*1. Please provide information on any recently adopted domestic legislation amending border entry, asylum and other international protection procedures for non-nationals since May 2021. Grateful if you could kindly submit the original text of the relevant provisions of the legislation or policy(ies), accompanied by an English translation if it is in a language other than English, French or Spanish.*

During 2021 several amendments were made to entry restrictions to Norway due to the corona virus. All entry restrictions were lifted on 26. November 2021. The right to seek asylum has not been affected by the entry restrictions at any time during the pandemic. The Interim Act relating to entry restrictions out of concern for public health and relevant regulation can be found in English [here](https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/2020-06-19-83) and [here](https://lovdata.no/dokument/SFE/forskrift/2020-06-29-1423) (unofficial translation). (Previous amendments should be available through the link.)

Amendments were made to the Immigration Regulation to strengthen the right to Immigration Board hearings in cases concerning credibility in relation to conversion. Moreover, the right to call witnesses is made clearer in these cases.

2. *Please provide information on recent or current border management legislation/policies/measures, (including those temporary measures as part of a state of emergency), with the view to control, reduce or prevent migrant arrivals in your country.*

Norway has since 2015 reintroduced temporarily control at parts of our internal borders to the EU. The reasoning for reintroducing and prolonging this measure has varied over time, but there is reference to an assessment of the terrorist threat to Norway. Reference has also been made to the potential for significant secondary movements into Norway of migrants with an undocumented identity.

*3. Please provide information on how the “safe third country” concept is applied and if there is any “safe third country” list in your country with the view to expedite border immigration and asylum procedures, as well as on any bilateral and multilateral agreement on collective/automatic re-admission of migrants of specific nationalities*.

The “safe third country” concept is regulated in the Norwegian Immigration Act, Section 32 (1) d, which is unofficially translated into English [here](https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/2008-05-15-35/KAPITTEL_4#KAPITTEL_4). It provides the Norwegian authorities with the power to, in certain situations, *refuse* to examine an asylum application on the merits if “the applicant has travelled to the realm after having stayed in a state or an area where the foreign national was not persecuted”.

The decision on whether an application may be refused an examination on the merits, is based on an individual assessment of each case. However, the power to refuse to examine an application on its merits under section 32 *does not apply* if the removal of the applicant would be in breach of the principle of *non-refoulement.*

Norway does not operate with a “safe third country”-list. However, Norway has a fast-track procedure for manifestly unfounded applications for asylum – “the 48 hour procedure”. The procedure has been in place for several years and has proven effective and beneficial. The first instance body (The Directorate of Immigration – UDI) shall process the case, make a decision and decide on a request for suspension within 48 hours from when the application is registered. Applications are decided on the merits, not dismissed, but in an expedited manner.

The procedure applies to citizens of countries that abide by human rights to an acceptable degree. An application from such nationals is presumed to be manifestly unfounded, but is removed from the procedure if, upon examination, it appears to have some merit. Applications that are not removed from the procedure, will be rejected on the grounds that there is no need for protection.

An application being rejected as manifestly unfounded has certain consequences (with some exceptions) that do not follow from an ordinary rejection:

* Expulsion
* No period for voluntary departure
* One week deadline for appeal
* Return may take place as soon as the first instance (UDI) has rejected a request for suspension (or the deadline for such a request has expired)

In most “regular” asylum cases, UDI grants suspension and return is not carried out until the appeals instance has reviewed the case. This is not the case in the 48 hour procedure. Norway considers review by the first instance to be sufficient when there is no arguable claim of human rights breaches – e.g. when an application has been rejected as manifestly unfounded.

*4. Please provide information on any progress made in developing independent border monitoring mechanism(s) at the national level.*

Norway is part of the Schengen agreement with the EU, hence we are taking part in the mechanisms in place within the EU.

On the national level Norway has The Parliamentary Ombud for Scrutiny of the Public Administration (the Parliamentary Ombud) which is responsible for scrutinising the public administration and all persons in its service in order to prevent individuals from being subjected to injustice, and in order to help ensure that the public administration respects and safeguards human rights. This is however an “Ombudsman” scrutinising the public administration in general, and there are no other specific monitoring mechanism in place as regards the border.