total capacity of Shelters for Unaccompanied Children (Κέντρα Φιλοξενίας Ασυνοδευτων Ανηλίκων, KFAA) dropped from 1,808 in April 2024 to 1,507 in March 2025.⁹⁴ At the moment, there are still no KFAA, apartments for semi-independent living or emergency shelters for children in Southern Aegean islands such as Leros and Kos.
58. This situation has resulted in a worrying increase in children deprived of dignified reception across the country, with hundreds facing precarious conditions.
59. In direct correlation to these developments, the number of unaccompanied children present inside "safe areas" of RIC and CCAC under substandard living conditions has risen exponentially over the past year:

⁹² *O.R. v. Greece* App No 24650/19, 23 January 2024; *W.S. v. Greece* App No 65275/19; *T.S. and M.S. v. Greece* App No 15008/19, 3 October 2024; *T.A. v. Greece* App No 15293/20, 3 October 2024; *M.A. and others v. Greece* App Nos 15192/20 and others, 3 October 2024; *N.N. and others v. Greece* App Nos 59319/19 and others, 19 December 2024.

⁹³ We also note the **M.A. and others v. Greece** group under standard procedure.

⁹⁴ Ministry of Migration and Asylum, *Unaccompanied children statistics*, available [here](#). We respectfully note that the figures provided by the Greek government in its 28 March 2025 Action Report in the **M.A. and others v. Greece** group do not reflect the accommodation capacity prevailing at that time: DH-DD(2025)327, para 10.



Source: Ministry of Migration and Asylum, UASC Statistics, Apr 2024 to Mar 2025, [here](#)

60. Unaccompanied and separated children inside “safe areas” of RIC and CCAC are deprived of their liberty, since they are not allowed to exit the boundaries of the fenced area inside the camp, let alone the camp altogether. Detention is imposed *de facto*, even after the expiry of a “restriction on freedom” order by the Director of the RIC / CCAC and regardless of whether or not the child has been registered an asylum seeker and has been issued corollary documentation. Administrative courts have found such detention to be arbitrary in recent cases relating to the “safe areas” of CCAC Samos and CCAC Kos,⁹⁵ as well as cases concerning RIC Malakasa.⁹⁶ In view of the above, we do not share the Greek government’s view that children in the “safe areas” of camps “remain there only for the time necessary for the completion of the identification and initial reception procedures”.⁹⁷
61. Living conditions inside the “safe areas” have been widely documented *inter alia* by the European Commission and the EUAA as grossly unsuitable for any person, let alone children.⁹⁸ Severe concerns range from lack of basic infrastructure, bedding and hygiene to address communicative diseases, to overcrowding, to absence of protection from (sexual) violence. We note that the Court has recently granted interim measures under Rule 39 in one case concerning the CCAC Samos “safe area”.⁹⁹

⁹⁵ Administrative Court of Syros, AP7/2025, 21 February 2025; Administrative Court of Rhodes, AP16/2025, 5 March 2025.

⁹⁶ Administrative Court of Athens, AP538/2025 and AP539/2025, 31 March 2025. See also Equal Rights Beyond Borders, ‘Court Declares Unlawful Detention of Two Minors in Malakasa Camp in Athens’, 7 April 2025, available [here](#). Note also Ombudsman, ‘Παρατεταμένη παραμονή ασυνόδευτων ανηλίκων σε ακατάλληλες συνθήκες διαβίωσης στο Κ.Υ.Τ. Μαλακάσας’, 362497/363041/66068/2024, 23 December 2024.

⁹⁷ DH-DD(2025)121, para 10, fn. 8; DH-DD(2025)327, para 10, fn. 5.

⁹⁸ For a recent analysis of conditions in CCAC, Solomon, ‘Unaccompanied children sleep on the floor in shifts in Greece’s “model camps”. The EU is aware’, 31 March 2025.

⁹⁹ **O.A. v. Greece** App No 2570/25.

62. In our view, the Greek government's increasing resort to *de facto* detention of children inside "safe areas" of RIC and CCAC, for prolonged periods and under unacceptable living conditions due to the absence of dedicated accommodation capacity, reflects a re-emergence of practices akin to "protective custody"¹⁰⁰ and requires close consideration from the Committee.

Guardianship

63. The implementation of the guardianship system set up under L 4960/2022 has been riddled with bureaucratic hurdles and delays, especially as regards the process of appointment of guardians to unaccompanied children.

64. These have been consistently noted by EU institutions in their exchanges with the Greek government. In March 2024, the European Commission acknowledged a "bottleneck" at the level of the Public Prosecutor in Athens,¹⁰¹ while the Greek authorities noted that "delays are being monitored in a few [Public Prosecutor] offices"¹⁰² and reiterated in June 2024 that "There is some delay in appointing guardians, mainly due to the workflow of the local Public Prosecutors."¹⁰³

65. By March 2025, the European Commission conceded that domestic practice "points to a problematic guardianship framework despite the length and attention given to discussions with the authorities" and that "the process for appointing guardian representatives at the level of Public Prosecutors is not functioning properly."¹⁰⁴

66. Current RSA casework includes cases of separated children who were not appointed guardians and remained *de facto* detained inside camps for periods exceeding six months,¹⁰⁵ similar to the cases recently found by the Administrative Court of Athens to amount to unlawful detention.¹⁰⁶

67. As of January 2025, 120 individuals had been appointed throughout Greece, each responsible for up to 15 children.¹⁰⁷ The number falls short of the needs of the 2,641 unaccompanied children estimated to be present in the country in early March 2025. It also represents a substantial drop from the number of 161 guardians in August 2024, reported by the government in its related Action Report.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁰ Contrary to submissions in DH-DD(2025)327, para 16.

¹⁰¹ European Commission, Email correspondence: 'Roll-out of the UAM guardianship scheme (March 2024)', Ares(2024)3983639, 11 March 2024.

¹⁰² European Commission, *Operational Conclusions 16th Steering Committee Meeting for Migration Management*, Ares(2024)5158926, 22 March 2024, 3.

¹⁰³ European Commission, *Operational Conclusions 18th Steering Committee Meeting for Migration Management*, Ares(2024)5820415, 6 June 2024, 4.

¹⁰⁴ Meeting Minutes of the CEAS Sub-Working Group of the Legal Aid Working Group, 10 March 2025, Item 2.6.

¹⁰⁵ Secretariat-General for Vulnerable Persons, 'Παροχή πληροφοριών', 4801/2025, 8 April 2025.

¹⁰⁶ Equal Rights Beyond Borders, 'Court Declares Unlawful Detention of Two Minors in Malakasa Camp in Athens', 7 April 2025.


¹⁰⁷ European Commission, *Communication on the status of migration management in mainland Greece*, COM(2025) 170, 4 April 2025, 9.

¹⁰⁸ DH-DD(2025)327, para 14.

Conditions of detention

Conditions in pre-removal detention centres

68. We reiterate our longstanding concerns regarding the conditions of detention of asylum seekers in Greece, not least due to chronic, unresolved shortages in medical personnel inside the pre-removal detention centres managed by the Hellenic Police.¹⁰⁹ These are corroborated by official statistics, pointing to a systematic lack of necessary staff such as doctors and psychologists to cater for the needs of the population detained by the Hellenic Police in such centres:



Source: Ministry of Citizen Protection, Reply to parliamentary question, 17 Apr 2024; 27 Sep 2024; 1 Apr 2025

69. In addition, the Greek government continues to implement immigration detention in police stations, under conditions clearly incompatible with Article 3 standards according to the established case law of the Court. Official figures of the Ministry of Citizen Protection refer to 163 foreign nationals detained in police stations at the end of 2024.

Conditions in *de facto* detention in RIC & CCAC

70. Beyond formal detention for removal or asylum processing purposes, asylum seekers are *de facto* deprived of their liberty inside RIC and CCAC until the completion of screening procedures, registration of their asylum applications and delivery of asylum seeker cards, as described in the [Registration](#) section of this submission and also highlighted by the CPT.¹¹⁰ Concerns relating to

¹⁰⁹ DH-DD(2023)903, paras 58-60; DH-DD(2021)521, paras 51 et seq.

¹¹⁰ CPT/Inf (2024) 21, para 104.

compliance of this regime and of its implementation with Article 5 of the Convention have been outlined in our contribution to the Committee's supervision of the **M.D. v. Greece** group of cases.¹¹¹

71. We further refer to the observations made in relation to [Living Conditions for Asylum Seekers](#) as regards the time spent by asylum seekers in screening procedures and prior to receiving an asylum seeker card. As for the [Living Conditions of Unaccompanied Children](#), detention under the conditions described above may last for even longer periods.
72. Importantly, asylum seekers *de facto* detained in RIC and CCAC cannot access legal representation to invoke their rights before the relevant administrative and judicial authorities or to complain against the conditions of their detention. That is given that RIC and CCAC refuse to certify the signature of residents who do not hold an asylum seeker card so as to allow them to authorise a legal representative in line with domestic law formalities.¹¹² This stance is in direct breach of domestic law provisions requiring all camps to certify residents' signature based on their declared details. We note that the RIC and CCAC refuse to certify the signature of asylum seekers *de facto* detained therein even though these persons have already had their personal details declared and have been assigned a six-digit Asylum Case Number.¹¹³

¹¹¹ DH-DD(2024)1235.

¹¹² Article 76(1) Greek Asylum Code; Article 11(1) Administrative Procedure Code, L 2690/1999, Gov. Gazette A' 45/09.03.1999.

¹¹³ Ombudsman, 361250/63190/2024, 10 December 2024. Note the pending case of **S.A. and others v. Greece** App No 34380/24.

Recommendations to the Committee

73. Drawing on the observations made in our present contribution, we urge the Committee to consider the following recommendations in its upcoming examination of the **M.S.S. v. Greece** and **H.A. v. Greece** groups of cases. We would particularly urge the Committee to:

Asylum procedure

- ❖ Assess persisting delays in registration of asylum applications in RIC and CCAC, coupled with *de facto* deprivation of liberty of asylum seekers during that time, and request concrete measures to ensure consistent compliance with the registration deadlines set out in domestic law.
- ❖ Request concrete information on the operation of the online platform for registration appointments and on measures guaranteeing that persons requesting appointments have automatic access to “asylum seeker” status and corollary rights and entitlements, in line with domestic law.
- ❖ Assess the compatibility with the Convention of domestic legislation establishing an unequivocal fee for second and onward subsequent asylum applications.
- ❖ Request information on the exact steps taken to ensure that a thorough assessment of Article 3 risks in Türkiye has been conducted prior to its designation as a safe third country.
- ❖ Request a thorough, comprehensive assessment of the quality of the Greek asylum process and its compliance with Article 3 and Article 13 standards, not least in light of systemic legislative and practical barriers to the accessibility and effectiveness of the remedy against negative asylum decisions.

Living conditions for asylum seekers

- ❖ Consider the Article 3 risks stemming from the accumulation of encampment of asylum seekers in isolated facilities and recurrent interruption and deficient management of core services and material conditions, including cash assistance, transportation, health care, interpretation.
- ❖ Request clarification on the exact content of “special reception conditions” due under domestic law to thousands of vulnerable asylum seekers in the reception system and on how such conditions are offered in camps.
- ❖ Urge for reinstatement of alternatives to camp accommodation and for full, constant access to services.
- ❖ Request concrete information on legislative measures to be introduced with a view to ensuring an accessible and effective domestic remedy concerning reception conditions.

Protection of unaccompanied children

- ❖ Maintain supervision of general measures pertaining to the protection, reception and detention of unaccompanied children in light of judgments such as *O.R. v. Greece*, delivered by the Court following the closure of the *Rahimi v. Greece* group, and in view of persisting related challenges.
- ❖ Request concrete information on the grounds, duration and conditions of *de facto* detention of unaccompanied and separated children inside RIC and CCAC, akin to “protective custody”.

Detention conditions

- ❖ Reiterate the prohibition on use of police stations for immigration detention purposes.
- ❖ Request a thorough assessment on the adequacy of health care and interpretation services in pre-removal centres.



<https://rsaegean.org/asylum-system-in-decline-mss-submission/>



Refugee Support Aegean (RSA)

Iasona Kalampoka 30
82131 Chios, Greece
+30 22711 03721
info@rsaegean.org
<https://rsaegean.org>



Stiftung PRO ASYL

P.O. Box 16 06 24
Frankfurt 60069, Germany
+49 69 2423150
europa@proasyl.de
<https://proasyl.de>