



European Migration Network (EMN)

EMN FOCUSED STUDY 2014

Good Practices in the return and reintegration of irregular migrants: Member States' entry bans policy & use of readmission agreements between Member States and third countries

Top-line 'factsheet'/Executive summary (National Contribution: Norway)

National contribution (one page only)

Overview of the National Contribution – introducing the study and drawing out key facts and figures from across all sections of the Focussed Study, with a particular emphasis on elements that will be of relevance to (national) policymakers.

Executive summary from NORWAY

This report presents Norwegian experiences with the use of *entry ban* and *readmission agreements* as tools and measures to promote and facilitate assisted voluntary and forced return to country of origin, of irregular third country national (TCN).

The study shows a lack of established routines to prepare statistics for some of the included items. This indicates a need to develop more advanced systems and/or options for registration of information about individual cases, which will enable delivery of more complex statistical information. Lack of relevant statistics also indicates that the use of, and the experiences with, *entry bans* and *readmission agreement* as a tool in return policy have a limited history and, as a consequence, only to a limited degree have been established and implemented as a strategic tool in an operational return policy.

The main conclusion of the study is that *entry bans* to enhance the national return policies, only are used to a limited degree.

Norway's ambition is to assess the need for an entry ban in all relevant cases, and on an individual basis. However, lack of adequate resources has not made that possible. No evaluation of the effects of using entry bans as a tool for return policy has been carried out in Norway.

In Norway, imposing entry bans is done by both *the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration* (UDI) and the *National Police Immigration Service* (NPIS). This shared responsibility is considered to give a high degree of flexibility in the implementation of the entry bans regulation.

All entry bans are registered in SIS by UDI.

Readmission agreements concluded by the European Commission on behalf of the Union do not cover Norway. Joint statements by the Commission and the third countries on the appropriateness of similar agreements with Norway and Iceland have facilitated the conclusion of similar bilateral agreements. Yet,

the application of these bilateral agreements are not registered. Thus, we cannot provide any statistics.

Norway has concluded bilateral readmission agreements with nineteen countries. Unfortunately, relevant statistics are only available for returns to Russia and Ethiopia.

Readmission requests to countries of origin are only submitted for cases involving forced return. IOM processes cases relating to assisted voluntary return.

Norway has a tripartite Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Government of Afghanistan, and UNHCR on voluntary and forced return of Afghan nationals from Norway to Afghanistan. The MoU includes return and reintegration support, both for voluntary and forced returnees.

The value of the separate bilateral readmission agreements is their contribution to facilitate effective returns. The return agreements regulate, promote and contribute to a common understanding of the procedures for sending verification applications and applications for travel documents.

Section 3 Entry bans (maximum 10 pages)

This section reviews the national legal framework for imposing entry bans, in particular the grounds for issuing an entry ban (including criteria/indicators for assessing whether the grounds apply in individual cases), the categories of third-country national who can be issued such a ban, and the territorial scope of the entry ban. It also provides an overview of the authorities responsible for the imposition and decision-making of entry bans. The practical implementation of entry bans is explored by reviewing the extent to which Member States use a graduated approach, where entry bans are withdrawn or suspended depending on individual circumstances and the category of third-country national. Cooperation between Member States when implementing entry bans is addressed by reviewing whether Member States enter an alert into the SIS following imposition of an entry ban and by reviewing the information exchange/consultation processes including existing information sharing mechanisms between Member States. The section finally also includes questions about the perceived or actual effectiveness of entry bans, the main challenges associated with entry bans and any evidence of good practice.

SECTION 3.1 NATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK ON ENTRY BANS: GROUNDS FOR IMPOSITION OF ENTRY BANS AND CATEGORIES OF THIRD-COUNTRY NATIONAL SUBJECT TO ENTRY BANS

Q1. In your Member State, which scenario applies to the imposition of entry bans?

- a) Entry bans are automatically imposed when the return obligation has not been complied with OR when no waiting period for voluntary departure has been granted

According to the Norwegian Immigration Act section 66, second paragraph, an entry ban shall be imposed in such cases, unless an entry ban would constitute a disproportionate measure in the particular case.

However, in many cases it is not possible to know whether the return obligation has been complied with or not, unless the person has participated in assisted voluntary return, has been returned by force or has been apprehended in Norway as being illegally present. If the TCN is apprehended the person will normally be subject to an entry ban.

(Yes/No)

- b) Entry-bans are automatically imposed on all return decisions other than under a)

No.

(Yes/No)

- c) Entry bans are issued on a case by case basis on all return decisions other than a)

Yes.

(Yes / No)

Q2a. What are according to national legislation in your Member State the grounds for imposing entry bans? Please answer this question by indicating whether the grounds defined in national law include the following listed in the table 3.1 below. In the final column, please add more detailed information on the criteria/indicators used to decide whether particular grounds apply in individual cases:

Table 3.1: Grounds for imposing entry bans

Grounds for imposing entry bans	Yes/No	Please provide information on the criteria/indicators used to decide whether particular grounds apply in individual cases
Risk of absconding ¹	Yes	All assessments are made on a case by case. If the grounds mention in 3.1. are present in a case, entry ban is imposed. If grounds mention in table 3.2. are present then these are considered on an individual basis.
The third-country national concerned poses a risk to public policy, public security or national security ² .	Yes	
The application for legal stay was dismissed as manifestly unfounded or fraudulent ³	Yes	
The obligation to return has not been complied with ⁴	yes	
Other (e.g. please indicate and add rows as appropriate)		Working without work-permit. False information when applying for a residence permit, e.g. false identity, pro- forma marriage.

Q2b. What are the national grounds based upon which your Member State can decide **not** to issue an entry ban? Please answer this question by indicating whether the grounds defined in national law include the following listed in the table 3.2 below. In the final column, please add more detailed information on the criteria/indicators used to decide whether particular grounds apply in individual cases:

Table 3.2: Grounds for not imposing entry bans

Grounds for not imposing entry bans	Yes/No	Please provide information on the criteria/indicators used to decide whether particular grounds apply in individual cases

¹ As stipulated in the Return Directive Article 11 (1) (a) in combination with Article 7(4).

² As stipulated in the Return Directive Article 11 (1) (a) in combination with Article 7(4).

³ As stipulated in the Return Directive in Article 11(1)(a) in combination with Article 7(4).

⁴ As stipulated in the Return Directive Article 11(1)(b).

Humanitarian reasons	Yes	For instance: Minors, victims of trafficking.
Right to family life (Article 8 ECHR)	yes	
Health reasons	Yes	

Q3. Please provide a short overview of the categories of third-country national that can be issued an entry ban by completing the table 3.3 below:

Table 3.3: Categories of third-country national who can be issued an entry ban

Categories of third-country national who can be issued an entry ban⁵	Who comply voluntarily with return decision (Y/N)	Who do not cooperate with return decision (Y/N)
Third-country nationals staying illegally on the territory of a Member State (including residence/visa over-stayers, rejected applicants for international protection, third-country nationals who entered the territory illegally)	Depends on previous illegally stay. If the TCN has stayed illegally for a long period before the return decision, an entry ban can be imposed even though the TCN returns voluntarily.	Yes
Third-country nationals who are subject to a refusal of entry in accordance with Article 13 of the Schengen Borders Code	Normally not unless they are considered to be threat to public order or security	Yes
Third-country nationals who are apprehended or intercepted by the competent authorities in connection with the irregular crossing by land, sea or air of the external border of a Member State and who have not subsequently obtained an authorisation or a right to stay in that Member State	No	Yes
Third-country nationals who are subject to return as a criminal law sanction or as a consequence of a criminal law sanction	Yes	Yes
Other (please indicate and add rows as appropriate)		

⁵ Based on Article 2 Return Directive

Q4. Specify the territorial scope of entry bans that are imposed by your Member State, i.e. do they apply to the entire EU territory or do they only cover the national territory of the Member State? If both types of entry bans can be imposed, please indicate that this is the case.

In most cases entry bans will apply for the entire Schengen-area (registration in SIS). But if the TCN has a resident permit in another Schengen country, a national entry ban may be issued.

Q5. Which institution(s) in your Member State decides whether or not to issue an entry ban on third-country nationals who are the subject of a return decision? Please specify whether this concerns for example the police, border police, immigration service, asylum agency etc.

The Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (UDI)

SECTION 3.2 PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF ENTRY BANS

Q6. Who informs third-country nationals of the imposition of the entry ban and what procedure is used to convey this information? Please specify

An expelled third-country national is informed about the entry ban in the expulsion decision. The Police inform the TCN. If necessary with the assistance of an interpreter. If the third country national has a lawyer, the lawyer will inform the TCN.

In all cases, the TCN is informed by the police or UDI in advance of any expulsion decision which includes an entry ban.

Q7. Do third-country nationals who have been imposed an entry ban have the possibility to appeal the decision? (Yes/No) Specify whether this is laid down in national law (make reference to the national legislation and the provision) and specify the concerned court of appeal

Yes, according to the Norwegian Immigration act, section 76.

Q8. Please indicate whether entry bans can be withdrawn or suspended in your Member State, specifying the categories of third country national who may be withdrawn/suspended from an entry ban, and explain the circumstances or reasons for this by filling out the table 3.4 below:

Table 3.4: withdrawal and suspension of entry bans

Categories of third-country national who can be exempted from an entry ban	Entry ban can be withdrawn or suspended (Y/N)	If yes, please provide information on the criteria/indicators used
Third-country nationals who can demonstrate that they have left the territory of the member State in full compliance with a return decision	Yes	

Victims of trafficking in human beings who have been granted a residence permit pursuant to Council Directive 2004/81/EC (provided they do not represent a threat to public policy, public security or national security)	Yes, in individual cases.	<p>This with reference to section 70 : <i>A foreign national may not be expelled where, in view of the seriousness of the offence and the foreign national's connection with the realm, expulsion would be a disproportionate measure against the foreign national concerned or the person's closest family members. In cases concerning children, the child's best interests shall be a fundamental consideration.</i></p> <p>and section 38 in The Norwegian Immigration Act</p> <p>A residence permit may be granted even if the other conditions laid down in the Act are not satisfied provided there are strong humanitarian considerations or the foreign national has a particular connection with the realm.</p> <p>To determine whether there are strong humanitarian considerations, an overall assessment shall be made of the case.</p> <p>For Further details, please see The Norwegian Immigration act: http://www.regjeringen.no/en/doc/laws/acts/immigration-act.html?id=585772</p>
Minors	Yes	See section 70 and section 38, The Norwegian Immigration Act
Unaccompanied Minors	Yes	See section 70 and section 38, the Norwegian Immigration Act.
Disabled people	Normally not	See section 70 and section 38, The Norwegian Immigration Act
Elderly people	Normally not	See section 70 and section 38, the Norwegian Immigration Act.
Pregnant women	Normally not	See section 70 and section 38, the Norwegian Immigration Act.

Single parents with minor children	Normally not	See section 70 and section 38, in The Norwegian Immigration Act.
Persons with serious illness	Yes, in individual cases	See section 70 and section 38 in The Norwegian Immigration Act.
Persons with mental disorders	Yes, in individual cases	See Section 70 and section 38 in the Norwegian Immigration Act.
Persons who have been subjected to torture, rape, or other serious forms of psychological, physical or sexual violence (e.g. victims of female genital mutilation)	Yes, in individual cases	See section 70 and section 38 in the Norwegian Immigration Act.
Other humanitarian reasons, (please indicate and add rows as appropriate)		
Other individual cases or certain categories of cases for other reasons (please indicate and add rows as appropriate)		

Q9. Is the institution responsible for the imposition of the entry ban the same as the authority that is competent to decide on withdrawal/suspension? Yes/ No. If not, or in case other actors are involved, please specify which ones and comment on the cooperation between the two actors.

In Norway it is the Norwegian Directorate of Immigration (UDI) who is responsible for imposing entry bans, withdrawals of entry bans and their suspension. Any decision made by UDI may be appealed, according to the Norwegian Immigration Act. The UDI has to reconsider its decision upon an appeal. If the UDI does not change its decision it may be appealed to the Norwegian Immigration Appeals board (UNE). UNE may or may not change the decision. A negative decision by UNE may be appealed to the Norwegian Judicial system for consideration in all three levels. This happens very rarely.

When a third- country national has received a final decision in an expulsion case which includes an entry ban, the person in question has to leave the country before a set date. If the person does not leave on his/her own accord (including with the assisted voluntary return program), the Norwegian police Immigration Service (NPIS) may remove / organize the transport of the person out of Norway.

SECTION 3.3 COOPERATION BETWEEN MEMBER STATES

Q10. Does your Member State enter an alert into the SIS when an entry ban has been imposed on a third-country national? (e.g. see Article 24 (3) of Regulation No 1987/2006 – SIS)? (Yes/No)

Please specify whether;

- Alerts are entered into the SIS as standard practice
- Alerts are entered into the SIS on a regular basis
- Alerts are entered into the SIS on a case-by-case basis

a) Is standard practice.

Q11a. Does your Member State share information on the use of entry bans with other Member States? (Yes/No) Yes, through registration in SIS.

- | | | |
|--|----------|--------------|
| a) Your Member State exchanges information as a standard practice registration and consultation through SIS. | Yes / No | Yes, through |
| b) Your Member State exchanges information on a regular basis | Yes / No | |
| c) Your Member State exchanges information on a case-by-case basis | Yes / No | |

a) Norway exchanges information on entry bans in each single case with other MS.

Q11b. What type of information is shared with other Member States? Please indicate whether any or all of the following types of information are shared:

- a) Number of entry bans imposed (Yes/No) **yes**
- b) Identity of the individuals who have been imposed an entry bans (Yes/No) **Yes**
- c) Reasons for imposing the entry bans (Yes/No) **yes**
- d) Decision to withdraw an entry ban and reasons for this (Yes/No) **Yes**
- e) Decision to suspend an entry ban and reasons for this (Yes/No) **Yes**
- f) Any other information (please specify)

When a third country national is removed to another MS, information is passed on from the National Police Immigration Service (NPIS) to the receiving country regarding whether the TCN has been expelled from Norway or not. All information elements a) – e) will be included.

Q11c. How is information shared with other Member States? Please provide an overview of the existing mechanisms to share information (e.g. via the Schengen Information System, bilateral exchange of information either face-to-face, over the telephone, via e-mail, other?)

Via Schengen Information System (SIS)

When a TCN is removed to another MS, the National Police Immigration Service (NPIS) makes sure that a form with the information regarding each deportee is handed to the police of the receiving country upon arrival. When the deportee is escorted, the escorting police officer will hand over the form. When a deportee is travelling unescorted, the form is handed to the captain of the flight, who will pass the form to the police in the receiving country upon arrival. The form usually contains confidential information regarding "details on rejection / expulsion from Norway". When a third country national is deported to Spain, information regarding whether the person has violated Norwegian Immigration or penal law is included.

Q12a. Article 11 (4) stipulates that "where a Member State is considering issuing a residence permit or other authorisation offering a right to stay to a third-country national who is the subject of an entry ban issued by another Member State, it shall first consult the Member State having issued the entry ban and shall take account of its interests in accordance with Article 25 of the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement". Please describe the processes how these consultations take place; indicate which authorities are involved as well as the method of consultation.

The Immigration authorities will in such cases consult the other member state through standard procedures in SIS. Based on information about the grounds for registering the person into SIS, Norway will assess whether to grant a residence permit or not.

Q12b. Has your Member State ever issued a residence permit or any other authorisation offering a right to stay to a third-country national who is the subject of an entry ban imposed by another Member State? (Yes/No); If yes, please indicate the number of residence permits issued to third-country nationals in these circumstances.

Yes. Statistics not available.

Q12c. In case your Member State has issued a residence permit or any other authorisation offering a right to stay to a third-country national who is the subject of an entry ban imposed by another Member State, please specify the circumstances based on which such decisions were taken.

Normally strong family links to Norway, e.g. spouse, children.

SECTION 3.4 EFFECTIVENESS OF ENTRY BANS

Q13. Has your Member State conducted any evaluations of the effectiveness of entry bans? (Yes/No) If yes, please provide any results pertaining to the issues listed in the table 3.5 below. The full bibliographical references of the evaluations can be included in an Annex to the national report.

3.5: Entry ban's effectiveness

Aspects of the effectiveness of entry bans	Explored in national evaluations (Y/N)	Main findings
Contribute to preventing re-entry	N	
Contribute to ensuring compliance with voluntary return ⁶	N	
Cost-effectiveness of entry bans	N	
Other aspects of effectiveness (please specify)	N	

Q14. The following indicators have been developed in order to measure the effectiveness of entry bans as a means for enhancing the ability of (Member) States to carry out sustainable returns, or provide proxy measures of their effectiveness. If your Member State collects any statistics that would permit the population of these

⁶ i.e. to what extent does the graduated approach (withdrawal or suspension of the entry ban) contribute to encouraging third-country nationals to return voluntarily?

indicators, please indicate this is the case and provide the statistics for the last 5 years. The statistics should be provided as a total number from January 1st until December 31st of each year.

Table 3.6: National statistics on entry bans

Indicators (refer to 12 month period, if possible data should be disaggregated by category of third-country national)	Y/N	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Number of entry bans imposed		2194	2929	2509	3111	3928
Number of decisions to withdraw an entry ban		NA	NA	NA	26	33
Number of decisions to suspend an entry ban		191	183	112	102	87
Number of persons who are the subject of an entry ban who have been re-apprehended inside the territory (not at the border)		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Proportion of persons issued an entry ban who have returned voluntarily – out of the total number of persons that were issued an entry ban		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Proportion of persons who were not issued an entry ban who have returned voluntarily – out of the total number of persons that were imposed a return decision		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Q15. Please indicate whether your Member State has encountered any of the following challenges in the implementation of entry bans and briefly explain how they affect the ability of entry bans to contribute to effective returns.

Table 3.7: Practical challenges for the implementation of entry bans

Challenges associated with entry bans	Y/N	Reasons
It is difficult to ensure compliance with entry bans on the part of the third-country national concerned	Yes	Because there is no common entry/exit- system in Schengen. Many cross the internal border from other

		Schengen countries. Due to lack of intra- Schengen border controls
It is difficult to monitor compliance with entry bans	Yes	Due to lack of intra- Schengen border controls
It is difficult to secure the cooperation of other MS in the implementation of entry bans ⁷	Not	
It is difficult to secure the cooperation of the country of origin in the implementation of entry bans	Yes	Countries of origin have no formal role in implementing entry bans, other than the duty to receive own- country nationals returned from Norway.
Other challenges (please specify and add rows as necessary)		

Q16. Please describe any examples of good practice in your (Member) State's implementation of entry bans, identifying as far as possible the reasons why the practice in question is considered successful. *In the synthesis report, these good practices will be compared and those which appear most transferrable to other Member States will be highlighted.*

Section 4. Readmission agreements⁸ (maximum 10 pages)

This section investigates the practical application of EU and separate bi-lateral readmission agreements of EU Member States with third countries. In particular, it attempts to ascertain how frequently EU and bi-lateral readmission agreements are used, any practical challenges Member States have experienced when carrying out return on the basis of readmission agreements and to what extent readmission agreements have been effective in ensuring the removal of irregular third-country nationals.

SECTION 4.1 INSTITUTIONAL SET-UP

Q17. Which authority is responsible for making applications for readmission to third countries in individual cases of forced and or voluntary return?

The National Police Immigration Service (NPIS) is responsible for making applications for readmission to third countries in individual cases of forced return.

SECTION 4.2 EU READMISSION AGREEMENTS

⁷ This could for example relate to problems in the use of the Schengen Information System, and/or the lack of a common system.

⁸ Please note that this Section only concerns readmission agreements with third countries and that any other readmission agreements with EEA countries are outside the scope.

Third-country nationals (including stateless persons)								
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 4.4: National Statistics on the number of returns under EU Readmission Agreement to third country 3 (specify the concerned third country)

	Number of readmission applications made to third country 3 based on EURAs				How many have concerned voluntary return?			
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2010	2011	2012	2013
Total numbers								
Own nationals								
Third-country nationals (including stateless persons)								

Q19. Has your (Member) State experienced any practical obstacles when implementing EU Readmission Agreements? Please answer this question by filling in the table below. Please specify in your answer whether problems are of a general nature and/or only experienced in relation to certain third countries. In case particular problems are experienced only in relation to specific third countries, please indicate which third countries these are (the latter is optional).

Table 4.4 Practical obstacles for the implementation of EU Readmission Agreements

Practical obstacles associated with EU readmission agreements	Yes/No	If yes, please specify whether only in relation to a specific third country, or more of general nature. Also illustrate the obstacle with an example in this column
Countries of origin do not cooperate in general		
Countries do not respect the deadlines		
Countries do not cooperate in relation to readmission applications of third-country nationals (as opposed to own nationals)		
Countries do not cooperate in relation to readmission applications of stateless persons (as opposed to own nationals)		
Countries do not issue travel document to enable readmission/return		
Gaps in own (Member) State's administrative capacity to implement readmission agreement		
Other obstacles (please add columns as necessary)		

Q20. Has your (Member) State conducted any evaluations of the effectiveness of EU and/or its bilateral readmission agreements?

(Yes/No) If yes, what issues have the evaluations covered? Please provide any results pertaining to:

Table 4.5 Findings of the evaluations of EU Readmission Agreements carried out by your MS (if applicable)

Aspects of effectiveness	Covered in national evaluations (Y/N)	Main findings
Recognition rates of readmission applications		
Other (please indicate and add rows as necessary)		

Q21. The following indicators have been developed in order to provide (proxy) measures of the effectiveness of EU and bilateral readmission agreements. If your Member State collects any statistics that would permit the population of these indicators, please indicate this is the case and provide the statistics for the last 5 years

Table 4.6: Indicators measuring the effectiveness of EU Readmission Agreements

Indicators (refer to 12 month period, if possible data should be disaggregated by own nationals and third country nationals, including stateless persons)	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Number of readmission applications sent					
Number of readmission applications that received a positive reply					
Number of requests for travel documents in the context of a readmission application					
Number of travel documents issued by third country after the positive reply					
Number of persons who were effectively returned					

Q22. Please provide an assessment of the added value of the EU Readmission Agreements in facilitating the effective returns in comparison with the period before the EU Readmission Agreements were concluded.

--

Q23. Does your Member State have any separate bilateral readmission agreements in place with third countries? Yes, Norway has separate bilateral readmission agreements with 19 different countries.

(Yes/No) If yes, please indicate the number of agreements, the third countries concerned, the date of the agreement, and the date of its entry into force

Afghanistan, signed 10.8.2005, entered into force 10.8.2005
 Albania, signed 12.9.2008, entered into force 1.5.2009
 Armenia, signed 20.1.2010, entered into force 26.6.2010
 Bosnia, signed 30.6.2005, entered into force 25.11.2007
 Burundi, signed 10.3.2009, entered into force 10.3.2009
 Ethiopia, signed 26.1.2012, entered into force 26.1.2012
 Georgia, signed 10.11.2011, entered into force 25.1.2012
 Hong Kong, signed 15.9.2006, entered into force 1.1.2007
 Iraq, signed 15.5.2009, entered into force 15.5.2009
 Kazakhstan, signed 12.10.2010, has not yet entered into force
 Kosovo, signed 15.10.2010, entered into force 1.1.2011
 Macedonia, signed 25.9.2006, entered into force 21.6.2007
 Moldova, signed 21.3.2005, entered into force 9.8.2006
 Montenegro, signed 16.12.2009, entered into force 16.12.2009
 Russia, signed 8.6.2007, entered into force 1.12.2008
 Serbia, signed 30.11.2009, entered into force 1.6.2010
 Tanzania, signed 5.4.2011, entered into force 5.4.2011
 Ukraine, signed 13.2.2008, entered into force 1.9.2011
 Vietnam, signed 4.7.2007, entered into force 14.10.2007

Q24. Please provide any available statistics on the number of readmission applications that your Member State has submitted on the basis of separate **bilateral readmission agreements**. Please only provide such statistics for the three third countries to which most readmission applications are made. The statistics are to be provided separately for each third country by filling out tables 4.7, 4.8, and 4.9. Please distinguish, if possible, between own nationals and third-country nationals or stateless persons. If there have been any instances of voluntary return under the separate bilateral readmission agreements, please indicate this in the last column of the tables:

Table 4.7: National Statistics on the number of readmission applications made under separate bilateral readmission agreements to third country 1 (specify the country concerned).

Please note that only for Russia and Ethiopia, are relevant statistics currently available.

RUSSIA	Number of readmission applications made to third country 1 based on separate bilateral readmission agreements				How many have concerned voluntary return?			
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2010	2011	2012	2013
Total numbers	277	290	173	119	0	0	0	0

Own nationals								
Third-country nationals (including stateless persons)								

Please note that several readmission applications may be submitted for the same Russian national, for example if the person absconds for a period or has provided incorrect identity information to Norwegian authorities.

Table 4.8: National Statistics on the number of readmission applications made under separate bilateral readmission agreements to third country 2 (specify the country concerned).

Please note that the the readmission agreement with Ethiopia was signed in 2012.

ETHIOPIA	Number of readmission applications made to third country 2 based on separate bilateral readmission agreements				How many have concerned voluntary return?			
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2010	2011	2012	2013
Total numbers	Na	na	34	23	0	0	0	0
Own nationals								
Third-country nationals (including stateless persons)								

Table 4.9: National Statistics on the number of readmission applications made under separate bilateral readmission agreements to third country 3 (specify the country concerned).

National Statistics on the number of readmission applications made under separate bilateral readmission agreements to third country 3 (specify the country concerned).	Number of readmission applications made to third country 3 based on separate bilateral readmission agreements				How many have concerned voluntary return?			
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2010	2011	2012	2013
Total numbers								
Own nationals								
Third-country nationals (including stateless persons)								

Please note that Norway only has statistics on the total number of persons (nationals and non-nationals) who are returned each year to the countries with which we have readmission agreements. These numbers do only to some extent reveal the number of readmission applications and applications for identity documents that are submitted to each country.

Q25. Please indicate the most common problems encountered in the implementation of separate bilateral readmission agreements by filling in the table 4.10 below. Please indicate whether problems are of general nature or whether these are only experienced in relation to specific third countries. In case particular problems are

experienced only in relation to specific third countries, please indicate which third countries these are (the latter is optional).

Table 4.10: Practical obstacles experienced under separate bilateral readmission agreements

Practical obstacles associated with separate bilateral readmission agreements	Yes/No	If yes, please specify whether only in relation to a specific third country, or more of general nature. Also illustrate the obstacle with an example in this column
Countries of origin do not cooperate in general	No	
Countries do not respect the deadlines	Yes	Specific third countries, e.g. Ethiopia, Russia.
Countries do not cooperate in relation to readmission applications of third-country nationals (as opposed to own nationals)	-	No information available.
Countries do not cooperate in relation to readmission applications of stateless persons (as opposed to own nationals)	-	No information available.
Countries do not issue travel document to enable readmission/return	Some	Ethiopia
Gaps in own (Member) State's administrative capacity to implement readmission agreement	NO	
Other obstacles (please add columns as necessary)		

Q26. Do any of the separate bilateral readmission agreements signed by your (Member) State include an article encouraging both Parties to promote the use of voluntary return? If yes, please indicate with which countries these agreements have been signed. If no, please confirm whether the agreements focus exclusively on readmission cases involving forced returns.

Yes, for Afghanistan and Ethiopia.

Q27. Does your Member State prefer to use separate bilateral readmission agreements instead of EU Readmission agreements with particular third countries? (Yes/No) If yes, please indicate with which third countries and the reasons for this.

Yes, as a consequence of the fact that Norway is not a EU- member state.

Q28. Has your (Member) State conducted any evaluations of the effectiveness of separate bi-lateral readmission agreements?

No.

(Yes/No) If yes, what issues have the evaluations covered? Please provide any results pertaining to:

Table 4.11: Evaluations on separate bilateral readmission agreements

Aspects of effectiveness	Covered in national evaluations (Y/N)	Main findings
Recognition rates of readmission applications		
Other (please indicate and add rows as necessary)		

Q29. The following indicators have been developed in order to provide (proxy) measures of the effectiveness of separate bilateral readmission agreements. Please provide the statistics for the three third countries to which most readmission applications are made on the basis of such agreements – these should be provided in a separate table for each of the third countries concerned (third country 1 in table 4.12; third country 2 in table 4.13; and third country 3 in table 4.14). If your Member State collects any statistics that would permit the population of these indicators, please indicate this is the case and provide the statistics for the last 5 years.

Table 4.12: Indicators measuring the effectiveness of separate bilateral readmission agreement with third country 1 (specify the country concerned)**RUSSIA**

Indicators (Refer to 12 month period for readmission applications made to third country 1. If possible data should be disaggregated by own nationals and third country nationals, including stateless persons)	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Number of readmission applications sent	115	227	290	173	115
Number of readmission applications that received a positive reply	90	187	265	150	85
Number of requests for travel documents in the context of a readmission application	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na
Number of travel documents issued by third country after the positive reply	Na	Na	Na	na	na
Number of persons who were effectively returned	57	102	362	245	205

Table 4.13: Indicators measuring the effectiveness of separate bilateral readmission agreement with third country 2 (specify the country concerned)**ETHIOPIA**

Indicators (Refer to 12 month period for readmission applications made to third country 2. If possible data should be disaggregated by own nationals and third country nationals, including stateless persons)	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Number of readmission applications sent	Na	Na	Na	34	23
Number of readmission applications that received a positive reply	Na	Na	Na		
Number of requests for travel documents in the context of a readmission application	Na	Na	Na	34	23
Number of travel documents issued by third country after the positive reply	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na
Number of persons who were effectively returned	Na	Na	Na	0	1

Table 4.14: Indicators measuring the effectiveness of separate bilateral readmission agreement with third country 3 (specify the country concerned) These statistics are not readily available.

Indicators (Refer to 12 month period for readmission applications made to third country 3. If possible data should be disaggregated by own nationals and third country nationals, including stateless persons)	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Number of readmission applications sent					
Number of readmission applications that received a positive reply					
Number of requests for travel documents in the context of a readmission application					
Number of travel documents issued by third country after the positive reply					

Number of persons who were effectively returned					
---	--	--	--	--	--

Q30. Please provide an assessment of the added value of the separate bilateral readmission agreements in facilitating effective returns in comparison with the period before the separate bilateral readmission agreements were concluded. Please only provide this assessment for the separate bilateral readmission agreements conducted with the three third countries to which most readmission applications are made.

Russia: The return agreement with Russia has contributed to a common understanding of the procedures for sending verification applications and applications for travel documents, and thus facilitated the returns.

Ethiopia: The return agreement has increased the number of voluntary returns to Ethiopia from Norway.

Section 5. Entry bans and readmission agreements: understanding the synergies with reintegration assistance (maximum 3 pages)

In view of the important role that reintegration assistance can play in ensuring the sustainability of returns, this section examines the dependencies that might exist between entry bans and readmission agreements, on the one hand, and reintegration assistance, on the other hand; it also explores the extent to which decision-makers in charge of issuing entry bans and making readmission applications cooperate with the officials in charge of granting / administering reintegration assistance. The answers to these questions will be used in the Synthesis Report to determine whether greater cooperation between the relevant authorities would lead to better outcomes for sustainable return.

Q31. Do the authorities in charge of imposing an entry ban subsequently consult with and/or inform the authorities in the concerned third country to which the individual is to be returned? If yes, at which stage in the process of imposing an entry ban is the third country consulted/informed? And if yes, do third countries subsequently impose travel bans on third-country nationals who were imposed an entry ban?

When a TCN is deported to a third- country, a form is handed over to the authorities (immigration) in the respective receiving country regarding the deportee (either by the escort from Norway, or via the captain of the aircraft carrying the deportee). If the person has been expelled from Norway, the form contains information about this. No information is given about the length of the entry ban.

If the TCN is returned with his/her own passport, a stamp is placed there, telling that he /she has been expelled from the Schengen area. The length of the entry ban is written into the passport under the stamp. This stamp will be visible to the immigration control officers in the receiving country.

Q32. Is it possible in your (Member) State for returnees who have been the subject of an entry ban to apply for re-integration assistance? (Yes/No) If yes, please indicate in which circumstances.

Yes. As a basic rule, the applicant would be accepted for re- integration assistance when accepted for the Voluntary assistance return programme. The only reasons for not being accepted for voluntary return and reintegration assistance, is that preparations for forced return have been made and are to

take place in the near future.

Q33. (If answered yes to question 32), are the competent authorities involved in making decisions about the use of entry bans and granting of re-integration assistance the same? Yes/No. **Yes.**

Q34. (If answered no to question 33), have any formal cooperation mechanisms been set up to facilitate coordination? (e.g. Protocols, contracts, conventions, working arrangements, etc.). Yes/No. If yes, please describe.

No

Q35. (If answered no to question 34), do the competent authorities consult with each other when making decisions? If yes, do these consultations take place on a regular basis as a standard practice, or are consultations only made on very few / exceptional occasions?

No

Q36. Does your (Member) State offer re-integration assistance to returnees who have been removed on the basis of a readmission agreement? Yes/No. If yes, please indicate in which circumstances.

Yes, for Afghan nationals. Forced returnees to Afghanistan are offered reintegration service in Afghanistan, both cash and in-kind reintegration service is offered.

Q37. (If answered yes to question 36), are the competent authorities involved in making readmission applications and granting re-integration assistance the same? Yes/No.

No.

Q38. (If answered no to question 37), have any formal cooperation mechanisms been set up to facilitate coordination? (e.g. Protocols, contracts, conventions, working arrangements, etc.). Yes/No. If yes, please describe.

No.

Q.39 (If answered no to question 38), do the competent authorities consult with each other when making decisions? If yes, do these consultations take place on a regular basis as a standard practice, or are consultations only made on very few / exceptional occasions?

No.

Section 6. Statistics

Contextual statistics on number of returns, etc. may be added to this section (besides the specific statistics requested in the body of the report to populate the effectiveness indicators). The statistics working group will also be consulted about this possibility.

Section 7. Key findings/conclusions

The Synthesis Report will outline the main findings of the Study and present conclusions relevant for policymakers at national and EU level.

Final Version 5th March 2014



European
Commission