



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Frontex and human rights : responsibility in 'multi-actor situations' under the ECHR and EU public liability law

Fink, M.

Citation

Fink, M. (2017, December 13). *Frontex and human rights : responsibility in 'multi-actor situations' under the ECHR and EU public liability law*. The Meijers Research Institute and Graduate School of the Leiden Law School of Leiden University. The Meijers Research Institute and Graduate School of the Leiden Law School of Leiden University, Leiden. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/58101>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/58101>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/58101> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Fink, Melanie

Title: Frontex and human rights : responsibility in 'multi-actor situations' under the ECHR and EU public liability law

Date: 2017-12-13

Frontex and Human Rights

*Responsibility in 'Multi-Actor Situations' under the ECHR
and EU Public Liability Law*

Frontex and Human Rights

*Responsibility in 'Multi-Actor Situations'
under the ECHR and EU Public Liability Law*

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof.mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op woensdag 13 december 2017
klokke 10.00 uur.

door

Melanie Fink

geboren te Dornbirn, Oostenrijk

in 1985

Promotoren: Prof. dr. R.A. Lawson
Prof. dr. M. Nowak (University of Vienna, Austria)
Co-promotoren: Dr. J.J. Rijpma
Prof. dr. S. Wittich (University of Vienna, Austria)
Promotiecommissie: Prof. dr. C. Binder (Bundeswehr University Munich,
Germany)
Prof. dr. N.M. Blokker
Prof. dr. E. Guild (Radboud University Nijmegen /
Queen Mary University of London, United Kingdom)
Prof. dr. S. Peers (University of Essex, United Kingdom)
Prof. dr. A. Reinisch (University of Vienna, Austria)
Prof. dr. R.C. Tobler

This thesis was written in the framework of a 'cotutelle de thèse' between Leiden University (Europa Institute) and the University of Vienna (Department for European, International and Comparative Law).

The research leading to this thesis received funding through:

- a DOC Fellowship of the Austrian Academy of Sciences;
- a Marietta Blau-Grant of the OeAD-GmbH (Austrian agency for international mobility and cooperation in education, science and research), financed by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science, Research and Economy.

Lay-out: AlphaZet prepress, Waddinxveen
Printwerk: Ipskamp Printing

© M. Fink 2017

All rights reserved. No part of this thesis may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

Acknowledgments

Writing this thesis was a challenging and rewarding experience. I was privileged to count on the intellectual and emotional support of many outstanding colleagues and friends, who encouraged me to start, motivated me to persevere, and pushed me to finish. I owe a debt of gratitude to all of them, but will limit myself to name a few for the extraordinary support they provided.

First of all, I would like to express my respect and gratitude to my supervisors Rick Lawson, Manfred Nowak, Jorrit Rijpma, and Stephan Wittich. I have benefited enormously from their generosity with time, insightful comments, and guidance. I thank them wholeheartedly for their unwavering support and availability. Jorrit, my supervisor, colleague, and friend, made sure that I remained on track from beginning to end. His encyclopedic knowledge of EU law, his mad skills to never stop asking questions, and his availability any day of the week and time of the day truly gave me confidence throughout the years of writing, and eventually the courage to call this manuscript finished.

I would also like to thank the members of the Reading Committee, Christina Binder, Niels Blokker, Elspeth Guild, Steve Peers, August Reinisch, and Christa Tobler. I am honoured they invested their time and mind to review this manuscript and I am grateful for their insightful comments.

This research would not have been possible without the generous funding of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and the Austrian agency for international mobility and cooperation in education, science and research. Their support allowed me not only to devote full-time to my research, but also provided the geographical mobility essential to carry it out.

My PhD journey started at the Department of European, International and Comparative Law of the University of Vienna and then took me to the Europa Institute of Leiden University and the Lauterpacht Centre for International Law of the University of Cambridge. I would like to thank all my colleagues for a most inspiring research environment and, most of all, for their humour, kindness, and friendship. I am particularly indebted to Stefaan Van den Bogaert, the Director of the Europa Institute, for welcoming me over and over again when I came back after every good bye and finally refused to leave.

While researching and writing this thesis I was lucky enough to be in the company of a number of extraordinarily kind, supportive, and funny friends from Vienna, Amsterdam, and all over the world. To my friends in Vienna, thank you for making me feel home whenever I am with you, whether that is on your beautiful Viennese rooftop terraces, or in the streets, parks, restaurants, and bars of Vienna. I sincerely appreciate your encouragement, humour, and friendship. To my friends in Amsterdam, thank you for not letting work stop me explore the city's treasures and distractions with you, and for being my family away from home. My dear Amsterdam butterflies, thank you for all those joyful moments spent in the air.

Reserving the most important for last, I wish to thank my whole family, but especially my parents Elke and Werner, their partners Andrea and Artur, my sister Anja with her lovely family, my brother Julian, and my grandparents Ilse and Ludwig. I thank you for all those moments full of laughter, food, and wine. But most of all I thank you for your unconditional support and love. You mean the world to me. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude, admiration, and love to my partner, João Pedro, for his tremendous support throughout this journey.

Melanie Fink

Leiden, 19 September 2017

Concise Table of Contents

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES	XVII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XIX
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 Research question and scope	10
1.3 Research design	15
1.4 Scientific relevance	25
1.5 Outline	27
2 FRONTEX-COORDINATED JOINT OPERATIONS	29
2.1 Frontex: an overview	30
2.2 Joint operations	43
2.3 Operational resources for joint operations	56
2.4 Implementing joint operations	72
2.5 Conclusion	94
3 RESPONSIBILITY UNDER THE ECHR	97
3.1 Responsibility of EU member states for breaches of the ECHR	98
3.2 Attribution of conduct: identifying the relevant rules	117
3.3 Responsibility for the primary breach	133
3.4 Responsibility for associated conduct	168
3.5 Conclusion	201
4 LIABILITY UNDER EU LAW	213
4.1 Introduction to EU public liability law	215
4.2 Liability for fundamental rights violations	231
4.3 Liability for the primary breach	273
4.4 Liability for associated conduct	321
4.5 Conclusion	357
5 CONCLUSION	369
5.1 Joint operations and legal responsibility under the ECHR and EU public liability law	370
5.2 Allocation of responsibility in multi-actor situations: the general rules	373
5.3 Allocation of responsibility in multi-actor situations: the case of Frontex	379
5.4 A way forward: obstacles and recommendations	394
5.5 Epilogue	405

REFERENCES	407
SUMMARY	435
ZUSAMMENFASSUNG (SUMMARY IN GERMAN)	443
SAMENVATTING (SUMMARY IN DUTCH)	451

Table of Contents

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES	XVII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XIX
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Setting the scene: Frontex, joint operations, and legal responsibility	1
1.1.1 'Reinforcing' Frontex: the European Border and Coast Guard Agency	2
1.1.2 Joint operations and allocation of responsibility in multi-actor situations	5
1.2 Research question and scope	10
1.2.1 Main research question	10
1.2.2 Scope of the research	11
1.2.2.1 The operations and actors	11
1.2.2.2 The legal framework	12
1.2.3 The research question in detail	15
1.3 Research design	15
1.3.1 General approach	15
1.3.2 Attribution and causation	21
1.3.3 Bases for responsibility: primary and associated responsibility	22
1.4 Scientific relevance	25
1.5 Outline	27
2 FRONTEX-COORDINATED JOINT OPERATIONS	29
2.1 Frontex: an overview	30
2.1.1 Origin, establishment, and tasks	30
2.1.1.1 The 'Schengen area': common rules governing external border control	30
2.1.1.2 Operational implementation of the common rules	32
2.1.1.3 Establishment and development of Frontex	33
2.1.1.4 Tasks of Frontex	35
2.1.2 Legal personality	37
2.1.3 Internal organisation	40
2.1.3.1 Governing bodies	40
2.1.3.2 Staff	41
2.1.3.3 Fundamental rights bodies	42

2.2	Joint operations	43
2.2.1	Joint border control operations	44
2.2.1.1	Activities during operations	44
2.2.1.2	Types of operation	47
2.2.1.3	Examples of joint border control operations implemented by Frontex	49
2.2.2	Joint return operations	51
2.2.3	Joint operations hosted by third states	53
2.3	Operational resources for joint operations	56
2.3.1	Financial resources	56
2.3.2	Pooling of human and technical resources	58
2.3.2.1	Human resources	58
2.3.2.2	Technical resources	61
2.3.2.3	Availability of pooled resources	63
2.3.3	Deployment of human and technical resources	64
2.3.3.1	Deployment of human resources	64
2.3.3.2	Deployment of technical resources	68
2.3.3.3	Operational Resources Management System (OPERA)	70
2.3.3.4	Overview: personnel deployed during operations	70
2.4	Implementing joint operations	72
2.4.1	Applicable rules during joint operations	72
2.4.1.1	Generally applicable rules	72
2.4.1.2	Operation-specific rules: the Operational Plan	73
2.4.1.3	Fundamental rights	75
2.4.2	Coordination structures during joint operations	77
2.4.2.1	Coordination structures located in the host state	77
2.4.2.2	Coordination instruments provided by Frontex	78
2.4.3	Authority over deployed resources	80
2.4.3.1	Command and control arrangements	80
2.4.3.2	Disciplinary authority, criminal jurisdiction, and civil liability	86
2.4.4	Responding to fundamental rights-related incidents	88
2.4.4.1	General rules on incident reporting	88
2.4.4.2	Dealing with fundamental rights-related incidents	89
2.4.4.3	Suspension, termination, or withdrawal of financial support	92
2.5	Conclusion	94
3	RESPONSIBILITY UNDER THE ECHR	97
3.1	Responsibility of EU member states for breaches of the ECHR	98
3.1.1	Responsibility for breaches of the ECHR	98
3.1.1.1	Conditions for responsibility under the law of international responsibility	98

3.1.1.2	Sources of the law of international responsibility	100
3.1.1.3	The law of international responsibility and the ECHR	102
3.1.2	Responsibility for conduct relating to EU law	104
3.1.2.1	Responsibility for conduct of the EU	104
3.1.2.2	Responsibility for conduct of EU member states	108
3.1.2.3	Responsibility for conduct during Frontex operations	115
3.2	Attribution of conduct: identifying the relevant rules	117
3.2.1	The rules on attribution of conduct	117
3.2.1.1	Attribution of conduct to states	117
3.2.1.2	Attribution of conduct to international organisations	121
3.2.1.3	Illustration	124
3.2.1.4	Possibilities of attribution to multiple entities	124
3.2.2	A special rule for Frontex operations?	126
3.2.2.1	A special rule for the European Union?	126
3.2.2.2	Responsibility allocation arrangements in the EBCG Regulation	130
3.3	Responsibility for the primary breach	133
3.3.1	Attribution of conduct during Frontex operations: the starting point	134
3.3.2	Attribution of conduct to the host state	136
3.3.2.1	Article 6 ASR	136
3.3.2.2	Article 6 ASR in the case law of the ECtHR	142
3.3.2.3	Article 6 ASR in the context of Frontex operations	145
3.3.3	Attribution of conduct to the EU	151
3.3.3.1	Article 7 ARIO	151
3.3.3.2	Article 7 ARIO in the case law of the ECtHR	157
3.3.3.3	Article 7 ARIO in the context of Frontex operations	162
3.3.4	Interim conclusion	165
3.4	Responsibility for associated conduct	168
3.4.1	Responsibility for violations of obligations to protect	169
3.4.1.1	Positive obligations under the ECHR: an overview	170
3.4.1.2	Protecting individuals from interference by third parties	172
3.4.1.3	Responsibility for failures to protect during Frontex operations	181
3.4.2	Responsibility for rendering aid or assistance	188
3.4.2.1	Derivative responsibility under international law	189
3.4.2.2	Responsibility for rendering aid or assistance	191

3.4.2.3	Aid or assistance in the context of Frontex operations	194
3.4.3	Interim conclusion	197
3.5	Conclusion	201
4	LIABILITY UNDER EU LAW	213
4.1	Introduction to EU public liability law	215
4.1.1	What is public liability?	215
4.1.2	Liability of the European Union and Union bodies	216
4.1.2.1	Legal basis	216
4.1.2.2	Judicial competence and admissibility	218
4.1.2.3	Conditions for liability of the European Union	219
4.1.3	Liability of EU Member States	223
4.1.3.1	Legal basis	223
4.1.3.2	Judicial competence and admissibility	224
4.1.3.3	Conditions for liability of EU member states	225
4.1.4	Analysing public liability law	226
4.1.4.1	Union and member state liability as a single system of public liability	226
4.1.4.2	Case law in the area of public liability	228
4.2	Liability for fundamental rights violations	231
4.2.1	Unlawfulness: the character of the rule infringed	232
4.2.1.1	Individual rights, direct effect, and public liability	233
4.2.1.2	Individual rights in public liability law	236
4.2.1.3	Fundamental rights as sources of 'individual rights'	239
4.2.2	Unlawfulness: the nature of the breach	244
4.2.2.1	Discretion and its limits	244
4.2.2.2	The obviousness and reprehensibility of the breach	246
4.2.2.3	The interplay between the factors determining seriousness	254
4.2.2.4	Interim conclusion: the 'reasonable unlawful interpretation'	260
4.2.2.5	The seriousness of fundamental rights violations	261
4.2.3	Damage and causal link	268
4.2.3.1	Damage	268
4.2.3.2	Causation	271
4.3	Liability for the primary breach	273
4.3.1	How to approach questions of allocation of liability	274
4.3.1.1	Attribution, causation, and allocation of liability in EU law	274
4.3.1.2	The approach of the CJEU	275
4.3.1.3	The approach adopted for the purposes of this study	276

4.3.2	Towards a categorisation of multi-actor situations in EU law	278
4.3.2.1	The starting point	278
4.3.2.2	A tentative categorisation of multi-actor situations in EU law	283
4.3.3	Independent application of Union legislation by member states	286
4.3.3.1	Liability of the Union for unlawful Union legislation	287
4.3.3.2	No liability of member states for application of unlawful Union legislation	289
4.3.3.3	Liability of member states for unlawful application of Union legislation	291
4.3.4	Cooperative application of Union law	293
4.3.4.1	Non-binding advice, recommendations, and opinions	294
4.3.4.2	Legally binding instructions	296
4.3.4.3	The pivotal role of the legal room for manoeuvre	299
4.3.5	Finding the competent court	301
4.3.5.1	The starting point: procedure follows substance	301
4.3.5.2	Exhaustion of local remedies	305
4.3.6	Interim findings: identifying the rules on allocation of liability	308
4.3.6.1	Allocation of liability between the Union and its member states	308
4.3.6.2	Allocation of liability between member states	310
4.3.6.3	Possibilities of joint or concurrent liability	310
4.3.6.4	Overview	311
4.3.7	Allocation of liability during Frontex operations	312
4.3.7.1	Frontex: normative control over conduct during joint operations?	314
4.3.7.2	Member states: normative control over conduct during joint operations?	316
4.3.8	Interim conclusion	317
4.4	Liability for associated conduct	321
4.4.1	Associated obligations under EU law	322
4.4.1.1	Obligations to supervise	322
4.4.1.2	Obligations to protect	324
4.4.2	Conditions for liability for associated conduct	327
4.4.2.1	Conferring rights on individuals	328
4.4.2.2	Sufficiently serious breach	331
4.4.2.3	Causal link	336
4.4.3	Joint or concurrent liability	338
4.4.3.1	Court competence	339
4.4.3.2	The impact of parallel proceedings	340

4.4.4	Liability for associated conduct in the context of joint operations	341
4.4.4.1	Associated liability of Frontex	342
4.4.4.2	Associated liability of participating states	346
4.4.4.3	Associated liability of the host state	349
4.4.5	Interim conclusion	352
4.5	Conclusion	357
5	CONCLUSION	369
5.1	Joint operations and legal responsibility under the ECHR and EU public liability law	370
5.1.1	Joint operations, deployed resources, and transfer of authority	370
5.1.2	Preconditions for legal responsibility under ECHR and EU law	372
5.2	Allocation of responsibility in multi-actor situations: the general rules	373
5.2.1	Allocation of primary responsibility under ECHR and EU law	374
5.2.2	Allocation of associated responsibility under ECHR and EU law	376
5.3	Allocation of responsibility in multi-actor situations: the case of Frontex	379
5.3.1	Primary responsibility of host states, participating states, and Frontex	380
5.3.2	Associated responsibility of host states, participating states, and Frontex	383
5.3.3	Summary of findings	386
5.3.4	Responsibility in Examples 1-4	388
5.4	A way forward: obstacles and recommendations	394
5.4.1	Determining responsibility	394
5.4.1.1	The authority regime	394
5.4.1.2	EU public liability law	396
5.4.2	Incurring responsibility	399
5.4.2.1	General aspects	399
5.4.2.2	Addressing multi-actor situations	400
5.4.3	Implementing responsibility	403
5.5	Epilogue	405
	REFERENCES	407
	SUMMARY	435
	ZUSAMMENFASSUNG (SUMMARY IN GERMAN)	443
	SAMENVATTING (SUMMARY IN DUTCH)	451

List of Figures and Tables

All Figures and Tables were developed by the author.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The challenge of allocating responsibility during Frontex operations	7
Figure 2: Definition of legal responsibility	11
Figure 3: Operations within the scope of this research	11
Figure 4: Forms of legal responsibility studied	15
Figure 5: Actor, unlawful conduct, damage, and their relationship	22
Figure 6: Allocation of responsibility: primary responsibility	22
Figure 7: Allocation of responsibility: associated responsibility	24
Figure 8: Allocation of responsibility: aid or assistance	24
Figure 9: Staff development 2005-2020	42
Figure 10: Budget development and distribution 2005-2016 (in Mio EUR)	57
Figure 11: Pooling and deployment of human resources	65
Figure 12: Pooling and deployment of technical resources	68
Figure 13: Principal actors and applicability of European human rights law	76
Figure 14: Command and control arrangements during joint operations	86
Figure 15: Conditions for responsibility to arise	100
Figure 16: Attribution of conduct of human resources used for Frontex operations (starting point)	135
Figure 17: Article 6 ASR: overview of requirements for attribution	140
Figure 18: Article 6 ASR: application to Frontex operations	151
Figure 19: Attribution of conduct of human resources used for Frontex operations (result)	166
Figure 20: Discretion and its limits in public liability law	245
Figure 21: Clarity of the rule/complexity of the situation and seriousness of the breach	253
Figure 22: Relationship between factors determining seriousness (phase two)	256
Figure 23: Relationship between factors determining seriousness (phase three)	261
Figure 24: Approaching questions of allocation of liability in EU law	277
Figure 25: Allocation of liability flowchart	312
Figure 26: Relevant rule applicable in the context of Frontex operations	313
Figure 27: Analysing associated liability in EU law	328

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of findings (preview)	18
Table 2: Personnel during joint operations	71
Table 3: Rules on attribution of conduct (overview)	124
Table 4: Rules on attribution of conduct (provisions relevant for Frontex operations)	136
Table 5: Summary of findings (1)	168
Table 6: Summary of findings (2)	201
Table 8: Categorisation of multi-actor situations in EU law: starting point	284
Table 9: Cases concerning allocation of liability in EU law	286
Table 10: Categorisation of multi-actor situations in EU law: situation 1	286
Table 11: Categorisation of multi-actor situations in EU law: situation 2	293
Table 12: Summary of findings (3)	320
Table 13: Summary of findings (4)	356
Table 14: Summary of findings (final)	387

List of Abbreviations

AFSJ	Area of Freedom, Security and Justice
ARIO	Articles on the Responsibility of International Organizations
ASR	Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts
CFI	Court of First Instance
CFR	Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CJEU	Court of Justice of the European Union (comprising <i>inter alia</i> the ECJ and the General Court)
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
EBCG	European Border and Coast Guard
EBCGT	European Border and Coast Guard Teams
EBGT	European Border Guard Teams
ECHR (also 'Convention')	European Convention on Human Rights
ECJ	(European) Court of Justice (one of the courts of the CJEU)
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EEAS	European External Action Service
ERIT	European Return Intervention Teams
EU (also 'Union')	European Union
ICC	International Coordination Centre
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ILC	International Law Commission
JCB	Joint Coordination Board
JO	Joint Operation
OLAF	European Anti-Fraud Office
OPCOM	Operational Command
OPCON	Operational Control
OPlan	Operational Plan
RABIT	Rapid Border Intervention Team
SCIFA	Strategic Committee on Immigration Frontiers and Asylum
SNE	Seconded National Expert
TACOM	Tactical Command
TACON	Tactical Control
TEP	Technical Equipment Pool
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

UN	United Nations
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
VCLT	Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties

Note: The research for this thesis was completed in April 2017. Subsequent developments are therefore not reflected in this study. This dissertation is written in UK English and was submitted to language review.