



**Submission to the
UN Human Rights Committee
on the Draft Text of
General Comment 35 on Article 9:
Liberty and Security of the Person**

For the Consideration of the UN Human Rights
Committee, during the 109th Session of the
Committee, 14 October – 1 November 2013, Geneva.

October 2013

About the Equal Rights Trust

The Equal Rights Trust (ERT) is an independent international human rights organisation whose purpose is to combat discrimination and promote equality as a fundamental human right and a basic principle of social justice. ERT focuses on the complex relationship between different types of discrimination, developing strategies for translating the principles of equality into practice.

Contact

Dr. Dimitrina Petrova
Executive Director
Tel: +44 (0)20 7610 2786
E-mail: dimitrina.petrova@equalrightstrust.org

The Equal Rights Trust
314 – 320 Gray’s Inn Road
London
WC1X 8DP
United Kingdom

www.equalrightstrust.org
info@equalrightstrust.org

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 4 |
| Equality and Non-Discrimination | 5 |
| Immigration Detention | 6 |
| The Protection of Stateless Persons | 10 |
| Conclusion | 12 |
| Annex: | |
| ERT Guidelines to protect Stateless Persons from Arbitrary Detention | 14 |

Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

- 1. Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention. No one shall be deprived of his liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedure as are established by law.*
- 2. Anyone who is arrested shall be informed, at the time of arrest, of the reasons for his arrest and shall be promptly informed of any charges against him.*
- 3. Anyone arrested or detained on a criminal charge shall be brought promptly before a judge or other officer authorized by law to exercise judicial power and shall be entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release. It shall not be the general rule that persons awaiting trial shall be detained in custody, but release may be subject to guarantees to appear for trial, at any other stage of the judicial proceedings, and, should occasion arise, for execution of the judgement.*
- 4. Anyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings before a court, in order that that court may decide without delay on the lawfulness of his detention and order his release if the detention is not lawful.*
- 5. Anyone who has been the victim of unlawful arrest or detention shall have an enforceable right to compensation.*

Introduction

The Equal Rights Trust (ERT) is an independent international human rights organisation whose purpose is to combat discrimination and promote equality as a fundamental human right and a basic principle of social justice. ERT focuses on the complex relationship between different types of discrimination, developing strategies for translating the principles of equality into practice.

ERT has worked on human rights standards related to immigration detention, particularly in the context of statelessness for the past five years. ERT's contribution to the discourse and development of standards on this issue includes the publication of:

1. *Unravelling Anomaly, Detention, Discrimination and the Protection Needs of Stateless Persons* (2010),¹ and
2. *The Equal Rights Trust Guidelines to Protect Stateless Persons from Arbitrary Detention* (2012).²

ERT is also an active member of the International Detention Coalition, has participated in the UN High Commissioner for Refugees & Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights Expert Roundtable on Alternatives to Detention and served as an expert reviewer of the recently published *Safeguarding Principles on Immigration Detention and the Rule of Law*.³

ERT welcomes the Human Rights Committee's (the Committee, HRC) commitment to further improve and elaborate on the text of General Comment 8, by drafting General Comment 35 on Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). ERT particularly welcomes the openness of the drafting process and the invitation to non-governmental organisations to comment on the draft text and to remain engaged in the process through the first and second readings.

ERT's submission focuses on the issues on which ERT has engaged and developed an institutional expertise over a period of time, namely:

1. Equality and non-discrimination,
2. Immigration detention, and
3. The protection of stateless persons.

It is intended to draw the attention of the Committee to issues which ERT believes have either been inadequately addressed (equality and non-discrimination and immigration detention) or not addressed at all (the detention of stateless persons) by the draft text of General Comment 35. Given the centrality of principles of equality and non-discrimination to the entire text of the Covenant, the growing phenomenon of immigration detention and the continuing failure of states and international human rights bodies to adequately recognise the human rights impact of statelessness and protect stateless persons from human rights violations including arbitrary

¹ The Equal Rights Trust, *Unravelling Anomaly: Detention, Discrimination and the Protection Needs of Stateless Persons*, 2010, available at:

<http://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/UNRAVELLING%20ANOMALY%20small%20file.pdf>

² The Equal Rights Trust, *Guidelines to protect Stateless Persons from Arbitrary Detention*, 2010, available at: <http://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/guidelines%20complete.pdf>.

³ British Centre for International and Comparative Law, Bingham Centre for the Rule of Law, *Immigration Detention and the Rule of Law: Safeguarding Principles*, 2013, available at:

http://www.biicl.org/files/6559_immigration_detention_and_the_rol_-_web_version.pdf.

detention, ERT hopes the Committee will strongly consider this submission and ensure that the final text of General Comment 35 address the concerns and issues raised below.

Equality and Non-Discrimination

Part VII of the draft text (Paras 56 – 71) focuses on the “**Relationship of article 9 with other articles of the Covenant**”. ERT is of the position that this text can be further strengthened by reference to the provisions of the Covenant relating to equality and non-discrimination and their relationship with article 9. The present draft contains only one such reference in paragraph 65:

In light of article 2, paragraph 1, of the Covenant, States parties have obligations to respect and to ensure the rights under article 9 to all persons who may be within their territory and to all persons subject to their jurisdiction.

ERT is of the position that the draft text should include reference to Article 26 ICCPR and elaborate on the relevance of the principles of “equality before the law” and “the prohibition of discrimination” to the human right of liberty and security of the person”. In this context, ERT wishes to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the Declaration of Principles on Equality which reflects a “moral and professional consensus among human rights and equality experts (...) [and is] based on concepts and jurisprudence developed in international, regional and national legal contexts”.⁴ The Declaration expands on the text of Articles 2(1) and 26 of the Covenant (and other standards) and provides detailed and authoritative guidance on concepts including equal treatment (Article 2 of the Declaration), positive action (Article 3) and the definition of discrimination (Article 5).

ERT therefore recommends that the Committee reference and restate in the draft text, previous General Comments which emphasise the centrality of the principles of equality and non-discrimination to the Covenant and all its provisions.⁵

In particular, ERT submits that the Committee consider exploring further through the text of the draft General Comment, the nexus between discrimination and inequality on the one hand, and detention on the other. For example:

1. that equality before the law is an essential prerequisite to ensure that every step of the detention process is not arbitrary,
2. that states have a heightened obligation to protect individuals from discrimination, when under state custody,
3. that detention is often unlawfully used by states as a tool of discrimination,
4. that members of vulnerable groups are more likely to be arbitrarily detained,
5. that detention creates vulnerability (for example, the impact of lengthy detention on mental health), and
6. that members of vulnerable groups – in particular irregular migrants and stateless persons – are less likely to be able to successfully challenge arbitrary or unlawful detention.

⁴ The Equal Rights Trust, *Declaration of Principles on Equality*, 2008, available at: <http://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/Pages%20from%20Declaration%20perfect%20principle.pdf>.

⁵ For example, see General Comment No. 18 (1989) on Non Discrimination, which states “Non-discrimination, together with equality before the law and equal protection of the law without any discrimination, constitute a basic and general principle relating to the protection of human rights.”

ERT's work on immigration detention and statelessness has led us to conclude that migrants, particularly irregular and stateless migrants, are more vulnerable to all forms of discrimination and unequal treatment, often culminating in unnecessary, arbitrary and lengthy detention. As stated in the preamble to the ERT Guidelines:

While states have a sovereign right to control their borders and if necessary to use immigration detention for these purposes, they are obligated to do so in compliance with international human rights law, which provides that detention should never be arbitrary. The increasing use of immigration detention, including for punitive purposes, and the criminalisation of irregular migration by a growing number of states, is therefore a concerning trend. These developments have largely occurred without regard to the specific circumstances of stateless persons and the implications of international human rights law on the detention of stateless persons.

Consequently, ERT submits that the draft should, in particular, emphasise the applicability of the "rights set forth in the Covenant (...) irrespective of reciprocity, and irrespective of (...) nationality or statelessness".⁶

Finally, ERT wishes to direct the Committee to Guideline 14 of ERT's *Guidelines to protect Stateless Persons from Arbitrary Detention* (ERT Guidelines), according to which:

All persons, including stateless persons, are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal benefit and protection of the law, including equal and effective access to justice.

- (i) National laws, policies and practices pertaining to immigration detention should not discriminate against stateless persons and should not be applied in a discriminatory way.*
- (ii) Immigration detention regimes should be designed and implemented in a manner which takes due consideration of the specific circumstances of statelessness and of the obligations of the state in respect of stateless persons. States should refrain from both direct and indirect discrimination on grounds of statelessness and should ensure that they reasonably accommodate the particular circumstances of all stateless persons.*

It is highly desirable that national immigration laws, policies and practices are made compliant with the principles of equality and non-discrimination, and with national equality and non-discrimination laws and policies.

Immigration Detention

Paragraph 18 of the draft text relates to immigration detention. ERT is of the position that the issue of immigration detention, which is a global and growing phenomenon, and one of the forms of deprivation of liberty least subject to judicial oversight and other effective forms of scrutiny, requires further attention and authoritative comment by the Committee. While the ERT Guidelines specifically focus on the detention of stateless persons, they draw from established international, regional and national standards (including those set out in the Covenant and by the Human Rights Committee) relating to immigration detention and the deprivation of liberty

⁶ Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 15 (1986) on The Position of Aliens under the Covenant.

at the most general level. Consequently, the ERT Guidelines provide a broad overview of the human rights protections that all migrants should benefit from in the context of immigration detention, and ERT urges to Committee to strengthen the present draft text, with reference to the ERT Guidelines and the sources it draws from.

While many of the core principles espoused by the ERT Guidelines are stated in the draft text, ERT believes that the following Guidelines contain principles which should also be included in the text of the General Comment:

1. **Guideline 27:** *Immigration detention should solely be for the administrative purposes of preventing unlawful entry or removal. The following do not constitute legitimate objectives for immigration detention:*

- (i) *The imposition of detention as a deterrent against irregular migration is not lawful under international law.*
- (ii) *The imposition of detention as a direct or indirect punishment for irregular immigration is not lawful under international law.*
- (iii) *The imposition of detention as a direct or indirect punishment for those who do not cooperate with immigration proceedings is not lawful under international law.*
- (iv) *The imposition of detention for the purpose of status determination is not lawful under international law.*
- (v) *The imposition of detention solely to protect public safety or national security is not lawful under international law.*
- (vi) *The imposition of detention solely for the purpose of administrative expediency is not lawful under international law.*

The criminalisation of irregular migration and the use of immigration detention as a punitive tool is a growing global phenomenon. Not only is this arbitrary and illegal under international law, it is also deeply harmful, both to the individual migrant subject to detention and to migrants at large, as such practices shape and mould social discourse on migration and paint irregular migrants as criminals who should be punished and not as vulnerable persons in need of protection.

As stated by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, “[t]he great majority of immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers are not criminals and therefore should not be confined in detention centres like criminals”.⁷ Furthermore, the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention has stated that “Migrants in an irregular situation have not committed any crime. The criminalization of irregular migration exceeds the legitimate interests of States in protecting its territories and regulating irregular migration flows.”⁸

2. **Guideline 28:** *Removal will not be a legitimate objective and detention pending removal will therefore be arbitrary in instances where removal:*

- (i) *is not practicable within a reasonable period of time;*
- (ii) *violates international law obligations of non-refoulement;*
- (iii) *violates the individual’s right to remain in his or her own country;*
- (iv) *violates the individual’s right to respect for private and family life; or*

⁷ Pillay, Navanethem, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, *Immigrants among millions unlawfully detained*, 2 October 2008, available at: <http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/L2538064.htm>.

⁸ UN Human Rights Council, *Report of the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention to the Human Rights Council*, 13th Session, A/HRC/13/30/2010, Para 58.

- (v) *violates other international human rights law standards.*

With regard to the issue of removal, ERT wishes to bring to the attention of the Committee, the following statement of the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention:

[T]here are situations in which a removal order cannot be executed because, for example, the consular representation of the country of origin of the migrant does not cooperate or there is simply no means of transportation available to the home country. An example of a legal limitation for removal is the principle of non-refoulement. In such cases, where the obstacle to the removal of the detained migrants does not lie within their sphere of responsibility, the detainee should be released to avoid potentially indefinite detention from occurring, which would be arbitrary... The principle of proportionality requires that detention always has a legitimate aim, which would not exist if there were no longer a real and tangible prospect of removal.⁹

3. **Guideline 39:** *Detention should always be for the shortest time possible. There should be a reasonable maximum time-limit for detention. It is highly desirable that states do not detain stateless persons for more than six months. States which at present have a lower than six month maximum time-limit for detention are urged not to increase it, and all states are urged to review and reduce their maximum time-limit for detention.*

While the draft text does state that detention should not be indefinite, ERT is of the position that it is equally important to impress that detention be for the shortest possible time, with a stated maximum time-limit. Such protections are a necessary prerequisite for ensuring that detention not be arbitrary and be proportionate.

4. **Guideline 41:** *The administrative purpose behind the detention should be pursued with due diligence throughout the detention period, in order to ensure that detention does not become arbitrary at any stage. Detention should be subject to automatic, regular and periodic review throughout the period of detention, before a judicial body independent of the detaining authorities. If at any stage, it is determined that the administrative purpose can be achieved without detaining the person, the person should be released in conformity with Guidelines 55 – 60 below or subject to a suitable and proportionate alternative to detention in conformity with Guidelines 31 - 36.*

The principle of due diligence and regular review articulated in the Guideline above, draws from regional and international authority including the 1988 UN Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment:

1. A detained person or his counsel shall be entitled at any time to take proceedings according to domestic law before a judicial or other authority to challenge the lawfulness of his detention in order to obtain his release without delay, if it is unlawful.

2. The proceedings referred to in paragraph 1 of the present principle shall be simple and expeditious and at no cost for detained persons without adequate means. The

⁹ *Ibid.*, Para 62.

*detaining authority shall produce without unreasonable delay the detained person before the reviewing authority.*¹⁰

Similarly, the HRC has held that detention which may have initially been legal may become arbitrary if it is unduly prolonged or not subject to periodic review,¹¹ and that “detention should not continue beyond the period for which the State can provide appropriate justification”.¹²

5. **Guideline 42:** *As soon as it becomes evident that the administrative purpose cannot be achieved within a reasonable period of time, or that the detention otherwise becomes incompatible with the tests set out in Guidelines 23 - 30, or upon the expiration of the maximum time-limit for detention, the detainee should be released in conformity with Guidelines 55 – 60 below.*

This Guideline draws from the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, according to which, “where the obstacle to the removal of the detained migrants does not lie within their sphere of responsibility, the detainee should be released to avoid potentially indefinite detention from occurring, which would be arbitrary.”¹³

6. **Guideline 44:** *There should be effective and open access to, and independent and regular monitoring of detention centres, by National Human Rights Institutions, civil society organisations and UN bodies, to ensure that they comply with national and international legal requirements. States are urged to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT).*

This important protection against ongoing arbitrary detention is well entrenched under international law. According to the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants:

*In order to monitor the conditions of detention of migrants, the Special Rapporteur believes that independent visits are crucial. OHCHR, UNHCR, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), national human rights institutions and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) should be allowed access to all places of detention. In addition to allowing for such visits, the ratification by States of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, allowing for visits by the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and the establishment of a national preventive mechanism, is of utmost importance to ensure proper monitoring of places where migrants are detained.*¹⁴

¹⁰ UN General Assembly, *Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment: resolution / adopted by the General Assembly, A/RES/43/173*, 9 December 1988, Principle 32.

¹¹ De Zayas, A., “The Examination of Individual Complaints by the United Nations Human Rights Committee under the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights”, in Alfredsson, G. et al. (eds), *International Human Rights Monitoring Mechanisms*, The Hague, 2001, pp. 67-121.

¹² *C. v Australia*, CCPR/C/76/D/900/1999, UN Human Rights Committee, (2002), Para 8.2.

¹³ See above, note 8, Para 63.

¹⁴ UN Human Rights Council, *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants, François Crépeau*, 20th Session, A/HRC/20/24/2012, Para 32.

Additionally, ERT recommends that the draft text include a more detailed analysis and overview of the obligation to fully exhaust all alternatives to detention before detention is resorted to. There is increasing consensus around the importance of alternatives to detention – an issue championed by the International Detention Coalition, but also extensively explored by UNHCR and the OHCHR. In effect, the obligation to explore all viable alternatives is intrinsic to the notions of necessity and proportionality, and ERT is of the position that the draft text should set out this connection and emphasise the obligation to explore all viable alternatives before deciding to detain. In this light, the Committee Members are urged to refer Guidelines 31 – 36 of the ERT Guidelines.¹⁵

The Protection of Stateless Persons

ERT's research, advocacy and standard setting related to immigration detention has centred around the issue of statelessness. Stateless persons are particularly vulnerable to arbitrary detention, and despite the applicability of international human rights law, are less likely to benefit from protection. As stated in the preamble to the ERT Guidelines:

At present, the immigration laws, policies and practices of most states do not sufficiently take into account the unique characteristics that set stateless persons apart from other migrants. All non-stateless migrants have an effective nationality, benefit from the protection of their state and have a country to be returned to. Stateless persons however, are not considered nationals under the operation of the law of any state, and the de facto stateless do not have an effective nationality. Both groups lack the protection of a nation state, and are unlikely to have consular or diplomatic protection and/or documentation.

The failure to recognise the particular circumstances of statelessness has created a protection gap; this is most evident in the context of immigration detention for the purpose of removal.

All stateless persons (including the de facto stateless) should enjoy the rights accorded to them by international human rights law. Their rights should be respected, protected and fulfilled at all times, including in the exercise of immigration control (...)

The circumstances facing stateless persons are significant factors to be taken into account in determining the lawfulness of immigration detention. The process of resolving the identity of stateless persons and a stateless person's immigration status is often complex and burdensome. Lawful removal of such persons is generally subject to extensive delays and is often impossible. Stateless persons detained for these purposes are therefore vulnerable to prolonged detention. These factors in turn make stateless persons especially vulnerable to the negative impact of detention. The emotional and psychological stress of lengthy – even indefinite – periods of detention without hope of release or removal is particularly likely to affect stateless persons. The Guidelines explain how these factual circumstances should affect decisions as to the lawfulness of detaining a stateless person.

States are obligated by international law to treat stateless persons in a way which is appropriate in light of their statelessness. States will be unable to comply with that obligation unless they take measures to identify stateless persons within their

¹⁵ The ERT Guidelines are annexed to this submission.

territory and subject to their jurisdiction. The Guidelines set out the minimum standards which states should apply in relation to the identification of stateless persons.

The above quote explains the human rights impact of the detention of stateless persons. Statelessness is an important issue with significant human rights implications. ERT recognises past instances in which both the HRC and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) have commented on the protection afforded to stateless persons by both the ICCPR and the ICESCR.¹⁶ General Comment 35 provides a further opportunity to authoritatively restate the rights of stateless persons under international human rights law, in relation to liberty and security of the person in general and immigration detention in particular. ERT therefore submits to the Committee, that the draft text should mention the specific vulnerabilities related to statelessness and articulate the protective steps that states must take to ensure that stateless persons are not arbitrarily detained. In this context, the below Guidelines are specifically brought to the attention of the Committee:

1. **Guideline 13:** *States have an obligation to identify stateless persons within their territory or subject to their jurisdiction as a first step towards ensuring the protection of their human rights.*

The obligation to identify stateless persons is implicit to the 1954 Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons.¹⁷ However, ERT is of the position that there is a wider obligation to do so under the equality and anti-discrimination provisions of international human rights law including articles 2(1) and 26 ICCPR. Accordingly, states have an obligation to identify stateless persons in order to ensure their equal treatment by the law and that they are not subject to direct or indirect discrimination. As stated by the UNHCR:

*Statelessness is a juridically relevant fact under international law. Thus, recognition of statelessness plays an important role in enhancing respect for the human rights of stateless persons, particularly through access to a secure legal status and enjoyment of rights afforded to stateless persons under the 1954 Convention.*¹⁸

Please note that Guidelines 19 – 22 provide further guidance on the obligation to identify stateless persons in the particular context of immigration detention. UNHCR has stated in this regard that:

*For stateless persons, the absence of status determination procedures to verify identity or nationality can lead to prolonged or indefinite detention. Statelessness determination procedures are therefore an important mechanism to reduce the risk of prolonged and/or arbitrary detention.*¹⁹

7. **Guideline 23:** *The immigration detention of stateless persons is undesirable and there should be a presumption against their detention.*

¹⁶ For example, see Para's a & 8 of HRC General Comment 15, Para 20 of HRC General Comment 27, Para 10 of HRC General Comment 31, Para 9 of HRC General Comment 32, Para's 36 – 38 of CESCR General Comment 19 and Para's 5, 26 & 36 of CESCR General Comment 20.

¹⁷ Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, ECOSOC RES/526 A(XVII) (1954).

¹⁸ UN High Commissioner for Refugees, *Guidelines on Statelessness No. 2: Procedures for Determining whether an Individual is a Stateless Person*, 5 April 2012, HCR/GS/12/02, available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4f7dafb52.html>, Para 4.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Para 62.

It is either impossible or extremely difficult to remove stateless persons. Therefore, detention would either serve no administrative purpose (where removal is impossible), or it would be a disproportionate means of achieving an administrative purpose (where removal is likely to take an unreasonable length of time). According to the UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Migrants:

Stateless persons do not benefit from the consular or diplomatic protection of a State, often do not possess identity documents and do not have a country to which to be returned. Stateless persons are especially vulnerable to prolonged detention. Being stateless and therefore not having a country to which automatic claim might be made for the issue of a travel document should not lead to indefinite detention, and statelessness cannot be a bar to release.²⁰

The UNHCR in similar vein has stated that:

Statelessness, by its very nature, severely restricts access to basic identity and travel documents that nationals normally possess. Moreover, stateless persons are often without a legal residence in any country. Thus, being undocumented or lacking the necessary immigration permits cannot be used as a general justification for detention of such persons.²¹

Conclusion

ERT's recommendations to the Committee focus on equality and non-discrimination, immigration detention and the protection of stateless persons. Below, is a summary of the key recommendations:

Recommendations related to Equality and Non-Discrimination:

ERT recommends that Part VII of the draft text on the **"Relationship of article 9 with other articles of the Covenant"** be amended to include greater reference to principles of equality and non-discrimination enshrined in the Covenant; in particular, Article 2(1) and Article 26. The General Comment should emphasise the centrality of principles of equality and non-discrimination to the entire Covenant including Article 9. ERT also recommends that the Committee explore through the text of the General Comment, the nexus between discrimination and inequality on the one hand, and detention on the other. In this regard, ERT submits that the General Comment should emphasise that Article 9 offers equal protection from arbitrary detention to all members of vulnerable groups including irregular migrants and stateless persons.

Recommendations related to Immigration Detention

ERT recommends that the draft text on immigration detention be expanded to provide authoritative interpretation of the protection afforded by Article 9 in the context of immigration detention, which is a growing global phenomenon, and one of the forms of deprivation of liberty least subject to judicial oversight. ERT further recommends that the General Comment:

²⁰ See above, note 14, Para 47.

²¹ See above, note 18, Para 59.

1. State that immigration detention should solely be for the administrative purposes of preventing unlawful entry or removal, and should not be used as a means of deterrence or punishment.
2. Analyse when removal is likely to be a legitimate objective, and when it is not, making detention pending removal arbitrary.
3. Emphasise in addition to the statement that detention should not be indefinite, that detention should always be for the shortest time possible.
4. Elaborate on the principles of due diligence and regular review, and the connection between these concepts and that of arbitrariness.
5. Emphasise the duty to release detainees as soon as it becomes evident that the administrative purpose cannot be achieved within a reasonable period of time.
6. Underscore the importance of effective and open access to, and independent and regular monitoring of detention centres, by National Human Rights Institutions, civil society organisations and UN bodies.
7. Analyse in greater detail the legal obligation to fully exhaust all alternatives to detention before detention is resorted to. In this regard, to state that the obligation to explore all viable alternatives is intrinsic to the notions of necessity and proportionality, and consequently to that of arbitrariness.

Recommendations related to the Protection of Stateless Persons

ERT recommends that the Committee include within the General Comment, text on statelessness emphasising the general point that Article 9 of the Covenant equally applies to stateless persons, and the specific point that states have an obligation under Article 9, in conjunction with Articles 2(1) and 26 to ensure that all immigration regimes cater to the specific circumstances of statelessness and do not directly or indirectly discriminate against stateless persons by subjecting them to unnecessary, arbitrary and lengthy detention. ERT further recommends that the General Comment:

1. Mention the specific vulnerabilities related to statelessness and articulate the protective steps that states must take to ensure that stateless persons are not arbitrarily detained.
2. Emphasise that states have a human rights obligation to identify stateless persons within their territory or subject to their jurisdiction, and that in the context of immigration detention, this is a prerequisite to ensuring that states fulfil their obligations under Articles 9, 2(1) and 26 of the Covenant.
3. State that the immigration detention of stateless persons is undesirable and there should be a presumption against their detention.

ANNEX

GUIDELINES TO PROTECT STATELESS PERSONS FROM ARBITRARY DETENTION

PREAMBLE

The Guidelines to Protect Stateless Persons from Arbitrary Detention (the Guidelines) address a gap in the application of international law, which has made many stateless persons vulnerable to arbitrary detention and post release destitution. The Guidelines focus primarily on the immigration detention of stateless persons (including the de facto stateless), but may also be relevant in other contexts.

At present, the immigration laws, policies and practices of most states do not sufficiently take into account the unique characteristics that set stateless persons apart from other migrants. All non-stateless migrants have an effective nationality, benefit from the protection of their state and have a country to be returned to. Stateless persons however, are not considered nationals under the operation of the law of any state, and the de facto stateless do not have an effective nationality. Both groups lack the protection of a nation state, and are unlikely to have consular or diplomatic protection and/or documentation.

The failure to recognise the particular circumstances of statelessness has created a protection gap; this is most evident in the context of immigration detention for the purpose of removal.

All stateless persons (including the de facto stateless) should enjoy the rights accorded to them by international human rights law. Their rights should be respected, protected and fulfilled at all times, including in the exercise of immigration control. Stateless persons are also protected under the 1954 Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons (the 1954 Convention).

While states have a sovereign right to control their borders and if necessary to use immigration detention for these purposes, they are obligated to do so in compliance with international human rights law, which provides that detention should never be arbitrary. The increasing use of immigration detention, including for punitive purposes, and the criminalisation of irregular migration by a growing number of states, is therefore a concerning trend. These developments have largely occurred without regard to the specific circumstances of stateless persons and the implications of international human rights law on the detention of stateless persons.

The circumstances facing stateless persons are significant factors to be taken into account in determining the lawfulness of immigration detention. The process of resolving the identity of stateless persons and a stateless person's immigration status is often complex and burdensome. Lawful removal of such persons is generally subject to extensive delays and is often impossible. Stateless persons detained for these purposes are therefore vulnerable to prolonged detention. These factors in turn make stateless persons especially vulnerable to the negative impact of detention. The emotional and psychological stress of lengthy - even indefinite - periods of detention without hope of release or removal is

particularly likely to affect stateless persons. The Guidelines explain how these factual circumstances should affect decisions as to the lawfulness of detaining a stateless person.

States are obligated by international law to treat stateless persons in a way which is appropriate in light of their statelessness. States will be unable to comply with that obligation unless they take measures to identify stateless persons within their territory and subject to their jurisdiction. The Guidelines set out the minimum standards which states should apply in relation to the identification of stateless persons.

The Guidelines do not attempt to develop new legal principle. They reflect and apply the existing human rights obligations of states towards stateless persons within their territory and subject to their jurisdiction. The Guidelines also draw from international good practice, and recommend actions which go beyond the minimum obligations of international human rights law. Such recommendations provide guidance on how states could offer better protection to stateless persons within their territory and subject to their jurisdiction.

The Guidelines comprise four parts. Part One focuses on definitions, the scope and interpretation of the Guidelines and basic principles. Part Two focuses on the identification of stateless persons and Part Three on the detention of stateless persons. Part Four is a series of additional guidelines.

PART I - INTRODUCTORY GUIDELINES

DEFINITIONS

1. A **stateless** person is defined under international law as a person “who is not considered as a national by any state under the operation of its law”.ⁱ A person who cannot acquire and/or prove his or her nationality due to legal, administrative, procedural and/or practical barriers may be considered stateless under international law. A migrant whose nationality is undetermined should be protected as stateless until proven otherwise.
8. A **de facto stateless** person has a legal nationality which is ineffective. For example, a person who does not benefit from consular or diplomatic protection from his or her country of evident nationality, or a person who with valid reason renounces the protection of his or her country, is considered to be *de facto* stateless.
1. **Detention** is understood to mean deprivation of liberty in a confined place. When considering whether a stateless person is in detention, “the cumulative impact of multiple restrictions as well as the degree and intensity of each of them should be assessed.”ⁱⁱ
2. **Immigration detention** is a form of administrative detention used as a last resort when necessary for the sole purpose of achieving a legitimate administrative objective such as removal or the prevention of unlawful entry.
3. An **alternative to detention** is any legislation, policy or practice that imposes a less coercive or intrusive deprivation of liberty or restriction on movement than detention.
4. **Protected characteristics** are those characteristics which, according to international human rights law, must not be the basis of discrimination. Protected characteristics include

“race, colour, ethnicity, descent, sex, pregnancy, maternity, civil, family or carer status, language, religion or belief, political or other opinion, birth, national or social origin, nationality, economic status, association with a national minority, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, disability, health status, genetic or other predisposition toward illness”.ⁱⁱⁱ

SCOPE

5. The Guidelines generally apply to stateless and de facto stateless persons. Unless the Guidelines state otherwise, they should be understood to be equally applicable to both groups. Consequently, hereafter in the Guidelines, the term ‘stateless’ is generally intended to include the *de facto* stateless as well.
6. The Guidelines apply to the immigration detention of, and decisions to detain all stateless persons within the territory or subject to the jurisdiction of states. They also address the identification of stateless persons, which is a necessary pre-requisite for their adequate protection; and the treatment of persons released from detention.

INTERPRETATION

7. In all circumstances, the Guidelines should be interpreted in a manner which provides the greatest protection for stateless persons; promotes their human rights and protects them from arbitrary detention. Under no circumstances should the Guidelines be interpreted in a manner which limits the enjoyment of human rights by stateless persons.
8. Any exceptions to the protections stated in the Guidelines should be interpreted in the narrowest possible manner.
9. The Guidelines are primarily a reflection of the existing human rights obligations of states towards stateless persons within their territory or subject to their jurisdiction. Such Guidelines use directive language – i.e. “states should”, “states shall”, “states have a duty”, etc. Where the Guidelines contain good practice recommendations this is reflected through the use of more persuasive language – i.e. “it is desirable that” etc.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

10. States have a duty to respect, protect and fulfil the human rights of all stateless persons within their territory or subject to their jurisdiction, including the right to be free from arbitrary detention. The human rights obligations of states in respect of stateless persons apply at all times, including in the exercise of immigration control.
11. States have an obligation to identify stateless persons within their territory or subject to their jurisdiction as a first step towards ensuring the protection of their human rights.
12. All persons, including stateless persons, are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal benefit and protection of the law, including equal and effective access to justice.

- (i) National laws, policies and practices pertaining to immigration detention should not discriminate against stateless persons and should not be applied in a discriminatory way.
- (ii) Immigration detention regimes should be designed and implemented in a manner which takes due consideration of the specific circumstances of statelessness and of the obligations of the state in respect of stateless persons. States should refrain from both direct and indirect discrimination on grounds of statelessness and should ensure that they reasonably accommodate the particular circumstances of all stateless persons.

It is highly desirable that national immigration laws, policies and practices are made compliant with the principles of equality and non-discrimination, and with national equality and non-discrimination laws and policies.

13. States party to the 1954 Convention have a legal obligation to treat stateless persons within their territory or subject to their jurisdiction in accordance with the provisions of that Convention.
14. States have the right to provide diplomatic protection and a duty to provide consular services to nationals outside their territory. States should exercise these rights and duties with due regard to their international human rights obligations; the failure to provide such protection or services can create *de facto* statelessness.
15. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has a special mandate to prevent and reduce statelessness and to protect stateless persons. The UNHCR has an obligation to fulfil this mandate to the best of its ability and states should at all times fully cooperate with the UNHCR in the fulfilment of this mandate.
16. It is recommended that states review their immigration policies and immigration detention regimes and take all necessary steps to bring them into adherence with the state's human rights obligations to protect stateless persons within their territory or subject to their jurisdiction and to reduce and prevent statelessness.

PART II - IDENTIFYING STATELESS PERSONS

IDENTIFYING STATELESS PERSONS

17. All immigration regimes should have efficient, effective, objective, fair and accessible procedures in place for the identification of stateless persons. It is highly desirable that such procedures comply with the standards and principles stated in relevant UNHCR Guidance.^{iv}
18. It is highly desirable that additionally, such procedures take into consideration the full range of factors which can undermine the effectiveness of a person's nationality, including:
 - (i) the failure of the state to provide diplomatic protection;
 - (ii) the failure of the state to provide consular services;
 - (iii) the lack of a practical route of return; and/or
 - (iv) the inability to guarantee safe return.

It is recommended that states maintain reliable and up-to-date information on countries which are likely to generate *de facto* statelessness.

19. All statelessness identification procedures should be non-discriminatory, and be applied without discrimination, including by reasonable accommodation of the needs of persons vulnerable to discrimination such as women, children, the elderly, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) persons, disabled persons and persons who may have particular needs and vulnerabilities, such as victims of torture and victims of trafficking.
20. Stateless persons should be identified in accordance with Guidelines 19 – 21 prior to being detained or subject to removal proceedings. All persons subject to such procedures should be allowed to remain in the country pending final decision.

PART III – THE DETENTION OF STATELESS PERSONS

DECISION TO DETAIN

21. The immigration detention of stateless persons is undesirable and there should be a presumption against their detention.
22. The detention of stateless persons should never be arbitrary.
23. Detention will be arbitrary unless it is *inter alia*:
 - (i) provided for by national law;
 - (ii) carried out in pursuit of a legitimate objective;
 - (iii) non-discriminatory;
 - (iv) necessary;
 - (v) proportionate and reasonable; and
 - (vi) carried out in accordance with the procedural and substantive safeguards of international law.
24. The mandatory immigration detention of irregular migrants is arbitrary and therefore unlawful under international human rights law.
25. Immigration detention should solely be for the administrative purposes of preventing unlawful entry or removal. The following do not constitute legitimate objectives for immigration detention:
 - (i) The imposition of detention as a deterrent against irregular migration is not lawful under international law.
 - (ii) The imposition of detention as a direct or indirect punishment for irregular immigration is not lawful under international law.
 - (iii) The imposition of detention as a direct or indirect punishment for those who do not cooperate with immigration proceedings is not lawful under international law.
 - (iv) The imposition of detention for the purpose of status determination is not lawful under international law.
 - (v) The imposition of detention solely to protect public safety or national security is not lawful under international law.

- (vi) The imposition of detention solely for the purpose of administrative expediency is not lawful under international law.
26. Removal will not be a legitimate objective and detention pending removal will therefore be arbitrary in instances where removal:
- (i) is not practicable within a reasonable period of time;
 - (ii) violates international law obligations of *non-refoulement*;
 - (iii) violates the individual's right to remain in his or her own country;
 - (iv) violates the individual's right to respect for private and family life; or
 - (v) violates other international human rights law standards.
27. In order for detention to be lawful, domestic law should prescribe the substantive and procedural safeguards which must be satisfied in order to detain a person and the detention must be carried out strictly in accordance with both national and international law by persons legally authorised for that purpose.
28. The following considerations should be taken into account in determining whether detention is non-discriminatory, necessary, proportionate and reasonable:
- (i) Any decision to detain must be based on an individual assessment.
 - (ii) A person should not be detained solely by reason of his or her statelessness.
 - (iii) The length of time it is likely to be necessary to detain a person in order to achieve the objective pursued will be an important factor in the assessment of the proportionality and reasonableness of detention.
 - (iv) Stateless persons are particularly vulnerable to the negative impact of detention, including the psychological impact, owing to their unique vulnerability to prolonged and indefinite detention. This could render their detention discriminatory, disproportionate and unreasonable.
 - (v) Any outstanding applications for protection should be exhausted before any decision to detain a stateless person is taken.
 - (vi) The inability of a stateless person to cooperate with removal proceedings should not be treated as non-cooperation.

ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION

29. Detention should only be used as a measure of last resort. Whenever a restriction of liberty is deemed necessary to fulfil a legitimate administrative objective, states have an obligation in the first instance to consider and apply appropriate and viable alternatives to immigration detention that are less coercive and intrusive than detention, ensure the greatest possible freedom of movement and that respect the human rights of the individual.
30. It is preferable that states have a range of alternatives available, so that the best alternative for a particular individual and/or context can be applied in keeping with the principle of proportionality and the right to equal treatment before the law.
31. The choice of an alternative should be influenced by an individual assessment of the needs and circumstances of the stateless person concerned and prevailing local conditions.^v In designing and applying alternatives to detention, states should observe the principle of minimum intervention.

32. The imposition of alternatives to detention which restrict a stateless person's human rights including the right to liberty should be subject to the same procedural and substantive safeguards as detention. States should therefore, apply all the relevant standards specified in the Guidelines and under international law to ensure that alternatives to detention pursue a legitimate objective, are lawful, non-discriminatory, necessary, proportionate and reasonable.
33. Where stateless persons are subject to alternatives to detention which restrict their human rights including the right to liberty, they should be subject to automatic, regular, periodic review before an independent judicial body to ensure that they continue at all times to pursue a legitimate objective, be lawful, non-discriminatory, necessary, proportionate and reasonable.
34. Alternatives to detention should be applied for the shortest time necessary within which the administrative objective can be achieved. If there is evidence to demonstrate that the administrative objective pursued cannot be achieved within a reasonable period of time, the person concerned should not be subject to such alternatives to detention and should instead be released in conformity with Guidelines 55 – 60 below.

ONGOING DETENTION

35. In instances where the detention of stateless persons complies with the safeguards and procedures established in Guidelines 23 - 30 above, stateless detainees should be entitled to the following minimum procedural guarantees:
 - (i) Detention shall be ordered by and/or be subject to the prompt and effective control of a judicial authority.
 - (ii) The individual shall receive prompt and full written communication in a language and in terms that they understand, of any order of detention, together with the reasons for their deprivation of liberty.
 - (iii) The individual shall be informed of their rights in connection with the detention order, including the right to legal advice, the right to apply for bail, seek judicial review and/or appeal the legality of the detention. Where appropriate, they should receive free legal assistance.
 - (iv) The individual should be informed of the maximum time-limit of their detention.
 - (v) All detaining authorities are urged to provide stateless detainees with a handbook in a language and terms they understand, containing information on all their rights and entitlements, contact details of organisations which are mandated to protect them, NGOs and visiting groups and advice on how to challenge the legality of their detention and their treatment as detainees.
36. Detention shall never be indefinite. Statelessness should never lead to indefinite detention and statelessness should never be a bar to release.
37. Detention should always be for the shortest time possible. There should be a reasonable maximum time-limit for detention. It is highly desirable that states do not detain stateless persons for more than six months. States which at present have a lower than six month maximum time-limit for detention are urged not to increase it, and all states are urged to review and reduce their maximum time-limit for detention.
38. When calculating the total time spent by an individual in detention, it is highly desirable that time spent in detention on previous occasions is taken into consideration unless the

material reasons for detention have changed. Such measures would protect the individual from being a victim of cycles of detention.

39. The administrative purpose behind the detention should be pursued with due diligence throughout the detention period, in order to ensure that detention does not become arbitrary at any stage. Detention should be subject to automatic, regular and periodic review throughout the period of detention, before a judicial body independent of the detaining authorities. If at any stage, it is determined that the administrative purpose can be achieved without detaining the person, the person should be released in conformity with Guidelines 55 – 60 below or subject to a suitable and proportionate alternative to detention in conformity with Guidelines 31 - 36.
40. As soon as it becomes evident that the administrative purpose cannot be achieved within a reasonable period of time, or that the detention otherwise becomes incompatible with the tests set out in Guidelines 23 - 30, or upon the expiration of the maximum time-limit for detention, the detainee should be released in conformity with Guidelines 55 – 60 below.
41. Conditions of detention should be prescribed by law and should comply with international human rights law and standards. While all international standards on conditions of detention should be complied with, the following are emphasised in particular:
 - (i) Conditions of detention for stateless persons should be humane, with respect shown at all times for the inherent dignity of the person. No detainees should be subject to torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.
 - (ii) Stateless persons in detention should be protected from discrimination and harassment and should be entitled to detention conditions which are not inferior to those provided to national detainees.
 - (iii) Stateless persons in detention should be subject to treatment that is appropriate to the administrative purpose of their detention. Under no circumstances should stateless detainees be housed in the same facilities as remand prisoners or convicted prisoners serving criminal sentences.
 - (iv) Immigration detention facilities should be designed and built in compliance with the principle that there is no punitive element to immigration detention. As such, detention centres should facilitate the living of a normal life to the greatest extent possible.
 - (v) Women and men should be detained separately unless they belong to the same family.
 - (vi) Reasonable accommodation should be provided to ensure that disabled persons in detention are treated in accordance with principles of international human rights law.
 - (vii) All stateless detainees should be allowed free and frequent access to: (i) their families, friends, communities and religious groups; (ii) their legal counsel; (iii) the UNHCR; (iv) the consulate of any state in order to establish nationality or the lack thereof; (v) medical and psychological care; and (vi) civil society organisations and visitors groups.
 - (viii) The human rights of stateless persons in detention – including the right to a nationality, the rights to respect for private and family life, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, freedom of expression and the rights to health, education, shelter and food - should be respected, protected and fulfilled at all times.
42. There should be effective and open access to, and independent and regular monitoring of detention centres, by National Human Rights Institutions, civil society organisations and UN bodies, to ensure that they comply with national and international legal requirements. States are urged to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT).

VULNERABLE GROUPS

43. Stateless persons are vulnerable and should be protected at all times. It is highly desirable that “statelessness” is recognised as a protected characteristic.
44. It is highly desirable that individual vulnerability assessments of all stateless detainees are carried out periodically by qualified persons, to determine whether detention has had a negative impact on their health and wellbeing. If this is determined to be so, there should be a reassessment of the proportionality of the detention, which may result in the person being released in conformity with Guidelines 55 - 60 below or subject to a suitable and proportionate alternative to detention in conformity with Guidelines 31 - 36.
45. Statelessness identification procedures should identify persons who are additionally vulnerable to discrimination or the negative effects of detention due to their specific characteristics, context and/or experience. Such persons include disabled persons, those with specific physical and mental health conditions and needs, victims of trafficking, victims of torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, LGBTI persons, the elderly, pregnant women, nursing mothers and those belonging to minorities which are at heightened risk of discrimination in detention.
46. Vulnerable persons should not be detained. In exceptional circumstances where a decision to detain vulnerable persons fulfils all criteria stated in the Guidelines:
 - (i) detention should only be permitted after the completion of a welfare assessment;
 - (ii) detention should only be permitted after it has been medically certified that the experience of detention would not adversely impact their health and wellbeing;
 - (iii) special steps should be taken to ensure that such persons are not subject to discrimination, harassment or abuse at the hands of other detainees or officers; and
 - (iv) such persons should have regular and timely access to all appropriate services, such as hospitalisation, medication and counselling to ensure that continuous care is provided.
47. Stateless children should not be detained. Stateless children should at all times be treated in accordance with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, including the principle of the best interests of the child. Children should not be detained because they or their parents, families or guardians do not have legal status in the country concerned. Families with stateless children should not be detained and the parents of stateless children should not be separated from their children for purposes of detention. In exceptional circumstances where children are detained because it is in their best interest, they should not be detained with adults unless it is in their best interest to do so.
48. There should be a presumption of release of children born in detention. Such children should have their births registered and their right to a nationality respected and protected in accordance with the provisions of international law.
49. As a general rule, stateless asylum-seekers should not be detained. The detention of asylum-seekers may exceptionally be resorted to for limited purposes as set out by the UNHCR, as long as detention is clearly prescribed by national law and conforms to general norms and principles of international human rights law.^{vi}

NON-NATIONAL PRISONERS AND EX-OFFENDERS

50. Non-national prisoners and ex-offenders shall benefit from all rights, procedural and substantive, stated in the Guidelines.

- (i)* It is highly desirable that non-national prisoners who may be stateless or who are at risk of statelessness are subject to statelessness determination procedures before completing their prison sentence. Where there is evidence to suggest that a non-national prisoner is stateless, any further detention after the completion of their sentence for purposes of removal is likely to be unnecessary, disproportionate and arbitrary.
- (ii)* It is highly desirable that removal proceedings against non-national prisoners who are to be removed from the country, begin a minimum of six months prior to the completion of their prison sentence, or at the beginning of their prison sentence if it is six months or shorter. Where there is no reasonable likelihood of removal at the time their sentence is complete, non-national ex-offenders should not be automatically subject to further detention pending removal.
- (iii)* Protecting public safety and national security do not constitute legitimate objectives for the imposition of immigration detention. Under no circumstances should non-national ex-offenders be held in immigration detention solely for these reasons.

PART IV – ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES

DATA AND STATISTICAL INFORMATION

51. It is highly desirable that states maintain reliable data, disaggregated by protected characteristic and by type of statelessness, showing:

- (i)* the number of persons who have been subject to statelessness identification procedures; and
- (ii)* the number of persons who have been recognised as stateless.

52. It is highly desirable that states maintain reliable data, disaggregated by protected characteristic and by type of statelessness, showing:

- (i)* the number of stateless detainees;
- (ii)* the reasons for their detention;
- (iii)* the length of their detention; and
- (iv)* the outcomes of their detention.

THE TREATMENT OF RELEASED STATELESS PERSONS

53. State obligations towards stateless persons do not cease after release from detention or alternatives to detention. Special care should be taken to address the vulnerabilities of stateless persons who are released from detention and to ensure that they enjoy all human rights which they are entitled to under international law.

54. Released stateless detainees should be provided with appropriate documentation and stay rights suitable to their situation.
55. Released stateless detainees should be protected from destitution.
56. Released stateless detainees should have access to healthcare, social welfare, shelter and primary education on an equal basis with nationals.
57. It is highly desirable that released stateless detainees are allowed to work. Such persons are entitled to equal work place rights as nationals.
58. It is most desirable that durable solutions are found for statelessness, including the facilitated naturalisation of stateless migrants.

COMPENSATION

59. All stateless persons who have been subject to arbitrary detention should be compensated in a fair and non-discriminatory manner.
60. Such compensation should take into account the length of detention, the impact of detention on the individual and the nature of treatment to which the detainee was subject.

ⁱ Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, ECOSOC RES/526 A(XVII) (1954), Article 1(1). For authoritative guidance on the interpretation of Article 1(1), see UN High Commissioner for Refugees, *Guidelines on Statelessness No. 1: The definition of "Stateless Person" in Article 1(1) of the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons*, 20 February 2012, HCR/GS/12/01, available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4f4371b82.html>.

ⁱⁱ UN High Commissioner for Refugees, *UNHCR's Revised Guidelines on Applicable Criteria and Standards relating to the Detention of Asylum-Seekers*, 26 February 1999, adapted from Guideline 1, available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3c2b3f844.html>.

ⁱⁱⁱ The Equal Rights Trust, *Declaration of Principles on Equality*, 2008, Principle 5, available at: <http://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/Pages%20from%20Declaration%20perfect%20principle.pdf>.

^{iv} UN High Commissioner for Refugees, *Guidelines on Statelessness No. 2: Procedures for Determining whether an Individual is a Stateless Person*, 5 April 2012, HCR/GS/12/02, available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4f7dafb52.html>.

^v See above, note 2, adapted from Guideline 4.

^{vi} *Ibid.*, adapted from Guidelines 2 and 3.