



Valletta Harbour, 20 November 2025  
EUAA/ED/2025/337

Mr Abdul Rajun

Sent by email to: [ask+request-16425-9db2b39a@asktheeu.org](mailto:ask+request-16425-9db2b39a@asktheeu.org)

**Subject: Your application for access to EUAA documents (No 006188)**

Dear Mr Rajun,

Reference is made to your correspondence dated 9 October 2025 (registered on 13 October 2025), in which you submitted to the EUAA a request for access to *“records concerning the development, testing, or dissemination of digital or automated tools used by national asylum authorities for registration, identity verification, or case assessment”*.

In this respect, you explained that you are particularly interested in *“internal reports, pilot project summaries, or guidelines addressing the use of such technologies; – exchanges with Member States or external contractors about their technical or operational implementation; – documents referring to language or dialect databases, data-carrier analysis tools, or other systems supporting registration interviews”*.

Please be informed that your request (No 006188) has been treated as an application for public access to documents falling under the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001<sup>1</sup>, in accordance with the Agency’s Management Board Decision No 6 of 20 September 2011<sup>2</sup>.

Having carefully examined your application and after having consulted the relevant internal and external entities, please find below the EUAA’s response thereto.

#### **I. RELEVANT DOCUMENTS IDENTIFIED**

Being highly committed to the principle of good administration in general, as well as in the context of its communication with the public, the EUAA’s services have carried out thorough administrative efforts to identify any relevant documentation.

As a result, the Agency has identified a total of 7 relevant documents falling under the scope of your application:

- Document 1: Practical recommendations on conducting remote/online registration (lodging), 2020 – guidance document;
- Document 2: Exploring new technical tools in the asylum procedure, 2022 – presentation;
- Document 3: EUAA Asylum Processes Network Thematic Meeting on Open-source Intelligence, 2022 – meeting minutes;

<sup>1</sup> Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents, (OJ L 145, 31.5.2001, p. 43).

<sup>2</sup> Management Board Decision No 6 of 20 September 2011 laying down practical arrangements to the documents of the European Asylum Support Office (EASO).





- Document 4 : Common European Language Indication and Analysis, 2024 – flyer;
- Document 5: Conference on Digital Innovation, 2025 – minutes report;
- Document 6: Digital Transformation of Asylum & Reception Systems, 2025 – situational update;
- Document 7: EUAA Asylum Processes Network Exchange Visit on the Interview Support Software, 2022 – report.

Pursuant to Article 4(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, as regards third-party documents, the Agency shall consult the third party concerned with a view to assessing whether an exception in paragraph 1 or 2 of the above-mentioned Article is applicable, unless it is clear that the document shall or shall not be disclosed. Therefore, the Agency carried out such consultations as set out below.

#### **The Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (UDI)**

The EUAA consulted UDI as regards the potential disclosure of document 2.

**Members of the EUAA Asylum Processes Network, the European Commission (EC), the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (EUROPOL), the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)**

The EUAA consulted the above-mentioned countries and organisations as regards the potential disclosure of document 3.

#### **The Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC), General Directors' Immigration Services Conference (GDISC)**

The EUAA consulted the above-mentioned organisations as regards the potential disclosure of document 5.

#### **German Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF)**

The EUAA consulted BAMF as regards the potential disclosure of document 7.

## **II. INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF THE IDENTIFIED DOCUMENTS**

The EUAA is highly committed to the principle of transparency and the rights of individuals to access documents of EU institutions, bodies and agencies as laid down in both Article 15 of the TFEU and Article 42 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU.

The Agency is pleased to inform you that documents 1, 4 and 6 are publicly available here:

- Document 1: <https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/easo-practical-recommendations-conducting-remote-online-registration-lodging-EN.pdf>;
- Document 4: <https://ind.nl/en/documents/12-2024/flyer-celia.pdf>;
- Document 6: [https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/2025-09/2025\\_digitalisation\\_asylum\\_reception\\_EN.pdf](https://euaa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/2025-09/2025_digitalisation_asylum_reception_EN.pdf).

Pursuant to the Agency's own assessment under Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, the following exceptions under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 needed to be taken into consideration concerning documents 2, 3, 5, and 7:



**i. Protection of personal data**

Article 4(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 stipulates that the institutions shall refuse access to a document where its disclosure would undermine the protection of privacy and integrity of individuals, in particular in accordance with EU legislation regarding the protection of personal data.

Pursuant to Article 3(1) of Regulation 2018/1725<sup>3</sup>, 'personal data' means: *"any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person ('data subject'); an identifiable natural person is one who can be identified, directly or indirectly, in particular by reference to an identifier such as a name, an identification number, location data, an online identifier or to one or more factors specific to the physical, physiological, genetic, mental, economic, cultural or social identity of that natural person"*.

Document 2 contains personal data, such as names and email addresses of contact points and experts of UDI. Documents 3 and 5 contain personal data, namely the names of the participants, panellists and presenters attended the meeting/conference. In the EUAA's assessment, the disclosure thereof would undermine the protection of the personal data of the natural persons whose names, email addresses and interventions are contained therein, in breach of the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725.

Therefore, access to these personal data must be refused pursuant to Article 4(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

**ii. Protection of the public interest as regards public security**

Article 4(1)(a), first indent of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 provides that the institutions shall refuse access to a document where its disclosure would undermine the protection of the public interest as regards public security.

Document 3 contains minutes of a meeting presenting different national practices concerning asylum and migration, including the use of digital platforms and tools used at national level in this context, as well as discussions between participants and observations of stakeholders attending the meeting. The use of such tools is part of the identification and verification of applicants for international protection which are core elements of the asylum procedure and the associated procedures relating to residence and immigration under the national law of Member States. Member States are obliged to perform these tasks under the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) and, in doing so, are dependent on the effective use of digital tools that enable the collection of accurate information. Disclosure of information about the operation of such tools would render their use impossible by allowing third parties to devise ways how to undermine the accuracy of the information inputted in the tools and thereby influence their operation.

Document 3 contains information on the use of these tools, and in particular the technical means and methods employed, as well as the intended or actual depth of the research; information which,

---

<sup>3</sup> Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by the Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 and Decision No 1247/2002/EC, (OJ L 295, 21.11.2018, p. 39).



if disclosed to the public, would seriously jeopardise the success of these measures. Even to a limited extent, *e.g.* by describing the scope of application and the instances on which those are used, such information could compromise the successful deployment of these digital tools and platforms.

Furthermore, document 3 also includes observations of Union institutions and agencies concerning their operational activities carried out in Member States. The disclosure of such information would negatively affect the cooperation between EU institutions and agencies and Member States, and would jeopardise those institutions and agencies in the proper fulfilment of their tasks and investigations. If document 3 was to be disclosed, EU agencies mandated to handle law enforcement tasks could not carry out their tasks, *e.g.* investigations, which would render criminal proceedings impossible. Public security in EU Member States, where these agencies carry out their operational activities, would therefore be seriously undermined if the information included in document 3 would be available for the public.

In addition, participants of the said thematic meeting of the EUAA Asylum Processes Network agreed prior to the meeting that distribution of the minutes is limited to the asylum and migration administrations of the participating countries and networks, therefore they engaged in free and frank exchanges concerning the topics; thus putting document 3 in the public domain would negatively affect mutual trust and cooperation between the EUAA and participants and stakeholders of the network.

Document 7 contains a report regarding the Asylum Processes Network Exchange Visit on the Interview Support Software (ASA) took place in Germany in 2022. Experts from EU+ countries joined this visit which was hosted by BAMF. Over the visit, participants gained a thorough understanding of ASA through detailed presentations and demonstrations given by colleagues from different departments of BAMF involved in the development of the tool. Discussions went beyond the tool and focused among others also on different support tools, interviews and how to develop and integrate such support tools in practice.

Participants of the visit agreed that document 7 would not be disclosed to the public as it was restricted to the EUAA, the EC, other relevant institutions of the EU, EU+ countries' administrations and the UNHCR.

If document 7 was to be disclosed, it would expose national practices on how such digital tools were used to shorten the length of asylum procedures and how those could be used as contingency management tools. The disclosure of such information by the EUAA would therefore negatively affect Germany's efforts to shorten lengthy asylum procedures and would jeopardise the country's public security by compromising the successful use of these digital tools. If Germany would not be able to use these digital tools embedded in its national procedures due to the disclosure of document 7, the country would not be able to properly handle large number of applications for asylum and to comply with its obligation under the CEAS, which would have an effect on irregular secondary movements of asylum seekers between Member States. Therefore, the disclosure of information about such digital tools would have a negative effect on the Union's public security as a whole. Moreover, the disclosure of document 7 would undermine the mutual trust between the national authority and the Agency.



In this sense, the Agency also recalls that well-established Union case law provides that “*the principle of strict interpretation of the exceptions set out in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 does not, in respect of the public interest exceptions provided for in Article 4(1)(a), preclude the institution concerned from enjoying a wide discretion for the purpose of determining whether disclosure of a document to the public would undermine the interests protected by that provision*”<sup>4</sup>.

The disclosure of relevant information in documents 3 and 7 would seriously undermine the cooperation and exchange of information between the national authorities and/or other actors and the EUAA, adversely affecting public security, and access should therefore be refused pursuant to Article 4(1)(a), first indent of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

### iii. Protection of international relations

In accordance with Article 4(1)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, third indent, the Agency shall refuse access to a document where disclosure would undermine the protection of the public interest as regards international relations.

In addition to the content described above, document 3 includes, *inter alia*, observations of the UNHCR.

The EUAA cooperates with the UNHCR at different levels and shares information and documents in a context of mutual trust and cooperation. Such an open and collaborative relationship with the UNHCR would be adversely impacted if the EUAA were to disclose documents and information originating from the UNHCR, having previously given assurances that the meeting minutes would not be disclosed to the public. The disclosure of the above-mentioned information would therefore have a substantial impact on the Agency’s international relations, *i.e.* it would affect negatively the work carried out by the EUAA and international stakeholders.

Document 5 contains a minutes report which outlines the participants’ positions and experiences with regard to the discussed topics, including exchanges of presentations and interventions from participants, such as the UNHCR, and from third countries, such as Albania, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia, the Republic of South Africa, Serbia, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The disclosure of these exchanges would undermine the Agency and the EU Member States’s ability to consult and exchange information with non-EU countries and international organisations in the future, whereby matters relating to digital innovation will continue to be discussed.

The IGC is an informal, non-decision-making forum for intergovernmental information exchange and policy debate on issues of relevance to the management of international migratory flows. To this end, the EUAA commits itself to safeguarding that the members and participants to the forum are provided with a secure environment to share their opinions and statements freely and without undue external pressure. The Agency and the participants of the conference have therefore built their trust on the prior agreement that the deliberations would not be made public, as has also been indicated in the minutes report.

---

<sup>4</sup> *ClientEarth vs European Commission, Case T-644/16, 11 July 2018.*



Consequently, disclosure of document 5 would have a detrimental impact on the atmosphere of mutual trust between the Agency and the invited conference participants, as well as between the former and the IGC community as a whole.

In light of the above considerations, the Agency concludes that access to documents 3 and 5 must be refused pursuant to Article 4(1)(a), third indent of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

#### **iv. Protection of commercial interests**

Article 4(2), first indent of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 provides that that the institutions shall refuse access to a document where its disclosure would undermine the protection of commercial interests of a natural or legal person, including intellectual property.

Documents 3 and 7 contain information about companies partnering with national authorities and realising solutions employed in the use the interview support software and in the use of open-source intelligence. These solutions include particular know-how, strategy and methodologies of these companies and national authorities with competitive value. Moreover, the information on the interview support software included in document 7 is the intellectual property of BAMF.

Disclosure of these documents would therefore undermine the protection of lawful interests of the companies and Member States in protecting their intellectual property; furthermore, putting this information in the public domain would negatively affect the companies' future competitive position. Therefore, access to this information included in documents 3 and 7 must be refused as per Article 4(2), first indent of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

The Agency further examined whether an overriding public interest exists in the disclosure of documents 3 and 7. The Agency has concluded that even if a public interest in disclosure can be identified, the latter needs to be weighed against the harm that would be occasioned by disclosure, *i.e.* the risk of negatively affecting the intellectual property of the relevant Member States and companies, as well as the competitive position and lawful commercial interests of companies partnering with Member States.

The disclosure of documents 3 and 7 would therefore have a negative impact on the commercial interests and the protection of intellectual property of the said companies and Member States, and access should therefore be refused pursuant to Article 4(2), first indent of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

### **III. PARTIAL ACCESS**

In accordance with the principle of proportionality<sup>5</sup>, the Agency further examined whether partial access could be granted to documents 2, 3, 5 and 7. Such examination was aimed to assess specifically whether the exceptions indicated above actually apply to the entire contents of the relevant documents.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Hautala v Council, Case T-14/98, 19 July 1999.*



As such, it has concluded that documents 3, 5 and 7 are covered by the exceptions under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, as detailed above, in their entirety.

Additionally, the relevant case law<sup>6</sup> provides that there is no obligation to grant partial access in case the remaining parts of the document would be meaningless and/or the administrative burden of blanking out the parts covered by exceptions would be excessive. In the Agency's assessment, even if some limited parts of the relevant document could theoretically be disclosed, the remaining parts thereof after inserting redactions against the exceptions under Article 4(1)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 would be rendered meaningless, therefore the EUAA does not consider it possible nor reasonably required to grant partial access to the document.

As to document 2, however, the EUAA is pleased to be able to inform you that it can provide wide partial access, since only limited parts of these documents are covered by the exceptions.

#### IV. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

**The EUAA is highly committed to upholding the principles of transparency and good administration. Please be assured that our services have tried their utmost to accommodate your present application for public access to documents.**

**As such, we trust you will find documents 1, 4 and 6 useful. As regards the partial disclosure of document 2 and the non-disclosure of documents 3, 5 and 7 however, we kindly note that the Agency is not in a position to disclose information which, if made public, would jeopardise the protection of the public interest as regards public security, international relations, commercial interests and the protection of privacy and the integrity of the individual, in accordance with the exceptions in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.**

Pursuant to Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, within 15 working days of the receipt of this letter, you may submit a confirmatory application to the EUAA asking it to reconsider its position. Pursuant to Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, the EUAA will reply to you within 15 working days from registration of such an application. You can submit a confirmatory application via the following methods:

**By post:**

The Executive Director  
European Union Agency for Asylum (EUAA)  
MTC Block A  
Winemakers Wharf  
Grand Harbour Valletta, MRS 1917  
Malta


**By electronic mail:** [pad.mailbox@euaa.europa.eu](mailto:pad.mailbox@euaa.europa.eu)

---

<sup>6</sup> *Kuijjer v Council, Case T-211/00, 7 February 2002; Reagens v Commission, Case T-181/10, 20 March 2014.*



Yours sincerely,



Nina Gregori  
Executive Director

**Attachment:**

- Document 2