



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Voluntary return and the limits of individual responsibility in the EU Returns Directive

Mommers, C.M.F.

Citation

Mommers, C. M. F. (2022, February 10). *Voluntary return and the limits of individual responsibility in the EU Returns Directive*. Meijers-reeks. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3264310>

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/1887/3264310>

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

Voluntary return and the limits of individual responsibility in the EU Returns Directive

Voluntary return and the limits of individual responsibility in the EU Returns Directive

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 10 februari 2022
klokke 11.15 uur.

door

Christian Martijn Francis Mommers

geboren te Harmelen

in 1979

Promotoren: Prof. dr. P.R. Rodrigues
Prof. dr. P. Boeles, emeritus

Promotiecommissie: Prof. dr. N.J. Schrijver
Prof. J.J. Rijpma
Prof. dr. G. Noll (University of Gothenburg)
Prof. dr. M.H.A. Strik (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen)

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

© 2022 C.M.F. Mommers

Behoudens de in of krachtens de Auteurswet van 1912 gestelde uitzonderingen mag niets uit deze uitgave worden vervoelvoudigd, 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.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation has been a process of stops and starts, trying to balance academic research with my professional and private life, more successfully during some periods than others. The various drafts have travelled with me from the Netherlands to Israel to Slovakia, back to the Netherlands, and finally to France. The relief of not having to pack up my notes and source materials if we decide to move again is almost worth it in itself.

I would not even have come close to completion without the wonderful and infinitely patient tandem of my promotor and co-promotor, professors Peter Rodrigues and Pieter Boeles. Pieter's openness and enthusiasm when I approached him many years ago provided me with the energy to dive into it. His approach of 'let's see how far we get' was the perfect way of giving me the freedom and confidence to explore my topic in different ways. While Peter 'inherited' me and my project after taking over Pieter's role at the Institute for Immigration Law, he was never anything less than fully supportive of my efforts, while also instilling in me a sense of structure and ensuring I kept my eye on the end goal of finishing. Although neither of them could have guessed at the time it would still take so long to get to this point, I hope this dissertation reflects the best of both worlds that Peter and Pieter's combined efforts brought.

I feel lucky to have benefitted from such a great doctorate committee, whose collective knowledge and track record made me very nervous, but whose comments were extremely helpful in putting the finishing touches on this dissertation: professor Gregor Noll, whose work inspired some of the key questions that helped shape my approach to this issue; professor Tineke Strik, with her unparalleled knowledge of the Directive and seemingly limitless supply of energy; professor Nico Schrijver, a preeminent voice on international law whose keen eye was invaluable; and professor Jorrit Rijpma, for bringing a crucial wider perspective on EU practice on readmission and showing how much there is still left to explore.

As an external PhD candidate, opportunities to engage in academic life were few and far between. But the moments I did get to spend at the Institute of Immigration Law, which later became part of the Europa Institute of the Leiden Law School, were always stimulating. I warmly thank current and past colleagues for always being welcoming and helpful during my infrequent visits. My gratitude also goes out to all other staff at the Europa Institute.

What I may have lost in being (very) external, I gained from keeping my feet firmly planted in practice. Colleagues in various organisations over the years have (maybe sometimes unwittingly) played an important role, whether it was by discussing current issues related to my topic or just

being interested in how I got on. I thank the mission of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) in The Hague for giving me the initial space to embark on this process, and to all colleagues there for the many stimulating discussions about the dilemmas involved in voluntary return, which planted the seeds for this research. The Refugee Rights Clinic of Tel Aviv University gave me a 'home' and a place to stay grounded in Israel. I thank energetic, fun and dedicated colleagues in the Dutch section of Amnesty International, from whom I learned a lot on many different levels. And of course my current colleagues at the Office of the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, some of the brightest in the business, for their interest and support.

But most importantly, of course, I have to thank my family. They may not have fully understood what I was working on (or why), but they have mostly been so kind not to make fun of me for that. In that way it is hopefully a family achievement for my mother Ria and also my late father Frans, for whom the completion of this dissertation unfortunately did not come soon enough to be with us, but I hope he would have been excited about it. Thanks to my brothers Frans and Ardi, and their families: Josine, Isabelle, Emma, Jan, and Sielke. And, most of all, to my wife Mária, who has had to suffer through the entire process but gave me the space to hide away for periods – shirking my family duties – and giving up weekend and holiday time so I could write. Her equal measures of support and the necessary moments of 'isn't it about time you finish?' are part of the fabric of this dissertation. And finally, to my kids, Jonas, Zora and Hannah, who were not even born yet when I started, but who at last have an answer to their increasingly frequent question: 'daddy, when is your book done?'

Table of contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XVII
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Voluntary return and individual responsibility in the Returns Directive	1
1.2 The Directive in a nutshell	3
1.2.1 Background to the Directive	4
1.2.1.1 Adoption of the original Directive	4
1.2.1.2 Objectives of the Directive	4
1.2.1.3 Scope of the Directive and applicability to member states	5
1.2.2 Key elements of the return procedure	7
1.2.2.1 The return decision: the start of the return procedure	7
1.2.2.2 The obligation to return: setting the parameters of individual responsibility	8
1.2.2.3 The voluntary departure period: how much time to act responsibly is given?	8
1.2.2.4 Enforcement of the return decision	10
1.2.2.5 Other elements	11
1.2.3 The recast proposal	12
1.3 Voluntary return: a potentially vague and open-ended concept?	15
1.3.1 The obligation to return	16
1.3.2 The voluntary departure period	18
1.3.3 Voluntary return as limitless responsibility?	20
1.4 Research questions and approach	22
1.4.1 Overall research question and sub-questions	22
1.4.2 Methodology and approach	22
1.4.2.1 Breaking down the obligation to return into specific categories of action	23
1.4.2.2 A triangle model for dealing with questions of responsibility	25
1.4.3 Scope of the analysis and limitations	29
1.4.3.1 Specific focus on the voluntary return stage	29
1.4.3.2 The scope of return issues	30
1.4.3.3 The limits of the triangle model	31
1.4.3.4 Specific circumstances of the actors included in the analysis	33

1.4.3.5	Time limits on sources used	35
1.5	Chapter overview	35
2	BACKGROUND AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK	39
2.1	Introduction	39
2.2	Background	40
2.2.1	The (perceived) benefits of giving legal priority to voluntary return	41
2.2.2	Voluntary return in practice: some facts and figures	45
2.2.3	The priority of voluntary return under pressure?	48
2.3	Voluntary return as expulsion and as international movement	50
2.3.1	Voluntary return as expulsion	50
2.3.2	Voluntary return as international movement	53
2.4	EU law	54
2.5	International human rights law	56
2.5.1	The dual role of international human rights law	57
2.5.2	The right to leave any country, including one's own	58
2.5.2.1	The right to leave in the relationship between third-country national and the EU member state	59
2.5.1.2	The relevance of the right to leave to voluntary return under the Directive	60
2.5.1.3	The right to leave and state obligations to issue travel documents	61
2.5.3	The right to return	62
2.5.4	Remarks on the potential role of other instruments	63
2.6	Customary international law	65
2.6.1	Customary international norms on expulsion	66
2.6.1.1	Roles of customary international law with regard to expulsion	67
2.6.1.2	The International Law Commission's draft articles on the expulsion of aliens	68
2.6.1.3	The role of customary international law in the interpretation of the Directive	69
2.6.2	Customary international norms on readmission	69
2.7	Multilateral treaties	71
2.7.1	Conventions on air and maritime traffic	71
2.7.2	The UN Convention on Transnational Crime and its Protocols on Migrant Smuggling and Trafficking in Human Beings	74
2.7.3	The Vienna Convention on Consular Relations	75
2.8	Readmission agreements and arrangements	76
2.9	Policy documents and 'soft law' instruments	80
2.10	Concepts and terminology	82
2.10.1	Voluntary return and related concepts	82
2.10.1.1	Voluntary return v. voluntary departure	82

2.10.1.2	Voluntary return and the voluntary repatriation framework for refugees	84
2.10.1.3	Voluntary return and assisted voluntary return programmes	84
2.10.1.4	The notion of 'voluntariness': between coercion and choice?	85
2.10.2	Other terminology	87
2.10.2.1	Third-country nationals, aliens, non-nationals, and illegal stay	88
2.10.2.2	Destination countries	89
2.11	Concluding remarks	90
3	IDENTIFYING COUNTRIES OF RETURN AS OBLIGATORY DESTINATIONS	91
3.1	Introduction	91
3.2	The country of origin as an obligatory destination	93
3.2.1	'Country of origin': a definition	94
3.2.2	Application of 'country of origin' to individuals with a nationality	95
3.2.3	A stateless person's 'country of habitual residence'	97
3.3	A transit country as an obligatory destination	99
3.3.1	General requirements on transit countries being obligatory destinations	99
3.3.1.1	The existence of a transit situation and additional limitations	100
3.3.1.2	Further requirements regarding the content of agreements and arrangements	102
3.3.2	Specific instruments and their ability to make a transit country an obligatory destination	104
3.4	Another third country	106
3.4.1	Voluntarily deciding to go to another third country: meaning and implications	107
3.4.2	Admission to another third country	110
3.5	Conclusions	111
3.5.1	Implications for the third-country national's responsibility	111
3.5.2	Implications for the analysis	112
4	READMISSION OBLIGATIONS OF THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN AND IMPLICATIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY	115
4.1	Introduction	115
4.2	The country of origin's obligation to readmit nationals and implications for individual responsibility	116
4.2.1	Customary international law	116
4.2.2	Readmission agreements	119
4.2.3	Multilateral treaties	123
4.2.4	International human rights law	124

4.2.4.1	The content of the obligation to readmit as a function of the right to return	124
4.2.4.2	Should human rights-based obligations to readmit be distinguished from inter-state obligations?	127
4.2.5	Implications for third-country nationals seeking return to their country of nationality	129
4.2.5.1	Obligations on the third-country national to provide evidence of eligibility for readmission	130
4.2.5.2	Limits on the obligation to provide evidence for readmission	131
4.3	The readmission of habitually resident stateless persons and implications for their obligations	133
4.3.1	Customary international law	134
4.3.2	Readmission agreements	137
4.3.3	Multilateral treaties	138
4.3.4	Human rights instruments	140
4.3.4.1	The 1954 Statelessness Convention	140
4.3.4.2	The right to return under the ICCPR	141
4.3.5	Implications for stateless persons' obligations to seek readmission to their country of habitual residence	146
4.4	Conclusions	149
5	INEFFECTIVE INTER-STATE READMISSION DUTIES AND THE COMPULSORY EXERCISE OF THE RIGHT TO RETURN	153
5.1	Introduction	153
5.2	Reasons for the ineffectiveness of inter-state readmission obligations of countries of origin	154
5.2.1	Unlawfulness of expulsion	154
5.2.2	Justifications for non-readmission	155
5.2.2.1	Countermeasures	156
5.2.2.2	Force majeure	157
5.2.2.3	Necessity	158
5.2.2.4	Justifications and the link with the right to return	160
5.2.3	Diverging views on the existence of a customary duty to readmit?	161
5.2.3.1	Issues of evidence of the existence of a customary rule	161
5.2.3.2	Challenges to the reciprocal nature of the readmission obligations and other doctrinal issues	164
5.2.3.3	A North-South divide?	166
5.3	The compulsory exercise of the right to return	168
5.3.1	Willingness to return as a relevant factor?	168

5.3.2	The compulsory exercise of the right to return as a logical consequence of the return obligation?	172
5.3.3	Compulsory exercise of the right to return and the purpose of rights	173
5.3.4	The ECtHR on 'negative rights'	175
5.3.5	Re-assessing the individual right to return and the obligation to return to a country of origin	179
5.4	Conclusions	180
6	READMISSION TO TRANSIT COUNTRIES	183
6.1	Introduction	183
6.2	Return to transit countries under EU readmission agreements	185
6.2.1	Initial comments on readmission agreements and their relevance to returns to transit countries	185
6.2.2	Conditions for readmission	187
6.2.2.1	Irregular entry or stay in the EU member state	187
6.2.2.2	Link to the transit country	188
6.2.2.3	Exceptions	189
6.2.3	Means of evidence	190
6.2.4	Readmission applications	191
6.2.5	Implications for third-country nationals and EU member states	192
6.2.5.1	Triggering of readmission obligations: is the individual's consent needed?	192
6.2.5.2	Obligations to provide relevant information and evidence	195
6.3	Return to transit countries under multilateral treaties	198
6.4	Return to transit countries under non-binding arrangements	201
6.5	Conclusions	205
7	IDENTIFYING APPROPRIATE COUNTRIES OF RETURN IN THE INDIVIDUAL CASE: DESTINATION CHOICE AND SAFE RETURN	209
7.1	Introduction	209
7.2	Choice of destinations	211
7.2.1	Expulsion and destination choice in (the preparation of) the ILC draft articles	211
7.2.2	The right to leave as a right to choose one's own destination?	214
7.2.3	The right to return to one's own country and interferences with choice	216
7.2.4	A transit country as the third-country national's preferred destination	218
7.3	Avoiding unsafe returns: voluntary return, non- <i>refoulement</i> and questions of responsibility	220
7.3.1	Non- <i>refoulement</i> in the Directive: a symbolic inclusion or real function?	222

7.3.2	Does voluntary return negate member states' responsibility for <i>refoulement</i> ?	225
7.3.2.1	Voluntary return as a sign of safe return?	225
7.3.2.2	Voluntary return as a waiver for protection against <i>refoulement</i> ?	226
7.3.3	The scope of non- <i>refoulement</i> obligations during the voluntary departure period	231
7.3.4	Closing the protection gap during the voluntary departure period	232
7.4	Conclusions	238
8	OBTAINING TRAVEL DOCUMENTS	241
8.1	Introduction	241
8.2	Situations in which there is no need to obtain travel documents	243
8.2.1	Third-country nationals already in possession of valid travel documents and confiscation by the EU member state	243
8.2.2	Return without travel documents?	245
8.3	Third countries' obligations to issue travel documents	246
8.3.1	The link between readmission obligations and the issuance of travel documents in inter-state instruments	246
8.3.2	The right to return and the right to travel documents	248
8.3.3	The right to leave and the right to travel documents with the broadest possible validity	249
8.3.4	The obligation to issue travel documents under the 1954 Statelessness Convention	252
8.4	Interactions with the competent authorities: requirements and limitations	254
8.4.1	Access to consular authorities	254
8.4.2	Dealing with fees for travel documents and other demands	257
8.4.3	The prevention of the procurement and use of fraudulent travel documents	261
8.5	The EU member state as an issuing authority?	262
8.6	Conclusions	265
9	PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS AND DEPARTURE FROM THE EU MEMBER STATE	269
9.1	Introduction	269
9.2	Fulfilling obligations for exiting the member state	270
9.2.1	Fulfilment of specific conditions in the individual case	270
9.2.2	General conditions for exiting external borders	271
9.3	Return assistance and the obligation to return	273
9.3.1	Return assistance and voluntary return: general comments	273

9.3.2	A right to return assistance under the Directive?	275
9.3.3	An obligation to seek assistance?	280
9.4	When have third-country nationals successfully ‘returned’?	282
9.4.1	Proof of arrival in the destination state: an unsettled matter?	282
9.4.2	Departure from the member state and the lack of a European effect	285
9.4.3	A gap in the Directive?	289
9.5	Conclusions	290
10	THE PRIORITY OF VOLUNTARY RETURN AND THE THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONAL’S ENTITLEMENT TO A VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE PERIOD	293
10.1	Introduction	293
10.2	General principles governing the priority of voluntary return	295
10.2.1	Formulation of the priority for voluntary return in the Directive	295
10.2.1.1	A right under EU secondary law	295
10.2.1.2	Undermining of a return procedure: a relevant factor?	296
10.2.2	The priority of voluntary return and fundamental rights	299
10.2.2.1	The right to leave as a right to voluntary return?	299
10.2.2.2	Voluntary departure as a mechanism to safeguard fundamental rights	300
10.3	Denying a voluntary departure period for reasons of public policy, public security or national security	301
10.3.1	The <i>Zh. and O.</i> case: the CJEU’s first engagement with the voluntary departure period	302
10.3.2	<i>Zh. and O.</i> and the denial of a voluntary departure period due to a risk to public policy	303
10.3.2.1	Requirements for considering a risk to public policy	303
10.3.2.2	Circumstances to be taken into account	305
10.3.2.3	Automatic application of Article 7(4), denial and the need for a fresh examination	306
10.3.3	Implications of the judgment beyond the risk to public policy	307
10.3.3.1	Risks to public security and national security	307
10.3.3.2	Implications for the application of Article 7(4) generally	308
10.4	Denying a voluntary departure period and the risk of absconding	309
10.4.1	General principles to be applied to the risk of absconding	309
10.4.2	‘Objective criteria defined by law’	310

10.4.3	The meaning of absconding and its relation to non-cooperation and non-return	313
10.4.3.1	Towards a definition of 'absconding'	313
10.4.3.2	The conflation of absconding with non-cooperation or non-return	316
10.4.4	Absconding and the 'mere fact' of illegal stay	319
10.4.5	Criminal law issues and the risk of absconding	322
10.4.6	Measures to prevent absconding and the right to a voluntary departure period	323
10.5	Denying a voluntary departure period in case of manifestly unfounded or fraudulent applications	324
10.6	Considering a voluntary departure period shorter than seven days: a necessary step to ensure proportionality?	328
10.7	The limits of provisions denying voluntary departure as compatible with fundamental rights	331
10.8	Conclusions	334
11	THE LENGTH OF THE VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE PERIOD	337
11.1	Introduction	337
11.2	Establishing an appropriate voluntary departure period	338
11.2.1	The 'appropriate' length of the voluntary departure period and effective enjoyment of the right to voluntary return	340
11.2.2	Individual circumstances: a role for concerns about non-compliance and non-cooperation?	342
11.2.3	Decision-making about the voluntary departure period: a joint effort?	345
11.2.3.1	Cooperation obligations of third-country nationals: providing relevant information about their 'starting position'	345
11.2.3.2	Due diligence obligations of the member state?	347
11.2.4	Minimum voluntary departure periods	350
11.2.4.1	Extremely short voluntary departure periods	350
11.2.4.2	The shortest period possible?	351
11.2.5	Assigning voluntary departure periods on the basis of the third-country national's (prior) legal status	352
11.3	Extending a voluntary departure period	353
11.3.1	The extension of a voluntary departure period 'where necessary'	354
11.3.2	Specific circumstances of the case to be taken into account	356
11.3.2.1	What does it mean to take circumstances 'into account'?	357
11.3.2.2	Financial interests and property rights as circumstances to be taken into account?	359

11.3.3	The links between the initial voluntary departure period and extension	360
11.4	Cutting short a voluntary departure period already granted	361
11.5	Conclusions	364
12	CONCLUSIONS	367
12.1	Introduction	367
12.2	Conclusions on the obligation to return (<i>research questions 1a and 1b</i>)	368
12.2.1	The obligation to seek readmission to destination countries (<i>return element (i)</i>)	369
12.2.1.1	Obligatory destinations	370
12.2.1.2	Specific obligations with regard to readmission to countries of origin	373
12.2.1.3	Specific obligations in relation to transit countries	379
12.2.1.4	Choice of destinations and avoiding unsafe returns	381
12.2.2	The obligation to obtain travel documents (<i>return element (ii)</i>)	385
12.2.3	The obligation to make arrangements for departure (<i>return element (iii)</i>)	389
12.3	The application of the voluntary departure period (<i>research questions 2a and 2b</i>)	392
12.3.1	The entitlement to a voluntary departure period and possibilities of denial (<i>research question 2a</i>)	393
12.3.1.1	The general principles governing the priority of voluntary return	393
12.3.1.2	Denial of a voluntary departure period for reasons of public policy, public security or national security	394
12.3.1.3	Denial of a voluntary departure period because of a risk of absconding	395
12.3.1.4	Denial of a voluntary departure period in case of manifestly unfounded or fraudulent applications	398
12.3.1.5	Considering a voluntary departure period shorter than seven days	399
12.3.1.6	Incompatibility of certain provisions and proposals with fundamental rights	399
12.3.2	The appropriate length of the voluntary departure period (<i>research question 2b</i>)	400
12.3.2.1	The initial voluntary departure period	400
12.3.2.2	Extension of the voluntary departure period	402
12.3.2.3	Cutting short a voluntary departure period	404

12.4 Responsibility for voluntary return: towards a more nuanced understanding and application	404
12.4.1 The importance of the external dimension	405
12.4.2 The individual and the member state: voluntary return as shared responsibility	407
12.4.3 A fair and transparent application of responsibility for voluntary return: proposed guidelines	410
PROPOSED GUIDELINES ON INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR VOLUNTARY RETURN IN THE CONTEXT OF THE EU RETURNS DIRECTIVE	413
SAMENVATTING (SUMMARY IN DUTCH)	425
REFERENCES	443
LIST OF CASES	465
LIST OF EU READMISSION AGREEMENTS AND AGREEMENTS RELATED TO READMISSION REFERENCED	471
LIST OF MULTILATERAL TREATIES REFERENCED	473
CURRICULUM VITAE	475

List of abbreviations

ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific states
ACVZ	<i>Adviescommissie Vreemdelingenzaken</i> (Dutch Advisory Committee on Migration Affairs)
AFP	<i>Agence France-Presse</i>
AG	Advocate General
AP	Associated Press
ARSIWA	Articles on the Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts
AVR(R)	Assisted Voluntary Return (and Reintegration)
CFR	EU Charter of Fundamental Rights
CJEU	Court of Justice of the EU
CoE	Council of Europe
CMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CTOC	UN Convention against Transnational Organised Crime
DG HOME	Directorate-General for Home Affairs of the European Commission
DIS	Danish Immigration Service
DRC	Danish Refugee Council
DT&V	<i>Dienst Terugkeer en Vertrek</i> (Dutch Repatriation and Departure Service)
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
EC	European Community
ECJ	European Court of Justice
ECommHR	European Commission on Human Rights
ECRE	European Council on Refugee and Exiles
ECSR	European Committee on Social Rights
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
EEA	European Economic Area
EEAS	European External Action Service
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
EP	European Parliament
EPRS	European Parliamentary Research Service
ERPUM	European Return Platform for Unaccompanied Minors
ESC	European Social Charter
ETS	European Treaty Series
EU	European Union
FAL Convention	Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic

FRA	EU Fundamental Rights Agency
HRC	Human Rights Committee
HRW	Human Rights Watch
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organisation
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ILC	UN International Law Commission
INLIA	<i>Internationaal Netwerk van Lokale Initiatieven met Asielzoekers</i> (International network of initiatives with asylum seekers)
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IMO	International Maritime Organisation
IRB	Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada
LIBE	Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs of the European Parliament
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NOS	<i>Nationale Omroepstichting</i> (Dutch national broadcast service)
OAS	Organisation of American States
OHCHR	UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
PACE	Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
PICUM	Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants
RD	Returns Directive
RDS	Repatriation and Departure Service
RWI	Raoul Wallenberg Institute
SBC	Schengen Borders Code
TI	Transparency International
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNTS	United Nations Treaty Series
WODC	<i>Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum</i> (Scientific Research and Documentation Centre of the Dutch Ministry of Justice)