



Home Office

Language analysis

Version 21.0

Contents

Contents.....	2
About this guidance.....	5
Contacts	5
Publication	5
Changes from last version of this guidance	5
Language analysis introduction.....	6
Audience.....	6
Purpose of instruction	6
Background	6
Application of this instruction in respect of children and those with children.....	6
Suitability criteria for language analysis	8
General points	8
LA on a case-by-case basis.....	8
LA targeted by nationality or national origin basis	9
Children	9
Authorisation to test.....	10
Preliminary considerations.....	10
Initial checks	10
Timing of LA and asylum interviews.....	10
Authorisation for LA	10
Compliance and consent.....	12
Claimant compliance with the language analysis process	12
Unaccompanied asylum seeking children: responsible adults	12
Claimant fails to attend or complete a language analysis interview	14
Medical grounds or disability grounds raised for not completing the LA interview	14
Language analysis interview	16
Booking the language analysis (LA) interview	16
Cancelling LA interviews.....	16
Conducting the LA interview	17
Language analysis: preliminary assessment.....	18
Preliminary assessment: outcomes	18
Updating Home Office records	18
CID.....	19
Preliminary assessment disputes claimed linguistic origin.....	19

Language analysis: full report and other items	20
Report and CD receipt, administration and obtaining copies	20
Full report outcomes	20
Report outcomes	21
Quality of LA reports	21
Translated transliterations	21
The substantive asylum interview	22
Preparation	22
Interview	22
Decisions and appeals in language analysis cases	23
General considerations	23
Granting asylum or humanitarian protection	23
Refusing the claim	23
Serving asylum refusals	24
Post-refusal and appeal actions	24
Process summary	25
Standard wordings for substantive interviews	27
Claimant participated, completed the interview and the outcome of the full LA provides strong evidence that they are of the nationality or national origin claimed	27
Claimant participated, completed the interview and the outcome of the full LA provides strong evidence that they are not of nationality or national origin claimed	27
Claimant did not attend the LA interview	27
Claimant agreed to take part but did not complete the LA interview	27
Claimant refused to participate in the LA interview	28
Only the preliminary results are held at the time of the substantive interview ...	28
Standard wordings for reason for refusal letters	29
The results of the analysis provide strong evidence to indicate that the claimant is from the place/group claimed (but still falls for refusal)	29
The results of the analysis provide strong evidence to indicate that the claimant is not from the place group claim, and is instead from another place or group, stated in the report	29
The claimant agreed to take part but did not complete the LA interview	29
Where satisfactory reason has been given	30
Where no reason has been given or satisfactory reason has not been given for failing to complete the LA interview	30
The claimant did not attend or take part in the LA interview	30
Where satisfactory reason has been given	30

Where no reason has been given or satisfactory reason has not been given for failing to attend or not agreeing to take part in the LA interview.....	30
Language analysis form 1 (LA Team authorisation request)	31
Language analysis form 2 (Verified order form)	33
Language analysis form 3 (DA SEF, consent form, ASL.3384).....	35
Language analysis form 4 (Verified cancellation form).....	36
Contacts	37
Sprakab.....	38
Process improvement.....	39

About this guidance

This guidance tells officers involved in the immigration system about the language analysis process used by the Home Office, how it is accessed and when it should be used.

Contacts

If you have any questions about the guidance and your line manager or senior caseworker cannot help you or you think that the guidance has factual errors then email Asylum Policy.

If you notice any formatting errors in this guidance (broken links, spelling mistakes and so on) or have any comments about the layout or navigability of the guidance then you can email Guidance – making changes.

Publication

Below is information on when this version of the guidance was published:

- Version **21.0**
- published for Home Office staff on **02 March 2018**

Changes from last version of this guidance

- consent section updated, to reflect remote interviewing by video-link process
- clarification regarding the weight given to language analysis evidence
- minor presentational updates
- contact details updated

Related content

[Contents](#)

Language analysis introduction

Audience

This instruction is for all officers involved in asylum screening, asylum casework and appeals, and other immigration casework where someone's true place of origin needs to be established.

Purpose of instruction

Language analysis (LA) is used by the Home Office to help establish an individual's true place of origin, where that origin is in doubt.

The LA process involves language experts talking and listening to individuals speak in their own language and dialect, analysing significant features in the speech, and producing written, reasoned conclusions as to their place of linguistic origin.

These conclusions are valuable in helping to confirm individuals' places of origin and to detect fraud. LA is therefore important in helping to maintain a firm but fair system that grants protection and/or leave to those who need it, or qualify for it, and which tackles abuse and protects public funds by quickly rejecting unfounded claims.

This instruction sets out:

- which cases may be appropriate for LA
- how mandatory authority to test may be obtained from the LA Team
- how testing must be arranged and documented
- how to handle LA issues in asylum interviews, refusal letters and appeals

Background

The Home Office's LA capability is provided by private suppliers. Until August 2014, the exclusive supplier was 'Sprakab'. Commercial changes in 2014 introduced a second supplier, 'Verified AB'. Since August 2014, the Home Office has used the services of both companies. Verified AB is the main supplier, with Sprakab providing services in a secondary capacity (use of this secondary capacity is determined and authorised strictly by the LA Team).

LA testing carries a cost. It is therefore only used in cases where the benefit is the greatest. Not every case where nationality is disputed will require or receive LA, and the fact of not testing does not signify a weaker argument in that case.

Application of this instruction in respect of children and those with children

Section 55 of the Borders, Citizenship and Immigration Act 2009 requires the Home Office to carry out its existing functions in a way that takes into account the need to

safeguard and promote the welfare of children in the UK. It does not impose any new functions, or override existing functions.

Officers must not apply the actions set out in this instruction either to children or to those with children without having due regard to the [statutory guidance on Section 55](#), which sets out the key principles to take into account in all Home Office activities involving children.

Our statutory duty to children includes the need to demonstrate:

- fair treatment which meets the same standard a British child would receive
- the child's interests being made a primary, although not the only, consideration
- no discrimination of any kind
- that asylum claims are dealt with in a timely fashion
- identification of those that might be at risk from harm

Related content

[Contents](#)

Suitability criteria for language analysis

Language analysis (LA) may be conducted on one of two bases:

- on case-by-case consideration, particular doubts are held about an individual's claimed origin
- targeted, because an inadequately-documented individual claims to be a nationality or have a national origin that may be tested under an exemption to the Equality Act 2010

Strict rules apply to testing under both bases (see the 'basis' sections, below).

General points

Whether on a case-by-case or targeted basis, testing must not proceed if:

- there is sufficient reason to accept claimed nationality or national origin (usually this will be where there is reliable and accepted documentary proof)
- Eurodac action is pending (see the instruction Dublin III regulation)
- informed consent has not been obtained
- the LA Team has not given explicit authorisation to test

In any case, testing should not ordinarily be necessary if an alternative nationality or place of origin can be clearly attributed to the individual through other means (for instance, a properly explored biometric match). Officers may raise the issue with the LA Team for further advice

LA on a case-by-case basis

Except where targeted testing by nationality or national origin is permitted (see examples below), LA may be carried out only where there are specific reasons to suspect the claimant has provided false information regarding their place of origin. The reason for doubting nationality or national origin on a case-by-case basis must be documented when seeking authority to test (see [Authorisation to test](#)).

Examples of when a claimant's claimed nationality or national origin might provoke doubt are:

- where the claimant is unable to speak to an adequate level the primary language expected of their claimed country or region of origin
- where there is a strong indication that the claimant's dialect or accent is inconsistent with their claimed country or region of origin
- where the claimant discloses contradictory statements or other unreliable evidence regarding their country or region of origin
- where the claimant lacks knowledge about their claimed place of origin, inconsistent with their education level, profession, and what they might reasonably be expected to know (for example, unable to name landmarks or villages near their home)

- where the claimant presents unreliable documentation regarding their country or region of origin

This list is not exhaustive - other bases for doubting claimed place of origin may apply.

LA targeted by nationality or national origin basis

LA testing may be targeted on the basis of an individual's claimed place of origin **only** in cases where an Equality Act exemption has been authorised by the Immigration Minister.

A referral to test on this basis does not require particular doubts as to the claimant's claimed place of origin to be articulated; there simply needs to be a lack of acceptable evidence regarding the claimant's claimed place of origin (for example, the claimant is undocumented, or has documentation upon which little reliance can be placed).

An Equality Act exemption came into effect on 20 February 2013, allowing the targeted testing of claimants claiming nationality of, or national origin in Syria, Palestine and Kuwait. However, at the present time, targeted testing is applied only in respect of those claiming nationality or national origin in Syria and Palestine.

The Equality Act exemption in respect of those claiming origin in Kuwait still stands, but until further notice, it will not be applied. Such individuals may still be LA tested, but only if there are particular doubts in the specific case regarding the place of claimed origin.

All testing, whether on a targeted or case-by-case basis, may proceed only after explicit authority to test is given by the LA Team.

Children

LA testing can assist in resolving the nationality or national origin of children. However, testing is presently restricted to those aged 12 or over, and only then after receiving explicit email authority to test, as part of the authorisation process.

The testing of unaccompanied asylum seeking children must be done in the presence of a responsible adult (see Processing children's asylum claims). It is important that officers take all reasonable measures to ensure that all children or young adults to whom LA applies comprehend the process. (See [Unaccompanied asylum seeking children – responsible adults](#)).

Related content

[Contents](#)

Authorisation to test

Preliminary considerations

Initial checks

Before considering language analysis (LA), officers must ensure that key actions and checks have been undertaken. In particular, officers must:

- ensure that standard actions have been taken in respect of recording identity, taking fingerprints, conducting security checks, Casework Information Database (CID) actions, screening, file creation
- take appropriate action, discussing with a senior caseworker or CIO in any case of doubt, if at this point information comes to light indicating that other action is appropriate to conclude or advance the claim (for instance, evidence of a Eurodac hit or of multiple claims where the other identity is concrete)
- check CID and the case file to ensure that LA has not already been conducted: this may arise if testing was undertaken at the time of screening - reports, if not attached to file, will be available from the LA Team - see [Report and CDs receipt, administration and obtaining copies](#)

Timing of LA and asylum interviews

LA should be arranged at the earliest point that testing criteria are engaged. Where the Equality Act exemption applies, this will usually be from the point of asylum screening. In other cases, it will usually be later in the process. Reasons for testing may arise only during or even after the substantive interview, potentially requiring a further asylum interview, in order to give the claimant an opportunity to explain any issues which have been identified.

It may be possible to arrange LA with the supplier at late notice, but this must not be relied on. Wherever possible, LA should be arranged in advance.

Authorisation for LA

LA testing may be undertaken only where clear and explicit email authorisation is given by the LA Team with regards to a specific case.

To obtain authorisation, officers must:

- 1) Ensure that the [Suitability criteria for LA](#) are met.
- 2) Agree the la proposition with an appropriate senior officer in the unit.
- 3) Fully complete [LA Form 1 \(LA Authorisation Request\)](#). Most information should be available from the screening interview, or the substantive interview in some cases. Officers must ensure that in this and all other transactions relating to LA testing, the same reference number is used throughout.

- 4) Send the form to the LA Team, which will respond to the request within 1 working day.
- 5) In exceptional circumstances where immediate authorisation to test is required, seek authorisation from the LA Team by telephone (see [Contacts](#)). In such cases, [LA Form 1](#) must be sent to the LA Team directly after the interview, to ensure records are maintained for audit and invoice purposes.
- 6) Copy the authorisation email to file if authorisation is given, and copy the reasons for testing from LA Form 1 to CID Notes, with a brief explanation.

Related content

[Contents](#)

Compliance and consent

Claimant compliance with the language analysis process

Before booking the language analysis (LA) interview with the provider, officers must gather basic information to inform the LA order. They must also establish informed consent and compliance with the process.

To establish compliance and consent, officers must:

- 1) Read the explanation contained on [LA Form 3 \(DA SEF, Consent Form, ASL.3384\)](#) to the claimant, through a Home Office (HO) interpreter if necessary. This explains and requests consent and participation in the process.
- 2) Answer any questions regarding the process where reasonable and necessary.
- 3) Give the claimant an opportunity to discuss the matter in private with their legal representative if they have one (either in person or on the telephone).
- 4) Invite the claimant to sign the consent form.
- 5) Invite the claimant to give their verbal consent if the interview is being conducted by video-link. Where given, officers must record this on LA Form 3 and note that the interview is happening remotely. The claimant must be given an opportunity to ask questions and obtain legal advice.
- 6) Place 1 copy of [LA Form 3](#) on the HO file to ensure events are clearly recorded, and to inform the later asylum interview and decision. Give a copy of the form to the claimant, by hand if they are present, or by post to the applicant or their legal representative if they are represented. A copy of the form must be given to the claimant regardless of whether and why they have or have not consented to LA testing.

Unaccompanied asylum seeking children: responsible adults

Additional compliance and safeguarding measures must be taken in respect of applying LA to unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC).

If applying LA to UASC, officers must:

- 1) Ensure that a responsible adult is present. Officers must inform the responsible adult that they may remain present throughout the whole process.
- 2) Give the child the opportunity to speak to the responsible adult, subject to the responsible adult being told that their role is not to offer advice to the child in respect of consenting or not consenting to LA, or any other legal matter.
- 3) Record (on the file minute and CID Notes) the name and claimed relationship of the responsible adult present (for example: uncle, social worker) at each encounter throughout the end-to-end process. If the relationship is unclear, or if there are significant changes of responsible adult throughout the life of the claim such that concerns arise, it may be appropriate to refer the child to social services or even the police (taking advice from a senior caseworker if appropriate): for further information, please see Processing children's asylum claims.

Related content
[Contents](#)

Claimant fails to attend or complete a language analysis interview

Failure to comply with language analysis (LA) by claimants may constitute behaviour which is designed to conceal information or obstruct the handling or resolution of the claim, under section 8(1) of the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants, etc) Act 2004 (see the instruction on Assessing credibility and refugee status). However, claimants must be afforded an opportunity to explain their behaviour.

If the claimant fails to attend or to complete the LA interview or fails to respond to questions asked by the analyst and does not have a reasonable explanation for doing so, the following actions must be taken:

- 1) Ascertain the reasons for the failure to attend or complete the LA interview, writing to the claimant and their legal representatives if they are not present.
- 2) Obtain and attach to file any written explanation as to why the individual did not attend.
- 3) Document the refusal to comply with the LA process on Part B of [LA Form 3 \(ASL.3384\)](#) and ask the claimant to sign the form confirming that they do not wish to participate. If the claimant refuses to sign, their reasons for not doing so must be recorded on the form.
- 4) If the reason for failing to attend or complete the LA interview is considered to be reasonable in all circumstances, consideration must be given to either attempting to interview again or to proceeding without the LA, without drawing any adverse conclusions from the previous failure.
- 5) If LA completion is not possible, update CID to show the refusal to consent:
 - In 'Person/Case search', enter HO reference in the 'Search Criteria' box
 - Click 'Special Conditions' on vertical menu
 - Select 'Language Analysis Test' from the static data
 - Enter the day of the test for the 'Lodged Date': Leave the 'Closed Date' blank, to clearly indicate that no test was completed
 - Update the 'Additional Information' field with the capitalised word 'non-completion' (write NON-COMPLETION), and a short summary of any reasons given for refused consent
 - Click 'Save/Exit'

Medical grounds or disability grounds raised for not completing the LA interview

Medical or disability grounds will only be regarded as a valid reason for failing to participate in LA if they impinge on the claimant's ability to attend for interview, to interact with the process, to use telephony equipment effectively, and to talk clearly (which may include learning difficulties or mental health issues which have the capacity to influence a person's speech).

If a claimant raises medical or disability grounds for being unable to participate, the decision on how to proceed must be taken by a Chief Immigration Officer (CIO) (in the National Intake Unit) or Senior Caseworker (SCW) (in other locations).

In the case of medical or disability issues, the following considerations and actions apply:

- if the CIO or SCW decides that the circumstances do not warrant the cancellation of the LA interview, this must be explained to the claimant. If the claimant does not wish to proceed then they must be asked their reasons, which must be recorded, with their signature, on [LA Form 3 \(ASL.3384\)](#), as per the guidance above (at [Claimant fails to attend or complete a LA interview](#))
- if the CIO or SCW accepts the explanation for the claimant's failure or inability to participate, this must be noted clearly on [LA Form 3 \(ASL.3384\)](#)

Related content

[Contents](#)

Language analysis interview

Booking the language analysis (LA) interview

After the LA Team has given permission to test, LA should be booked directly with Verified, between 8am and 4pm on working days (UK time, excluding [Swedish public holidays](#)). Wherever possible, the interview must be booked in advance, giving the supplier fair notice to organise and prepare. For a limited number of cases, late notice interviews may be arranged, possibly within less than an hour.

To book an LA interview, officers must take the following actions:

- 1) Ensure an interview room is available for the time of the prospective interview.
- 2) Use handset telephones at all times, except for where claimant accessibility is a factor (for example, being unable to hold a handset steady – see [medical grounds or disability grounds raised for not completing the la interview](#)). This is important because speakerphone sound quality is not usually as good as handsets, which can affect the analysis and compromise the effectiveness of LA testing.
- 3) Complete [la form 2 \(verified order form\)](#) as fully as possible, clearly identifying the name of the home office officer dealing with the case and the preferred date and time of the LA test - send the form to verified and the LA team. Verified will usually respond within 1 to 2 hours, either agreeing the proposed date and time, suggesting an alternative, or (as may be the case for less common languages or dialects) acknowledging the request and promising a prompt substantive response - the booking confirmation must be copied to file - it will detail the telephone number to be used when conducting the LA interview.
- 4) If an immediate response is required, officers may make the request by telephone, sending the verified order form to verified immediately afterwards to confirm details.
- 5) Ensure that in this and all other transactions relating to LA testing, the same reference number is used throughout (preferably the HO reference).

See [Contacts](#) list for telephone numbers and email addresses.

Cancelling LA interviews

On occasion, it may be necessary to cancel an interview; for instance, if the claimant fails to attend their interview at the appointed time, or if a test is no longer required.

Late cancellations carry a charge to the Home Office, and so, without delay, officers must inform Verified and the LA Team if an interview will not take place.

To cancel an LA interview, officers must:

- 1) Complete and send the cancellation form (see [LA Form 4](#) for standard text) to Verified, copied to the LA Team.

- 2) Update CID Notes to confirm the due time of the LA interview, the time of the cancellation, and the reason for the cancellation.

If a planned LA interview is cancelled, or not completed, on 2 occasions, officers must not attempt to rebook a third LA test with Verified without obtaining further explicit authorisation from the LA Team. This further authorisation does not require a formal application, but it does require the situation and the reason for the earlier cancellations to be clearly explained to the LA Team, either by email or telephone. Officers must also explain to the LA Team the actions that will be taken to minimise the risk of further cancellations for the case.

Conducting the LA interview

To conduct a LA interview, ordinarily lasting 20-30 minutes, officers must:

- 1) Escort the claimant to the interview room. If required, an interpreter should be present to interpret for the officer and the claimant during and after the LA.
- 2) Telephone verified on the number they provide in their booking confirmation, at the agreed LA interview time.
- 3) Allow the claimant to speak directly to the analyst. The analyst will explain that the purpose of the conversation is only to analyse the claimant's language and that the claimant should not state their name.

Related content

[Contents](#)

Language analysis: preliminary assessment

Verified will provide a preliminary assessment regarding linguistic origin, normally within 30 minutes of the interview. This assessment will be sent in all cases to the contact email provided by the referring officer in their order form.

Officers may also telephone Verified to ask for their assessment (using the booking number), but must do no sooner than 30 minutes after the interview. In such cases, Verified will relay the information provided in the email notification. Officers must not expect or ask Verified to explain or expand upon their preliminary assessment.

After providing the preliminary assessment, Verified will undertake a detailed analysis of the speech recording. They will deliver the full written report within 3 working days if the linguistic origin is assessed to be as stated, or within 5 working days if the linguistic origin is assessed to be other than stated.

The preliminary assessment will usually be indicative of the full language analysis (LA) outcome, but by its nature it is only indicative, and it needs to be treated with this in mind. Asylum decisions must never be based on the preliminary assessment.

Preliminary assessment: outcomes

The preliminary assessment will be in the following form:

The following assessment is made without prejudice to the outcome of any subsequent analyses. The assessment is holistic in nature and is not based on the same foundation as a full and properly reasoned LA report, and must therefore not be treated as such.

Case reference: A1234567

The language use is consistent with the stated linguistic background: (Yes/No)

The language use is associated with (If No above)*: (Alternative linguistic origin)

*It is not within the analyst's area of expertise to express himself/herself with certainty outside of the interviewee's stated linguistic background. This association is not to be treated as expert testimony, but rather as an aid in guiding further investigation.

Updating Home Office records

Following the LA interview, the preliminary results email must be copied to file and the outcome clearly minuted to file. CID must also be updated.

CID

Officers must update CID, according to the following actions:

- 1) In 'Person/Case search', enter HO reference in the 'Search Criteria' box.
- 2) Click 'Special Conditions' on vertical menu, select 'Language Analysis Test' from the static data and enter the day of the test for the 'Lodged Date' and 'Closed Date'.
- 3) Update the preliminary assessment if known in the 'Additional Information' field.
- 4) Click 'Save/Exit'.
- 5) Also update CID Notes.

Preliminary assessment disputes claimed linguistic origin

If the preliminary result clearly indicates that the claimant does not have the linguistic origin claimed and the claimant is still present and available for further questioning, officers must consider and take the following action:

- 1) Inform the claimant about the LA preliminary findings and invite their comments.
- 2) Question the claimant and attempt to ascertain their true place of origin if still doubted.

Related content

[Contents](#)

Language analysis: full report and other items

Report and CD receipt, administration and obtaining copies

Officers must note and take action in respect of the following points:

- Verified will send full reports via email to the Language Analysis (LA) Team and the named contact in the order form
- Verified's full reports are delivered within 3 working days if the linguistic origin is as claimed, or 5 working days if it is other than claimed
- upon receipt of the report by email, officers must print and attach a hard copy to file, minute the file, and note receipt on CID Notes
- if officers receive the report or any associated LA materials but are no longer responsible for the case, they must check CID to identify the new caseworker, confirm interest and then forward the report to them, recording action on CID Notes
- in screening cases, the caseworker will not be known at the time of the LA test: after routing, caseworkers must check CID and file for evidence of testing and where relevant, request the report from receiving officer, or the LA Team
- CD audio recordings of the interview are delivered to the LA Team by post within 10 working days of the LA interview (hard copies of the LA report are no longer supplied)
- the LA Team will forward CD audio recordings to the relevant caseworker
- caseworkers must upon receipt of the CDs, attach them securely to file, minute the file, and note receipt on CID Notes
- copies of reports, CDs or other documents may be obtained by emailing the LA Team in the first instance officers must not ask Verified directly for copy reports, CDs, or other documents

Full report outcomes

Each report will express its analysis and results according to at least one and possibly 2 hypotheses. Every report will address the first hypothesis, which is that the speaker has the linguistic background as claimed. If linguistic background is not as claimed (see negative outcomes below), a second hypothesis proposing an alternative background will be tested.

There are 7 possible outcomes to each hypothesis in a Verified report (Sprakab reports differ):

- **+3** - the language analysis shows with certainty that the results obtained are clearly consistent with the linguistic community as stated in the hypothesis
- **+2** - the language analysis clearly suggests that the results obtained most likely are consistent with the linguistic community as stated in the hypothesis

- **+1** - the language analysis somewhat suggests that the results obtained more likely than not are consistent with the linguistic community as stated in the hypothesis
- **0** - the language analysis can neither confirm nor refute the hypothesis, as the results obtained do not constitute a basis on which to assess the linguistic community as stated in the hypothesis
- **-1** - the language analysis somewhat suggests that the results obtained more likely than not are inconsistent with the linguistic community as stated in the hypothesis
- **-2** - the language analysis clearly suggests that the results obtained most likely are inconsistent with the linguistic community as stated in the hypothesis
- **-3** - the language analysis shows with certainty that the results obtained are clearly inconsistent with the linguistic community as stated in the hypothesis

Report outcomes

The report's results are relevant to linguistic background. This may be highly relevant to the consideration of the claimant's place of origin and to nationality, but they are not the same. LA evidence must be carefully considered in the context of claimed background, and place of origin determined only after fully considering all of the evidence in the case.

Quality of LA reports

If officers have questions relating to the findings of the report, they must [email or telephone](#) the LA Team, which will if necessary contact Verified and seek clarification.

Translated transliterations

Translated transliterations are word-for-word translated written records of the language analysis interview. They will not explain the analysis or detail the nuances of language, dialect or accent that may be determinative to the main points of contention in language analysis appeals.

Since translated transliterations have a cost to the public purse, consideration must always be given as to their helpfulness in clarifying a point at dispute that cannot be resolved by reference to the test report and audio recording. If a representative requests a translated transliteration, they must be asked to explain why it is needed, to inform such consideration.

Requests for a translated transliteration must be reasoned and directed to the LA Team inbox (not to Verified directly). The request and the reply must be documented in CID Notes. The LA Team will liaise with Verified to obtain the report, which will usually be provided within 10 working days.

Related content

[Contents](#)

The substantive asylum interview

Preparation

Whether or not language analysis (LA) reports are available or expected in a case, officers must prepare questions to investigate the evidence of nationality or national origin thoroughly at interview, as well as prepare questions relating to the basis of claim. Officers must follow the policy for interviewing as set out in Asylum Interviews.

Interview

Officers must take the following actions at the time of the asylum interview:

- 1) Read out the standard interview procedural statements.
- 2) Record and read to the claimant the appropriate standard wording according to the findings of the LA, or if applicable, the wording relevant to refusing to undertake LA - see [Standard wording for the substantive interview](#).
- 3) Ask the questions tailored to the LA findings.
- 4) Proceed with the interview, ensuring that the claimant's basis of claim is fully and robustly explored, including issues relating to their claimed nationality or national origin.

Related content

[Contents](#)

Decisions and appeals in language analysis cases

General considerations

An asylum decision must not rely solely on the language analysis (LA) report (or a failure to comply with or complete LA), to the exclusion of other evidence. As with all decisions, the totality of evidence available in the case must be fully and properly considered, including the claimant's interview evidence and any relevant country of origin information, and the decision maker must assess the weight to be given to the LA in each case.

The weight to apply to a LA report will vary according to the particular conclusion it records, and the reasoning it provides (see [Full report outcomes](#)). A report with a single hypothesis which concluded, 'The language analysis can neither confirm nor refute the hypothesis, as the results obtained do not constitute a basis on which to assess the linguistic community as stated in the hypothesis' would not of itself be evidence and must not be given weight.

The nationality or national origin of a claimant must be assessed by weighing all the available evidence, including their interview evidence and any written statement submitted (especially relating to the country knowledge appropriate to their background), documentary evidence, any expert reports and the LA report.

For further guidance refer to the instructions Assessing credibility and refugee status and Drafting, implementing and serving asylum decisions.

Granting asylum or humanitarian protection

If the LA report provides strong evidence that the claimant is of the nationality or national origin claimed, and if the claimant establishes a well-founded fear of persecution in their country of origin, protection must be granted accordingly, with the grant consideration minute properly recording the weight given to the LA evidence.

Refusing the claim

Reason for refusal letters (RFRLs) placing reliance on LA must contain the appropriate standard wording immediately after the introductory consideration paragraph at part C of the RFRL. (See Assessing credibility and refugee status)

Where nationality or national origin is doubted or disputed, the RFRL must properly address this. (See the instruction Nationality: doubtful, disputed and other cases.)

If officers are unsure of how to address the nationality issue in the RFRL they must seek advice from a senior caseworker (SCW). The Country Policy Information Team

(CPIT) should also be contacted with any country specific queries (after reading the appropriate country reports).

Serving asylum refusals

Officers must serve any refusals according to standard practice (see the instruction Drafting, implementing and serving asylum decisions). In addition, officers must handle the LA documents according to the points below:

- LA report and annexes: copy to file and mark for inclusion in any appeal bundle, copy to the legal representative, copy to the claimant
- [LA Form 3 \(Direct Analysis Form, ASL.3384\)](#): copy to file and mark for inclusion in any appeal bundle, copy to the legal representative, copy to the claimant
- LA audio CD: copy to file, copy to the legal representative, or to the claimant if there is no representative

The CDs should usually be served with the decision. However, if the decision is ready for service and the CDs are expected but slightly delayed, it may be appropriate to serve the decision and to serve the CDs immediately after they are received.

Post-refusal and appeal actions

The documents listed at [Serving asylum refusals](#) must be included in the appeals bundle, as well as any other relevant documents which may be held. A copy of the recording of the LA interview on CD must also be provided if the court requests it.

If further statements from the analyst or linguist in Verified who wrote the report are considered to be necessary to support the case at appeal, officers must email a request to the LA Team.

If during the course of an appeal, an Immigration Judge considers a translated transliteration to be necessary, officers must search the file to ensure that one is not already held, and if not, order one. See [Translated Transliterations](#).

Related content

[Contents](#)

Process summary

The following information is in summary only. Officers must read the full instruction.

- 1) Claimant's claimed place of origin is doubted, or claimant claims an origin that is targeted for language analysis (LA) testing, such that LA is considered appropriate.
- 2) Officer asks further questions as necessary to obtain information sufficient to complete [LA Form 1 \(Authorisation Request\)](#).
- 3) Officer emails [LA Form 1](#) to the LA Team, requesting authorisation to test, usually in a single, language or dialect. Authorisation is given or refused by the LA Team (this is required for all tests – whether case by case testing, or targeted by nationality or national origin).
- 4) Officer emails LA [Form 2 \(Verified Order Form\)](#) to book LA (telephoning and emailing for urgent cases). Verified confirm booking time and provide telephone number.
- 5) [LA Form 3 \(Direct Analysis Form, ASL.3384\)](#) explained to claimant by officer, and claimant invited to consent to test. Claimant consents by signature or officer's record, or refuses to consent.
- 6) If the booked LA interview cannot be undertaken, it must be cancelled by sending [LA Form 4 \(Verified Cancellation Form\)](#) to Verified. (HO is charged for late cancellations).
- 7) LA interview undertaken, lasting about 20-30 minutes. The claimant has a conversation with the Verified interviewer, who will speak the language being analysed at mother-tongue level. The conversation is recorded, and forms the basis of the analysis
- 8) The preliminary assessment will be notified to the officer by email within 30 minutes after the end of the interview (or officer can telephone for the assessment after this time); CID Special Conditions and CID Notes are updated by officer.
- 9) The Verified analyst reviews the interview recording, taking fully into account linguistic features such as phonology, morphology and lexicon.
- 10) The full LA report will be sent electronically to the email address specified on the order form. If the linguistic origin is as claimed, the report will arrive within 3 working days, and if linguistic origin is other than as claimed, it will arrive within 5 working days.
- 11) The CD recordings of the LA interview will arrive with the LA Team within 10 working days, and will be sent directly to the officer's address as specified on the order form.
- 12) Asylum decisions must not be based solely on the LA outcomes, but must take full account of the detailed findings and consistency levels in the LA report, as well as the wider evidence in the case.
- 13) Any refusal decision must be served with relevant LA documents (for example, report, CD).
- 14) Transliterations (word for word transcriptions of the interview), additional CD copies or supplementary statements may sometimes be required. They may be obtained only by making a request to the LA Team (not to Verified directly).

Related content
[Contents](#)

Standard wordings for substantive interviews

The following lines are suggested wordings for exploring language analysis (LA) issues in asylum interviews. They must be carefully tailored according to the particular facts in the case, with questions to ascertain the claimant's response to the issues raised. Country knowledge must always be properly explored in the asylum interview, regardless of the LA results.

Refer also to [The substantive asylum interview](#) section in this instruction.

Claimant participated, completed the interview and the outcome of the full LA provides strong evidence that they are of the nationality or national origin claimed

You took part in a language analysis interview on [date] to ascertain your linguistic origin. You claimed to come from [place or clan or group] and to be of [nationality]. The language analysis considered the hypothesis [state the hypothesis of the claimed origin]. The language analysis conclusion to this was that [state the conclusion].

Claimant participated, completed the interview and the outcome of the full LA provides strong evidence that they are not of nationality or national origin claimed

You took part in a language analysis interview on [date] to ascertain your linguistic origin. You claimed to come from [place or clan or group] and to be of [nationality]. The language analysis considered the hypothesis [state the hypothesis of the claimed origin]. The language analysis conclusion to this was that [state the conclusion]. Language analysis also considered the hypothesis [state the second hypothesis]. The language analysis conclusion to this was that [state the conclusion].

Claimant did not attend the LA interview

On [date], you were asked to attend a language analysis interview on [date and time] to help ascertain your linguistic origin. You did not attend that interview. We asked you to explain your non-attendance [in a letter dated [date]/in an interview on [date]]. You explained your behaviour as [outline explanation, if any].

Claimant agreed to take part but did not complete the LA interview

On [date], you were asked to take part in a language analysis interview to ascertain your linguistic origin. It is noted that although you initially agreed to take part in the language analysis interview, [outline circumstances of non-completion, for example,

stopped partway through]. You sought to explain your behaviour as being due to [outline explanation].

Claimant refused to participate in the LA interview

You did not agree to take part in the language analysis interview. You have not provided a satisfactory explanation for this (for example, disability or medical reason).

Only the preliminary results are held at the time of the substantive interview

You took part in a language analysis interview on [date] to ascertain your linguistic origin. You claimed to come from [place or clan or group] and to be of [nationality].

The full language analysis report is not yet available to us. We will not make a decision based on language analysis without receiving the full report. However, we have received a preliminary assessment of your linguistic origin. This will not of itself be part of the evidence used to decide your claim. It states [outline preliminary assessment].

Related content

[Contents](#)

Standard wordings for reason for refusal letters

The following lines are suggested standard wordings for common scenarios likely to arise in language analysis (LA) refusal decisions, but they must be carefully tailored to the particular facts in the case.

Refer also to [Refusing the claim](#).

The results of the analysis provide strong evidence to indicate that the claimant is from the place/group claimed (but still falls for refusal)

You took part in a language analysis interview on [date] to ascertain your linguistic origin. You claimed to come from [place or clan or group] and to be of [nationality]. The language analysis considered the hypothesis [state the hypothesis of the claimed origin]. The language analysis conclusion to this was that [state the conclusion].

Giving full consideration to this and the other evidence in your case, it is accepted that you come from [place or clan or group].

The results of the analysis provide strong evidence to indicate that the claimant is not from the place group claim, and is instead from another place or group, stated in the report

You took part in a language analysis interview on [date] to ascertain your linguistic origin. You claimed to come from [place or clan or group] and to be of [nationality]. The language analysis considered the hypothesis [state the hypothesis of the claimed origin]. The language analysis conclusion to this was that [state the conclusion]. Language analysis also considered the hypothesis [state the second hypothesis]. The language analysis conclusion to this was that [state the conclusion].

Giving full consideration to this and the other evidence in your case, it is not accepted that you come from [place or clan or group]. It is considered that you actually come from [place or clan or group].

The claimant agreed to take part but did not complete the LA interview

On [date], you were asked to take part in a language analysis interview to ascertain your linguistic origin. It is noted that although you initially agreed to take part in the language analysis interview, [outline circumstances of non-completion, for example, stopped partway through. If limited LA conclusions were expressed, set these out]. You sought to explain your behaviour as being due to [outline explanation].

Where satisfactory reason has been given

It is considered that you gave a satisfactory reason for failing to complete the language analysis interview. In coming to a decision on your asylum claim, no adverse inferences have been drawn from the fact that you did not complete a language analysis interview.

Where no reason has been given or satisfactory reason has not been given for failing to complete the LA interview

You did not give a satisfactory reason for failing to complete the interview. It is considered that someone in genuine need of international protection would assist the authorities of a safe country in establishing the validity of their claim for asylum. Your failure to participate fully in the language analysis interview undermines your claim to be a refugee. This fact is not of itself determinative, but it is part of the overall evidence that is available for the consideration of your claim.

The claimant did not attend or take part in the LA interview

On [date], you were asked to take part in a language analysis interview to ascertain your linguistic origin. It is noted that you failed to attend [or] refused to take part in the interview. You sought to explain your behaviour as being due to [outline explanation].

Where satisfactory reason has been given

It is considered that you gave a satisfactory reason for failing to attend [or] participate in the language analysis interview. In coming to a decision on your asylum claim, no adverse inferences have been drawn from the fact that you did not complete a language analysis interview.

Where no reason has been given or satisfactory reason has not been given for failing to attend or not agreeing to take part in the LA interview

You did not give a satisfactory reason for failing to attend [or] participate in the language analysis interview. It is considered that a person in genuine need of international protection would assist the authorities of a safe country in establishing the validity of their claim for asylum. Your failure to participate fully in the language analysis interview undermines your claim to be a refugee. This fact is not of itself determinative, but it is part of the overall evidence that is available for the consideration of your claim.

Related content

[Contents](#)

Language analysis form 1 (LA Team authorisation request)

Official – sensitive: Start of section

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

Official – sensitive: End of section

Related content

[Contents](#)

Language analysis form 2 (Verified order form)

Official – sensitive: Start of section

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

Official – sensitive: End of section

Related content

[Contents](#)

Language analysis form 3 (DA SEF, consent form, ASL.3384)

Official – sensitive: Start of section

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

Official – sensitive: End of section

Related content

[Contents](#)

Language analysis form 4 (Verified cancellation form)

Official – sensitive: Start of section

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

Official – sensitive: End of section

Related content

[Contents](#)

Contacts

Official – sensitive: Start of section

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

Official – sensitive: End of section

Related content

[Contents](#)

Sprakab

Official – sensitive: Start of section

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

Official – sensitive: End of section

Related content

[Contents](#)

Process improvement

Official – sensitive: Start of section

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

The information on this page has been removed as it is restricted for internal Home Office use.

Official – sensitive: End of section

Related content

[Contents](#)