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This report provides an overview of alternatives to immigration detention in Africa. Drawing from examples in 32 African countries, the report highlights some of the measures in place that contribute to the effective and humane governance of migration, while avoiding the use of unnecessary immigration detention.

African policy makers are facing both internal and external pressure to manage migration more effectively. The research undertaken for this report demonstrates that:

- Many African States are managing migration well with strategies that respect rights and support preferred outcomes in a cost-effective manner
- Alternatives to immigration detention are found in a wide range of contexts across the region
- Non-government organisations (NGOs) are at the forefront of developing and implementing alternatives to detention in this region
- Alternatives for vulnerable groups, such as children and survivors of trafficking, are more widely available

This report is of particular use for immigration authorities and other departments responsible for domestic policy. The following areas are of specific interest to these key departments:

- There are existing State commitments – including national, regional and international laws and regulations – to develop and implement alternatives to detention
- There are authorities in the region that can provide technical expertise in the development and/or expansion of alternatives to detention
- A wide range of examples of alternatives to detention can be used to develop or expand implementation in your national context, with shared benefits for migrants and citizens
This report will also be of value for government officials engaged in international and regional diplomatic roles. Specifically, it enables diplomats to:

- Identify avenues to protect your own citizens from immigration detention in other States through alternatives to immigration detention, and use this to advocate for those citizens during bilateral meetings
- Identify and expand opportunities for shared regional approaches that assist in reducing the need for immigration detention
- Name positive examples of domestic and regional law, policy and practice
- Draw from such positive examples to support arguments for particular commitments in inter-governmental agreements, such as the Global Compact on Migration and the Global Compact on Refugees

I wish you well in your endeavors to provide an effective and humane migration governance system.

Sincerely,

Commissioner
Maya Sahli Fadel

Executive summary

This report is the second publication in the International Detention Coalition’s (IDC) series mapping alternatives to immigration detention in Africa. The research has identified and described a range of alternatives to immigration detention currently operating in the Africa region that enable states to achieve legitimate migration goals without the use of detention. It contains new and updated country case studies covering 32 African countries.

Alternatives to detention are laws, policies or practices by which persons are not detained for reasons relating to their migration status. They provide a range of mechanisms that used together provide an effective way to manage migrants, housed in the community with freedom of movement, for the duration of their migration status determination. Alternatives can be effectively implemented to avoid detention at all stages of a migration procedure, including upon arrival, during processing of migration-related claims, or when preparing for departure. Such systems that avoid the use of detention have been identified across the African continent including in countries experiencing “transit” migration, those hosting large numbers of refugees, asylum seekers or irregular migrants, and/or those with limited resources available to manage such populations.

The case studies detailed in this report include a range of alternatives implemented by civil society, governments or a combination of both. They range from spontaneous and ad hoc measures, to laws and policies implemented in a systematic and sustained manner. The case studies were gathered by IDC staff between January 2017 and January 2018 through member surveys, telephone interviews, desk research, and country visits to South Africa, Zambia, Malawi and Botswana in April and May 2017, and trainings in Libya from 2016 to 2017. The material is presented using the IDC’s Community Assessment and Placement model ("CAP model") as a framework. The CAP model is a tool for governments, civil society and other stakeholders to build systems that ensure immigration detention is only used as a last resort and that alternatives to detention result in optimal outcomes.

Liberty: A presumption against detention

The survey identified national legislation in several African countries that may be used to uphold a presumption of liberty for migrants entering their territories. These include laws providing for the non-detention of certain groups of migrants such as unaccompanied children, refugees, asylum seekers, trafficked victims and stateless persons. In some countries, Constitutional provisions – such as freedom of movement and protection against arbitrary detention – provide legislative safeguards for all persons, including non-nationals. In some countries where migration related offences are criminalised, national laws or sentencing guides contain time limits on the length of any administrative or punitive detention. There are various sub-regional processes that are working towards stronger presumptions of liberty. Most notably, through the Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA), southern African states have committed to developing and implementing alternatives to detention. There is a need to close the gap between these policy developments and their implementation, throughout the region.

Identification and decision-making

The use of standardised identification and screening mechanisms, by which migrants are assessed and referred to relevant authorities for processing, is increasing in many countries – led by government ministries, civil society, or a combination of both. Whilst screening tends to happen in an ad hoc manner, there
have been some attempts to roll out referral mechanisms across a whole country and to train front line officials to screen, identify and refer different categories of migrant amongst groups of mixed migrants. Identification of victims of trafficking mechanisms appear to be well-resourced but under-utilised in several countries.

Case management and case resolution
The IDC identified several examples of case management systems, mainly for vulnerable persons such as unaccompanied children, victims of trafficking and, refugees and asylum seekers. A growing number of these case management systems are holistic, including not just the legal aspects of the case but responding to the unique social, psychological and medical strengths and challenges of individuals. Some case management programs pursue collaboration with government and NGOs across borders, especially to support an individual voluntarily departing for their country of nationality. Other systems contain some elements of a case management approach or only cater to certain categories of migrants. The majority of the case management systems identified are run by civil society or run through informal or formal collaborations between the government and NGOs. An increasing number of service referral networks were identified which maximise the use of existing resources, rather than creating parallel support systems for migrants.

State-led initiatives that reduce the population at risk of immigration detention include the resolution of migration status of groups through amnesties for undocumented migrant workers, and prima facie refugee status for certain nationalities. Efforts to open up more pathways to legal migration, via labour channels within economic and political regional blocs, were also identified that assist in expanding case resolution options.

Placement options
The use of shelters and safe houses for all categories of migrants – particularly vulnerable migrants – was identified as a means to house people in the community without conditions, while their migration status is being determined. Options for community placement with conditions, such as bail or reporting, were also identified. Provisions permitting the adoption and guardianship of unaccompanied or separated children are available in several African countries. There is also a clear trend towards the deinstitutionalisation of children into family or foster care.

Minimum standards
Minimum standards, such as respect for fundamental rights and access to basic needs, underpin successful alternatives. Across Africa international legal standards continue to be domesticated, with governments lifting reservations on refugee and migrant rights provisions. This reflects the increasing recognition of migrants’ contributions to local host economies when they are permitted to work and trade to meet their own basic needs. The issuing of documentation to regularise an individual’s stay in a country whilst their migration status is being determined is now used in some countries. Provisions that entitle all persons within a state’s territory de jure access to education, employment and healthcare are available in some countries. Other states are mainstreaming refugees’ access to government-run social assistance services developed for citizens, so as to avoid parallel systems and to multiply the benefits of diverse funding streams.
1. Introduction

1.1 Alternatives to detention in Africa: Project description

African Members of the International Detention Coalition (IDC) have undertaken combined information gathering with the hope of triggering meaningful advocacy at national, regional and international levels against the use of immigration detention. The first publication in our series to map alternatives to detention in Africa was the “Alternatives to Immigration Detention in Africa, 2015-2016” report focused on six countries: Egypt, Kenya, Libya, South Africa, Tanzania and Zambia. This report contains new descriptions of alternatives to detention currently operating in an expanded selection of 32 African countries. These include laws, policies and practices that allow migrants to live in the community with freedom of movement while their immigration status is being resolved or while they are awaiting removal from the host country.

Evidence was gathered through member surveys, telephone interviews and desk-based research. The report includes case studies identified during the IDC’s meetings and site visits in South Africa, Zambia, Malawi and Botswana in April and May 2017. An IDC staff delegation visited the region to discuss alternatives to detention, following up on the 2016 Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA) commitment to “develop and implement” alternatives to detention. More than 25 Member organisations and 50 government representatives were engaged in multiple sessions, and follow up programming work has taken place since in Malawi, Zambia and South Africa. The report also includes the alternative to detention processes being developed in Libya in collaboration with the IDC. The methods of evidence gathering have led to a broad overview based on published information, the knowledge of key informants and limited in-country discussions.

1.2 Definition of alternatives to immigration detention

The phrase “alternatives to immigration detention” (“alternatives”) is not an established legal term nor a prescriptive concept. Rather, it is a fundamentally different way of approaching the governance of migration. Alternatives are a pragmatic and proactive approach, focused on working with each person to resolve their migration situation, shifting the emphasis away from security and restriction. This approach respects asylum seekers, refugees and migrants as rights holders who can be empowered to comply with immigration processes, without the need for restrictions or deprivations of liberty. The IDC defines alternatives to detention as “any law, policy or practice by which persons are not detained for reasons relating to their migration status”.

Within this broad definition, alternatives to detention can therefore be either formal practices such as programmes operating in the community in a systematic and sustained manner or informal and ad hoc responses such as one-off or short-term practices that are not formally recognised by the government. Alternatives can be effectively implemented to avoid detention at all stages of a migration procedure, including upon arrival, during processing of migration-related claims, or when preparing for departure. While some governments may only consider alternatives to detention to be appropriate when there is a plan for voluntary return and no option for local integration, other governments consider alternatives an integrated strategy for promoting the best possible outcomes from the community setting.

“Alternatives can be effectively implemented to avoid detention at all stages of a migration procedure”
1.3 Benefits of alternatives to detention

The IDC’s ten-year programme of global research has highlighted the benefits of pursuing alternatives to immigration detention.³ The IDC’s main findings are:

Alternatives are up to 80% cheaper than detention due to lower running costs and they also eliminate costly litigation and compensation claims.

- **There are alternatives.** There are a range of alternatives to detention that governments can draw upon to reduce unnecessary immigration detention and increase the success of community-based migration management. The IDC has identified more than 250 examples in over 60 countries. This includes in countries with large numbers of migrants and few resources.

- **Alternatives can be applied in the majority of cases.** Detention is rarely necessary while working with people towards satisfactory case resolution. Placement options range from open accommodation in the community with minimal requirements for low-risk groups, through to intensive supervision and case management for populations of highest concern, such as non-citizens facing deportation after completing a prison sentence.

- **Alternatives are more affordable.** Alternatives are up to 80% cheaper than detention due to lower running costs. They also eliminate costly litigation and compensation claims.¹⁰

- **Alternatives are more humane.** Alternatives are less harmful than detention.¹¹ Community placement supports health and wellbeing and upholds human rights.

- **Alternatives are highly effective.** Alternatives achieve effective case resolution outcomes: up to 95% appearance rates and up to 69% voluntary and independent return rates for refused cases. When people are able to live in the community and remain engaged throughout the process of their migration status determination, they are more likely to be reconciled to the outcomes of their eventual immigration decision.

1.4 The Community Assessment and Placement model

This report uses the IDC’s Community Assessment and Placement model (CAP model) to present the alternatives currently in place in Africa identified during the mapping process. The CAP model is a tool for governments, civil society and other stakeholders to build systems that ensure detention is only used as a last resort and that community options result in optimal outcomes (see Figure 1).¹² Readers can find more information on all elements of the CAP model in There Are Alternatives.¹³

The CAP model is a tool to build systems that ensure detention is only used as a last resort and that community options result in optimal outcomes.
Figure 1: The Community Assessment and Placement model (CAP model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification &amp; Decision Making</th>
<th>Screening &amp; Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement Options</td>
<td>Community without conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditions or limited restrictions in the community with review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>Detention as a last resort, with review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Management, Support &amp; Resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Liberty: A presumption against detention

The first overarching principle of alternatives is the right to liberty including a presumption against detention. Migrants are rights holders who should be free to live in the community, rather than being forced into places of detention, while they await a migration status decision.14 Liberty can be established by adopting laws, policies and practices that create a presumption of liberty; provide a mandate to apply alternatives in the first instance; only permit restriction of liberty when other alternatives cannot be applied; only allow use of detention as a last resort; or prohibit the detention of vulnerable individuals.

2.1 Regional legislation

The African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights 1984 outlines the right to liberty and protection from arbitrary arrest or detention (Article 6) and the right to freedom of movement (Article 12(1)).15

2.2 National legislation

A presumption against detention for all persons with irregular migration status exists in national legislation. For example, Constitutional provisions for freedom of movement, right to personal liberty and protection from arbitrary detention exist in Zambia (Constitution 2016, Article 11 and 13),16 Uganda (Constitution 1995),17 Zimbabwe (Constitution 2013, Section 49)18 and South Africa (Constitution 1996).19

Legislation can be an alternative to detention and assist States to ensure that detention is used as a last resort

National laws prohibit the detention of vulnerable individuals, for example, asylum seekers and refugees are protected from detention in Lesotho (Refugee Act 1983 and Regulations of 1986, Article 9(1)b),20 Uganda (Refugees Act 2006, Section 30),21 Djibouti (Refugee Law, passed in January 2017)22 and South Africa (Refugees Act 1998)23 – although the presumption of liberty is threatened by the government’s White Paper on International Migration.24 Legal protections for stateless people exist in Algeria (Aliens Law 2008, Article 42).25 Whilst not detailed in law, Ethiopia maintains an open-door policy for Somali refugees.26 A partial presumption against detention can be created by the existence of time limits on the permissible length of detention in national laws. Limits exist in Zimbabwe,27 Botswana,28 Angola,29 South Africa,30 Zambia31 and Malawi.32

Malawi’s Immigration Act 196433 contains many provisions that can be used to prevent the detention of migrants. An Immigration Law Audit14 was undertaken in 2016 to summarise such alternatives to detention, prompted by the challenge of non-national children unsuitably placed in the prison system of Malawi. The report was initiated as a result of roundtable meetings in 2015 that sought to address such issues.35 The government hosted a second meeting in May 201736 where a Technical Working Group on Alternatives to Detention and a Statement of Principles37 were created in which the government committed to developing an alternative to prison pilot for children irregularly entering the country.
In focus:
Alternatives for children

Alternatives to detention for children exist across the continent. Detention of children is a child rights violation, as it is never in a child’s best interests: as such, children should never be detained for reasons relating to their or their parents’ migration status.38

Liberty: Protections for unaccompanied or separated refugee children are outlined in Article 23(3) of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child 1990 and Best Interests of the Child are detailed in Article 439 as well as the national laws of Algeria40, Egypt,41 Tunisia,42 Kenya,43 Lesotho,44 Botswana,45 Mozambique,46 South Africa47 and Swaziland.48

Identification and decision making: There are child-specific screening systems and accompanying trainings for government officials in place in Algeria,49 Ethiopia,50 Djibouti,51 Kenya,52 Zambia,53 Malawi54 and Zimbabwe.55

Case management: Case management systems run by civil society and the government for children are operating in Ethiopia,56 Kenya,57 Malawi,58 Zambia,59 Mozambique60 and Zimbabwe.61 Monthly “case conferences” take place in Zimbabwe for government and NGO actors to discuss individual cases. Case resolution for unaccompanied children through Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVRR) to their country of nationality has been identified in Mozambique62 and Zambia.63

There are bilateral and multilateral attempts to harmonise case management systems for children across borders. For example, the “West Africa Network” (WAN)64 is based on a standardised procedure65 for government authorities and NGOs across 16 countries to undertake the identification, protection and reintegration of children (in their countries of nationality or in “third” countries).

Placement options: Migrant children are housed in shelters while their migration situation is resolved. Use of shelters is codified in law, for example, in Malawi66 and Uganda,67 Community placement for children is widespread in practice, for example, state-run shelters exist in Malawi,68 Zimbabwe,69 South Africa,70 Mozambique71 and Tunisia.72 There are shelters run by civil society, including religious institutions in Zambia,73 Botswana,74 Kenya,75 Morocco76 and Malawi.77 Foster care or guardianship arrangements for non-national children are an example of alternative care for children in the community and are codified in law in Zambia,78 Uganda,79 Kenya,80 Tanzania,81 Zimbabwe,82 South Africa,83 Libya,84 as well as in domestic law in Egypt and Morocco through the Kafala system.85 Other ad hoc placement of children in host families has been identified in Senegal,86 Malawi,87 Kenya88 and Zimbabwe.89

Minimum standards: Basic needs such as food and healthcare are provided through the aforementioned placement options and case management systems. Non-discrimination provisions exist in national laws, for example, in Sudan,90 South Africa91 and Botswana.92 Refugees in Djibouti were mainstreamed into national school systems in 2017.93 The government of Zimbabwe reviewed the Children’s Act 1972 in 2017 in order to incorporate definitions of unaccompanied migrant children.94 Legal status and documentation is issued, such as free birth certificates for refugee children in Ethiopia,95 Mauritania96 and Zimbabwe.97 National laws that consider unaccompanied child migrants found on the border with an unidentifiable nationality as their own nationals exist in Kenya,98 Tanzania,99 Zambia100 and Swaziland.101
3. Identification and decision-making

Successful migration governance programs understand that refugees, asylum seekers, stateless persons, irregular migrants and other non-citizens without legal status are a highly diverse population with different needs and motivations. Identification via screening and ongoing assessment of individuals highlights the key aspects of their migration situation such as legal obligations; identity, health and security checks; vulnerability; individual case factors; and community context. A robust and effective screening system is essential to facilitate referral of the migrant to the appropriate entity and determine the level of case management needed. The IDC and UNHCR’s Vulnerability Screening Tool is a useful guide when designing country-specific screening mechanisms.\(^\text{102}\)

A robust and effective screening system is often a common factor for successful migration governance programs

3.1 Screening and assessment

Screening, identification and referral measures are codified in law, such as the victim referral system outlined in Botswana’s Anti-Trafficking law 2014.\(^\text{103}\) Other countries have devised guidelines for frontline immigration officials – often referred to as National Referral Mechanisms (NRMs). In Zambia the NRM\(^\text{104}\) has been rolled out with immigration officers nationwide. A Directory of Services to Aid Migrant Referrals is currently undergoing review, while a Directory of Services for Cases of Trafficking is already in use.\(^\text{105}\) The NRMs of Botswana, Zimbabwe and Malawi were being reviewed at the time of writing.\(^\text{106}\) Malawi’s NRM was adapted from the Zambian model following discussions during a Training of Trainers (TOT) for the protection of vulnerable migrants that took place in Lilongwe, November 2014. Screening and referral systems specifically designed to identify victims of trafficking exist in Mozambique\(^\text{107}\) and Senegal.\(^\text{108}\)

While a screening and referral mechanism at point of arrival or contact can avoid the detention of vulnerable persons altogether, it is important that screening systems are used within detention centres as well.\(^\text{109}\) For example, vulnerable categories of migrants are screened out of detention centres through monitoring visits to centres by NGOs in Tunisia\(^\text{110}\) and Zambia.\(^\text{111}\) HAART Kenya is exploring possibilities to identify and release victims of trafficking caught up in prisons and detention centres.\(^\text{112}\)

3.2 Training of immigration personnel

Training events and awareness campaigns to sensitise local government officials to refugee and trafficking issues were run by the governments of Senegal,\(^\text{113}\) Botswana,\(^\text{114}\) Somaliland,\(^\text{115}\) Lesotho,\(^\text{116}\) Ethiopia\(^\text{117}\) and Zimbabwe.\(^\text{118}\) In Zambia, 2017, the NRM was introduced into the standard training of the Police Services.\(^\text{119}\) Civil society-led training also took place in Kenya and Uganda. HAART Kenya’s Awareness Department trained police about trafficking issues and the Refugee Law Project (RLP) Uganda trained officials working in the Justice, Law and Order sector after which there was a reduction of reported cases of arrests and increase in referrals of migrants and refugees.\(^\text{120}\)
4. Case management, support and resolution

4.1 Case management

The most successful alternatives use case management across all stages of the migration process, to ensure a coordinated approach to each case. Case management is a social work approach that builds on an individual’s strengths, identifies vulnerability or protection concerns, and addresses needs. The case manager - who is not a migration status decision-maker - facilitates access to all relevant information and support services, and provides a link between the individual, the authorities and the community. Case management is useful to track cases and collect anonymised data that may be used for evidence-based policy design in future.122

Case managers can contribute to timely case resolution by identifying legal, practical and personal barriers to likely outcomes and working on shared solutions

Case management systems are run by civil society. For example, in Tunisia, migrants visit the Tunis-based Terre d’Asile Tunisie to request legal, medical or social assistance.123 The caseworker classifies the client’s case as “Green” or “Red”. Green flags a form of less-intensive case management such as administrative support for self-sufficient migrants. “Red” flags intensive support in which the complex case is assigned to one of the 20 specialised NGO partners who provide support such as legal aid, housing, healthcare as well as Family Planning in Clinics run by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with whom the Terre d’Asile drop-in centre has an operational partnership. Other features of the Terre d’Asile programming include a “Civil Society Empowerment Platform” which aims to sensitise grassroots organisations to refugee and migrant issues in Tunisia.

Victims of trafficking identified by Police in Kenya are referred to HAART,124 an NGO who receives several referrals per day. Caseworkers devise a case plan and arrange accommodation in local shelters or in group living arrangements – sometimes financed through the client’s collective savings, acquired through employment. The government legalises the client’s temporary stay in the country, while HAART, IOM and NGOs in the client’s country of citizenship work collaboratively to trace the individual’s family. When medical, psychosocial and psychiatric support is required, HAART refers the client to a partner NGO. HAART has a partnership with a local hotel so that clients may access employment if desired.125

Migrants in Egypt visit St Andrews Refugee Service (StARS)126 in Cairo to access assistance. StARS has a referral mechanism with other service providers related to mental and physical health, housing, financial or community support needs. The centre welcomes 20,000 migrants per year. Many former beneficiaries are employed by StARS which means that the initial screening interviews are conducted by people who represent the major refugee communities in Egypt and are therefore sensitive to the client’s socio-cultural and linguistic needs.127

A case management system for migrants in Algeria is operated by Recontre et Développement (R&D) – a social service agency established by the Reformed Church. Staff identify the purpose of the migrant’s visit and assess their particular needs. Support available includes medical care, enrolment in school, clothes or assistance to return to their country of citizenship. In 2014, the organisation reported more than 1,900 visits from migrants of over 30 nationalities, with most from Sub-Saharan Africa.
In 2013, R&D helped more than 200 minors and paid the school fees for 23 children to attend school.\textsuperscript{128}

**The most successful alternatives use case management across all stages of the migration process, to ensure a coordinated approach to each case, with collaboration between government and civil society**

Case management systems are also run by governments or by a government and civil society in collaboration. For example, if a suspected victim of trafficking visits Terre d’Asile Tunisie they are referred to the National High Authority for Combating Human Trafficking and accommodated in centres run by the Ministry of Social Affairs (MSA) that provide food, clothing, legal aid, medical and psychological services. Since November 2017, sub-Sahara African Embassies have been involved with the referral mechanism and by mid-2018, the system will be formalised.\textsuperscript{129}

There are efforts to harmonise cross-border case management procedures through bi-lateral meetings between Southern African governments. The Immigration Department of Zambia has run meetings with Malawi, Zimbabwe, Tanzania and Mozambique. In addition, peer-to-peer learning is taking place between case management practitioners, for example, the Malawi National Technical Working Group on Trafficking in Persons visited Zambia in March 2017 to learn about protection mechanisms.\textsuperscript{130}

For some people, migration status is resolved through departure from the country. Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVRR) can facilitate voluntary departure of migrants who are unable or unwilling to remain in host countries – especially for people who have been trafficked and asylum seekers who have not been granted refugee status.\textsuperscript{131} AVRR has been facilitated by IOM in Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique,\textsuperscript{132} Zimbabwe,\textsuperscript{133} Libya\textsuperscript{134} and Egypt\textsuperscript{135} and by the government in Djibouti.\textsuperscript{136}

### 4.2 Resolving migration status

The resolution of a migration case can take many forms, from permanent solutions such as regularization or return, medium-term options such as protection, humanitarian interventions, study or temporary work permits, and short-term status while a more substantive claim is decided.

In addition to such individualised case consideration, some governments provide for large-scale or group-based case resolution. A permanent migration solution for one group of refugees exists in Tanzania, with the government offering citizenship to Burundi refugees.\textsuperscript{137} Some asylum seekers are given prima facie refugee status – in Uganda during an influx\textsuperscript{138} and in Djibouti for Somali and Yemeni asylum seekers.\textsuperscript{139}

Other countries have offered amnesties for undocumented migrants through the granting of residency permits. For example, in Djibouti for undocumented Ethiopian migrants\textsuperscript{140} and in Morocco where 18,000 one-year residency permits were granted to undocumented migrants in the country through a 2013 National Policy on Immigration and Asylum (NPIA).\textsuperscript{141} The government of Zimbabwe conducted exemption interviews for Rwandan refugees who lost prima facie refugee status due to the 2013 Rwandan cessation clause.\textsuperscript{142} In Algeria, refugees can apply for a residency permit.\textsuperscript{143}
In focus: Alternatives to detention in Libya

While all kinds of migrants are exposed to arbitrary and indefinite detention in Libya, efforts are on-going to divert people into alternatives. Meetings have taken place since 2014 including the constitution of a Mixed Migration Working Group (MMWG) in 2016 to oversee the implementation of alternatives.

Liberty: A law on immigration and refugee status which outlines the importance of alternatives to detention especially for children has been drafted by a Libyan NGO, the International Organisation for Cooperation and Emergency Aid (IOCEA).

Identification and decision making: Migrant identification in Libya is a decentralised and ad hoc process that varies by location. When vulnerability screening occasionally takes place during detention visits by NGOs, asylum seekers or refugees are referred to UNHCR. Meanwhile, unaccompanied or separated children, people awaiting deportation or voluntary return by IOM, adults with family living in Libya, and people who are able to work may be eligible for release into an alternative.

Placement options: Migrants are permitted to live in the community, with conditions pending expulsion, according to the Aliens Law 1987, Article 18. In practice, unaccompanied children are sometimes placed in informal and ad hoc foster care arrangements. Adults in Sabratha in the West and Janzour in the Northwest of Libya are occasionally placed in the community with conditions through local release-to-work programmes.

Through a collaboration between municipal authorities and detention centre managers in Sabratha, operating since 2014, undocumented migrants are matched with labour market needs. If requested by a local employer, migrants may be issued with identification documents recognised by local authorities to prevent their re-arrest and released into the community to take up the promised employment. Individuals with community links such as a spouse legally employed in Libya are released from detention. At the time of writing, an “Alternative Solutions” pilot was underway to accommodate vulnerable migrants in Embassy-run shelters or with host families pending voluntary departure to their countries of nationality.

Case management: The MMWG sub-working group on Case Management has developed specific forms and pathways for case referrals from detention centres including a “Joint Vulnerability Criteria”.

Minimum Standards: The Libyan authorities attempt to fulfil their minimum standards obligations under the Convention Against Torture, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and national laws through cooperation with international agencies and local NGOs who have access to places of detention for the purposes of monitoring conditions, humanitarian interventions and non-food item delivery. The draft law proposed by Libyan NGOs (detailed above) encourages further formalisation of migrant protection.
5. Placement options

The CAP model prioritises placement in the community without conditions – or with liberty – in the majority of cases. If shown to be necessary in the individual case, conditions such as monitoring, supervision and surety may be applied. Finally, immigration detention may be used as a last resort, in exceptional cases; provided the standards of necessity, reasonableness and proportionality have been met. Many community-based placement options have been described in the previous section as a material element of the case management process. Further examples are mentioned below.

5.1 Unconditional placement options

The use of unconditional community placement may be codified in law. For example, the government of Algeria amended its Anti-Trafficking law to provide housing, financial assistance and medical care for trafficked people. In Uganda, the Refugees Act 2006 (Section 38) gives asylum seekers and refugees the right to choose their place of abode: in the refugee settlements where they are supported by the government and UNHCR or self-settlement in urban centres. The Prevention of Trafficking in Persons Act 2009 (Section 12(1) and 12(7)) provides for the use of open accommodation for trafficked people. In Ethiopia, 75,000 refugees of all nationalities can move freely and live in towns and cities as part of an expanded out of camp policy.

In practice, the use of open reception centres is widespread. For example, there are government-run shelters reserved for people who have been trafficked in Senegal, Zimbabwe, the Gambia and Zambia.

A transit centre in Lusaka, Zambia, hosts over 80 refugees pending relocation or resettlement, or while their asylum applications are being processed by UNHCR. An open reception centre for asylum seekers in Lesotho issues guests with ID cards so that they can access appropriate services. There are shelters run by both government and NGOs, for example in Lesotho an NGO-run shelter for trafficked people could be re-established through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the government.

5.2 Conditional placement options

Conditional placement imposes restrictions or conditions on a person’s liberty. Persons at risk of detention can apply for conditional release by applying for bail, bond surety, or other consequences for non-compliance in place of a custodial sentence in Egypt (Articles 146-148 of the Criminal Code). Zambia's Immigration Act 2010 provides for bail (Section 57) or report orders (Section 14). Zimbabwe's Immigration Act 2001 allows for release through a bond (Article 9). Section 14(2) of Malawi's Immigration Act allows for bail if the immigrant provides sureties. In Uganda, poor health may be a basis for seeking release from detention on bond or bail. In cases of grave illness, release has often been granted.

Community placement with monitoring conditions such as directed residence pending deportation, is available in Egypt (Criminal Code, Article 145 and 149), Sudan (Passports and Immigration Act 1994, Article 22) and Tunisia (Organic Law 68-7, Article 19). Reporting requirements exist in Kenya and Zambia (Section 14 of the Immigration Act 2010). In practice, the Zambian Immigration Department issued 9,837 Report Orders in 2016 and have reported that very few individuals do not comply.
Placement at a nominated address is possible in **Mozambique** where the Immigration Department grants release from detention if a) the individual proves their financial capacity to pay the costs of deportation; or b) if friends or family members living legally in **Mozambique** sign a Terms of Responsibility (TOR) confirming that they will pay the travel ticket. These alternatives to detention are not mentioned in law but are administrative measures in place. In **Botswana** there have been *ad hoc* instances of migrants being housed in alternative accommodation by their Consulates pending the migrant’s departure to their country of citizenship.\textsuperscript{166} “In practice the use of open reception centres is widespread”

**In focus:**

**Facilitating lawful migration**

Sub-regional economic communities\textsuperscript{167} are exploring freedom of movement between member states, including the Southern African Development Community (SADC),\textsuperscript{168} the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS),\textsuperscript{169} the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD),\textsuperscript{170} the Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CENSAD),\textsuperscript{171} and the Arab Maghreb Union (AMU/UMA). Bilateral arrangements are also in place in **Kenya** - for citizens of the East African Community (EAC)\textsuperscript{172} and in **South Africa** - for SADC citizens through the White Paper on International Migration\textsuperscript{174} and for **Lesotho** citizens through a 2013 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Labour Cooperation.\textsuperscript{175} Initiatives to facilitate labour migration between the island nations in the Indian Ocean and the African mainland are developing in **Madagascar**\textsuperscript{176} and the **Seychelles**.\textsuperscript{177}

A Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)\textsuperscript{178} pilot on labour rights is in place in the **Zambia-Zimbabwe** border region, which prevents the detention of labourers who live in one country but work in the other country. Although the two countries have not yet ratified the COMESA Protocol on the Free Movement of Persons, Labour, Services, Right of Establishment and Residence; with support from IOM, they set up National Monitoring Committees (NCM) in 2016, to monitor the implementation of the proposed Protocol.\textsuperscript{179} This is a clear example of practice leading policy in the Africa region.
6. Minimum standards

The IDC discusses minimum standards in relation to the standards that are needed to make alternatives to detention processes work. Minimum standards can be established through: respect for fundamental rights, including the right to liberty and freedom of movement; meeting basic needs – including education, health care, employment rights; legal status and documentation; legal advice and interpretation; fair and timely case resolution; and regular review of placement decisions.

6.1 Respect for fundamental rights

Ensuring fundamental rights are respected can support migrants to stay engaged with authorities, minimise secondary movement and improve the safety and security of both migrant and local populations.

Migrants are better able to comply with requirements if they are able to access and meet their basic needs while in the community

Various African regional bodies and processes establish minimum standards. Most notably, through the Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA), member governments have requested templates for good practices that align with their MIDSA commitments. The Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVRR) technical guidelines were created by IOM; the Protection of Unaccompanied Minors technical guidelines are being created by Save the Children; the Vulnerability Screening technical guidelines have been created by the IDC and UNHCR.

6.2 Formal status and documentation

Formal status – and documentation of that status – is another minimum standard. Documentation on arrival is issued, for example, in Malawi (Immigration Act 1964, Section 10) and Kenya (Refugees Act 2006, Section 11); documentation is issued to allow asylum seekers and refugees to pass through the territory. Temporary stay permits for trafficked people are available in Mauritius (The Combating of Trafficking in Persons Act 2009, Section 7), Gambia (Anti-Trafficking Act 2007), South Africa (Prevention and Combating of Trafficking in Persons Bill, Section 15(I)), and Botswana (Anti-Trafficking Act 2014). Administration of documentation for refugees and asylum seekers by the government is available in Uganda, Swaziland and Zimbabwe as well as bio-metric documents in South Africa and Ethiopia and travel documents for refugees in Swaziland. UNHCR issues documentation for refugees in Egypt and Algeria where trainings for the police are conducted in order to raise awareness about this form of identification. Documentation to regularise certain groups is evident in South Africa where a new Zimbabwean Exemption Permit (ZEP) was launched in January 2018. In addition, the Lesotho Special Permit (LSP) provides an amnesty to those who had previously obtained ID documents fraudulently.

Documentation for those facing departure is issued in some countries. Provision of exit permits to allow for voluntary departure is possible in Malawi (within 14 days, Section 21(4) of the Immigration Act 1964) and Zambia for rejected asylum seekers (Section 39 of the Immigration Act 2010). In practice, the Voluntary Repatriation Declaration Form has been recognised by the government of Zimbabwe as a valid document for refugees to travel with when voluntarily departing.

There are many local practices of administering documentation. For example, a NGO-run transit centre in Zambia issues a “Gate Pass” to
refugees which protects people from detention in Lusaka because intercepting authorities can call the transit centre’s telephone number detailed on the Pass to understand the status of the resident before detaining them. This practice has developed into a formalised Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) within Lusaka, involving Action Africa Help Zambia (AAHZ), UNHCR and the Ministry of Home Affairs.299

6.3 Legal advice and interpretation
The minimum standard of legal advice and interpretation200 is provided for in both international201 and national laws. For example, in Tunisian law No. 2016-5 of 16, any person, regardless of nationality, can be represented by a lawyer, and Terre d’Asile Tunisie is training lawyers on these provisions.202 National law detailing the right to interpretation is detailed in Section (8)1 of Malawi’s Immigration Act and Section 42(1) (a) of the Constitution of Malawi.

6.4 Meeting basic needs
The ability of migrants to meet their own basic needs represents another minimum standard. There is evidence that migrants are better able to comply with requirements if they can meet their basic needs while in the community. Legislation that ensures both nationals and non-nationals are entitled to access all services is evident in Morocco (Constitution 2011, Article 30).203 Non-nationals can access healthcare in Zimbabwe204 and Tunisia, while Uganda205 and Egypt206 extend health rights to refugees only. In collaboration with Médicins du Monde Tunisie, Terre d’Asile Tunisie runs an advocacy programme to inform doctors that they may apply Constitutional rights to migrants.207

There have been attempts by several African governments to mainstream services for refugees and asylum seekers through existing national services to avoid parallel systems for refugees from those for host communities. Successful mainstreaming of refugees into national health service systems has been identified in Ghana,208 Djibouti,209 and discussed in Egypt.210 Refugees will be mainstreamed into the national education systems of Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) member countries – Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Uganda. Certificates that are recognised throughout the region will be administered to refugees who complete secondary education.211 In Egypt, only Syrian and Sudanese refugees have access to public education.212

Mainstreaming migrants, refugees and asylum seekers access to government-run social assistance services developed for citizens can avoid parallel systems and multiply the benefits of diverse funding streams

An example of both refugee and host communities benefitting when the creation of parallel healthcare systems is avoided can be seen in Lusaka, Zambia. Using UNHCR funding, a Lusaka-based transit centre run by Action Africa Help Zambia (AAHZ) was able to improve the infrastructure of their health clinic. The surrounding host community became frustrated as the good standard of medical care was exclusively available to refugees. To increase the sustainability of the centre, the centre opened the clinic to the wider community and therefore could use their migration funding to develop the host population’s standard of health-care. The host community subsequently became more tolerant of newcomers, employing some of the refugees in domestic work such as gardening. This has led to reciprocity as hospitals and clinics in other parts of Lusaka have opened their doors to refugees living nearby to save them having to travel across the city to the transit centre’s clinic.213
Granting the right to work to migrants, asylum seekers and refugees benefits the local community through the economic contributions reduces reliance on state resources

A number of African countries provide refugees with employment rights while their protection needs are being determined. There is a growing body of evidence that suggests granting the right to work to asylum seekers and refugees benefits the local community through the economic contributions of newcomers and reduces reliance on state resources or charitable supports for basic welfare. Employment access is outlined in law or policy in Zambia (Refugees Act 1970), Kenya (Refugees Bill 2017), Rwanda, Uganda, Algeria, and Swaziland as well as in Zimbabwe and Botswana for high-skilled refugees. The Comprehensive Refugee Response Frameworks (CRRF) of Ethiopia and Djibouti outline employment and educational rights for refugees. As part of Djibouti’s Refugee Law, passed in January 2017, all refugee camps were to be categorised as “villages” by the end of 2017 which promotes further freedom of movement that will enable easier access to services and jobs.

Conclusion

Drawing on the framework of the IDC’s Community Assessment and Placement (CAP) model, this report has highlighted the wide range of alternatives to detention currently in operation across the African continent, that could be expanded nationally or adapted in other African countries with similar migration contexts.

Case studies include spontaneous, ad hoc or local measures as well as laws and policies implemented in a systematic and sustained manner - with implementation by civil society, governments or partnerships between both. The research has shown that it is possible to manage migration in a holistic, rights-respecting way, without resorting to the use of detention. Streamlined identification, decision-making and referrals can increase the ability of governments to manage people within their territories effectively. A holistic, individualised approach to case management reduces demand on government resources and increases the likelihood of compliance. Additionally, placement options are already available in most host communities that can be increased through government and civil society cooperation with locals.

IDC’s ten-year programme of research has found that alternatives to detention are on average 80% cheaper than custodial immigration detention while still ensuring compliance with immigration requirements - up to 95% appearance rates and up to 69% voluntary and independent return rates for refused cases. African nations can - and in many cases are already - exploring, developing and implementing many rights-respecting and cost-effective ways to manage migration without the use of detention. This report is an attempt to address the information gap on alternatives in Africa and can increase understanding of the successes and on-going challenges particular to this unique continent that will allow for the expanded use of alternatives to immigration detention in Africa.
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