

UNDERSTANDING VOLUNTARY RETURN

A RIGHTS-BASED ASSESSMENT

EXPERIENCES OF SYRIANS RETURNING FROM TURKEY TO SYRIA

MÜLTECİ-DER
Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneği

Thematic Report | November 2026 | Association for Solidarity with Refugees

Understanding Voluntary Return: A Rights-Based Assessment

Association for Solidarity with Refugees (Mülteci-Der)

First published in November 2026

This report was prepared with the financial support of EuroMed Rights through EU fund "Empowering Civil Society to Fight Impunity / NDICI - THE-NEAR/2023/449-257". Association for Solidarity with Refugees is solely responsible for the content, and it does not necessarily represent the official views of the EU or EuroMed Rights.



Cover image: generated with Anthropic Claude Opus 5.5.

© This report may be freely used, reproduced and distributed, provided that the source is cited.

Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneği

Address: Uğur Mh. 848 Sk. No: 16, Konak, İzmir

Email: ofis@multeci.org.tr

Phone: +90 549 483 54 21

Web: www.multeci.org.tr

The Association for Solidarity with Refugees (Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneği - Mülteci-Der) is an independent, rights-based civil society organisation established in 2008. It advocates for the rights of refugees, migrants and asylum seekers in Turkey. In line with its mission, the Association provides legal aid, supports vulnerable individuals and carries out monitoring, reporting and advocacy work to align Turkey's policies and practices with international human rights standards. It is an active member of several national and international networks, in particular the European Council on Refugees and Exiles (ECRE) and Mülteci Hakları Koordinasyonu.

Mülteci-Der meets regularly with different groups within refugee, asylum seeker and migrant communities, and monitors their experiences, their needs and the rights violations they report. Alongside legal advice, information and referral support, the Association carries out fieldwork and qualitative research. Through this work, it aims to make the voices of under-represented and disadvantaged groups heard and to bring their experiences into rights-based advocacy and policy work.

This report is based on individual semi-structured interviews with people who returned from Turkey to Syria after 8 December 2024. The findings reflect the experiences of the 15 people interviewed. They do not represent the views and experiences of all returnees, of groups in similar situations or of Syrians across Turkey. The report aims to make visible the problems encountered at different stages of the return process and to contribute to rights-based monitoring work.



CONTENTS

1. Introduction 5
   1.1. Legal framework 6
   1.2. Previous concerns 7
   1.3. About this report 8
2. Overview 8
   2.1. Summary of the research 8
   2.2. Key findings 9
3. Methodology 12
   3.1. Research design 12
   3.2. Participants 12
   3.3. Ethics and personal data protection 13
   3.4. Limitations 14
4. Key Themes and Findings 15
   4.1. The decision to return 15
   4.2. Information, procedural safeguards and travel support in Turkey 18
   4.3. Border crossing 22
   4.4. Arrival and life after return 25
   4.5. Children 28
   4.6. Family separation and the wish to return to Turkey 31
5. Conclusion 33
   5.1. Key concerns 33
   5.2. Participants' requests 34
   5.3. Comparison with previous reports 35

Annex: Interviewed participants 37

1. INTRODUCTION

Millions of people fleeing the conflict that began in Syria in 2011 sought refuge in Turkey. Most of them were registered under temporary protection within the framework of the Law on Foreigners and International Protection No. 6458 (LFIP) and the Temporary Protection Regulation.[1] As of 5 November 2026, there were 2,196,216 Syrians registered under temporary protection in Turkey.[2] A large proportion of them have lived in Turkey for more than ten years and many of their children were born and grew up in Turkey.

After the fall of the Assad government on 8 December 2024, return became one of the main issues in migration policy and public debate in Turkey. Official statements presented voluntary return as a policy priority and several measures were introduced to facilitate return procedures. In this context, Go-and-See visits were carried out in the first half of 2025, allowing Syrians to assess conditions in their country in person. Some support was also provided for transport costs and specific needs.[3] According to a statement by the Ministry of Interior dated 4 May 2026, 667,565 Syrians had returned voluntarily from Turkey to Syria since 8 December 2024.[4]

[1] Law No. 6458 on Foreigners and International Protection, Official Gazette No. 28615, 11 April 2013; Temporary Protection Regulation, Official Gazette No. 29153, 22 October 2014.

[2] Göç Araştırmaları Vakfı (Migration Research Foundation), "Türkiye'nin Aylık Göç Trendleri – Ekim 2026" [Turkey's Monthly Migration Trends, October 2026], 5 November 2026. The analysis is based on data from the Presidency of Migration Management dated 5 November 2026 and gives the Syrian population under temporary protection as 2,196,216. https://gocvakfi.org/turkiyenin-aylik-goc-trendleri-ekim-2026/

[3] UNHCR, "Voluntary Repatriation of Syrian Refugees in Türkiye", April 2026. The briefing note states that Go-and-See visits were authorised in the first half of 2025 and that targeted support was provided for transport and specific needs. https://data.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/121985

[4] Anadolu Ajansı, "İçişleri Bakanlığı'ndan 'Suriyelilerin geri dönüşüne' ilişkin iddialarla ilgili açıklama" [Statement by the Ministry of Interior on claims about the 'return of Syrians'], 4 May 2026. According to the Ministry of Interior statement, the number of Syrians who had made a voluntary return after 8 December 2024 stood at 667,565 as of that date. https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/gundem/icisleri-bakanligindan-suriyelilerin-geri-donusune-iliskin-iddialarla-ilgili-aciklama/3926727

1.1. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The principle of non-refoulement provides that no one may be sent to a place where they would face torture or inhuman or degrading treatment, or where their life or freedom would be under threat. This principle is one of the core safeguards of international refugee and human rights law and is set out in Article 4 of the LFIP. The voluntary return of people under temporary protection is governed in particular by Article 42 of the Temporary Protection Regulation. Article 12(1)(a) of the Regulation provides that temporary protection ends on an individual basis when a person leaves Turkey of their own will.[5] According to UNHCR's current guidance, accessed on 3 November 2026, under the standard procedure the application is made to the Provincial Directorate of Migration Management (PDMM) in the province of registration. Interviews are held with the applicant and the family members who will return with them. Family members over 18 are asked to sign separate forms, and a travel permit valid for 15 days is issued for reaching the chosen border gate. However, the practices described in the interviews differed from this standard procedure, particularly in some returns in early 2025.

Under international standards, a return can be considered voluntary only if the person decides without physical, psychological or material pressure, and on the basis of sufficient, accurate and up-to-date information. UNHCR's handbook on voluntary repatriation sets out as core principles that the decision must be free and informed, and that return must take place in conditions of safety and dignity.[6] In practice, these principles require safeguards such as a separate interview with each adult, a real opportunity for the person to reconsider their decision, and objective information on conditions in the area of return. UNHCR monitors voluntary return procedures in Turkey and holds individual interviews with some applicants.

[5] Law No. 6458 on Foreigners and International Protection, Art. 4; Temporary Protection Regulation, Art. 12(1)(a) and Art. 42. UNHCR Türkiye, "Returning Procedure" and "Temporary Protection Related Matters" (accessed 13 November 2026). According to UNHCR's guidance, readmission to Turkey and the reactivation of the temporary protection identity card after voluntary return are assessed on an individual basis. https://help.unhcr.org/turkiye/information-for-syrians/volrep/returning-procedure/ ; https://help.unhcr.org/turkiye/information-for-syrians/volrep/temporary-protection-related-matters/

[6] UNHCR, Handbook: Voluntary Repatriation: International Protection (Geneva: UNHCR, 1996).

According to its briefing note of April 2026, 73 per cent of the returns recorded as of 16 February 2026 had been monitored by UNHCR and assessed through interviews.[7]

1.2. PREVIOUS CONCERNS

In previous years, international human rights organisations raised serious concerns about whether some returns from Turkey to Syria were voluntary. A 2019 study by Amnesty International and a 2022 review by Human Rights Watch reported that some Syrians had been held in administrative detention, deported, and made to sign voluntary return forms under pressure. These findings do not mean that every return under the official voluntary return procedure was forced. However, they show the importance of safeguarding free will and informed decision-making at every stage.[8] Mülteci-Der's previous studies from 2025 and 2026 also documented the expectations and hesitations of Syrians in Turkey regarding return, and their views on Go-and-See visits. After December 2024, UNHCR underlined the right of Syrians to return voluntarily on an individual basis. However, in its current assessment of May 2026, it stated that it does not promote large-scale voluntary return, because of the widespread humanitarian crisis in the country, the destruction of housing and critical infrastructure, and the limited capacity of communities to receive returnees.

UNHCR's May 2026 assessment stresses that the security and human rights situation in Syria remains fragile and unpredictable, and that there are serious difficulties in housing,

[7] UNHCR, "Voluntary Repatriation of Syrian Refugees in Türkiye", April 2026. According to UNHCR's briefing note, more than 626,000 people were estimated to have returned from Turkey to Syria as of 16 February 2026; 73 per cent of recorded returns had been monitored by UNHCR and assessed through interviews. https://data.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/121985

[8] Amnesty International, "Turkey: Sent to a War Zone: Turkey's Illegal Deportations of Syrian Refugees", 25 October 2019, EUR 44/1102/2019; Human Rights Watch, "Turkey: Hundreds of Refugees Deported to Syria", 24 October 2022. See also Mülteci-Der, "Hayatları Yeniden İnşa Etmek, Evi Yeniden Tanımlamak: Suriyeli Mülteciler ve Geri Dönüş Tartışması" [Rebuilding Lives, Redefining Home: Syrian Refugees and the Return Debate] (18 April 2025) and "Umut ile Belirsizlik Arasında: Suriyeli Mültecilerin Gönüllü Geri Dönüş ve 'Git ve Gör' Ziyaretlerine İlişkin Görüşleri" [Between Hope and Uncertainty: Syrian Refugees' Views on Voluntary Return and Go-and-See Visits] (22 January 2026).
https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/eur44/1102/2019/en/ ;
https://www.hrw.org/news/2022/10/24/turkey-hundreds-refugees-deported-syria ;
https://multeci.org.tr/2025/04/18/hayatlari-yeniden-insa-etmek-evi-yeniden-tanimlamak ;
https://multeci.org.tr/2026/01/22/umut-ile-belirsizlik-arasinda/

infrastructure, basic services, livelihoods and documentation. Although conditions vary by region, shelter, access to healthcare, education, employment and security remain the main problem areas for returnees.[9]

1.3. ABOUT THIS REPORT

This report documents the experiences of 15 Syrians who returned from Turkey to Syria under the voluntary return procedure after 8 December 2024. It covers the different stages of the return process: the decision, administrative procedures in Turkey, the border crossing, arrival in Syria and life after return. Mülteci-Der's previous studies from 2025 and 2026 focused on the views of Syrians living in Turkey who were considering return. This report complements those studies by following the experiences of people who have returned. The aim is to document the process with a rights-based approach and to contribute to Mülteci-Der's monitoring and advocacy work.

Section 2 summarises the scope of the research and its key findings. Section 3 explains the research method and its limitations. Section 4 presents the thematic findings, supported by anonymised accounts from participants. Section 5 closes with the key concerns and participants' requests.

2. OVERVIEW

2.1. SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH

This report is based on semi-structured interviews with 15 Syrians who returned from Turkey to Syria under the voluntary return procedure after 8 December 2024. The interviews

[9] UNHCR, International Protection Considerations with Regard to Asylum-Seekers from the Syrian Arab Republic, HCR/PC/SYR/2026/1, May 2026, in particular the section "Returns to Syria". https://www.refworld.org/sites/default/files/2026-05/2026_syria_ipcs.pdf

followed a guide of seven sections covering the decision to return, procedures in Turkey, the border crossing, arrival in Syria and life after return (see Section 3).

Twelve participants are women and three are men. They are aged between 30 and 59. Eleven lived in İzmir and four in İstanbul; 13 had spent at least ten years in Turkey. Returns to Syria took place over a period from early 2025 to August 2026.

Nine participants returned to Aleppo, three to Deir ez-Zor, one to Damascus, one to Hasakah and one to Idlib. Seven participants used the Öncüpınar (Bab al-Salameh) border gate and six used border gates in Hatay; most of these six crossed at the Cilvegözü (Bab al-Hawa) border gate. One participant used the Akçakale (Tel Abyad) border gate, and one flew to Hatay and crossed the border there.

This is a qualitative study with a small number of participants, and the findings are not statistically representative. The report does not aim to explain all returns from Turkey to Syria. It aims to make visible the individual experiences of the people interviewed and the rights and protection issues that stand out in these experiences.

2.2. KEY FINDINGS

The decision to return. Participants' decisions were usually shaped by several factors together. The wish to be reunited with family after many years and the expectation that conditions would improve after 8 December 2024 were mentioned often. Many participants described economic pressures such as rising rents, debts and difficulty making a living. Some said they felt that social acceptance of Syrians in Turkey had declined. The wish for children to be educated in Arabic, the hope of finding work in public institutions and sudden events such as a death or illness in the family also influenced some decisions.

Choice and necessity. While some participants described return as their own choice, eight described the decision as a necessity, or as a decision taken mainly by another family member. This was particularly evident in the accounts of women participants. At least four women said

they did not want to return or remained undecided until the last moment, and that the decision was taken mainly by their husband or his family.

Lack of visit options. Eleven participants said they had wanted, or still want, the option to visit Syria and return to Turkey. Nine of them said such an option could have changed or delayed their decision, or replaced permanent return. Participants mentioned obstacles such as family members being unable to visit together, fear of not being readmitted, the cost of switching to a residence permit and the high fees reportedly charged by intermediaries. One male participant said an official told him that if he made a visit, everyone in the same household would have to return by a certain date, and that he then cancelled his visit application.

Information and procedural safeguards in Turkey. Most participants described the procedures at PDMMs as quick and easy, and many said officials were attentive and helpful. However, the information given on the consequences of return for their status in Turkey and for future re-entry appears to have been limited or inconsistent. Some participants recalled being told they could not enter Turkey for five years, while others said they were given no information about re-entry. This period is what participants say they were told. UNHCR's current published guidance states that readmission and the reactivation of temporary protection are assessed on an individual basis.

Individual interviews and consent. Practice on individual interviews appears to have varied between participants. Some participants were asked about their decision to return and whether they were under pressure. Others, in particular some women whose husbands handled the procedures, said they were not asked any questions. One woman said she was not interviewed separately even though she cried throughout her appointment. One participant said her son was asked to interpret for another applicant, and that her other son signed a voluntary return document while held in a Removal Center (Geri Gönderme Merkezi - GGM).

Border crossing. Participants generally described the procedures at the border as orderly; waiting times ranged from around one hour to 11–13 hours. At some border gates free transport was provided between the two gates, while at others participants used paid vehicles. Access to food, water and waiting areas was inconsistent. For children to cross,

documents were required such as birth certificates and, where one parent was staying in Turkey, written consent. Two women described experiences of their treatment at the border that raise concerns about privacy and human dignity.

Life after return. After the initial relief of being reunited with family, most participants faced difficulties with housing, livelihoods, electricity, water, healthcare and finding work. Conditions varied widely depending on the area of return. Some participants said certain services had improved, while others said they had no regular access to electricity and water. Some people said they had applied for cash support but had received no assistance by the time of the interview.

Children. The interviews showed that return had significant effects on children's education and wellbeing. Many children who grew up in Turkey and were educated in Turkish could speak Arabic but struggled to read and write it. Some children were placed in lower grades than their age or the grade they had completed in Turkey, and some refused to go to school. Gaps in marriage and birth records also delayed some children's school enrolment.

Family separation. Return split some families across the border. At least six participants had a spouse, children or other close family members who stayed in Turkey. One father said he was told that his nine-year-old son, who stayed in Turkey, refused to eat or drink because of the separation. Participants said that the restrictions on re-entry which they say were communicated to them made family visits more difficult.

Overall assessment. Nine participants expressed regret or assessed their return mainly negatively. Five gave a mixed assessment and said the timing of return was too early, particularly for their children. One participant described return as a positive step. Eight participants said they would like to return to Turkey if a legal route were available.

Taken together, the accounts suggest that in some cases return decisions may be shaped by economic and family pressures, the social environment, and incomplete or inaccurate information about conditions in Syria. The interviews show that signing a voluntary return form does not on its own show that a decision was free and informed. They point to the importance of individual safeguards so that each adult can express their own decision. They

also show that serious difficulties may arise after return in housing, livelihoods, health, education and family unity.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. RESEARCH DESIGN

The research used a qualitative approach based on semi-structured interviews. The interview guide consists of 49 open-ended questions in seven sections: basic information, the decision to return, return procedures in Turkey and reaching the border, the border crossing, entering Syria and reaching the place of residence, life after return, and overall assessment. Each interview was planned to last 50 to 60 minutes.

The questions were written in neutral language. Interviewers did not describe the participant's return in advance as "voluntary", "forced", "safe" or "unsafe". For example, instead of being asked whether they had been pressured to return, participants were asked to describe how their decision developed. This approach allowed participants to describe the nature of their decision in their own words.

Interview notes were taken in Turkish. The notes were analysed thematically, following the stages of return set out in the interview guide.

3.2. PARTICIPANTS

The research included people who returned from Turkey to Syria under the voluntary return procedure after 8 December 2024. The available interview notes do not record how participants were reached. Fifteen people took part in the research, 12 women and three men. Participants were aged between 30 and 59. Eleven had last lived in İzmir and four in İstanbul; three had lived in another province before moving to İzmir. Thirteen participants had stayed in Turkey for at least ten years.

Participants returned to the governorates of Aleppo (nine), Deir ez-Zor (three), Damascus (one), Hasakah (one) and Idlib (one). Where dates were given, returns took place from around the start of 2025 until August 2026. Seven participants crossed at the Öncüpınar (Bab al-Salameh) border gate and six at border gates in Hatay, mainly Cilvegözü (Bab al-Hawa). One participant crossed at the Akçakale (Tel Abyad) border gate, and one travelled by air. Most participants returned with their children. Two participants returned alone, leaving their spouse and children in Turkey.

No children were interviewed for the research. Information about children was obtained from their parents or grandparents.

3.3. ETHICS AND PERSONAL DATA PROTECTION

The research was carried out in line with the guidance on ethical principles and personal data protection prepared by the Association. In line with the guidance, interviewers explained Mülteci-Der's work, the purpose of the research and how the information would be used. Participants were told that participation was voluntary, that they could decline to answer any question or end the interview at any time, and that this decision would not affect their access to any service or support.

Personal data were processed within the framework of Law No. 6698 on the Protection of Personal Data (KVKK). Participants were given an information notice. The explicit consent form asked for separate explicit consent for the use of anonymised findings and for the use of anonymised direct quotes. Both documents were prepared in Turkish and Arabic. Only data necessary for the research were collected. Identity numbers, full addresses and the names of family members or third parties were not recorded.

Interviewers took a trauma-informed approach. Participants were not asked for details of distressing events unless they chose to share them. Where participants mentioned a need for legal, psychosocial or other support, they were given information or referred through the Association's existing referral mechanisms. Support was never made conditional on taking part in the research.

In this report, participants are identified by the codes P01–P15, their gender and their age group. Details that could identify a person, alone or in combination, have been generalised or removed. Direct quotes have been lightly edited for clarity and language, while keeping the meaning of participants' accounts.

3.4. LIMITATIONS

The findings are based on the accounts of 15 people and are not statistically representative. Participants were selected from among people who returned from Turkey to Syria through the voluntary return procedure. The findings therefore do not reflect the experiences of people who did not return, who lived in other provinces or who used different routes. The sample is weighted towards women, people who lived in İzmir and people who returned to Aleppo. The experiences of men, of people from other provinces and of people who returned to other parts of Syria are therefore less represented.

The sample has further limitations. Of the 15 participants, 12 are women, 11 lived in İzmir and nine returned to Aleppo. The experiences of men, of people from other provinces and of people who returned to other areas are therefore less represented. Participants returned at different times, and some practices, such as travel support, changed during this period.

The accounts are based on participants' own statements and have not been independently verified. Some participants described events that took place months before the interview, or more than a year earlier, and this may affect how dates and details are remembered. The fact that participants were living in Syria at the time of the interview may have influenced what they chose to share. Where a participant described a decision taken by their spouse or another family member, the report reflects only the perspective of the person interviewed. As no children were interviewed directly, findings on children are based on the accounts of parents or grandparents.

4. KEY THEMES AND FINDINGS

This section follows the stages of return covered in the interviews. Each theme opens with a short description and is supported by quotes, anonymised so that participants cannot be identified.

4.1. THE DECISION TO RETURN

Participants' decisions were shaped by several factors at the same time. The accounts show that the line between choice and necessity was often unclear.

4.1.1. FAMILY TIES AND THE CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT

Most participants described the wish to be reunited with their families after many years as a strong factor. Some had not seen their parents, siblings or other relatives for more than ten years. After the fall of the Assad government on 8 December 2024, the idea of return grew stronger for participants who felt that the conditions that had caused them to leave had ended or improved. Some said that news reports and social media posts gave the impression that conditions in Syria had improved, but that the reality they found on arrival was different.

> *"The only reason I returned to Syria was to see my mother and my family, and to visit my father, who is getting older."* (P04, a man in his thirties)
>
> *"The reason we sought refuge no longer existed, so it was time to return to my country."* (P15, a man in his forties)

Participants mostly got information from relatives in Syria, from people who had returned before them, from social media and from the news. Some relied on PDMM staff or on information meetings held by civil society organisations. Relatives' advice varied: some told them not to return, while others encouraged them to return. Several participants said the

conditions described to them were more positive than what they saw when they arrived in Syria.

> *"When you hear this news, you get excited and decide to return. But when we arrived, the reality we faced was very different from what the news described."* (P04, a man in his thirties)

4.1.2. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PRESSURES IN TURKEY

Many participants spoke about economic pressures in Turkey. Rising rents, debts, irregular or low-paid work and being unable to save influenced some families' decisions. Some participants said they had to move house several times, and others said their spouse could no longer work because of health problems. Some wanted their children to be educated in Arabic. Others thought the skills they had gained in Turkey would be useful in Syria; for example, a woman who learned hairdressing in İzmir was able to continue this work after return.

> *"My husband's salary was no longer enough for us to live on. We had to borrow money, especially because of rising rents."* (P11, a woman in her thirties)

Some participants said they felt that social acceptance of Syrians in Turkey had declined after December 2024. Some reported that Syrians were told, "The war is over, why are you still not going back?" Others said new decisions and practices made them feel under pressure. These accounts reflect participants' own perceptions; the report does not use them to generalise about Turkish society as a whole.

> *"Even if I had not made a voluntary return, the conditions and the social environment in İzmir would have made our return almost compulsory."* (P15, a man in his forties)

4.1.3. CHOICE AND NECESSITY

While some participants described return as a clear personal choice, eight described the decision as a necessity or as one taken mainly by another family member. The death of someone close, a parent's illness, a spouse having already returned, a family member's need

for care and financial hardship in Turkey influenced some decisions. For example, one participant said that after her husband returned to Syria, rising debts and loneliness meant that she also had to return.

> *"When my husband returned to Syria, I had no choice but to return too."* (P02, a woman in her forties)
>
> *"So, in fact, I can say it was a forced return."* (P05, a woman in her forties)

Gender and family decision-making dynamics were clear in some accounts. At least four women said they did not want to return or were undecided until the last moment, and that the decision was made mainly by their husband or his family. One woman said she went to the PDMM many times to reconsider her husband's decision, but in the end had to return with him. Another woman said she had asked to wait until her children's school year was over, but could not change her husband's decision.

> *"To be honest, I did not want to return; my husband forced me to return."* (P07, a woman in her forties)
>
> *"We did not want to return, but we agreed and returned for his sake."* (P13, a woman in her thirties)

Other participants, both women and men, described return as their own decision and spoke positively about being together with their families again.

> *"I cannot say that I regret it. On the contrary, I am very happy. Being together with family is worth the world."* (P03, a woman in her thirties)

4.1.4. LACK OF A VISIT OPTION

One of the issues that came up most often in the interviews was the lack of an option to visit Syria and return to Turkey before deciding. Eleven participants said they had wanted, or still want, such an option. Nine of them said the possibility of a visit could have changed or delayed their decision, or replaced permanent return. One participant said they believed the

differences between living conditions in Turkey and Syria cannot be fully understood without going to Syria for at least three months.

Participants described different obstacles to visiting. These included visits being open to only one family member, fear of not being readmitted to Turkey, the cost of converting a temporary protection identity card to a residence permit, and the high fees reportedly charged by intermediaries. One participant said he had heard a rumour that the identity cards of people who went on a visit would be cancelled. One woman said she did not use this option because she thought she would need her husband's written consent to visit.

One participant said he had initially applied to make a short visit to his family. According to his account, an official at the PDMM told him that if he went on the visit, everyone living at the same address would have to return to Syria in July, and then asked whether he wanted to cancel his application. The participant said he cancelled his application with his young son in mind and later applied for voluntary return. This account could not be independently verified. However, if confirmed, it raises serious concerns about the accuracy of the information given on the visit procedure and about the options open to the applicant.

> *"If the official at the migration office had asked me, 'You have the right to a visit, don't you want to use it?', I would definitely not have made a voluntary return."* (P01, a man in his fifties)

Not all participants found the idea of a visit useful. One participant said a short visit would not show the real situation.

> *"Even if one person from the family went to assess the situation, they would not fully understand the real situation, because in the end they would be going there as a guest."* (P12, a woman in her thirties)

4.2. INFORMATION, PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS AND TRAVEL SUPPORT IN TURKEY

Most participants described the procedures at PDMMs as quick and easy, and many said officials were polite and helpful. However, the accounts show that information on the consequences of return and separate counselling for each adult were not provided consistently, and that access to travel support varied between participants.

4.2.1. THE APPLICATION PROCESS

Participants described procedures that were similar but not identical. Some made an appointment through e-Devlet (the e-Government portal) or by phone and went to the PDMM, where they signed the voluntary return documents, gave biometric data and received a travel permit. Some participants were given 10 to 15 days to leave Turkey. One participant who returned in January 2025 said she did not go to the PDMM in her province of registration; she said the information and procedures were handled at an office at the border which she believed belonged to the United Nations. A participant who returned by air said he completed the procedures at the airport. These differences suggest that the procedure may vary depending on the time and form of application.

> *"Honestly, the ease of the procedures in public institutions and their transparency deserve real appreciation. Everything went easily, comfortably and smoothly."* (P15, a man in his forties)

4.2.2. INFORMATION ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF RETURN

Many participants said they received little or no information about the legal and administrative consequences of voluntary return in Turkey. Five participants said they were not told whether, or under what conditions, they could enter Turkey again. Three participants recalled being told they could not enter Turkey for five years. In contrast, one participant reported that the United Nations staff member who interviewed him said he could visit Turkey with a visa in future. These accounts raise questions about the consistency of the information given to applicants.

> *"They gave us no information about returning to Turkey."* (P06, a woman in her fifties)

> *"The only information the migration office gave us was that we could return to Turkey only after five years."* (P07, a woman in her forties)

Three participants said they were told they could change their minds until they reached the border gate. One participant was told that if she changed her mind, her temporary protection identity card would be cancelled and a code would be entered in her records. Another participant said her husband was told that changing their minds would mean lengthy procedures and paperwork. UNHCR's current guidance states that temporary protection ends after voluntary return, and that readmission to Turkey and the reactivation of the identity card are assessed individually by the authorities. It is therefore not accurate to present the five-year period reported by participants as an automatic legal ban that applies to everyone.

4.2.3. INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS AND CONSENT

Practice on individual interviews appears to have varied between participants. Some participants were asked about their reasons for returning, their living conditions in Turkey and whether they were under pressure. In some cases these interviews took place with an interpreter, or with staff whom participants described as United Nations personnel. One participant said that before she signed, the interpreter confirmed whether the decision to return was voluntary and explained the procedures.

Other participants said they were not asked any questions. This was mentioned in particular by some women whose husbands handled the procedures. One woman said officials directed all questions to her husband; another said she only signed the documents. These accounts show the importance of ensuring that, in family applications, each adult can express their own decision separately.

> *"I told my husband I wondered why they had not asked me whether I was returning of my own free will."* (P14, a woman in her thirties)
>
> *"We were not asked anything and were given no information."* (P13, a woman in her thirties)

One woman said she cried throughout her appointment. She had heard that when one spouse cried, officials sent the couple home to talk and reconsider their decision, and she expected to be interviewed separately. According to her account, this did not happen, and her husband encouraged her to sign the documents. The participant said she had clearly stated that she did not really want to return.

> *"They had me sign the return documents while I was crying. In fact, I did not want to return at all."* (P07, a woman in her forties)

Another participant said that while she was reconsidering her decision, she went to the PDMM more than ten times, and that the female staff were understanding towards her. However, she said that on the day of her appointment she was not asked any separate questions, because the staff already knew her. The same participant said her son was asked to interpret for an elderly woman waiting in the queue, and that her other son signed a voluntary return document while he was held in a Removal Center (GGM). Using family members or other applicants as interpreters raises concerns about accuracy, confidentiality and independent decision-making. Voluntary return documents signed in administrative detention also raise the question of whether free will was adequately safeguarded.[10]

Taken together, these accounts point to the importance of individual counselling for each adult, in particular for women, who may have less say in family decision-making. They also point to the importance of each person being able to express their own wishes without pressure. Signing a form does not on its own show that a person made their decision freely and on the basis of sufficient information.

[10] These sources concern earlier cases, reported in 2019 and 2022, of deportations and of people being made to sign voluntary return forms under pressure. They should not be read as independent verification of the specific incident described by the participant interviewed for this report. See Amnesty International, "Turkey: Sent to a War Zone" (25 October 2019); Human Rights Watch, "Turkey: Hundreds of Refugees Deported to Syria" (24 October 2022).

4.2.4. TRAVEL SUPPORT

Only two of the 15 participants said they received travel support when leaving Turkey. In one case, an official at the PDMM applied on the participant's behalf, and the payment was made in Turkish lira through the post office (PTT). Three participants had returned before the support scheme began. Seven participants said they were not informed of the support and only learned about it later. One participant applied for support but did not receive a payment. Another participant said he was told he could not benefit from the support because his Kızılay (Turkish Red Crescent) card had been cancelled due to a commercial registration. The support amounts and eligibility conditions that participants reported differed from one another.[11]

One participant said she could not understand whether the support would be given per person or per family, and that she set off without waiting for the payment because of pressure from her landlord over rent. Another participant said she was told the assistance could be collected from the PTT within 15 days; another said they did not receive enough information about the amount of assistance and the eligibility conditions.

> *"If we had waited for the travel money, we would have had to pay rent in the meantime."* (P08, a woman in her thirties)

Many participants covered transport and moving costs themselves; some borrowed money to return. In one family, the father stayed in Turkey for some time longer to pay off debts from the family members' travel and resettlement costs. These examples show that it matters when and how clearly support is announced, as well as how much is provided.

4.3. BORDER CROSSING

Participants generally described the procedures at the border as orderly. Experiences varied depending on the border gate, the time of day and the period of return.

[11] UNHCR, "Voluntary Repatriation of Syrian Refugees in Türkiye", April 2026; UNHCR Türkiye, "Returning Procedure" (accessed 13 November 2026). UNHCR's briefing note states that targeted support was provided for transport costs and specific needs, and the current procedure page explains that eligibility for support should be assessed at the time of application. https://data.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/121985 ; https://help.unhcr.org/turkiye/information-for-syrians/volrep/returning-procedure/

4.3.1. PROCEDURES AND WAITING

On the Turkish side, participants waited their turn, sometimes after taking a queue number. They then handed in their identity cards, gave fingerprints, had their photographs taken and signed documents; one participant also described an eye scan. Some participants were asked whether their decision to return was voluntary and how the children were related to them. Some said they were told they could still change their minds at the border, while others said they were not asked any questions. Participants also reported being given a document listing the names of family members, to present on the Syrian side.

Waiting times and the services provided varied depending on the border gate, the time of day and the period of return. Some participants waited around one hour; others said they saw people waiting 11 to 13 hours because of crowding. In some places, waiting areas consisted of tents or halls. Some participants were given free buses or minibuses between the two border gates, while others had to use paid services or private vehicles. Some participants said they were offered food and water, while others said no support was provided. One participant said her son was given a sandwich and water at the border gate; another said there was no food or drink available during the wait.

> *"When my water bottle ran out, I said to myself, 'My water in Turkey has run out too.'"* (P06, a woman in her fifties)

4.3.2. DOCUMENTS FOR CHILDREN

For children to cross the border, birth certificates and documents showing the parent-child relationship were required. One participant said that for children with no civil registration in Syria, a Turkish civil registry extract or a hospital birth certificate approved by the governorate was needed. Where one parent was staying in Turkey, that parent's written consent was also required. One woman said she was asked for a consent letter for her child even though her husband had already returned to Syria. Participants reported that some families who could not obtain the required document reached the border gate but could not complete their procedures.

> *"Some people were crying because they had not got a consent letter from their husbands. The officials said they could not let the children through without that document."* (P02, a woman in her forties)

4.3.3. TREATMENT AT THE BORDER

Most participants described border officials on both sides as polite and helpful. Some said officials on the Syrian side offered water and tea or helped carry luggage. However, two women described incidents on the Turkish side that raise concerns about human dignity and privacy.

In the first incident, a pregnant woman said a police officer touched her stomach to check whether she was pregnant. She said she was told that some women pretended to be pregnant to avoid queuing. She was then allowed to pass without queuing. The participant described the attitude of the security officers as much more negative than that of other officials.

In the second incident, a woman who had been crying since her appointment at the PDMM said an official at the border laughed at her while taking her identity card. Later, another official asked her why she was crying and whether the family had debts. The participant's account shows the importance of an approach that is sensitive to, and respectful of, a person's emotional state during the return process.

> *"While taking my identity card, the official said to me, 'You are crying so much, your eyes are swollen. Is this just because you are going back to Syria?' and started laughing."* (P07, a woman in her forties)

4.3.4. LAST-MINUTE DECISIONS

Some participants still had their identity cards with them when they reached the border gate and knew they could change their minds until the procedures were complete. One woman whose husband had already returned said she considered whether to go on, but continued with the return procedure because she was worried about the safety of her sons, who would have stayed in Turkey without their father. She also said her adult son, who did not want to return, turned back at the border and later joined the family.

> *"We still had our identity cards with us, so we could have changed our minds, but I was afraid for my children."* (P08, a woman in her thirties)

4.3.5. THE JOURNEY AFTER THE BORDER

After crossing the border, some participants were taken by free buses to the bus stations in Azaz, Sarmada or Dana. Some were met by relatives; others used private vehicles or paid services. One family said the driver they had arranged in advance left them at a place that was not a border gate, and that they reached the border gate with the help of relatives. Another family said that when they arrived in Idlib late at night, landlords asked for high prices, and they paid USD 300 for a short stay. Two participants were given contact details at or near the border to apply for assistance; however, they had not received any assistance by the time of the interview.

4.4. ARRIVAL AND LIFE AFTER RETURN

After the initial happiness of being reunited with family, most participants described difficulties in meeting basic needs. Conditions varied widely depending on the area of return, on whether the family had a home of its own and on its access to family support. Some saw improvements in certain services; others faced serious shortages in housing, electricity, water, healthcare and work.

> *"When we first arrived, everything was nice. We were all very happy. After that, we had to settle down and organise our lives, because life goes on. So only the first two or three weeks were nice."* (P04, a man in his thirties)

4.4.1. HOUSING

Housing was the need mentioned most often. Some participants whose families had a house settled more easily; however, some of these houses were damaged or shared with other family members. Others rented homes at high rents or stayed with relatives. The rents that participants reported started at around USD 100 a month and went higher. One family

moved house three times in eight months; in another family, the spouses stayed separately with their own families while they continued to look for a suitable home. One participant said that because he had no home of his own, he first stayed with his sister and later moved to a house where he paid USD 100 a month in rent.

> *"The basic need is housing. People need homes where they can have a roof over their heads. Many people have returned, but they have no homes."* (P06, a woman in her fifties)

4.4.2. ELECTRICITY, WATER AND HEALTH

Access to electricity and water varied considerably from area to area. Some participants said the electricity supply had improved markedly since early 2025; one said that in his area, electricity was cut briefly about every five or six hours. Others said they had electricity for only a few hours a day, or had no mains electricity at all. Some families turned to alternatives such as generator subscriptions or solar panels; however, not everyone could afford these. Access to water was also irregular: in some places water was supplied once a week, and in some areas it was bought from tankers. One participant said that in Hasakah, mains water had not been available for a long time and they could not be sure the water was clean.

> *"There are traffic police, and the electricity and water services are better. Everything, everything has improved."* (P10, a woman in her thirties)

Participants mostly found public health services inadequate. Some said there was no state hospital or health centre in their area, and that private clinics were not affordable. One participant said he could not work because of health problems with his neck and hand, but could not afford the cost of examinations and imaging. Another family had to travel to Damascus for treatment of a spouse's leg infection after treatment in Deir ez-Zor brought no results. Some participants, however, said that access to healthcare was better in their area.

> *"The hospital is like living on the street; there are bad smells and dirt everywhere."* (P03, a woman in her thirties)

4.4.3. WORK AND INCOME

Ten participants pointed to limited job opportunities. Those who found work mostly spoke of low-paid and irregular day labour. One participant said that although he was a university graduate, he could not apply for public sector jobs because of the age requirements for recruitment, and he was working in a marble factory. In contrast, a woman who was able to use the vocational skills she gained in Turkey said she had started working in Syria as a hairdresser, a trade she learned in İzmir. Other participants said their certificates, diplomas or work experience in Turkey did not help them enough to find work in Syria.

> *"There is not enough work, even in construction."* (P12, a woman in her thirties)
>
> *"I had learned this trade in İzmir and started doing it here too. Thank God, the trade I learned has helped me a lot."* (P10, a woman in her thirties)

4.4.4. ASSISTANCE

No participant said they had received cash assistance after arriving in Syria. Many participants said they had applied, or were thinking of applying, for USD 600 in support that they had heard was given to returnees; however, none had received a payment by the time of the interview. Some said they had received no response to their applications for months, while others said they were told the support was no longer given or was subject to other conditions. One participant said there had been no response yet after applying for assistance; another said they were offered help with marriage registration instead of assistance. These accounts show that this amount cannot be presented as an automatic entitlement or a confirmed payment for all returnees.

> *"It has been almost a year, but I still have not received any assistance."* (P05, a woman in her forties)

4.4.5. SOCIAL RELATIONS AND SAFETY

Many participants said they felt like strangers in their own country. They said they were criticised by people who had stayed in Syria during the war, that people assumed those returning from Turkey were wealthy, or that they were overcharged. One woman recalled

that she had helped others during her years in Turkey, and said that after return she herself was left without financial and social support. Other participants said the support of their families and close circles made it easier to adjust.

> *"Unless you return to your pre-war home, you feel like a stranger even in your own country."* (P02, a woman in her forties)
>
> *"They say, 'We thought you would bring back lots of gold when you returned. It turns out you came back empty-handed.'"* (P03, a woman in her thirties)
>
> *"In Turkey, we chose our social circle, it did not choose us, but here it is not like that."* (P05, a woman in her forties)

Perceptions of safety varied by area. Some participants in Aleppo and Damascus who spoke about safety said they generally felt safe; however, one participant in Aleppo mentioned a recent explosion, and another described the fear she felt during clashes. A participant living in Hasakah mentioned the presence of armed persons in the area, the danger of stray bullets and tensions between communities, and said she was worried that new clashes might break out. These accounts show that experiences and perceptions of safety vary with local conditions.

One participant summed up the difference between how people living in Syria see conditions and how returnees experience them:

> *"We realised that this improvement applies to people living in the country, especially compared with conditions during the war. But for people who lived abroad and came back, the situation is very bad."* (P11, a woman in her thirties)

4.5. CHILDREN

The accounts showed that children were the group most affected by return. Many of the children were born or grew up in Turkey and were educated in Turkish. Parents described difficulties with language, school, civil registration and adjustment.

4.5.1. LANGUAGE AND SCHOOL

Many children who were educated only in Turkish in Turkey can speak Arabic but cannot read or write it. For this reason, some children were placed in lower grades than the one they had completed in Turkey. One participant said his son, who should have continued in seventh grade, was placed in first grade because of the language barrier, and that the child refused to attend this class. Another child did not want to continue at school because he could not read or write Arabic. One girl switched to distance education because of difficulties adjusting. Participants reported that private Arabic lessons cost around USD 150 a month and that some families could not afford this.

> *"My younger son went to school there and his education was entirely in Turkish. He does not know how to read and write Arabic. That is why he completely refuses to go to school here."* (P02, a woman in her forties)
>
> *"My son should be continuing in 7th grade, but because of the language barrier they placed him in 1st grade."* (P15, a man in his forties)

Two participants raised concerns about how pupils are treated at school. One participant said her son did not want to go to school after seeing teachers beat or punish pupils. Another mother said pupils who did not do well in their lessons were punished. In contrast, participants reported that children who had learned Arabic before return through online courses, mosque classes or study at home adjusted to school more easily.

Children who learned Arabic before return through online courses, mosque classes or lessons at home adjusted more easily. In these cases, parents said schools gave the children a placement test and placed them in suitable grades.

4.5.2. CIVIL REGISTRATION

Participants described problems with civil and marital status documents that affected children's access to school. Some children born in Turkey were not entered in the family register in Syria. Some parents who married in Turkey had to register their marriage in Syria

as well, through a court. One participant said the school would not enrol the children until the marriage and the children's entry in the family register were complete. Another participant said they were waiting for a lost family booklet to be renewed, and a grandmother reported being asked for USD 50 per child to register her grandchildren.

> *"They did not accept the school registration. They told me I first had to make my marriage official in Syria and register my children in the family booklet."* (P04, a man in his thirties)

One woman said that because her marriage had not been registered in Syria, she appeared as single in official records. She said this made it harder to register her children at school. It also made it harder for her to apply for assistance and to go to court over the custody of her children. This example shows that marital status and birth records can be decisive for access to education, social assistance and justice.

4.5.3. WELLBEING

Parents described children who missed Turkey, saw it as their home, or were shocked when they saw the destruction in Syria. Some children missed their friends and teachers in Turkey; others adjusted over time, especially when they were with relatives. One father said the boy's mother told him that his nine-year-old son, who stayed in Turkey, was refusing to eat and drink because he missed his father. Another mother said her daughter would say "There was everything in Turkey" when she could not meet her needs. Meeting the care and education needs of one child who was reported to need specialised developmental support was a further difficulty for the family.

> *"[My son] says, 'Dad, why did you bring us to this country? Everywhere is destroyed, everything is in ruins.'"* (P04, a man in his thirties)
>
> *"Because they were born and grew up in Turkey, they see it as their homeland."* (P05, a woman in her forties)
>
> *"At first they kept telling me they wanted to go back to Turkey, but now they love Syria very much."* (P03, a woman in her thirties)

4.6. FAMILY SEPARATION AND THE WISH TO RETURN TO TURKEY

Return has split many families across the border. Many participants said they would like to return to Turkey, at least for a while, but could see no legal way to do so.

4.6.1. DIVIDED FAMILIES

At least six participants had a spouse, children or other close family members who stayed in Turkey. In some families, one spouse had returned earlier while the other stayed in Turkey for some time longer because of debts or the children's situation. Some participants left some of their children in Turkey, while others returned alone. One father said he was told that his nine-year-old son, who stayed in Turkey, was finding the separation very hard, refusing to eat and drink and constantly asking for his father. Participants said the restrictions on re-entry that were communicated to them prevented family visits.

> *"I did not want to leave my children, my wife and my family and come here alone."* (P01, a man in his fifties)
>
> *"My family has been scattered; part of my family is here in Syria and the other part is in Turkey."* (P09, a woman in her thirties)

Separation affected family members who stayed in Turkey as well as those who returned to Syria. One participant said her son-in-law, who stayed in Turkey, could not visit his wife and child. Participants proposed creating legal routes that would allow family members to visit each other, and providing support to people who stay behind in Turkey when their relatives return.

4.6.2. REQUESTS FOR A LEGAL ROUTE BACK

Eight participants said they would like to return to Turkey if a legal route were available. They asked for their files to be reassessed, to be granted residence or work permits, or to be able to visit family members. One participant said she went to the border with her children

to find out whether she could enter Turkey again, and was told she had a five-year entry ban. She said her family later applied to the governorate, but the application was rejected on the grounds that they could not meet the financial guarantee required. UNHCR's published guidance states that readmission to Turkey and the reactivation of the temporary protection identity card after voluntary return are assessed individually; the five-year period reported by participants should therefore not be interpreted as a general, automatic legal ban.

Another participant said that after news of a regulation on family reunification, some families went to lawyers, but it turned out that the regulation only covered family members of Turkish citizens. One participant said she had heard that some people travelled back and forth to Turkey by irregular routes, but that she wanted to use only legal routes.

> *"To be honest, I do not want to go by irregular routes either. I want everything to be done through legal and official channels."* (P02, a woman in her forties)
>
> *"Just as I used to miss Syria, now I miss İzmir."* (P08, a woman in her thirties)
>
> *"I hope you will take my voice, and the voices of others who made a voluntary return and regret their decision, to senior officials."* (P04, a man in his thirties)

4.6.3. LOOKING BACK

Nine participants expressed regret or assessed their return mainly negatively. Five gave a mixed assessment: while they were happy to be reunited with family, they felt the timing of return was too early, particularly for their children's education and adjustment. One participant described return as a positive step. Many participants advised relatives and friends in Turkey, particularly families with no home, income or support network in Syria, not to return without carefully assessing current conditions.

> *"We cried when we left Syria and sought refuge in Turkey; now we are crying again as we return to our own country."* (P06, a woman in her fifties)
>
> *"It was the hardest decision I have made. I do not regret it, but I think it was not the right time."* (P11, a woman in her thirties)

5. CONCLUSION

Most participants described the return procedures in Turkey as quick and orderly. However, the accounts raise concerns that the safeguards meant to ensure that voluntary return rests on a free and informed decision were not applied in the same way in every case. Participants' experiences also show that significant difficulties may arise after arrival in Syria in housing, livelihoods, health, education and family unity. These findings suggest that return should be seen as a process that runs from information before the decision to living conditions after return, rather than only as a border crossing procedure.

5.1. KEY CONCERNS

Voluntariness and information. Some participants described return less as a free choice and more as a decision shaped by economic, social or family circumstances. The lack of an option to visit Syria and return to Turkey may have led some people who only wanted to visit to choose the permanent return procedure. Accounts of a five-year period before re-entry to Turkey after return also point to gaps and inconsistencies in information. Current UNHCR guidance states that readmission and the reactivation of temporary protection are subject to individual assessment.

Individual counselling. Participants' accounts show that, in family applications, practice varied on whether each adult was interviewed separately and whether each person had a real opportunity to express their own decision. Some women said they were not asked any questions, and others said they were not heard separately even though they were visibly distressed. The use of an applicant's family member as an interpreter for another person, and the signing of a voluntary return form by a participant's son while he was held in a GGM, also raise concerns about procedural safeguards.

Travel support. Only two of the 15 participants said they received travel support when leaving Turkey. Some participants had returned before the support scheme began; some said

they were not informed of the support or were found ineligible. One participant reported being told he could not benefit from the support because his Kızılay card had been cancelled due to his commercial registration. Some families borrowed money to cover transport costs, or set off without waiting for the assistance to come through.

Human dignity and documents at the border. Most participants described border officials as polite and helpful. However, two women described incidents that raise concerns about privacy and human dignity. Document requirements for children, such as birth certificates and written consent where one parent stays in Turkey, delayed or prevented some families from crossing. Support with food, water and transport between the two border gates also varied depending on practice and the border gate.

Conditions after return. Most participants faced difficulties with housing, electricity, water, healthcare and finding work. Some participants said infrastructure had improved in certain areas, while others said they had no regular access to electricity or clean water. No participant said they had received cash assistance after arriving in Syria. Problems with marital status and civil registration also made it harder for children to access school, and for one woman to apply for assistance and to bring custody proceedings.

Children and family unity. Language barriers, placement in lower grades, adjustment to school and civil registration problems stood out in children's experiences. Some children felt the emotional effects of separation from family members in Turkey, or of being cut off from the life they had built there. Return split families across the border. Participants asked for clear information on the conditions for re-entry and visits, and for family members to be able to visit each other through legal routes.

5.2. PARTICIPANTS' REQUESTS

Based on their experiences, participants made the following requests:

- The option to visit Syria and return to Turkey before deciding; for example, Go-and-See visits that are open to all family members, accessible, and do not depend on costly intermediaries.
- For those who want it, the option of legal stay in, or re-entry to, Turkey until conditions in Syria improve, through options such as the reassessment of files and residence or work permits.
- Clear and accessible arrangements that allow family members separated across the border to visit each other.
- Separate, accurate and understandable information for each adult on the return procedure, the consequences of the end of temporary protection and the conditions for readmission to Turkey, together with reliable information on current conditions in the area of return.
- Adequate and accessible financial support in the first period after return, particularly for families with no home, limited work opportunities or specific needs.
- Arabic literacy and language programmes, placement in suitable grades, catch-up education, and services for children who need special education or developmental support, to support children's access to education.
- Support for repairing damaged homes and for improving access to basic electricity, water and health services.
- Conveying the experiences of returnees and their families to the relevant public institutions and decision-makers, and reassessing their files and individual situations.

> *"Rather than counselling and paperwork services, more cash assistance could be provided. Because, frankly, if you have no money here, you cannot do anything."*
> (P07, a woman in her forties)

5.3. COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS REPORTS

This report complements two previous studies by Mülteci-Der. "Hayatları Yeniden İnşa Etmek, Evi Yeniden Tanımlamak" (Rebuilding Lives, Redefining Home, 2025) and "Umut ile Belirsizlik Arasında" (Between Hope and Uncertainty, 2026) examined the expectations, concerns and preferences of Syrians living in Turkey who were considering return to Syria.

This report focuses on the experiences of 15 people who have returned. Because the samples and timing of the studies differ, the findings are not directly comparable. Taken together, however, they show that the decision to return does not rest on a single factor, that information and the option to visit are important, and that the experiences of women and children need specific attention.

Overall, the findings suggest that some return decisions were made under economic, social and family pressures and with limited information about their consequences. After return, many people, and children in particular, face significant difficulties in housing, livelihoods, healthcare, education and family unity. Return policies should therefore address both the safeguards that ensure a decision is voluntary and informed, and sustainable living conditions after return, in safety and dignity.

ANNEX: INTERVIEWED PARTICIPANTS

Code	Gender	Age group	Governorate of return	Year of return
P01	Male	50s	Aleppo	2025
P02	Female	40s	Aleppo	2026
P03	Female	30s	Aleppo	2025
P04	Male	30s	Aleppo	2026
P05	Female	40s	Aleppo	2025
P06	Female	50s	Aleppo	2025
P07	Female	40s	Idlib	2025
P08	Female	30s	Aleppo	2025
P09	Female	30s	Aleppo	Not stated
P10	Female	30s	Aleppo	2025
P11	Female	30s	Deir ez-Zor	Not stated
P12	Female	30s	Damascus	2025
P13	Female	30s	Deir ez-Zor	2026
P14	Female	30s	Hasakah	2026
P15	Male	40s	Deir ez-Zor	2026

The Association for Solidarity with Refugees (Mülteci-Der) is a civil society organisation that has carried out rights-based work since 2008. It works so that asylum seekers, refugees and migrants affected by forced migration can access their rights and services with dignity, in line with universal human rights and international and national law.

Mültecilerle Dayanışma Derneği (Mülteci-Der)

Address: Uğur Mh. 848 Sk. No: 16

Konak / İzmir / Türkiye

Phone: +90 549 483 54 21

Email: ofis@multeci.org.tr

Web: www.multeci.org.tr