



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Systemic accountability of the European Border and Coast Guard: the legal responsibility of Frontex for human rights violations**

Gkliati, M.

### **Citation**

Gkliati, M. (2021, November 11). *Systemic accountability of the European Border and Coast Guard: the legal responsibility of Frontex for human rights violations*. Meijers-reeks. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3240559>

Version: Publisher's Version

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3240559>

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

Systemic Accountability of the  
European Border and Coast Guard

The legal responsibility of Frontex for  
human rights violations



# Systemic Accountability of the European Border and Coast Guard

The legal responsibility of Frontex for  
human rights violations

PROEFSCHRIFT

Ter verkrijging van  
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,  
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties  
te verdedigen op donderdag 11 november 2021  
klokke 10.00 uur

*door*

Mariana Gkliati

Promotoren: Prof. dr. mr. P.R. Rodrigues  
Prof. dr. L.F.M. Besselink (Universiteit van Amsterdam)

Promotiecommissie: Prof. dr. N.M. Blokker  
Dr. V. Moreno-Lax (Queen Mary, University of London,  
UK)  
Prof. dr. S. Carrera (the European University Institute,  
Florence, Italy)  
Prof. dr. R.A. Lawson  
Prof. dr. M.L.P. Loenen

Lay-out: AlphaZet prepress, Bodegraven  
Printwerk: Ridderprint, Alblasserdam

© 2021 M. Gkliati

*Behoudens de in of krachtens de Auteurswet van 1912 gestelde uitzonderingen mag niets uit deze uitgave worden veeelvoudigd, opgeslagen in een geautomatiseerd gegevensbestand of openbaar gemaakt, in enige vorm of op enige wijze, hetzij elektronisch, mechanisch, door fotokopieën, opnamen of enig andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de auteur.*

*No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission of the author.*

*to Christos and Eleni*



## Acknowledgments – The myth of the lone genius

*“I felt that I had to do everything on my own, because asking for help was a sign that I was not intelligent enough. I now see how destructive this attitude was.”*

Martin Chalfie, 2008 Nobel Prize in Chemistry

The myth of the lone genius perpetuates the idea that our creative accomplishments are exclusively our own. Our achievements as scientists, academics, writers tend to be seen as solo pursuits, lavished by hiding the contributions of others. My experience in this doctoral journey has deconstructed for me this hyper-individualistic conception of creativity. Collaborating was key and a significant number of people have greatly accounted for this product.

I wish to acknowledge their contributions, but unfortunately, I can only mention some of them in this limited space. Such mention could not possibly fail to start from my promotor, Prof.dr.mr. P.R. Rodrigues. I am grateful for the opportunity to develop my proposal and work with him on my PhD at one of the most important universities in Europe. He has been a supervisor to count on and an extremely valued colleague.

My experience in the Netherlands has started with Dhr. prof. dr. L.F.M. Besselink at Utrecht University (then) who supported me through my Masters, mentored me, offered me countless opportunities, supervised my MA thesis, and agreed to accompany me as co-promotor in my PhD, this time from the UvA. I would enter his office in panic and leave with a solution. This journey would have not been possible without him.

I am also grateful to the Meijers Research Institute, which has chosen and financially supported my PhD project. Moreover, I would like to acknowledge Gerrie Lodder and Mark Klaassen, my colleagues at the Institute of Immigration Law, Damiaan van Eeten, Licette Claproth and all other library and administrative staff of Leiden University, who have tirelessly supported my research, teaching and other activities throughout the years. As I am starting the new chapter at Radboud University, I cannot but look back with gratitude and respect.

The Refugee Law Initiative (RLI), University of London, has been my research's second home. I have profited immensely from the opportunities, support, hospitality, mentoring, and feedback I have received from David Cantor, Sarah Singer, Violeta Moreno-Lax, and the RLI network.

Moreover, I need to acknowledge the Netherlands Network for Human Rights Research that has supported me in my starting years and expanded my horizons. Annick Pijnenburg and my fellow members at the Migration & Borders Working Group deserve special mention for the fruitful collaboration and enriching discussions.



I should also express my gratitude to the members of my Reading Committee that enhanced the quality of my work with their comments, along with all those colleagues that generously give their time, dedication, and ideas to each other. Academia may be a particularly competitive field – not always unsullied – but I feel the need to extend a warm thanks to all those keeping the academic culture of generosity alive. I should also extend a special thanks for the unseen work of mostly women academics and administrators keeping our institutions alive.

The PhD does not have to be a lonely process. Mine was not. Therefore, I would like to give a special thanks to colleagues from civil society, policy-makers, journalists, and lawyers who have kept me on my toes with their ever-burning questions. I am indebted to Statewatch's Tony Bunyan, Chris Jones and Jane Kilpatrick, for their hospitality, support and invaluable contribution to my work with material and insights.

A warm thanks also to all my students at Leiden, the RLI, and the Roma Tre Law Clinic for all the energy and inspiration they gave me. When I was tired, discouraged, when I was doubting myself, I could always draw from the waves of their energy.

I am also grateful to Dimitris, my informal promotor for his career guidance and emotional support throughout my PhD. The contribution of my childhood friends, Despoina and Vasso, even though distant, has been invaluable. When everything around you is always changing it's important to have a constant in your life.

My dearest thanks to Antonia, Eduardo, Hariwa, Nacho, Sophia, Jeremy, Caspar, Jilles, Nikoletta, Merel, Sophia, Loes, Bas, Alex, Ying, and all my friends from KSU and ReInform for the interactions, triggers, debates, criticisms, support, and inspiration I draw from their example. Eternal gratitude I owe to Chrats, Kleoniki, Aman Molli and all my musical friends in Greece and in the Netherlands for keeping me sane and on track with the rest of my life.

Finally, my deepest gratitude goes to my parents for their constant support, patience and self-sacrifice, especially sacrificing all these years without me and not once making me look back, for they know we would have all turned into stone.

# Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS – THE MYTH OF THE LONE GENIUS	VII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XIII
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1 Background and context	1
2 Research aim and research questions	3
3 Scope and delineation	6
4 Academic relevance	8
4.1 Contextualisation in the body of literature	10
5 Societal relevance	12
6 Methodology	13
6.1 Human rights embeddedness	14
6.2 Do you believe in Human Rights?	14
PART I EMPIRICAL:THE DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN RIGHTS SENSITIVITIES	17
2 FRONTEx: SEPARATING THE INSIDERS FROM THE OUTSIDERS	19
1 Introduction	19
2 Frontex and the European Border and Coast Guard	19
2.1 The establishment	20
2.2 The mandate	24
2.2.1 <i>Original mandate</i>	25
2.2.2 <i>Frontex Regulation 2007 amendment</i>	26
2.2.3 <i>Regulation on Frontex immigration liaison officers’ networks</i>	28
2.2.4 <i>Frontex Regulation 2011 amendment</i>	28
2.2.5 <i>EUROSUR Regulation (2013)</i>	30
2.2.6 <i>Sea Operations Regulation (2014)</i>	34
2.2.7 <i>European Border and Coast Guard Regulation (2016)</i>	37
2.2.7.1 <i>Returns</i>	38
2.2.7.2 <i>Monitoring and supervisory powers</i>	39
2.2.7.3 <i>Intelligence Activities</i>	40
2.2.7.4 <i>Cooperation with Third Countries and at Hotspots</i>	40
2.2.7.5 <i>Individual Complaints Mechanism</i>	41
2.2.8 <i>European Border and Coast Guard Regulation 2019 amendment</i>	42
2.2.8.1 <i>Standing corps of 10,000 border guards</i>	42

2.2.8.2	Returns	43
2.2.8.3	In the centre of extensive data processing	44
2.2.8.4	Cooperation with Third Countries	44
2.3	Operational capacity	45
2.4	Joint operations in a nutshell	50
2.5	The European Border and Coast Guard: What it is and what it's not	51
3	Conclusions	52
3	HUMAN RIGHTS SENSITIVITIES AND THE NEED FOR PROTECTION FOR THE INDIVIDUAL	53
1	introduction	53
2	Joint border surveillance operations	54
2.1	Sea borders	54
2.2	Land borders	63
2.3	Air borders	64
2.4	Frontex as a humanitarian agent	64
2.5	The apprehended migrants in a member state	66
3	Return operations	67
4	Intelligence activities	70
5	Cooperation with Third States	72
6	Risk analysis	76
7	Conclusions	77
	PART II CONCEPTUAL: FROM MANY HANDS TO SYSTEMIC ACCOUNTABILITY	79
4	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK (I): RESPONSIBILITY	81
1	Introduction	81
2	The conceptual understanding of responsibility	81
2.1	The different readings of responsibility	82
2.2	Liability	88
3	The problem of many hands	89
4	The responsibility of Frontex	90
4.1	Fundamental rights obligations	90
4.2	The irresponsibility of the agency or the <i>problematique</i> of blame-shifting	93
4.3	Fundamental rights find their place in Frontex work but a dangerous mindset remains	95
4.4	The Preliminary Question of the Responsibility of Frontex	96
5	Nexus and the problem of many hands	101
6	Conclusion	105
5	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK (II): ACCOUNTABILITY	107
1	Introduction	107
2	Accountability and its different readings	107

2.1	Accountability as answerability: the importance of the rule of law	108
2.2	A supranationalist starting point on accountability	110
2.3	Types of accountability as a social mechanism for answerability	112
2.4	The relationship between accountability, responsibility and liability	114
3	The answerability of Frontex before legal and non-legal fora	115
3.1	Non-legal accountability	115
3.2	Democratic or political accountability	116
3.3	Social accountability	118
3.3.1	<i>The Frontex Consultative Forum</i>	120
3.4	Professional accountability	122
3.5	Administrative accountability	123
3.5.1	<i>Financial oversight</i>	123
3.5.2	<i>External monitoring</i>	123
3.5.3	<i>The Fundamental Rights Officer</i>	124
3.5.4	<i>The Fundamental Rights Strategy</i>	126
3.5.5	<i>The individual complaints mechanism</i>	127
3.6	Interim Conclusion	131
3.7	Legal accountability: From individualist to systemic accountability	133
3.8	The traditional approach to accountability and its limitations	134
3.9	A Cue from Rawls' Theory of Justice and Court Practice	135
3.10	Systemic Accountability as Limitation of Coercive Power	139
3.11	The identifying features of systemic accountability and its practical implementations	141
4	Conclusion	144
PART III NORMATIVE: PLURALISM IN HUMAN RIGHTS PROTECTION		147
6	A NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK ON RESPONSIBILITY	149
1	Introduction	149
2	A normative framework found in the interaction of international and EU law	149
2.1	Responsibility of Frontex or the Union?	151
2.2	Frontex as a matter of international law: a pluralist interpretation of EU law	157
2.3	Applying non-binding law?	161
3	The ARIIO principles and the angles of attribution	163
3.1	The internationally wrongful act	164
3.2	Attribution of conduct	165
3.3	Agents of an international organization	166
3.4	Exercise of effective control	167

3.4.1	<i>Normative power</i>	169
3.4.2	<i>Decision-making power (operational command and control)</i>	169
3.4.3	<i>De facto power</i>	170
3.4.4	<i>Disciplinary power</i>	170
3.4.5	<i>Power to prevent a violation</i>	170
3.4.6	<i>Degree of effective control</i>	171
3.5	Dual attribution of conduct	171
3.6	Rules of indirect attribution of responsibility	174
3.7	Aid and Assistance	175
3.8	Direction and Control	177
4	Conclusions	178
7	APPLICATION OF THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK TO THE EBCG	181
1	Introduction	181
2	Direct responsibility	181
2.1	Are the agency's new statutory staff de jure agents of Frontex?	182
2.2	Do non-staff members of the standing corpse constitute de facto organs of Frontex?	183
2.3	Does Frontex have effective control over the conduct of the seconded officers?	184
2.4	Dual attribution of responsibility in EBCG operations	187
3	Indirect responsibility	188
3.1	Is Frontex responsible due to aid and assistance?	188
3.2	Is Frontex responsible through direction and control?	189
4	De jure or de facto competence	190
5	The problem of many hands in EBCG operations	192
6	The Nexus theory and the responsibility of multiple actors	193
6.1	Joint Responsibility in general EU law and the EBCG Regulation	193
6.2	The Meaning and Practical Implications of Joint responsibility	195
6.3	The nexus in the rules of attribution of responsibility	198
6.4	Rules of Invocation of Responsibility	199
6.5	The advantages of the Nexus theory in EBCG operations	203
6.6	The limitation of the Nexus theory and a systemic accountability solution	204
7	Conclusion	205
	PART IV APPLIED:LEGAL REMEDIES AND LITIGATION AVENUES	209
8	LEGAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN PRACTICE: CJEU	211
1	Introduction	211
2	Legal accountability in the EBCG regulation	212

3	Legal remedies and the jurisdiction of the CJEU	214
4	Preliminary reference procedure	214
5	Complaints by privileged applicants	216
6	Action for annulment and failure to act	217
6.1	Individual access hindrances in an action for annulment	218
6.1.1	<i>Public interest litigation</i>	222
6.2	Admissibility in EBCG operations	223
6.3	Reviewable acts of the agency	225
6.3.1	<i>The reviewability of the decision on individual complaints mechanism</i>	225
6.3.2	<i>Reviewability of the risk analysis</i>	227
6.3.3	<i>Reviewability of the refusal to access documents</i>	229
7	Action for damages	230
7.1	Admissibility	231
7.2	Merits	234
7.3	Illegal act	234
7.4	Damage	236
7.5	Causal link	237
7.6	Complications of the action for damages in EBCG operations	240
7.7	The limits of the competence model	241
7.8	Non-binding opinions	244
7.9	Positive obligations – breach by omission or failure to act	245
8	Action for damages for joint liability	247
8.1	Towards a fundamental common law on joint liability	247
8.2	The binaries of causality and the competent court	249
8.3	EU joint liability against the background of the nexus and systemic accountability	252
8.4	A new route for joint liability through the principle of subsidiarity	256
8.5	Action for damages summarised	258
9	Conclusions	259
9	LEGAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN PRACTICE: ECtHR AND DOMESTIC COURTS	263
1	Introduction	263
2	European Court of Human Rights	264
2.1	Present status of the EU before the ECtHR	264
2.2	The accession of the EU to the ECHR: a recurring promise	265
2.3	The Accession Agreement	266
2.4	The nexus and systemic accountability after the accession	268
2.5	The future of the Bosphorus presumption	272
3	Domestic courts	275

3.1	Domestic courts complementing the EU system of legal remedies	275
3.2	In search of systemic accountability: the national judge ruling on damages	276
3.3	Ruling on the liability of members of teams	278
3.4	The relevance of national courts in the ECHR legal system	280
4	Conclusion	281
10	GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	283
1	Forming a hypothesis on responsibility and accountability	283
2	The fundamental rights obligations of the agency	284
3	Responsibility in EBCG operations: a matter of interaction between EU and international law	285
4	The responsibility of Frontex	286
4.1	Direct responsibility	286
4.2	Indirect responsibility	287
5	Legal accountability difficult but not impossible	288
6	Summing up the remedies before the CJEU	290
7	Nexus and systemic accountability	292
7.1	The Nexus theory	293
7.2	Joint responsibility	294
7.3	Systemic accountability	295
7.4	The solution on joint liability through the principle of subsidiarity	296
7.5	Living up to the standards of responsibility and accountability	298
8	The future of joint liability and systemic accountability before the ECtHR	299
9	Recommendations: the way forward	300
	SUMMARY	303
	SAMENVATTING (DUTCH SUMMARY)	305
	LITERATURE	309
	CURRICULUM VITAE	359

# List of Abbreviations

ACP	States of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific
AFIC	Africa-Frontex Intelligence Community
ARIO	Articles on the Responsibility of International Organizations
ARS	Articles on the Responsibility of States
CAT	Convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
CFI	Court of First Instance
CFR	Charter of Fundamental Right of the European Union
CJEU	Court of Justice of the European Union
CoE	Council of Europe
CPMP	Committee from Proprietary Medicinal Products
CPT	Committee for the Prevention of Torture
CRATE	Centralised Record of Available Technical Equipment
EASA	European Union Aviation Safety Agency
EASO	European Asylum Support Office
EBCG	European Border and Coast Guard
EBCGA	European Border and Coast Guard Agency
EC	European Commission
ECDC	European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control
ECRE	European Council on Refugees and Exiles
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EDPS	European Data Protection Supervisor
EEC	European Economic Community
EGC	General Court
EMA	European Medicines Agency
EP	European Parliament
ETIAS	European Travel Information and Authorisation System
EU	European Union
EUROPOL	European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation
EUROSUR	European Border Surveillance System
FRA	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights
FRO	Frontex Fundamental Rights Officer
FRS	Fundamental Rights Strategy
FRY	Former Republic of Yugoslavia
GUE/NGL	European United Left-Nordic Green Left
HRW	Human Rights Watch
IBM	EU's Integrated Border Management
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICJ	International Court of Justice
IICPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights



---

ILC	International Law Commission
ILOs	Immigration Liaison Officers
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JHA	Justice and Home Affairs Council
LIBE	European Parliament Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NHRIs	National Human Rights Institutions
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PACE	Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
PCU	External Borders Practitioners' Common Unit
RABIT	Rapid border intervention teams
SADC	African Development Community
SBC	Schengen Borders Code
SCIFA	Strategic Committee on Immigration, Frontiers and Asylum
SIS	Schengen Information System
TEC	Treaty establishing the European Community
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
UK	United Kingdom
UMOSOM	United Nations Operation in Somalia
UN	United Nation
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
VIS	Visa Information System