

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Abbreviations	15
Introduction	17
1. Framework of cooperation	18
2. Scope of the study	23
3. Terminology	24
Chapter One: Jurisdiction and Complicity in Extraterritorial Migration Control	29
1. Jurisdiction	30
1.1 Jurisdiction in general international law and in human rights treaties	30
1.2 Jurisdiction of a state, not of a court	33
1.3 Scope of the Convention <i>ratione personae, materiae, loci and temporis</i>	33
1.4 The territorial principle and the evolution of exceptions to it	34
1.4.1 Overview: the territorial principle and its exceptions	34
1.4.2 The <i>travaux préparatoires</i>	38
1.5 The exceptions	39
1.5.1 Effective control	39
1.5.1.1 The meaning of effective control	40
1.5.1.2 Effective control of a place?	46
1.5.1.3 Non-military control over other areas	48
1.5.1.3.1 Cooperation with the Republic of the Niger	49
1.5.1.3.2 EU Turkey Deal	51
1.5.1.3.3 Effective control in such cooperation?	51

1.5.2	State agent authority and control	56
1.5.2.1	Consular and diplomatic agents	57
1.5.2.1.1	Development of the case law on the question of the exercise of jurisdiction in the context of consular and diplomatic agents	57
1.5.2.1.2	Visas	58
1.5.2.1.3	Immigration Liaison Officers	62
1.5.2.1.4	Conclusion	64
1.5.2.2	Executive or judicial functions carried out by Convention States in accordance with custom, treaty or other agreement	65
1.5.2.2.1	The exception and the role of attribution	65
1.5.2.2.2	The example of the European Coast and Border Guard (ECBG)	69
1.5.2.3	Extraterritorial use of force	71
1.5.2.4	Conclusion	77
1.5.3	Extraterritorial effects of Convention State measures	77
1.5.4	Criticism of the Court's approach to extraterritorial jurisdiction – a functional approach?	80
1.5.5	Conclusion	85
1.6	Territorial acquiescence or connivance in the acts of foreign officials	85
1.7	Conclusion	87
2.	State responsibility for aid and assistance under Art. 16 ASR	88
2.1	The customary status of Art. 16 ASR	89
2.1.1	What is customary law?	89
2.1.2	Is Art. 16 ASR customary law?	91
2.1.2.1	State practice	92
2.1.2.2	Opinio iuris	95
2.1.3	Conclusion	96
2.2	The scope of Art. 16 ASR	96
2.2.1	The material element	97
2.2.1.1	Forms of “aid or assistance”	97
2.2.1.2	Connection between the conduct of the assisting state and the principal wrong	99

2.2.1.3.	The substantial link requirement in the context of proxy migration control	104
2.2.1.4	The lending of state organs as aid and assistance	108
2.2.1.5	Capacity building and training of third state officials	109
2.2.1.6	Conclusion	113
2.2.2	The mental element	113
2.2.2.1	Drafting history and Commentary	114
2.2.2.2	ICJ judgment in the Bosnian Genocide case and its reception	116
2.2.2.3	Element of shared purpose or desire to break the law?	118
2.2.2.4	The knowledge requirement	120
2.2.2.4.1	Degree of knowledge	120
2.2.2.4.2	Knowledge of what?	122
2.2.2.4.3	Relevant time	123
2.2.2.4.4	Relevant actor	124
2.2.2.4.5	Burden of proof	124
2.2.2.4.6	Conclusion	125
2.2.2.5	Mental element in the context of aid and assistance to human rights violations	125
2.2.3	The opposability element	128
2.3	The nature of responsibility under Art. 16 ASR	130
2.4	Conclusion	132
3.	Connection between the concepts of jurisdiction under Art. 1 ECHR and complicity under Art. 16 ASR	133
3.1	Territorial complicity	133
3.2	A new exception to the territorial notion of jurisdiction: Extraterritorial complicity	135
3.2.1	First solution: No responsibility for extraterritorial complicity	137
3.2.2	Second solution: extraterritorial obligations without jurisdiction	142
3.2.3.	Third solution: Extending Milanovic' third model	147
3.2.3.1	The suggestion	147
3.2.3.2	The concept of positive obligations and Milanovic' model	149

3.2.4	Fourth solution: The development of a new exception to the merely territorial notion of jurisdiction	150
3.2.4.1	The idea	151
3.2.4.2	The idea as <i>de lege ferenda</i>	152
3.2.4.3	Significance of customary international law	153
3.2.4.4	Significance of the ASR for the Convention	154
3.2.4.3.1	Jurisdiction and attribution	155
3.2.4.3.2	Jurisdiction and the concept of an internationally wrongful act	157
3.2.4.5	Dependence on the opposability requirement	159
3.2.4.6	Detachment from a spatial or personal element	160
3.2.4.7	Possible wide reach of the model in other areas of human rights law	164
3.3	Monetary Gold Principle in the context of the ECtHR	165
3.4	Complicity of two Convention States	167
4.	Conclusion	167
Chapter Two: State responsibility of EU member states in the context of externalised migration controls		169
1.	The European Union and the Convention	170
2.	The <i>Matthews</i> case: responsibility for human rights violations stemming from EU primary law	172
3.	Responsibility of EU member states	173
3.1.	The <i>Bosphorus</i> presumption of equivalent protection afforded by the European Union	174
3.2.	The requirement of a state act	178
3.2.1.	The decision in the case of <i>Behrami</i> and <i>Saramati</i>	178
3.2.2.	The <i>Behrami</i> decision from the perspective of the work of the ILC	181
3.2.2.1.	Conflict between the test for attribution applied by the ILC and the test applied by the ECtHR	182
3.2.2.2.	The possibility of dual or multiple attribution	183
3.2.3.	The application of the <i>Behrami</i> decision to the European Union	185

3.2.4. The case law of the ECtHR in the context of the EU in the light of the work of the ILC	189
3.2.5. Conclusion	191
3.3. EU member state responsibility for discretionary decisions	191
3.5. First case after Luxembourg stopped the accession: The Avotiņš case	197
3.6. Conclusion	201
4. The framework of externalised migration controls within the European Union	201
4.1. Strategic orientation of the EU	203
4.2. Policy dialogues on the regional level: The Khartoum process and the Rabat process	208
4.3. EU and member state action <i>in concreto</i>	211
4.3.1 Common Security and Defence Policy missions in the area of border control	211
4.3.2 European Border and Coast Guard Agency's (Frontex) operations	217
4.3.2.1. Frontex' cooperation with third countries	218
4.3.2.2. Joint operations hosted by third states	220
4.3.2.3. Member state responsibility in the framework of the European Border Surveillance System (EUROSUR)	222
4.3.3 Budgetary measures	223
4.3.3.1 EU trust funds for external action	224
4.3.3.2. EU Facility for Refugees in Turkey	228
4.3.3.3. Conclusion: budgetary measures	229
4.4 Conclusion on the framework of externalised migration control	229
5. Conclusion	230
Chapter Three: Violations of Substantive and Procedural Rights	231
1. Relevant international law obligations of the relevant States	232
1.1. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)	233
1.2. The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT)	233

2. Burden of proof and standard of proof	234
2.1. Burden of proof	234
2.2. Standard of proof	236
3. The right to life	238
3.1. The right to life in the ICCPR	238
3.2. Risk assessment: Danger for the right to life in third states	243
3.2.1. Libya	243
3.2.1.1. Excessive use of force	243
3.2.1.2. Risk to life during search and rescue operations by the Libyan Coastguard	244
3.2.1.3. Libya's approach to abuses by traffickers and smugglers	245
3.2.1.4. Deaths in immigration detention	246
3.2.1.5. Denied access to medical treatment for migrants	247
3.2.1.6. Conclusion: risk assessment – Libya	247
3.2.2. Turkey	248
3.2.3. Niger – the “Sahara cemetery” and the right to life	249
3.2.4. Conclusion	250
3.3. Art. 2 ECHR and the Convention state's obligations in the context of extraterritorial complicity	251
3.3.1. The substantive obligation	251
3.3.1.1. The substantive obligation de lege lata	252
3.3.1.2. A suggestion based on Art. 16 ASR	255
3.3.2. The procedural obligation	260
3.4. Conclusion	265
4. Freedom from Torture and Inhumane and Degrading Treatment	265
4.1. The prohibition of torture and inhumane and degrading treatment under the CAT and the ICCPR	266
4.2. Risk assessment	269
4.2.1. Libya	269
4.2.2. Turkey	271
4.2.3. Niger	273
4.3. The substantive and procedural obligations under Art. 3 ECHR in the context of extraterritorial complicity	274
4.3.1. The substantive obligation	275
4.3.1.1. The substantive obligation de lege lata	275

4.3.1.2. A suggestion based on Art. 16 ASR	278
4.3.2. The procedural obligation	281
4.4. Conclusion	283
5. Cooperation in violations of the non-refoulement principle	283
5.1 The right to non-refoulement in the ICCPR and the CAT	284
5.2 Risk assessment	287
5.2.1 Non-refoulement in Libya	288
5.2.2 Non-refoulement Turkey	288
5.2.3. Niger	291
5.2.4. Conclusion	293
5.3 Non-refoulement under the ECHR	293
6. Freedom from arbitrary detention	295
6.1 Right to liberty in the ICCPR	295
6.2 Risk assessment	299
6.2.1 Arbitrary detention of migrants in Libya	299
6.2.2. Arbitrary detention of migrants in Turkey	301
6.2.3. Arbitrary detention in Niger	304
6.2.4. Conclusion	305
6.3 The right to liberty in the ECHR	305
6.3.1. Diverging case law of the ECtHR and the HRC on immigration detention	306
6.3.2. Obligations under Art. 5 ECHR in case of extraterritorial complicity	310
7. The freedom of movement: The right to leave	311
7.1 Art. 12 (2) ICCPR	312
7.2 Risk assessment	315
7.3 Art. 2 (2) of the Fourth Protocol to the Convention	316
8. Justification of human rights violations by anti-trafficking policies	318
9. Conclusion	323
Conclusion	325
1. Main findings	325
2. Recommendations and concluding thoughts	332
Bibliography	335