

INTERNAL

Summary of UNHCR proposals to complement national asylum systems through new multilateral approaches

UNHCR is mandated to achieve better protection and solutions for all persons of its concern and committed to co-operating with efforts designed to address migratory strains on asylum systems. The Agenda for Protection, deriving from the Global Consultations process has spurred new thinking to tackle these problems, including through the development of special agreements in the context of the High Commissioner's Convention Plus initiative. UNHCR is therefore in the process of exploring measures to improve protection and solutions arrangements in regions of origin, while proposing an EU-based approach to deal with certain caseloads of essentially manifestly unfounded applications lodged primarily by "economic migrants" resorting to the asylum channel. These proposals should be seen to complement existing national asylum systems. UNHCR is further prepared to examine with States how national asylum systems, and in particular their procedural aspects, could be rendered more efficient.

State responsibility is a key concept, which must be maintained at all stages, but can often be better fulfilled through international cooperation and the sharing of commitments. Together with improving the working of their national asylum systems, EU States also have the challenge of strengthening the capacity of asylum countries at points where refugees first seek international protection. Amelioration of asylum conditions in countries hosting major refugee populations and more accessible solutions are prerequisites if the pressures driving onward movement, the so-called "secondary flows", are to be reduced. These are shared responsibilities in keeping with the principle of international solidarity and burden sharing.

Protection and solutions in regions of origin as part of the Convention Plus initiative:

A genuine and concerted effort is required, in partnership with States and international and non-governmental organizations, to improve the quality and effectiveness of protection available within the countries in regions close to the source of refugee movements, as well as to promote durable solutions. Convention Plus can serve as an important enabling mechanism to develop comprehensive approaches through multilateral special agreements. The following would be elements of such an initiative:

- **Strengthened protection capacity in host countries:** Effective protection must be assured. Agreement on what constitutes effective protection, identification of protection inadequacies, a willingness of the host country to address them, as well as substantial financial and material investment to enable host countries, UNHCR and other relevant actors to implement agreed objectives, are therefore required. As foreseen in the Agenda for Protection, UNHCR is working with a number of States to boost their protection capacities, focusing especially on countries from which significant secondary movements are taking place. In UNHCR's experience, improved availability and access to means for **self-reliance** is particularly relevant to avert secondary movements, and is an important precursor to a durable solution. The High Commissioner's proposal on "Development Assistance for Refugees" (DAR) not only aims to enhance effective protection and promote durable solutions for refugees, but also to provide concrete support to, and burden sharing with, host countries in the developing world. At the same time, it would reduce pressures for onward movement, and thereby reliance on smugglers and traffickers. DAR should be built into responses, particularly in protracted refugee situations, to better equip refugees for any of the three durable solutions.
- **Comprehensive durable solutions arrangements** comprising the following elements:
 - Active promotion of **voluntary repatriation and sustainable reintegration**. The Agenda for Protection promotes strengthened co-operation to make repatriation possible and sustainable. In post-conflict situations, the High Commissioner has proposed an integrated approach, the "4 Rs" (Repatriation, Reintegration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction) which aims to bring together humanitarian and development actors in order to facilitate sustainable reintegration and bridge the transition period between emergency relief and long-term development.

- “Development through Local Integration” (DLI) as a strategy in circumstances where the **local integration of refugees** in countries of asylum is a viable option. DLI aims at soliciting additional development assistance to underpin this durable solution.⁴
- Multilateral commitments to expand **resettlement** as a protection tool, a durable solution as well as an instrument of burden-sharing. Expanded resettlement options might be made available in the form of a multi-lateral pool administered by UNHCR. In this respect, a joint EU-resettlement scheme would be useful.
- **Processing in countries of first asylum** if necessary to access effective protection or durable solutions, such as: i) in the context of a comprehensive durable solutions framework, or ii) where access to effective protection or a durable solution requires formal individual recognition of status. The entire caseload present in the country of first asylum should have equal access to such arrangements.
- **Facilitated return** to and readmission by countries of asylum in regions of origin where effective protection is agreed and continues to be available, possibly as part of an integrated approach, consisting of:
 - **An admissibility procedure:** to determine whether responsibility for providing protection lies in the country of destination or the country of first asylum, based on factors such as previous stay in a country offering effective protection and continued enjoyment of such protection upon return, or as part of a comprehensive durable solutions strategy. Strong links to the destination country, such as family, should lead to processing of the asylum claim in the destination country, as should an on-going large-scale influx of refugees in the country of first asylum.
 - **Specially tailored readmission arrangements** should ensure prompt transfer under acceptable conditions, and would benefit from assistance schemes and other supportive incentives, which could reinforce the aforementioned efforts.

An EU-based mechanism as a step towards a common asylum system:

To target caseloads of asylum seekers that are composed primarily of economic migrants and to reinforce returns of persons not in need of international protection, UNHCR proposes a special EU-based mechanism to be piloted in respect of designated countries of origin. The mechanism could be an important step towards a common asylum system and would rely on an EC regulation or directive. Pre-negotiated readmission agreements to effect the swift return of rejected cases would be a prerequisite. They should be easier to negotiate as they could be limited to nationals, and would benefit from the joint political weight of the EU and its Member States, and UNHCR facilitation. The EU-based mechanism would further include the following elements:

- **Closed reception facilities** in which asylum seekers would be required to reside for the duration of the procedure (not to exceed one month), provided that the special needs of vulnerable persons, including children, are met. Exceptions could be made in cases where there is no fear of absconding and irregular movement. The centres could be located within one or possibly more States close to the external borders of the EU, probably of the enlarged EU of 2004. They would provide facilities in line with international standards and the EU Directive Laying Down Minimum Standards for the Reception of Asylum Seekers in Member States, as well as interpretation services and legal counselling for all asylum-seekers.
- **Immediate transfer** from EU Member States to the joint facilities of asylum seekers of the designated nationality, with the exception of persons who are medically unfit to travel or stay in closed reception centres, and unaccompanied or separated children.
- **Rapid determination of claims** on an individual basis by a consortium of national asylum officers and second instance decision-makers, who would determine international protection needs, in line with the future EU Qualification Directive, in a single procedure that follows international standards. Appeals could be limited to simplified reviews. The entire process should be completed within one month, unless a particular case reveals

⁴ There are close linkages between DLI and DAR since both aim to tap the potential of development funds in securing durable solutions for refugees.

special complexities, in which case the claim should be transferred to a regular national asylum procedure. UNHCR would monitor the determination process, provide advice, and could play a role in the simplified review process.

- **Rapid transfer to asylum state:** Persons found to be in need of international protection would be distributed fairly amongst Member States, according to a pre-determined key that would take into account effective links, including family, educational, or cultural ties.
- **Rapid return** of persons found not to be in need of international protection. Arrangements for effecting return to the country of origin would need to be in place.
- The process would be a partnership effort involving States and relevant international organizations. It would require **joint EU funding and operation** of the centres and for the transfer to the asylum state or return to country of origin, as applicable, possibly from a special EU budget, and the sharing of resources and expertise. The common European approach would avoid simple deflection of movements to other countries. It would, moreover, reinforce burden-sharing with border States of the EU that, following the logic of EURODAC and the Dublin II Regulation, would bear the brunt of refugee status determination, a serious burden particularly for candidate States that lack the necessary resources, expertise and reception facilities.
- **Common asylum system:** Such a process would represent an important initial step towards a common EU-wide asylum system, including joint efforts on return and readmission, and a key for fair distribution of persons in need of international protection.

UNHCR Geneva
April 2003

EXPLANATION OF THE REGIONAL PRONG

A. Introduction

This note offers a narrative explanation of the first prong of a three-pronged working proposal by UNHCR to improve the availability of protection and solutions for refugees in the region of origin while addressing certain asylum dilemmas confronting host States.¹ It is part of a more comprehensive approach, which includes also work on improving national asylum systems and a better handling of manifestly unfounded cases, the latter of which is elaborated upon as the EU prong in a separate narrative note.

B. Starting Premises

For UNHCR, the starting premises for strengthened regional approaches are the following:

- (i) A better managed global system centred on multilateral co-operation and the equitable sharing of responsibilities and burdens (rather than unilateral responses which may well just shift burdens) is a positive ambition;
- (ii) Improved management of asylum does not require formal amendment of the current international legal framework, in particular the 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocol, whose continued viability - and indeed need for strengthened implementation - is repeatedly and authoritatively asserted;
- (iii) What is required, though, are co-operative arrangements buttressing the international legal regime so as to facilitate the delivery of protection in complex scenarios whilst meeting State concerns about the effective management of borders;
- (iv) A genuine and concerted effort, in partnership with States and international and non-governmental organisations, to improve the quality and effectiveness of protection available within the countries in regions close to the source of refugee movements has to have an integral place in systems which might be developed;
- (v) Readmission arrangements to facilitate return are crucial to underpin international co-operative efforts;
- (vi) Effective protection for refugees and viable solutions which respect the dictates of equitable responsibility and burden sharing, must be as much the goals of better international co-operation as border control;
- (vii) State responsibility is a key concept, which must be maintained at all stages but can be fulfilled through international co-operation and the sharing of commitments;
- (viii) Practically speaking no action plan has a real chance of success unless it is reliably resourced for as long as is necessary;
- (ix) Interception en route is an increasingly prominent feature of State practice. As it can impede access of refugees to international protection, the matter will be considered by UNHCR's Executive Committee this year and should

¹ While this note is specifically a contribution to the current dialogue within the EU, it contains elements common across regions which are not EU-specific. It draws heavily on analyses that have been undertaken during the Global Consultations process and experience derived from other regional contexts, which have been informing and guiding UNHCR's policies for some time.

generate a conclusion setting out parameters that could then be built into any co-operative responses;

- (x) Detention of all asylum-seekers as a matter of course is inherently undesirable and costly. As outlined in Executive Committee Conclusion No. 44, and further elaborated in UNHCR's Guidelines on Detention, the limited restrictions permissible are those necessary, (i) to verify identity; (ii) to determine the elements on which the claim for refugee status or asylum is based; (iii) in cases where asylum-seekers have destroyed their travel and/or identity documents or have used fraudulent documents in order to mislead the authorities of the State, in which they intend to claim asylum; and (iv) to protect national security and public order.
- (xi) A transfer of responsibility to another country should be consistent with the dictates of international law and practice. These normally require transfers to take place on the basis of links, such as, for example, previous stay on the territory of the third country, previous issuance of an entry visa or close ties on the basis of family. Subject to basic standards applying in relation to transfers, admission can be negotiated based on the first country of asylum or the "safe third country" concepts. In this connection, UNHCR's Executive Committee has stipulated that no asylum-seeker should be sent to a third country for determination of the claim without sufficient guarantees in each individual cases that: i) the person will be admitted to that country; ii) will enjoy there effective protection, in particular against *non-refoulement*; iii) will have the possibility to seek and enjoy asylum; and iv) will be treated in accordance with accepted international standards.

C. Protection and solutions arrangements in the region of origin

A number of different measures will need to be taken to move ahead on improving protection and access to durable solutions in the region of origin. These are the following:

1. Strengthened protection capacity in host countries

The Agenda for Protection foresees more effective co-operation to strengthen protection capacities in refugee-receiving countries in regions of origin.² During the Global Consultations process a number of strategies as well as some best practice examples were identified.³ UNHCR is already working in a number of countries to this end. In order to ensure that available protection is indeed effective protection, analyses of gaps in the treatment of specific groups of refugees in selected countries is being undertaken. This work should lead to the identification of inadequacies and encourage a willingness on the part of the host country to address them, as well as substantial financial and material investment to enable host countries, UNHCR and others to respond. In UNHCR's experience, refugees often move on because they are not allowed, or not given, the means to become self reliant pending a durable solution. Self-reliance is therefore often particularly relevant to avert secondary movements. Using development assistance for this purpose would enable genuine progress in this area. The High Commissioner's proposal, "Development Assistance for Refugees" (DAR), not only aims, from a development assistance perspective, to enhance effective protection and promote durable solutions for refugees, but also to provide concrete support to, and burden sharing with, host countries in the developing world. DAR should be built into responses, particularly in protracted refugee situations, to better equip refugees for any of the three durable solutions.

2. Comprehensive durable solutions arrangements

Comprehensive plans of action to arrive at solutions for targeted refugee groups, particularly those in protracted situations, could be developed, drawing also on gaps analyses to be

² Goal 3, Objective 2 of the Agenda.

³ See UN doc. EG/GC/01/19 of 4 September 2001.

undertaken for specific caseloads. Such plans of action might variously include arrangements of the following sort:

- Active promotion of **voluntary repatriation and sustainable reintegration**. The Agenda for Protection promotes strengthened co-operation to make repatriation possible and sustainable. In post-conflict situations, the High Commissioner has proposed an integrated approach, the “4 Rs” (Repatriation, Reintegration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction) which aims to bring together humanitarian and development actors in order to facilitate sustainable reintegration and bridge the transition period between emergency relief and long-term development.
- Strategic use of targeted development assistance to achieve more equitable burden-sharing for countries hosting large numbers of refugees and to promote **self-reliance** of refugees. Self-reliance is an important precursor to any of the three durable solutions. An integrated approach which anchors refugee issues within national, regional and multilateral development agendas is called for.
- “Development through Local Integration” (DLI) as a strategy in circumstances where the **local integration of refugees** in countries of asylum is a viable option. DLI aims at soliciting additional development assistance to underpin this durable solution.⁴
- Multilateral commitments to expand **resettlement** as a protection tool, a durable solution as well as an instrument of burden-sharing. Expanded resettlement options might be made available in the form of a multi-lateral pool administered by UNHCR.

3. Facilitated Return

Facilitated return would consist of a number of elements. How they are combined would vary according to specific regional circumstances, the States involved, the compatibility of their asylum systems and whether or not individual processing is necessary in the country of first asylum.

- **An admissibility procedure:** Its purpose would be the prompt differentiation and subsequent channelling of claims to be handled in one of two locations, that is, the country of destination or the country of first asylum (should processing be necessary in the latter case). Factors in this context include previous stay in a country offering effective protection and continued enjoyment of such protection upon return or processing facilities available in the country of first asylum as part of a durable solutions strategy. Furthermore, strong links to the destination country, such as those based on family connections, would speak in favour of processing asylum claims in the destination country. Following a burden-sharing rationale, the latter would also apply in case the first country of asylum is faced with a large-scale influx of refugees.
- **Agreement on “effective protection” requirements:** There has to be a shared understanding on the types of situations guaranteeing effective protection, leading to timely and genuine solutions.
- **Readmission arrangements:** Readmission arrangements would need to be in place to ensure that individuals who are to be returned to countries offering effective protection, can be transferred promptly and under acceptable conditions. Such arrangements would benefit from assistance schemes and other supportive incentives. Targeted support would bolster the protection available in the first country of asylum and facilitate continued stay in host countries in the region until longer term solutions can be realised. The negotiation process should also be used specifically to address protection and assistance gaps, which could improve protection in the country of first asylum, leading to timely and genuine solutions.

⁴ There are close linkages between DLI and DAR since both aim to tap the potential of development funds in securing durable solutions for refugees.

- **Processing in the country of first asylum:** Individual processing may not always be necessary (for example where refugee status and attached rights flow from *prima facie* recognition). There will, however, be situations where processing is integral to accessing solutions and/or rights, for example: i) in the context of a comprehensive durable solutions framework set out in special agreements; or ii) where the solution, be it continued effective protection in the country of first asylum or resettlement elsewhere, requires formal recognition of status. In all these instances, it is important that the entire caseload present in the country of first asylum has equal access to processing arrangements.

4. Partnerships

Co-operative partnership arrangements would have to underpin the international framework, drawing upon the specific expertise of different actors, including UNHCR, IOM and non-governmental organisations. They should be formalised through memoranda of understanding at the country level, which would feed into broader regional arrangements. Ideally co-operation would be built around existing programmes managed by partner organisations, including for example IOM's assisted voluntary return programmes, or existing programmes to respond to the needs of victims of trafficking.⁵

D. Challenge

Not all the elements set out in this paper are necessarily new. Many are drawn directly from understandings generated during UNHCR's Global Consultations process and carried forward within the Agenda for Protection. States are encouraged to give active consideration to the timely platform offered by the Agenda for Protection and the Convention Plus initiative⁶, as enabling mechanisms for the development and implementation of an effective international framework to address the irregular movement of asylum-seekers and refugees. Convention Plus provides a basis for transforming ad hoc or unilateral responses to the causes and effects of irregular migration and forced displacement into multilateral special agreements to bring this international framework into working effect.

**UNHCR Geneva,
April 2003**

⁵ At Headquarters level a co-operative mechanism is emerging between UNHCR, IOM, UNHCHR and ILO, as a forum to discuss issues of common concern relating to the asylum/migration nexus.

⁶ The Global Consultations process focused on the *tools of protection* - those presently available and those in need of development – as the means to achieve better global management of refugee issues through more reliable and effective international responses incorporating greater equity in the sharing of responsibilities and burdens. The High Commissioner has identified the development of multi-lateral special agreements, termed Convention Plus, as an appropriate way to craft such tools of protection, complementing and buttressing the 1951 Convention regime.

EXPLANATION OF THE EU PRONG

A. Introduction

Recurrent problems faced by States in Europe are abuse of the asylum channel by “economic migrants” and the non-return of persons found not to be in need of international protection. These issues have also been of concern to UNHCR, as they undermine the credibility of national asylum systems. The Agenda for Protection, deriving from the Global Consultations process is spurring new thinking and initiatives to tackle these problems, including through the development of special agreements in the context of Convention Plus. UNHCR is convinced that it is possible to combat abuse of asylum systems and to secure the return of persons found not to be in need of international protection, while at the same time preserving the core principles of the existing international refugee law framework and enhancing protection of refugees worldwide.

The EU-based mechanism, outlined below, represents one component of a multi-pronged approach UNHCR would like to propose. Such EU-based processing would be piloted through a joint process in respect of asylum applicants originating from designated countries of origin who are primarily economic migrants resorting to the asylum channel. These common processing centres would be located within but close to the external borders of the current EU, or alternatively of the EU as enlarged in 2004. This arrangement could be coupled with new or expanded **resettlement** quotas to increase avenues for and access to durable solutions globally for persons in regions of origin and/or stranded in transit countries without effective asylum systems.

B. Elements of the EU-based mechanism for “processing”

Immediate transfer: Upon arrival anywhere within the territory of EU Member States or at their borders, all asylum-seekers of the designated countries of origin would be transferred immediately to the centres, except for persons who are medically unfit to travel or stay in closed reception centres, as well as unaccompanied and separated children. The centres could be located initially in one or two EU Member States. Previous stay or transit through the country hosting the centre is irrelevant.

Closed reception centres should provide for decent accommodation and reception facilities in line with international standards and the EU’s own Directive Laying Down Minimum Standards for the Reception of Asylum Seekers in Member States. Asylum-seekers transferred to such centres for determination of their claims would be required to reside in them during the full duration of the procedure, provided, however, that the special needs of vulnerable persons, including children, are met. Closed reception centres will be difficult to avoid, unless there is no fear of absconding and irregular movement in a particular case. Interpretation services and legal counselling should be provided to all asylum-seekers in the centres.

Procedures: “Processing” would be conducted in accordance with commonly agreed procedures respecting international standards. First instance decisions should be taken promptly, and appeals could be handled in the form of simplified reviews. Processing should be completed within one month, unless a particular case reveals special complexities. Determination of any needs for international protection should be made in a single procedure. A consortium of national asylum officers and second instance decision-makers would be responsible for the determination of the claims. UNHCR would monitor the determination process, provide advice, including through country of origin information, if necessary. The Office could also be part of the review process. The modalities of UNHCR’s involvement would need to be worked out in more detail.

EC Regulation or Directive: Depending on whether or not the arrangement is supranational or multilateral, a new EC instrument would regulate the transfer, the “processing” of the cases as well as the distribution criteria for those found to be in need of international protection. Given the close date of EU enlargement, transfer to and processing in candidate countries joining the EU in 2004 might also be considered. The future EC Qualification Directive would form the substantive basis for the determination of refugee status or subsidiary protection.

Funding and operation: The process would require joint EU funding and operation of the “processing centres”, possibly with funding from a special EU budget, and the sharing of

resources and expertise. The operation of the centre would be a partnership effort involving States and relevant international organisations.

Returns and readmission: The burden of returning persons found not to be in need of international protection would be carried by the EU and its Member States, and would not fall solely on the State hosting the processing centre. Pre-negotiated agreements for return and readmission would be an important aspect of such a set-up. Negotiations would be greatly facilitated by the joint political weight of the EU and all of its Member States.

Single procedure: All persons found to be in need of international protection would be distributed fairly amongst Member States, according to a pre-determined key that would take into account effective links, including family, educational, or cultural ties.

C. Advantages of an EU-wide approach

A joint EU-based mechanism, if efficiently managed, should have the effect of (i) deterring abuse of the asylum system, as well as smuggling (ii) avoiding burden-shifting within Europe; and (iii) building on ongoing burden-sharing within the EU. It would also represent an important step towards creating a common asylum system.

- **Combating abuse of the asylum system by “economic migrants”:** Consistent with the objective of tackling the abuse of asylum systems, the main focus would be on populations who consist primarily of economic migrants, that is, persons from specific countries of origin whose asylum applications are likely to be manifestly unfounded. Rapid processing in closed centres close to the external EU border should have a strong deterrent effect.
- **Avoiding burden-shifting in Europe:** “Asylum problems” in Europe are still perceived primarily from a national perspective. Asylum policies adopted by any one country in Europe inevitably have an impact on other countries, often resulting in a shifting of the burden to neighbouring States. Common European approaches are necessary to avoid the deflection of movements to other countries.
- **Burden-sharing with border States of the EU:** Despite the recently adopted “Dublin II Regulation” and a limited framework for burden-sharing in the form of the European Refugee Fund, no real burden-sharing mechanism currently exists within the EU. Such a mechanism would be particularly relevant in situations where one State is overwhelmed by the number of asylum applications. It is precisely in relation to the processing of applications in the EU that considerable steps could be taken to reduce the burden more generally, and to ensure a more equitable sharing of the responsibility of processing asylum claims. Following the logic of both EURODAC and the Dublin II Regulation, EU border States are foreseen to bear the brunt of refugee status determination. However, since States, particularly candidate countries, lack the necessary resources, expertise and reception facilities, joint processing and solutions should be the approach.
- **Common asylum system:** Such a process would represent an important step forward in developing a common EU-wide asylum system, by providing for a common single procedure for manifestly unfounded cases, joint efforts on return and readmission, and a common key for distributing fairly persons in need of international protection.

D. Comparative advantages to “transit processing” in a third country outside the EU

Such an EU-based set-up, as outlined above, would have all the advantages and effects of transit country “processing” (as has, for example, been proposed by the UK), without the legal, political and practical difficulties that a set-up in a third country outside the EU would entail:

- Such processing, particularly if based on an EU instrument, should avoid the question regarding the lawfulness of transfer (including possible devolution) of state responsibility. Since it would be an EU-based system involving countries with similar levels of protection, it would make challenges in courts less likely, or at least less likely to succeed.
- Such an approach would have a similar deterrent effect as processing in transit countries outside the EU, particularly since Member States currently at the border of the EU as well as candidate countries are in large part also transit countries.
- It would be more compatible with the international refugee protection regime.
- There would be no negative precedent, and EU Member States would show that they were indeed able to agree on burden-sharing rather than burden-shifting mechanisms.
- Secondary movements within the EU would also be reduced, as persons would normally be unable to leave a processing centre and at any rate would no longer be entitled to additional adjudication on the territory of another Member State.
- The process could function as a pilot to identify criteria for distribution more broadly of persons found to be in need of international protection.
- Such a system would probably be more economical, since it would lead to a sharing of resources, including asylum officers, interpreters, and legal counsellors.
- It would avoid far more difficult and costly negotiations with third countries, whose asylum systems would risk being jeopardised as a result of the establishment of processing centres.

E. Disadvantages

- UNHCR’s proposal for an EU-wide approach could negatively affect the debate in EU countries not currently facing a political problem with the migration/asylum nexus. This disadvantage would, however, also apply with respect to “processing” outside the EU.
- Neither EU-based nor ‘transit’ processing would resolve the situation of persons without identification or fraudulent identification documents, which would remain a problem.
- The proposal does not address the irregular entry and stay of economic migrants who do not resort to the asylum channel. The problem of illegal immigration per se requires different responses.

F. UNHCR involvement

- UNHCR would be willing to provide support to this type of EU-based processing.
- In line with its supervisory responsibility, UNHCR would monitor decision-making and be prepared to consider participating in a review board, especially with a view to promoting harmonisation in the decision making process.
- Further, UNHCR would also contribute to negotiations with countries of origin for purposes of readmission of persons found not to be in need of international protection, including in the context of the Convention Plus initiative. The EU and Member States could thereby rely not only on UNHCR’s experience and resources, but also on its standing as a neutral multilateral agency, which should be of particular use in facilitating the necessary contacts and agreements.

**UNHCR Geneva,
April 2003**

UNHCR WORKING PROPOSAL

EU DESTINATION STATE

Prescreening/Admissibility Procedure for prompt differentiation and channeling of claims into one of three processes

