

**10-Point Plan Expert Roundtable No. 1:
Controlling Borders while Ensuring Protection
20 – 21 November 2008, Geneva**

Summary Report

Introduction

The Expert Roundtable No.1 ‘Controlling Borders while Ensuring Protection’ was convened by UNHCR in cooperation with the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, on 20 and 21 November 2008 in Geneva with funding provided by the European Commission. It was the first in a series of four thematic meetings on UNHCR’s ‘10-Point Plan of Action on Refugee Protection and Mixed Migration’ (‘10-Point Plan’). Around 40 experts from governments, international governmental and nongovernmental organizations, the academia and UNHCR explored practical ways as to how to operationalize refugee and human rights protection in the context of border and entry management. A particular emphasis was given to the challenges for the entry system related to the phenomenon of ‘mixed migratory movements’.¹

1. Clarification of terminology

Participants first discussed terminology and the concept of ‘protection-sensitive entry systems’:

Experts welcomed that the 10-Point Plan employed the term ‘entry management’ which is broader than the commonly used term ‘border control’. Several European experts mentioned that the entry management has undergone important changes in their countries and moved away from the actual, physical border towards ‘virtual’ borders. States have set in place measures outside their own territory, on the high seas and on the territory of third states. These included cooperation agreements with third states, out-posting of immigration officials, extraterritorial interception operations and the factual delegation of certain control functions to private actors through the employment of carrier sanctions.

Participants underlined that it was essential to include activities beyond immediate measures at the border of a State’s territory into an entry management strategy. The term ‘entry system’ should encompass all measures taken by a State to control entry into and stay on its territory, irrespective of whether they take place within the territory, at the border or outside the State’s territory. Such measures could range from legislative clarifications through the direct refusal of entry by authorised personnel.

Experts explicitly emphasized that the entry system should be respectful of refugee protection requirements, especially the principle of *non-refoulement*. They also emphasized that the notion ‘protection-sensitive’ should not be restricted to ensuring adherence to international refugee law only. The notion called for the respect of people’s human rights and the dignified and respectful treatment of all persons within

¹ The annotated agenda and list of participants are annexed.

mixed movements, regardless of their status. Mixed movements often included refugees and migrants in extremely vulnerable situations with different humanitarian and protection needs. Safeguards were necessary to ensure that specific needs such as those of refugees, asylum seekers, women and other victims of human trafficking and unaccompanied minors are identified and addressed.

2. Core Functions and Objectives of a Protection-Sensitive Entry System

Conflicting objectives?

Participants emphasized that the entry system had to meet several, at times conflicting objectives, including migration management, crime prevention and respect of protection obligations. Strong expectation to meet control requirements could cause practical dilemmas for border guards, compromising their ability to be sensitive to claims for refugee protection. This was especially the case where border officials are required to meet performance indicators for effective border control or are otherwise submitted to considerable pressure to prevent entry.

But experts also underlined that conflicts between control and protection objectives should and could be solved. The success of increasingly tight border controls was questioned and several participants mentioned that such measures in their countries had not stopped people from arriving, sometimes by ever more dangerous routes. Tighter border control without corresponding protection safeguards would risk threatening the possibilities of refugees and other people in need of international protection to access safety.

Another important objective of the entry system was crime prevention. The development of anti-smuggling and anti-trafficking legislation including criminal penalties, immigration sanctions and travel bans has provided governments with additional possibilities for interventions. Additionally, cooperation and exchange of information among countries along migration routes have yielded positive results in combating these crimes.

A protection-sensitive entry system should, however, also include adequate safeguards to ensure that such measures do not also penalize the victims of such crimes. Some experts mentioned that specific training programmes have produced positive results, including an increased sensitization of border guards and the capability to identify victims of trafficking and distinguish them from traffickers.

A legal presentation on the 'non-penalization of entry of refugees' referred to the fact that the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951 Convention) specifically addresses the fact that refugees fleeing persecution often do not have the possibility to obtain the documentation necessary for an authorized entry. Art 31(1) of the 1951 Convention exempts refugees from penalization for irregular entry, if they are coming directly from a territory where they faced persecution and have presented themselves without delay to the authorities.

Experts agreed that further research would be useful on the legal aspects of the entry management, including a comparative analysis of Art. 31 (1) of the 1951 Convention,

the question of State responsibility for extraterritorial actions and for the involvement of private actors in the entry system.

Timing and location of protection measures

Participants noted that a protection-sensitive entry system should include measures at the pre-departure stage. It would, as one participant pointed out, ‘help to provide protection without the need to make a potentially dangerous journey’. As a measure of prevention, it was seen useful to inform people who may consider leaving on their options, their rights and obligations and to raise awareness on the risks of human trafficking and smuggling.

Several participants expressed concerns on whether it can be assessed whether refugees have access to international protection elsewhere when they are intercepted long before reaching the territory of their desired asylum country. It was seen crucial that protection begins before physical entry into the territory of the intended destination country. The human rights of all people on the move should be protected at every stage of the entry process. This, however, requires solution of a number of practical and legal questions.

A specifically problematic area identified by participants was interception on the high seas where support services are regularly not available to those intercepted. Border officials have to decide quickly on interception measures and are often not in a position to resort to the advice and assistance of asylum experts.

A legal presentation on the extraterritorial application of the *non-refoulement* principle underlined that States’ *non-refoulement* obligations under international human rights and refugee law are not restricted to their territory. They apply extraterritorially wherever the State exercises its jurisdiction. Supervisory bodies to international human rights and refugee treaties, especially the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), have taken a cautious approach with regard to the establishment of jurisdiction, and require effective control over a territory or person. There is, however, a growing tendency in the international human rights discourse to hold States responsible for violations of human rights which they have caused.

Providing access to services at the initial reception stage and before the final status of the applicant is established was emphasized as another fundamental requirement of a protection-sensitive entry system. Such services ensure that persons with specific needs are identified and addressed in a timely manner.

3. Actors in Protection-Sensitive Entry Systems

Traditional actors in entry management include different State entities from border guards to officials in ministries of interior, immigration or security, justice etc. Increasingly, private actors also have become involved in entry management tasks. Two categories of actors were specifically discussed: carriers such as transport and shipping companies which are tasked with certain control functions and civil society representatives, sometimes in cooperation with international organisations, supporting governments in providing assistance and protection services to newly arrived persons.

Carriers

Several participants voiced concerns about the increased involvement of private carriers in entry control procedures. Their roles were often not adequately defined and safeguards are lacking that would help carriers to identify asylum seekers and to take differentiated approaches. It was also discussed whether and to what degree States remain responsible for actions carried out by carriers and for ensuring that all border control measures comply with international human rights and refugee protection standards.

A legal presentation on “State Obligations and Private Actors in the Entry System” highlighted the following points: Private involvement in migration control has been increasing in recent years, expanding the obligations of carriers, using private contractors to assist border control and process visa applications and the hiring of private security firms assist border management in third countries. For the asylum seeker these new forms of private-public partnerships raise a number of protection challenges. So far case law has been limited and little is generally known about the conduct and consequences of privatised migration control. Principles of customary international law nonetheless provide strong arguments that States retain basic protection obligation and responsibilities even when delegating immigration functions to private actors.

Civil society representatives

Participants concurred that the increasing involvement of non-governmental organisations and other civil society representatives was a positive development, which could ensure better safeguards and provide additional services. It was therefore important that they be given access to people seeking entry, including in transit zones. At the same time it was mentioned that the involvement of several actors could also create confusion. It was therefore necessary to stress the importance of coordination and clear definition of roles and responsibilities. In some countries, specific legislation or agreements has helped to clearly establish the roles of non-governmental organisations.

4. Establishing and Improving Protection-Sensitive Entry Systems

Participants exchanged practices and suggestions on the implementation of a protection-sensitive entry management. These included the following:

Cooperation

Throughout the roundtable, participants underlined the importance of effective cooperation, amongst organisations, with and between different branches of government institutions and law enforcement bodies, on national, sub-regional, regional and even global basis. Cooperation required clarity about mandate, roles and responsibilities of all actors involved in border management and coordination. Participants reported about the positive experiences with cooperation agreements formalized through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or a Tripartite

Agreement. Participants pointed out the potential of international organisations playing a facilitator role between governmental bodies and civil society organisations in reaching such agreements.

Cooperation between States was relevant not only in law enforcement areas such as combating international crime, but could also facilitate the return of non-refugees. Cooperation among transit and destination countries was important to establish a system of burden sharing and for agreeing on the responsibility for the examination of asylum applications. Participants expressed concerns that inter-state cooperation in the area of border management often focused on control only and more attention should be given to include refugee protection and human rights concerns into cooperation and readmission agreements. In this respect it was recommended to conduct further research on existing readmission agreements. Some experts also suggested that cooperation should also include, where necessary, capacity building measures.

Information sharing was identified as an important tool benefiting all relevant actors in the coordination, identification and effective protection of people crossing borders. Information sharing is or should be taking place between governments, humanitarian organizations, including UNHCR, and migrants, on national, regional or international level.

Actors involved in border management should regularly meet and discuss issues of common interest and identify problem areas. Humanitarian agencies and NGOs could better coordinate their functions and exchange cross-border information.

Some participants mentioned good experiences with cross-border cooperation between NGOs. They mentioned examples where NGOs informed their partners in other countries about the arrival of asylum-seekers who are returned under 'safe third country' arrangements to third States for the examination of their asylum requests.

Participants underlined that the exchange of best practices and twinning arrangements could be beneficial for a more protection-sensitive border management as well as help to overcome certain resource constraints and asked that this issue is given the appropriate attention in the future. Furthermore, collection of data, which should not just encompass numbers but also profiles of people on the move, was also seen as an area requiring further action.

Tools for information exchange could include cross border meetings, handbooks, manuals and the internet. Information networks have the benefit of reaching out to a larger audience and provide access to information that is normally only available to a limited group.

Specific good practice examples:

The MoU between the Hungarian Border Guards, UNHCR and the Hungarian Helsinki Committee, establishing a monitoring framework with specific responsibilities allotted to each of the three parties. The MoU has improved access to the territory, asylum procedures and brought practices in line with international law. A public report on the project agreed upon by all three parties has been presented to

the public. Similar MoUs have also been concluded in other Central European Countries (Slovakia, Slovenia and Romania).²

The partnership between UNHCR London and the British Refugee Council aims to initiate a dialogue on protection-sensitive entry systems with the UK Government. The following five main objectives have been agreed upon: 1) to organize senior level discussions between civil society, UNHCR and the UK Government; 2) to design an independent monitoring model for the UK's outposted immigration control, 3) to develop a strategy for UK parliamentary lobbying 4) to agree on refugee law and human rights training for outposted UK immigration officials; 5) to develop a refugee protection toolkit for outposted immigration officials.

Examples of inter-state cooperation mentioned include: 1) the Migration and Development for South Africa initiative (MADFSAs), a mechanism for dialogue between Governments in the Southern Africa region and providing university training courses on general migration and refugee protection and 2) the Cross Border Cooperation Process in Central and Eastern Europe, supported by the EU, UNHCR and the Swedish Migration Board and promotes networking on migration issues through intergovernmental and NGO meetings.

One example of a successful information network provided during the Roundtable is the Population Movement Tracking System in Somalia that monitors the movement of displaced people in Somalia. It has been particularly useful to humanitarian agencies, the national authorities and the media to identify refugees and migrants on the move and requiring humanitarian assistance and/or protection. Through an information network, relevant actors are alerted about these movements, allowing them to ensure adequate responses.

Protection tools

A protection-sensitive entry management should ensure that asylum seekers are given effective access to a procedure in which their protection needs can be examined. This includes access to information, interpretation, and legal advice. People with specific needs may require further services.

It was acknowledged that the identification of asylum seekers and other persons with special needs was not an easy task for border officials and required a proactive approach. Several participants highlighted the particular importance of communication between persons seeking entry and border or migration officials. The availability of information about rights and procedures, legal advice and interpretation services could facilitate such communication.

Several participants emphasized that border guards and other actors who fulfil similar functions should be given guidance on how to identify and refer asylum seekers and other people who may have specific needs to mechanisms where these needs can be assessed and addressed. Such guidelines should differentiate between different entry situations such as ports, airports, land borders, in-country applications and encounters taking place extraterritorially. For the identification of asylum seekers

² A copy of the MoU and an information note are included in the documentation of the roundtable.

it was stressed that entry officials should be able to create confidence and establish a meaningful communication with persons seeking entry.

Participants also mentioned that it was important to provide border guards with tools to facilitate this task. While some tools in this regard existed already participants recommended that additional ones be developed.

Specific good practice examples:

Participants referred to the following examples: Lists of countries or groups with specific protection needs, questionnaires regarding specific protection risks (as used in the Netherlands and Canada); toolkits and practical guidelines for migration and border officials on how to identify asylum seekers and follow protection obligations in their everyday activities; structures which provide border guards with the possibility to contact asylum experts and discuss problematic cases.

Training

Training was considered as an effective means to ensure (a protection-sensitive) implementation of the entry system and equip all actors in the entry system with the knowledge and skills to apply it in their daily work. Training should be all-inclusive, involving also private actors and bodies which, though not directly in contact with people seeking entry, nevertheless influence the design and implementation of the system, such as judges and policy makers.

Training should be provided to all new staff. Regular follow-up training events could ensure that entry officials are aware of changes in policies and/or the composition and profiles of migratory movements. Participants expressed some concerns regarding uncoordinated training provided by different actors and recommended joint or, at least harmonized training.

Participants suggested that training strategies and materials should further be made available in order to build upon the experience and know-how of others. This was also seen as a way to overcome resource limitations for the development of training modules.

Specific good practice examples:

“Protection with Broader Migration Flows” training in Angola: The use of case studies and videos and the work in teams of trainers from different organisations and institutions have been identified as being helpful in a country that has only recently been exposed to mixed migration issues.

FRONTEX’s capacity building programmes: FRONTEX provides comprehensive and specified training to all EU border officers, including on joint returns, safe third countries, and false documents. The training is based on a common core curriculum, with a strong human rights component. The curriculum also requests all European border guards to follow the relevant national legislation on asylum claims.

Another example given was the training package for immigration officers in Canada. This training has to be undertaken by all immigration officials and includes special sections for tasks at land borders.

Monitoring

Many participants underlined that monitoring and quality-control mechanisms were essential instruments for the establishment and continuous improvement of a protection-sensitive entry system. Some experts reported about the monitoring mechanisms they have been setting up in their countries and suggested the following steps: (i) assessment of the current situation (existing legislative framework, key stakeholders, roles and responsibilities, operational context, compliance with international standards) and identification of strengths and gaps; (ii) organization of a workshop/meeting with stakeholders to clarify roles, develop strategies to overcome current gaps; (iii) regular monitoring of day-to-day activities and analysis of new developments; (iv) establishment of problem solving structures; (v) evaluate and list lessons learned and share findings of different activities with stakeholders, with the aim of further improving the system. Participants frequently referred to the important role UNHCR has played in establishing trust between governmental and civil society partners, and in facilitating and implementing the monitoring mechanisms.

Specific good practice examples:

The activities under the Hungarian MoU aim at monitoring the entry of persons in need of protection to the territory of, and access to the asylum procedures as well as their protection against *non-refoulement*. Lawyers from the Hungarian Helsinki Committee visit border sections with full access to foreigners, border police staff and detention facilities, as well as statistics and (anonymous) case files. Reports are being made from individual visits and issues taken up in regular tripartite working groups. The work under the MoU has helped to increase mutual understanding and transparency, developed confidence, enhanced access to asylum, identified training needs as well as needs for changes in existing laws, particularly on non-penalization of entry, *non-refoulement*, and the cooperation between border police and immigration/asylum authorities.

Canada has regular quality control assessments of all stages and levels of border and immigration operations. The findings form the basis for adjustments and improvements of the existing system.

In the United Kingdom, an independent inspectorate has been tasked with monitoring the UK Border Agency in its implementation of national legislation in issues related to immigration and asylum.

State responsibility for extraterritorial activities and private actors

Several participants deplored the lack of information about extraterritorial border control activities, especially when undertaken by carriers or other private actors and their impact on the possibility of refugees to access countries in which they would be granted effective protection. It was recommended that this be further examined and

possibilities explored on how States' extraterritorial border control could be brought in line with international human rights and refugee protection standards.

One suggestion made in this respect was that outposting of immigration and border control officers could be accompanied by the parallel deployment of asylum experts. It was also recommended that outposted border officials or airline staff refer intercepted asylum seekers to their embassy for further examination. Embassies should and could make more use of humanitarian visa to allow onward travel in specific protection cases. While UNHCR's mandate generally does not allow for interventions in the country of origin, UNHCR may assist in assessing whether onward travel from countries of transit is necessary for protection reasons.

Conclusion and follow-up

Experts appreciated that the roundtable has provided them with the opportunity to exchange views on the basic features of a protection-sensitive entry system and on experiences and practices developed in different regions. Many experts mentioned that they will inform relevant actors in their governments about the results of the roundtable and share the background material with them.

Participants said that they would welcome continued exchange of information within the group and suggested to create a platform for exchange. The group felt that given the variety of regional and national particularity, it had not been possible to discuss all issues exhaustively. Participants agreed that it would be useful to continue these discussions on regional, sub-regional and national level. They welcomed the roundtable organized by the British Refugee Council and UNHCR London in December as a good practice to follow.

UNHCR
December 2008

Annex 1:

List of Participants

Government Experts

| No. | Name | Function | Department/Organization | Duty Station | Email Address |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Mr. George Bowles | Director of Immigration Policy and Programs | Canada Border Services Agency | Canada | George.bowles@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca |
| 2 | Dr. Tonatiuh Garcia Castillo | Director for Regularization and Residency | National Immigration Authority, Ministry of Interior | Mexico | Tonatiuh@cantab.net |
| 3 | Mr. Jean Cheney | Chief of Operations | Travellers Sector Saint-Bernard-de-Lacolle, Canada Border Services Agency | Canada | Jean.Cheney@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca |
| 4 | Ms. Yochi Gnessin | Deputy State Attorney | Ministry of Justice | Israel | yochig@justice.gov.il |
| 5 | Mr. Wim Hamelink | Information & Analyses Unit | Immigration Division Schiphol Airport, Ministry of Defence | Netherlands | W.Hamelink@mindef.nl |
| 6 | Ms. Judianti Isakayoga | Deputy Director for Foreign Affairs Cooperation | Directorate General of Human Rights, Ministry of Law and Human Rights | Indonesia | Judianti_bp@yahoo.com |
| 7 | Mr Jamshed Khamidov | Counselor | Permanent Mission of Tajikistan to the United Nations Office, Geneva | Tajikistan | |
| 8 | Ms. Reham Kholeif | 2 nd Secretary, Refugee Affairs Departement | Ministry of Foreign Affairs | Egypt | rkholeif@hotmail.com |
| 9 | Dr. Antonio Carlos Floriano Lessa | Chefe da Divisao Policial de Retirada Compulsorias | Delegado da Policia Federal, Ministry of Justice | Brazil | lessa.acfl@dpf.gov.br |
| 10 | Dr. Essam Al-Mahbashi | Officer in Charge of Refugee File | Africa Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs | Yemen | Essam56@hotmail.com |
| 11 | Mr Rodolfo Quintano Monsalve | Head of Department a.i. | Department of Immigration, Ministry of the Interior | Chile | rquintano@interior.gov.cl |
| 12 | Mr. Aleksandre Pinchuk | Readmission Unit | State Border Guard Service | Ukraine | sabalmasov@pvu.gov.ua |
| 13 | Mr. Murodov Sherkhon | Head of Department for Citizenship Affairs | Migration Service, Ministry of Interior | Tajikistan | |

Governmental and Nongovernmental Organizations

| No. | Name | Function | Department/Organization | Duty Station | Email Address |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|----------------|---|
| 14 | Ms. Carla Edelenbos | Human Rights Officer, Secretary Committee on Migrant Workers | Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights | Geneva | cedelenbos@ohchr.org |
| 15 | Mr. Kim Eling | First Secretary | Permanent Delegation of the European Commission to the United Nations Office at Geneva | Geneva | Kim.ELING@ec.europa.eu |
| 16 | Ms Toryn Lesser | | OHCHR | Geneva | |
| 17 | Dr. Mariam Djibrilla Maiga | President | Federation des Reseaux de Femmes Africaines pour la Paix | Mali | Mamanferfap10@yahoo.fr |
| 18 | Mr. Jonathan Martens | Programme Specialist/Counter-Trafficking | IOM | Geneva | JMartens@iom.int |
| 19 | Mr. Isaac de Toro Mezquita | Seconded National Expert | Training Unit, FRONTEX | Europe | isaac.mezquita@frontex.europa.eu |
| 20 | Ms. Helen Muggerridge | International Protection Policy Advisor | UK Refugee Council | United Kingdom | helen.muggerridge@RefugeeCouncil.org.uk |
| 21 | Dr. Marta Pardavi | Co-Chair | Hungarian Helsinki Committee | Hungary | marta.pardavi@helsinki.hu |

| No. | Name | Function | Department/Organization | Duty Station | Email Address |
|-----|-------------------------|------------------|--|--------------|--|
| 22 | Ms. Alanna Ryan | Policy Associate | ICMC | Geneva | ryan@icmc.net |
| 23 | Mr Soenke Schmidt | | Permanent Delegation of the European Commission to the United Nations Office at Geneva | Geneva | |
| 24 | Ms. Katharina Schnoring | Chief of Mission | International Organization for Migration | Angola | KSCHNORING@iom.int |
| 25 | Ms. Joyce Tlou | Focal Point | Human Rights Commission | South Africa | jtlou@sahrc.org.za |

Academia

| No. | Name | Function | Department/Organization | Duty Station | Email Address |
|-----|------------------------------|--|--|----------------|--|
| 26 | Ms. Guillemette Carlucci | Research Assistant | Programme for the Global Study of Migration (PSGM), Graduate Institute of Geneva | Geneva | |
| 27 | Dr. Vincent Chetail | Faculty Member; Research Director of International Migration Law | Programme for the Global Study of Migration (PSGM), Graduate Institute of Geneva | Geneva | vincent.chetail@graduateinstitute.ch |
| 28 | Dr. Jérôme Elie | Researcher and Coordinator of Activities | Programme for the Global Study of Migration (PSGM), Graduate Institute of Geneva | Geneva | jerome.elie@graduateinstitute.ch |
| 29 | Ms. Marion Fresia | Anthropologist | Institut d'Ethnologie, University of Neuchatel | Switzerland | marfresia@yahoo.fr |
| 30 | Mr. Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen | Policy Analyst, Researcher | Danish Refugee Council | Denmark | thomas@gammeltoft-hansen.dk |
| 31 | Professor Jussi Hanhimäki | Professor of International History and Politics; Director of the Programme for the Global Study of Migration | Programme for the Global Study of Migration (PSGM), Graduate Institute of Geneva | Geneva | jussi.hanhimaki@graduateinstitute.ch |
| 32 | Mr. Tim Howe | Legal Expert | | United Kingdom | Tim.howe@web.de |
| 33 | Ms. Fara Ndiaye | Research and Administrative Assistant | Programme for the Global Study of Migration (PSGM), Graduate Institute of Geneva | Geneva | seune.ndiaye@graduateinstitute.ch |

UNHCR

| No. | Name | Function/Department | Duty Station | Email Address |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|----------------|--------------------|
| 34 | Ms. Erika Feller | Assistant High Commissioner (Protection) | Geneva | |
| 35 | Ms. Alia Al-Khatat-Williams | Senior Legal Officer, Bureau of Middle East and North Africa | Geneva | ALKHATAA@unhcr.org |
| 36 | Mr. Karim Amer | Executive Assistant, Bureau for Asia and the Pacific | Geneva | AMER@unhcr.org |
| 37 | Mr. Christian Baureder | Consultant | Geneva | BAURED@unhcr.org |
| 38 | Ms Carolyn Ennis | Eligibility Officer | Turkey | ennis@unhcr.org |
| 39 | Ms. Anja Klug | Senior Legal Officer, Protection | Geneva | KLUG@unhcr.org |
| 40 | Ms. Angela Li Rosi | Head of Policy Unit, Bureau for Europe | Geneva | LIROSI@unhcr.org |
| 41 | Ms. Fatima Mohammed | Senior Protection Officer | Somalia | MOHAMMEF@unhcr.org |
| 42 | Ms. Kate Pooler | Regional Protection Officer | Ukraine | POOLER@unhcr.org |
| 43 | Ms. Sile Reynolds | Consultant | United Kingdom | REYNOLDS@unhcr.org |
| 44 | Ms. Maria Riiskjaer | PDES | Geneva | riiskjae@unhcr.org |
| 45 | Ms. Geraldine Salducci | Consultant | Geneva | SALDUCCG@unhcr.org |
| 46 | Ms. Afeeza Sovani | Intern | Geneva | SOVANI@unhcr.org |
| 47 | Mr. Leonard Zulu | Senior Regional Protection Officer | Hungary | ZULU@unhcr.org |

Annex 2:

**10-Point Plan Expert Roundtable No. 1:
Controlling Borders while Ensuring Protection
20 – 21 November 2008, Geneva**

Agenda

Thursday, 20 November

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 8:30 – 9:00 | Registration |
| 9:00 – 9:15 | Welcome |
| 9:15 – 9:30 | Opening Address by the Assistant High Commissioner (Protection), Ms. Erika Feller |
| 9:30 – 10:30 | Introductory Session: Establishing a working definition of “protection-sensitive entry systems” |

The opening session will provide an opportunity to develop an understanding of the concept ‘protection-sensitive entry system’ in UNHCR’s 10-Point Plan, which is the central theme of the Roundtable discussion. It will lay the foundation for the following sessions in which different elements of the concept will be examined in greater detail. Participants will first discuss the terms ‘protection-sensitive’ and ‘entry system’ and then elaborate a working definition of the concept.

The following questions, inter alia, will be discussed: What is the meaning of the qualification ‘protection-sensitive’? Who should be protected (all people seeking entry or only specific groups such as refugees, asylum-seekers, children, victims of trafficking, persons with medical needs) and against which threats (return, persecution, human rights violations)? Which elements encompass the term ‘entry system’? Why does the 10-Point Plan employ the notion of ‘entry systems’ and not the commonly used term ‘border control’ or ‘border management’? Are there any new methods of controlling entry into states’ territories? What are these methods and how do they relate to the discussions?

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 10:30 – 11:00 | Coffee Break |
| 11:00 – 12:30 | Working Session I: Reconciling (state) security and (refugee) protection |

This session aims to further elaborate the objectives of a protection-sensitive entry system and at setting them into relation to each other. States have the right to control their borders, to decide whether or not to allow a non-national to enter their territory and to know who is residing in their territory, at all times. Border control is an important mechanism to combat international crime and to avert security threats. At the same time, individuals wishing to enter a state’s territory may need assistance to meet their own basic needs and support to access their rights, as these individuals,

who have been forced to flee persecution and human rights violations, may not be able to return to their country and require protection.

Many States have mechanisms in place that ensure that protection concerns are taken into consideration in their entry systems. Protection obligations enshrined in international, regional or national law underline the importance that States have given to the protection of individual human rights.

- i. What are the core functions of a protection-sensitive entry system?

Based on the working definition of a “protection-sensitive entry system” agreed upon in the opening session, participants will examine in more detail the different objectives of a protection-sensitive entry system, including those related to ‘control’ and ‘protection’.

- ii. Is there a conflict of interest between border control and international protection objectives?

Participants will look more closely at objectives that can place contradicting demands on entry officials. They will discuss how these contradictions can be solved. The following questions will be discussed: Does access of asylum seekers to the territory, without the necessary documentation, undermine efforts to prevent irregular entry? How can potential security risks related to individual asylum seekers be dealt with? Can entry officials realistically be expected to address humanitarian needs? Would border officials be better able to reconcile different objectives with additional training, guidance and expertise?

- iii. Are there specific protection safeguards required to combat international crimes such as smuggling and trafficking?

International migration, particularly irregular migration, often involves human smuggling and trafficking in persons. Combating these serious crimes raises specific problems for security and law enforcement activities and is challenging from a protection perspective, especially if smugglers and traffickers are among a mixed group of people requesting entry at a state’s border. The following questions will be discussed: How can traffickers and smugglers be identified and separated from those who are victims of their crimes? How should they be punished? Which safeguards are necessary to ensure that measures against smugglers and traffickers do not negatively impact asylum seekers? Are entry officials responsible for the identification of victims of trafficking? Are these officials responsible for addressing the specific needs of victims of trafficking or victims of human rights abuses?

12:30 – 13:30 **Lunch**

13:30 – 15:00 **Working Session II: Protection-sensitive entry systems: A common task**

This session will further elaborate on the roles and responsibilities of different actors involved in entry management. The session will explore the contributions that these

actors can make to a protection-sensitive entry system and identify areas that may require the involvement of additional stakeholders.

- i. Who are the main actors of a protection-sensitive entry system and where are they located?

Primary responsibility for the management of entry systems lies with the State and its authorities. Apart from border and coast guards, these actors may also include other governmental departments, including asylum authorities. Entry officials may be placed at different locations, including outside of their own territory. States have also delegated a variety of tasks relating to entry management to private actors, such as airline companies or the shipping industry. Depending on the national system, the management of the entry system may also include international agencies, such as IOM and UNHCR, or civil society representatives.

The following questions will, inter alia, be discussed: Which state bodies are involved in entry management? Where are they located (in the country, at the border, at sea, or in the territory of third States)? Are governmental bodies of third States involved in the management of the entry system and to what extent? Where have border control tasks been (partially) outsourced to private actors? Have the responsible actors changed over time and why? What role have international agencies and civil society representatives played? How do participants view these developments? Are there regional differences?

- ii. What are the respective roles and responsibilities of the main actors of a protection-sensitive entry system?

After having exchanged information on the variety of actors who are involved in the management of entry systems, participants will discuss their experiences with regard to the role and responsibilities of these actors. The following questions, inter alia, will be discussed: Is there a division of labour between the different actors involved in the entry system?; How has this division been developed and does it work? Do responsibilities vary in different regions and to what extent?

- iii. Are there any protection tasks that do not fall within the mandate of a specific actor?

Having looked at issues and stakeholders, are there any fields of work that are not adequately covered and why? What possible solutions can be envisaged?

- iv. Other challenges

This session will provide an opportunity for participants to discuss challenges to the establishment and management of a protection-sensitive entry system. The following are some suggested questions for discussion: Is co-operation amongst different actors functioning well? How are conflicting interests resolved? Are there time constraints or can people stay at a state border until their protection needs are examined? Do increased numbers of people requesting entry raise particular challenges? Do difficult geographical settings, such as remote areas, sea borders or the high seas, bring particular operational challenges? How can resource limitations be addressed?

15:00 – 15:30 **Coffee Break**

15:30 – 17:00 **Special Session: Identifying the legal problems implicated in protection-sensitive entry systems**

The roundtable focuses on the operational challenges of a protection-sensitive entry system and possibilities to overcome these challenges. There are, however, a variety of important legal questions in connection with the management of entry systems. This session provides participants with the opportunity to familiarize themselves with some of these legal questions. Legal experts will make short presentations on each of the following topics, particularly as they apply in the context of border control and protection. The presentations will be followed by a discussion involving all participants.

- i. Non-penalization of entry of asylum-seekers
Vincent Chetail, Graduate Institute Geneva

The imposition of entry requirements on non-nationals (eg. documentation, visas) is a long-established mechanism for controlling access to national territory and responds to a range of objectives, including security concerns. It is important, though, that the entry regime contains systematic safeguards to ensure that such mechanisms do not become an insurmountable obstacle to the individual's right to seek asylum. This presentation will elaborate on the circumstances under which international refugee law exempts refugees from penalties for illegal entry.

- ii. Extra-territorial application of the *non-refoulement* principle
Anja Klug, Senior Legal Officer, UNHCR

States are increasingly employing a range of measures against irregular travellers situated outside of their territory, including at high sea and in the territory of third States (e.g. maritime interdiction, out-posted immigration officers). The presentation will examine whether the relevant provisions of international human rights and refugee law, and at a minimum, the prohibition of *non-refoulement*, are binding on States when acting extraterritorially.

- iii. State obligations and private actors in the entry system
Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen, Legal Expert, Danish Refugee Council

Many States impose sanctions on carriers for the transportation of non-nationals, who do not possess proper travel documentation, to their territory. As a result, carriers can be obliged to prevent the transportation of irregular travellers on their vessels, regardless of any potential protection needs that these individuals might have. This presentation will discuss whether and to what extent a State can be held liable for any breaches of international law by such private entities (carriers).

18:00 – 19:00 **Reception**

Friday, 21 November

9:00 – 10:30 **Working Session III: Establishing and improving protection-sensitive entry systems**

This session will explore practical ways to establish and maintain a protection-sensitive entry system by taking into account different operational realities, including limitations in resources. Different roundtable participants will present projects regarding this topic. Participants will be invited to draw general conclusions from these examples and discuss how these ideas might be replicated in their respective country/region.

i. Presentation of good practice examples:

- Controlling borders and ensuring protection in Angola
Katharina Schnöring, Chief of Mission, IOM Angola
- A Memorandum of Understanding with the Hungarian Border Guards on monitoring and training in Hungary
Marta Pardavi, Executive Director, Hungarian Helsinki Committee
- Establishing a dialogue with UK government officials on protection-sensitive entry systems
Sile Reynolds, Consultant, UNHCR London

ii. Discussion

The subsequent discussion will focus on the following three questions:

- What are the main steps to establish a protection-sensitive entry system?

Participants are invited to refer to the presented examples and their own relevant experiences, to brainstorm ideas on how a control-focused border system can be developed into a protection-sensitive border system.

- What resources and tools are needed?

Addressing protection concerns within the entry system will require resources and expertise. Based on the result of previous discussions and good practice examples, participants are invited to list resources and tools which might facilitate the establishment of a protection-sensitive entry system.

- How can training, monitoring and other support best contribute to the improvement of a protection-sensitive system?

This session will specifically focus on training and monitoring in the context of entry systems. The following questions are intended to guide the discussion: What contributions can training, monitoring, and capacity-building activities make in establishing protection-sensitive entry systems? Where can these activities be best placed in the overall system? What actors can deliver or support the above activities?

10:30 – 11:00 **Coffee Break**

11:00 – 12:30 **Working Session IV: Controlling Borders and Mixed Migration: An international phenomenon requiring international cooperation**

International migration is a global phenomenon and by definition, involves a variety of countries that are situated along migration routes. Addressing the challenges to international migration, including those related to entry systems, is best discussed in the context of international cooperation. This session will discuss in which areas cooperation would be most important and on what level (eg. bilateral, regional, global) co-operation can yield the best results.

i. What is the relevance of information sharing and information networks?

Information sharing is key to any form of cooperation. How can this tool be employed to strengthen the protection component of an entry system? What examples of information networks can be discussed to inspire similar initiatives in the migration context?

ii. What local, regional or global approaches have been useful?

Participants can discuss the following questions: Are there examples of sub-regional or regional initiatives and what are the practical results that they have achieved? What type of facilitator role can international organisations play?

iii. How can ideas and best practices be better exchanged and discussed?

Participants may wish to reflect on the form of exchange and discussion which they think would be most useful. Can this be through cross-border meetings, regional conferences, the establishment of data bases and use of internet, handbooks or manuals? Where do experts see the most urgent need for action?

iv. Are there other good practices of state co-operation?

Participants can discuss further examples of co-operation relating to capacity building, financial support, and joint border surveillance.

12:30 – 13:30 **Lunch**

13:30 – 14:30 **Conclusions, Recommendations and Closure**