Questionnaire for Evaluation of the RSD Decision

Work Unit	
Eligibility Officer	
File no.	
Type of procedure	
Decision No.	
Country of Origin	
Vulnerable category	

	CRITERIA TO BE ASSESSED	ASSESSMENT RESULT			COMMENTS
	I. IDENTITY DATA	**YES**	**NO**	**N/A**	
1	Did the decision state the correct name, DOB, nationality and application/file number?				
2	Does it state 'claims to be' where nationality/identity is in doubt?				
3	If nationality doubted have reasons been provided?				
4	Does it state 'disputed' where age has been disputed?				
	II. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIM				
5	Does the decision establish all the key elements of the facts/events displayed by the applicant (who, what, why, where and when) in order to evaluate the reason(s) of past persecution/serious harm?				
6	Does the basis of claim (summary of the applicant's statements) follow a clear chronological order?				
7	Does the decision identify any future persecution/serious harm feared by the				

	applicant on return?				

	III. LEGAL ANALYSIS PERTAINING TO QUALIFICATION FOR REFUGEE DEFINITION				
8	Does the decision identify the correct Convention reason(s) for persecution as stated by the applicant or as identified by the eligibility officer, in situations where the applicant did not present them in an explicit manner?				
9	Was the presence or absence of effective state protection analyzed in an appropriate manner?				
10	Has the concept of the internal flight alternative been properly applied?				

	IV. EVALUATION OF INTERNAL CREDIBILITY (SUBJECTIVE FEAR)				
11	Does the decision state clearly and with sound reasons what aspects of the claim are:				
	i) Accepted				
	ii) Rejected				
	iii) Uncertain				
12	Are speculations avoided in the decision?				

	V. EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL CREDIBILITY (OBJECTIVE FEAR)				
13	Does the decision quote the COI which are relevant for the case?				
14	Are the COI quoted in the decision used taking into account the specific elements of the case?				
15	Does the decision take into consideration all				

	relevant evidence in evaluation of the risk of persecution/serious harm (e.g. warrants, court decisions, newspaper reports)?				
16	Does the decision mention the standard of proof applied?				

	VI. APPLICATION OF EXCLUSION CLAUSES				
17	Where the case, was it properly applied one of the exclusion clauses stipulated by the law? (e.g of properly application: inclusion before exclusion, proportionality test, standard of proof)				

	VII. FORMAL ASPECTS				
18	Did the standard paragraphs used by the eligibility officer correspond to the specific type of procedure applied to the case?				
19	Is the decision correct from the grammatical point of view?				