



**2025/0101(COD)**

26.9.2025

**\*\*\*I**

## **DRAFT REPORT**

on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2024/1348 as regards the establishment of a list of safe countries of origin at Union level  
(COM(2025)0186 – C10-0069/2025 – 2025/0101(COD))

Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs

Rapporteur: Alessandro Ciriani

### ***Symbols for procedures***

- \* Consultation procedure
- \*\*\* Consent procedure
- \*\*\*I Ordinary legislative procedure (first reading)
- \*\*\*II Ordinary legislative procedure (second reading)
- \*\*\*III Ordinary legislative procedure (third reading)

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the draft act.)

### ***Amendments to a draft act***

#### **Amendments by Parliament set out in two columns**

Deletions are indicated in ***bold italics*** in the left-hand column. Replacements are indicated in ***bold italics*** in both columns. New text is indicated in ***bold italics*** in the right-hand column.

The first and second lines of the header of each amendment identify the relevant part of the draft act under consideration. If an amendment pertains to an existing act that the draft act is seeking to amend, the amendment heading includes a third line identifying the existing act and a fourth line identifying the provision in that act that Parliament wishes to amend.

#### **Amendments by Parliament in the form of a consolidated text**

New text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Deletions are indicated using either the **■** symbol or ~~strikeout~~. Replacements are indicated by highlighting the new text in ***bold italics*** and by deleting or striking out the text that has been replaced.

By way of exception, purely technical changes made by the drafting departments in preparing the final text are not highlighted.

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION .....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	13



## DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

**on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2024/1348 as regards the establishment of a list of safe countries of origin at Union level  
(COM(2025)0186 – C10-0069/2025 – 2025/0101(COD))**

**(Ordinary legislative procedure: first reading)**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Commission proposal to Parliament and the Council (COM(2025)0186),
  - having regard to Article 294(2) and Article 78(2) point (d) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, pursuant to which the Commission submitted the proposal to Parliament (C10-0069/2025),
  - having regard to Article 294(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,
  - having regard to the opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee,
  - having regard to the opinion of the Committee of the Regions,
  - having regard to Rule 60 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the opinion of the Subcommittee on Human Rights,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (A10-0000/2025),
1. Adopts its position at first reading hereinafter set out;

## Amendment 1

### Proposal for a regulation Recital 6

#### *Text proposed by the Commission*

(6) The EU candidate countries have been granted this status by the European Council through a unanimous decision, following a recommendation from the European Commission. With regard, in particular, to the political criteria for EU membership, the EU candidate countries were found to have advanced towards reaching the stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities. It can, therefore, be concluded that those third countries that have been granted EU candidate status should be designated as safe countries of origin, except where the following circumstances apply: there is a serious and individual threat to a civilian's life or person by reason of indiscriminate violence in situations of international or internal armed conflict in the country; restrictive measures within the meaning of Title IV of Part Five of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union have been adopted in view of the country's actions; **or when** the EU-wide recognition rate pertaining to the applicants from the country is higher than 20%.

#### *Amendment*

(6) The EU candidate countries have been granted this status by the European Council through a unanimous decision, following a recommendation from the European Commission. With regard, in particular, to the political criteria for EU membership, the EU candidate countries were found to have advanced towards reaching the stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities. It can, therefore, be concluded that those third countries that have been granted EU candidate status should be designated as safe countries of origin, except where **any of** the following circumstances apply: there is a serious and individual threat to a civilian's life or person by reason of indiscriminate violence in situations of international or internal armed conflict in the country, **unless the threat is limited to a specific geographical area and the civilian can access effective protection in another part of the country**; restrictive measures within the meaning of Title IV of Part Five of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union have been adopted in view of the country's actions **affecting fundamental rights and freedoms and that are relevant for the designation of a third country as safe country of origin**; the EU-wide recognition rate pertaining to the applicants from the country is higher than 20%.

Or. en

## Amendment 2

### Proposal for a regulation Recital 6 a (new)

*Text proposed by the Commission*

*Amendment*

***(6a) To ensure uniform application of this Regulation across all Member States, it is necessary to establish a clear and coordinated mechanism for determining when a candidate country for accession to the Union should no longer be considered a safe country of origin. In order to provide legal certainty, the Commission should carry out regular and objective assessments of the relevant circumstances and, where appropriate, communicate its findings to Member States through a formal notification. This notification should be made publicly available and should take effect uniformly across the Union from a specified date.***

Or. en

## Amendment 3

### Proposal for a regulation Recital 11

*Text proposed by the Commission*

*Amendment*

(11) With regard to India, according to the information from the Asylum Agency, 9 Member States currently designate India as a safe country of origin at national level, and the Union-wide recognition rate for applicants from India was 2% in 2024. The country has ratified the main international human rights instruments. India is a constitutional republic and a parliamentary democracy. There are no indications of expulsion, removal or extradition of citizens of India to countries where there is a risk of death penalty, torture, persecution, or inhuman or degrading treatment. There is, in general, no real risk of serious harm within the meaning of Article 15 of the

(11) With regard to India, according to the information from the Asylum Agency, 9 Member States currently designate India as a safe country of origin at national level, and the Union-wide recognition rate for applicants from India was 2% in 2024. The country has ratified the main international human rights instruments. India is a constitutional republic and a parliamentary democracy. There are no indications of expulsion, removal or extradition of citizens of India to countries where there is a risk of death penalty, torture, persecution, or inhuman or degrading treatment. There is, in general, no real risk of serious harm within the meaning of Article 15 of the

Regulation (EU) 2024/1347. While India retains the death penalty in its criminal law and did not sign the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which aims to abolish the death penalty, nevertheless, the death penalty has not been applied in practice since 2020. India has **ratified** the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. There is no armed conflict taking place in India and therefore no threat exists by reason of indiscriminate violence in situations of international or internal armed conflict. There is, in general, no persecution in the country within the meaning of Article 9 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1347.

Regulation (EU) 2024/1347. While India retains the death penalty in its criminal law and did not sign the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which aims to abolish the death penalty, nevertheless, the death penalty has not been applied in practice since 2020. India has **signed** the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. There is no armed conflict taking place in India and therefore no threat exists by reason of indiscriminate violence in situations of international or internal armed conflict. There is, in general, no persecution in the country within the meaning of Article 9 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1347.

Or. en

#### Amendment 4

#### Proposal for a regulation

#### Recital 16

##### *Text proposed by the Commission*

(16) *Nevertheless*, considering that there is, in general, no risk of persecution or serious harm, within the meaning of Regulation 2024/1347, in Bangladesh, Colombia, Egypt, India, Morocco and Tunisia, as well as Kosovo as potential candidate for membership of the Union, as also shown by the very low recognition rates, **they should** be designated as safe countries of origin at Union level.

##### *Amendment*

(16) Considering that there is, in general, no risk of persecution or serious harm, within the meaning of Regulation 2024/1347, in Bangladesh, Colombia, Egypt, India, Morocco and Tunisia, as well as Kosovo as potential candidate for membership of the Union, as also shown by the very low recognition rates, **it can be concluded that they satisfy the criteria to be designated as safe countries of origin at Union level. This is without prejudice to the possibility for Member States to designate other third countries as safe countries of origin at national level and to the possible future designation of additional third countries as safe countries of origin at Union level by means of future amendments to Regulation (EU) 2024/1348.**

Or. en

## *Justification*

*In order to preserve the flexibility of the Union and its Member States in responding to evolving circumstances, it is appropriate to clarify that the establishment of a common list of safe countries of origin at Union level does not preclude the possibility for Member States to maintain or adopt national designations of other third countries as safe, nor does it exclude the future inclusion of additional third countries in the EU list.*

### **Amendment 5**

#### **Proposal for a regulation**

##### **Recital 18**

###### *Text proposed by the Commission*

(18) Considering that the migratory situation can rapidly change and there is increased pressure resulting from the arrivals of mixed flows with a high proportion of those with low chances of receiving international protection, Member States should be able to apply the ground for accelerating the examination of applications set out in Article **41(1)(j)** of Regulation (EU) 2024/1348, from an earlier date than the general date of application of that Regulation. This would allow Member States to react quickly and in a flexible manner to changes in the migratory flows. Considering that applications from such applicants are likely to be unfounded, dealing with them swiftly in an accelerated or a border procedure would allow the asylum and migration authorities to more efficiently assess genuine claims, deliver faster decisions and thereby contribute to a better and more credible functioning of asylum and return policies, in full respect of fundamental rights.

###### *Amendment*

(18) Considering that the migratory situation can rapidly change and there is increased pressure resulting from the arrivals of mixed flows with a high proportion of those with low chances of receiving international protection, Member States should be able to apply the ground for accelerating the examination of applications set out in Article **42(1)(j)** of Regulation (EU) 2024/1348, from an earlier date than the general date of application of that Regulation. This would allow Member States to react quickly and in a flexible manner to changes in the migratory flows. Considering that applications from such applicants are likely to be unfounded, dealing with them swiftly in an accelerated or a border procedure would allow the asylum and migration authorities to more efficiently assess genuine claims, deliver faster decisions and thereby contribute to a better and more credible functioning of asylum and return policies, in full respect of fundamental rights.

Or. en

### **Amendment 6**

#### **Proposal for a regulation**

##### **Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 1 – point a**

*Text proposed by the Commission*

1. The countries that have been granted the status of candidate states for accession to the Union are designated as safe countries of origin at Union level, unless one of more of the following circumstances apply:

*Amendment*

1. The countries that have been granted the status of candidate states for accession to the Union are designated as safe countries of origin at Union level, unless one of more of the following circumstances apply **to them**:

Or. en

**Amendment 7**

**Proposal for a regulation**

**Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 1 – point a**

Regulation (EU) 2024/1348

Article 62 – paragraph 1 – point a

*Text proposed by the Commission*

(a) there is a serious and individual threat to a civilian's life or person by reason of indiscriminate violence in situations of international or internal armed conflict in the country;

*Amendment*

(a) there is a serious and individual threat to a civilian's life or person by reason of indiscriminate violence in situations of international or internal armed conflict in the country, ***unless the threat is limited to a specific geographical area and the civilian can access effective protection in another part of the country;***

Or. en

**Amendment 8**

**Proposal for a regulation**

**Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 1 – point a**

Regulation (EU) 2024/1348

Article 62 – paragraph 1 – point b

*Text proposed by the Commission*

(b) restrictive measures within the meaning of Title IV of Part Five of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union have been adopted in view of ***the*** country's actions;

*Amendment*

(b) restrictive measures within the meaning of Title IV of Part Five of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union have been adopted in view of ***that*** country's actions ***affecting fundamental rights and freedoms and that are relevant***

*for the designation of a third country as safe country of origin as set out in Article 61;*

Or. en

## **Amendment 9**

### **Proposal for a regulation**

#### **Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 1 – point a**

Regulation (EU) 2024/1348

Article 62 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1 a (new)

*Text proposed by the Commission*

*Amendment*

*The Commission shall regularly assess whether any of the circumstances referred to in points (a), (b), or (c) apply to a candidate country for accession to the Union. In that case, it shall issue a formal notification to the Member States, specifying the date from which the country concerned shall no longer be considered a safe country of origin at Union level.*

Or. en

*Justification*

*To ensure uniform application of this Regulation across all Member States and to provide legal certainty, it is necessary to establish a clear and coordinated mechanism for determining when a candidate country for accession to the Union should no longer be considered a safe country of origin or can be reinstated after a suspension.*

## **Amendment 10**

### **Proposal for a regulation**

#### **Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 1 – point a**

Regulation (EU) 2024/1348

Article 62 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1 b (new)

*Text proposed by the Commission*

*Amendment*

*The Commission shall also issue a formal notification to the Member States when it concludes that the circumstances referred to in points (a), (b), or (c) no longer apply.*

***In such cases, the designation of the country as a safe country of origin at Union level may be reinstated, with effect from the date indicated in the notification.***

Or. en

*Justification*

*To ensure uniform application of this Regulation across all Member States and to provide legal certainty, it is necessary to establish a clear and coordinated mechanism for determining when a candidate country for accession to the Union should no longer be considered a safe country of origin or can be reinstated after a suspension.*

**Amendment 11**

**Proposal for a regulation**

**Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 2 – point a**

Regulation (EU) 2024/1348

Article 79 – paragraph 2

*Text proposed by the Commission*

However, Article 59(2), Article 61(2) and Article 61(5) point (b) shall apply from the day of entry into force of Regulation (EU) .../...[amending Regulation (EU) 2024/1348] as regards the application of the concept of ‘safe **third** country’ in accordance with Articles 36 and 37 Directive 2013/32/EU and that of ‘safe country **of origin**’ in accordance with Article 38 of Directive 2013/32/EU.;

*Amendment*

However, Article 59(2), Article 61(2) and Article 61(5) point (b) shall apply from the day of entry into force of Regulation (EU) .../...[amending Regulation (EU) 2024/1348] as regards the application of the concept of ‘safe country **of origin**’ in accordance with Articles 36 and 37 Directive 2013/32/EU and that of ‘safe **third** country’ in accordance with Article 38 of Directive 2013/32/EU.;

Or. en

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The proposal provides a much-needed strategic gangplank to strengthening the European Union's operational efficiency in the field of asylum and migration, in that it seeks to consolidate application of the concept of 'safe country of origin', not least by means of a list of safe third countries of origin applicable to the whole EU, and advances the implementation of certain provisions of the Pact on Migration and Asylum, and in particular those under Regulation (EU) 2024/1348 establishing a common procedure for international protection in the Union and repealing Directive 2013/32/EU ('Asylum Procedure Regulation'), which are now scheduled for June 2026.

Besides designating as safe countries of origin at EU level those countries granted candidate status, along with one potential candidate for accession, and establishing a list (contained in Annex II) of other countries deemed to be safe countries of origin at EU level, the proposal for a regulation brings forward the possibility of designating countries as safe with the exception of specific areas within their territory or for clearly identifiable categories of persons, thus offering Member States greater flexibility at national level, and it also advances the possibility of processing in a border procedure or an accelerated procedure applications by nationals of third countries for which the proportion of decisions granting international protection at EU level stands at 20 % or lower;

In a rapidly changing geopolitical and migratory context, the Union has embarked resolutely on a paradigm shift in its management of migration flows, and is gradually abandoning the ineffective approaches adopted in its previous models. This change in policy and regulatory direction is rooted in a better-structured and pragmatic vision more attuned to the pressing needs of security, efficiency and solidarity, and which reflects the clear will to gird the Union with joint, opportune and legally robust tools with which to address migratory challenges in a secure and lasting manner, while fully respecting the fundamental principles of the EU's legal order. The proposal respects fundamental rights and is in line with the principles recognised by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, including the right to asylum and protection against refoulement under Articles 18 and 19.

The Commission's proposal is therefore to be welcomed, and its strategic value acknowledged, as it allows for earlier implementation of the most urgent operational provisions of the Pact, thereby strengthening the capability of the Union and its Member States to take action in the short term.

This acceleration of the initial timeframe is justified by the need to ensure that the Union and its Member States are not left devoid of any effective instruments until June 2026, in circumstances where migratory pressure and the challenges arising from returns, border management and the processing of applications for international protection call for swift and effective responses. The proposal for a regulation should be viewed in this context, with its aim being to consolidate practical application of the concept of 'safe country of origin' as a key tool for facilitating and expediting the processing of likely-to-be unfounded applications and ensuring a more efficient and credible management of the European asylum system. Given these circumstances, it is vital that the proposal be considered and adopted as swiftly as possible, hence avoiding delays that would undermine its effectiveness. As was expected, the proposal designates the candidate countries and one potential candidate

for EU membership, along with six other countries, as safe countries of origin at EU level. Under the Asylum Procedure Regulation, where an applicant for international protection comes from a safe country of origin, the examination of an application is accelerated and completed within a maximum of three months. Moreover, if the applicant has not yet been authorised to enter the territory of the Member States, a Member State may examine the application in a border procedure.

We therefore agree with the Commission's choice of including among the countries designated as safe countries of origin those which have candidate status or potential candidate status for accession to the European Union. We believe this to be the right choice and one in keeping with the current legal framework, as it was based not only on an automatic presumption, but also on a multilevel technical analysis carried out by the European Union Agency for Asylum (EUAA). The analysis served to thoroughly assess the judicial, institutional and fundamental rights situation in each of the countries, irrespective of the stage they had reached in the accession process.

The criteria applied were those laid down in the Qualification Regulation (EU 2024/1347) and the Asylum Procedure Regulation itself, and include verification of the absence of systemic persecution, serious harm or structural human rights violations. The designations are therefore based on objective, verifiable and harmonised EU-level parameters that comply fully with international law and the fundamental principles of the EU's legal order.

At the same time, the proposal factors in the possibility that issues may arise in the future, and hence provides for a mechanism for the dynamic review of the list that allows for suspension or reinstatement of designation as a safe country of origin based on future developments. It was nevertheless considered appropriate, in the interests of uniform application of the regulation across all Member States and greater legal certainty, to make certain amendments to the text, in order not only to clarify the circumstances determining suspension but also to establish a clear and coordinated mechanism for deciding when a candidate country for accession to the Union can no longer be deemed a safe country of origin, or may be reinstated as such after suspension. It is therefore felt that the Commission should conduct regular objective assessments of the relevant circumstances and formally notify the Member States of the outcome of those assessments. Such notification should be made public and should take effect uniformly across the Union from a specified date.

We also agree with the designation of the countries listed in the Annex, as this constitutes a concrete and necessary step towards building a truly common, cohesive and functional European asylum system. We would stress once again that each designation was based on a thorough technical analysis conducted by the EUAA, relying on qualified sources and objective criteria set out in EU regulations, and which was transparent and accessible, being made available to Members under the rules in force with the possibility of their accessing the sources.

The countries on the list were assessed on the basis of their capacity to ensure, structurally, the absence of persecution and serious harm, as well as on the existence of judicial and institutional protection mechanisms. However, the presumption of safety can still be superseded in individual cases, in line with the principle of individual assessment and the right to effective remedy.

It should be stressed that designation as a 'safe country of origin' leaves full scope for

assessing individual applications and for every applicant's right to demonstrate his or her own vulnerability or personal risk, in line with the guarantees laid down in EU legislation. In other words, the proposal does not do away with the principle of individual assessment, but integrates it into a more efficient system which reduces the risk of abuse and enables resources to be concentrated on the most complex cases and the most vulnerable individuals who, paradoxically, are currently those being penalised. The application of accelerated procedures is not tantamount, therefore, to denying the right to asylum, but is a streamlining of the system, which is currently overloaded and structurally sluggish.

It should also be emphasised that the Commission asked the EUAA to focus its analysis on a limited number of countries, selected on the basis of objective criteria, including that of a recognition rate of under 5 %. This approach made it possible to establish an operational short list, which helped to kick-start the process. That said, the list is not exhaustive and does not preclude the 'safe country of origin' principle from being applied to other countries. It serves as a starting point, and may be amended and extended, not least in the light of other items of information, including the designations already appearing on the national lists drawn up by many Member States.

In conclusion, the proposal fits fully into the strategic vision of the reform of the European asylum system, which seeks to remedy the inefficiencies of the past and design a model based on clear rules, cooperation between Member States, security and the protection of fundamental rights. The early adoption of the list of safe countries of origin, together with the other areas covered by the proposal, not only constitutes a firm step towards a more credible and efficient system, but also sends a strong political signal: the Union stands ready to act and to address migratory challenges with rigour, humaneness, efficiency and foresight. Supporting this proposal means opting for a Europe that is more in tune with values, safer and fairer.

It means equipping the EU with operational solutions that reinforce citizens' trust and strengthen cooperation between Member States.