

**Question for written answer E-000112/2015
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Barbara Spinelli (GUE/NGL), Bodil Ceballos (Verts/ALE), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL), Rina Ronja Kari (GUE/NGL), Kostas Chrysogonos (GUE/NGL), Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), Kostadinka Kuneva (GUE/NGL), Laura Ferrara (EFDD), Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL), Lola Sánchez Caldentey (GUE/NGL), József Nagy (PPE) and Ana Gomes (S&D)

Subject: Impact of Tarakhel v Switzerland on the implementation and possible revision of the Dublin III Regulation

On 4 November 2014 the European Court of Human Rights ruled, in the case *Tarakhel v Switzerland* relating to a transfer of asylum seekers in the framework of the Dublin system, that a family of refugees should not be transferred unless sufficient assurances of adequate accommodation in the receiving country were granted. Such 'case by case' assessment is not currently framed by the EU legislation, which only foresees a general early warning system (Article 33) which would be triggered by the European Asylum Support Office (EASO), a body which, moreover, is still in its early stages of development.

Notwithstanding these problems, Commissioner Avramopoulos has recently declared that he '[does] not see an urgent need for major changes to the asylum system in the near future', nonetheless adding that 'this is not ruled out for the medium term after careful consideration'.

1. Is the Commissioner aware, despite this, that in less than two years he is expected to report on 'the application of this [Dublin] Regulation' and 'where appropriate, [to] propose the necessary amendments'?
2. Will EASO, in order to ensure the credibility of the 2016 report, submit its first full early warning report (under Article 33) in 2015?
3. Pending revision of the Dublin Regulation, can the Commission state what measures it intends to take in order to avert the risk of increasing numbers of court cases at national and European level?