

INTERVIEW ASSESSMENT FORM

Interviewer:		Legal Assistant/Council present:	
Work unit:		Previous evidence provided:	
Reviewer:		Interpreter present:	
Interview date:		Gender of Interviewer:	
Start time (actual):		Gender of Interpreter:	
End time:		Gender of Claimant:	
Asylum authority file number:		Gender of Legal Assistant:	
Nationality of claimant:		Interview recorded/taped:	
Language spoken:		Feedback provided:	

	CRITERIA TO BE ASSESSED	ASSESSMENT			COMMENTS
		YES	NO	N/A	
	PREPARING/OPENING THE INTERVIEW				
1	Was all the introductory information, including all relevant instructions covered by the interviewer?				
2	Was it apparent that interviewer had conducted relevant research for the interview by consulting?				
	i) Evidence submitted by the claimant prior to the interview such as statements made at the entry point or initial screening of supporting documents provided?				
	ii) Country of origin information evidence?				
3	Were additional relevant documents asked for?				
	ESTABLISHING THE BASIS OF THE CLAIM				
4	Were all the key elements (who, what, why, when and where) of the basis of claim clearly established?				
5	Was the presence or absence of harm/persecution feared by the claimant on return identified?				
6	Was the claimant's Convention reason(s)/lack of Convention reason(s) examined?				
7	i) Where applicable, did interviewer establish whether or not the claimant sought protection in his or her home country?				
	ii) Where applicable, did the interviewer establish whether or not internal relocation was relevant and reasonable?				
	iii) Where applicable, did the interviewer put relevant country of origin information on sufficiency of protection or internal relocation to the claimant?				
8	Were European Convention on Human Rights issues fully explored?				
	THE TYPE OF QUESTIONING				
9	Did the interviewer use "open" questions to allow the claimant to bring his or her story to light?				
	Did the interviewer use "closed" questions to allow				

10	the claimant to give details of the basis of the claim?				
11	Were all questions asked appropriate and relevant?				
FOCUSSING THE INTERVIEW					
12	Were all issues relevant to the facts of the claim investigated fully?				
13	Did the interview focus on the material facts of the claim?				
14	Did the interview follow a logical structure?				
THE TONE OF THE INTERVIEW					
15	Was the tone of the interviewer appropriate (having regard to the circumstances of the claimant as well as the need to establish the full facts of the claim)?				
CONTROLLING THE INTERPRETER					
16	Did the interviewer maintain control of the interpreter's conduct in the interview?				
17	Where there was reason to believe that not all of what the claimant had stated was interpreted, or in cases of unclear translation, did the interviewer seek clarification from the interpreter?				
18	Where the standard of the target language of the interpreter is poor, was this addressed by the interviewer?				
EXAMINING INCONSISTENCIES					
19	Was the claimant asked to explain all significant inconsistencies between the asylum interview and other information provided by the claimant?				
20	Was the claimant asked to explain all significant inconsistencies between the information provided by him/her and relevant objective country of origin information?				
THE INTERVIEW RECORD					
21	Does the interview record accurately reflect the interviewer's questions and the answers given?				
22	If the interview is not taped, is the interview record eligible?				
OTHER					
23	As a result of any relevant issues that arose during the interview, was the claimant asked if he or she had further evidence to submit in support of his or her claim?				
24	Where appropriate, were breaks offered?				
25	If any difficulties arose during the course of the interview (e.g. disruptive children/apparent mental illness/apparent severe trauma etc), did the interviewer handle the situation appropriately?				
APPLICATION OF THE EU PROCEDURES DIRECTIVE					
26	i) Was the claimant informed about his or her rights and obligations in a language he or she is reasonably supposed to understand (Article 10 (1) (a))?				

	ii) Did the claimant receive the service of an interpreter (Article 10 (1) (b))?				
27	i) Did the personal interview take place under conditions which ensure appropriate confidentiality (Article 13 (2))?				
	ii) Was the interviewer sufficiently competent to take account of all personal or general circumstances of the application (Article 13 (3) (a))?				
	iii) Was the interpreter able to ensure appropriate communication between the claimant and interviewer (Article 13 (3) (b))?				
28	Does the record contain at least the essential information regarding the application as defined in Article 4(2) of the EU Qualification Directive (Article 14 (1))?				
29	If the national law permits a claimant to bring a legal adviser/counsellor to the interview, was the representative allowed to be present at the interview (Article 16 (4))?				
30	i) If the claimant was an unaccompanied minor, was his or her representative allowed to be present, and to ask questions or make comments at the interview (Article 17 (1) (b))?				
	ii) Did the interviewer have the necessary knowledge of the special needs of minors (Article 17 (4) (a))?				

Instructions:

With respect to the questions concerning the EU Asylum Procedures Directive, please note whether the Legislation has provided for higher or lower standards than those outlined in the Directive. Further, in the comment section please note whether there are any legal or procedural problems implementing the Directive.