



PART 2: ASSESSMENT TOOL

ICAO TRIP Guide on **BORDER CONTROL MANAGEMENT**



ICAO

SECURITY AND FACILITATION

VERSION 1, 2018

The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) is a UN specialized agency established by States in 1944 to manage the administration and governance of the Convention on International Civil Aviation (Chicago Convention).

ICAO works with the Convention's 191 Member States and industry groups to reach consensus on international civil aviation Standards and Recommended Practices (SARPs) and policies in support of a safe, efficient, secure and economically sustainable and environmentally responsible civil aviation sector.

ICAO's mission is to serve as the global forum of states for international civil aviation, with the objective to support and enable a global air transport network that meets or surpasses the social and economic development and broader connectivity needs of global business and passengers.

Security & Facilitation is one of the five comprehensive Strategic Objectives of ICAO, meant to enhance global civil aviation security and facilitation. This Strategic Objective reflects the need for ICAO's leadership in aviation security facilitation and related border security matters.

Disclaimer

All reasonable precautions have been taken by ICAO to verify the information contained in this publication. However, the published material is being distributed without warranty of any kind, either expressed or implied; nor does it necessarily represent the decisions or policies of ICAO. The responsibility for the interpretation and use of the material contained or referred to in this publication lies with the reader and in no event shall ICAO be liable for damages arising from reliance upon or use of the same. This publication shall not be considered as a substitute for the government policies or decisions relating to information contained in it. This publication contains the collective views of an international group of experts, believed to be reliable and accurately reproduced at the time of printing. Nevertheless, ICAO does not assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of the views expressed by the international group of experts.

Published by:

ICAO
Security & Facilitation
International Civil Aviation Organization
999 Robert-Bourassa Boulevard
Montréal, QC, Canada H3C 5H7

Email: fal@icao.int
Tel: + 1 514 954-9219
Fax: +1 514 954-6077
www.icao.int/Security/FAL/TRIP
www.icao.int

Printed by ICAO
2018 International Civil Aviation Organization

ICAO TRIP Guide on **BORDER CONTROL MANAGEMENT**

PART 2: ASSESSMENT TOOL



| ICAO

SECURITY AND FACILITATION

Funded by the
Government
of Canada

Canada

The development of this guide was funded by the Government of Canada as part of a counter-terrorism capacity-building project implemented by the International Civil Aviation Organization for the benefit of its Member States.

Contributors to the ICAO TRIP Guide on Border Control Management:



CONTENTS

- 1. ABOUT THIS ASSESSMENT TOOL – SCOPE AND APPLICATION 5**
- 2. ICAO TRIP AND BORDER CONTROL MANAGEMENT 6**
- 3. NATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR BORDER CONTROL MANAGEMENT 7**
- 4. INSPECTION SYSTEMS AND TOOLS 8**
 - A. Visas and Electronic Travel Systems 9
 - B. Document Readers..... 10
 - C. Biographic Identity Verification 11
 - D. Biometric Identity Verification..... 12
 - E. National Watchlists 13
 - F. Entry & Exit Databases 14
 - G. Automated Border Control..... 15
- 5. INTEROPERABLE APPLICATIONS 16**
 - H. Advance Passenger Information and Interactive Advance Passenger Information..... 17
 - I. Passenger Name Record 18
 - J. Public Key Infrastructure and the ICAO Public Key Directory..... 19
 - K. eMRTD Biometric Identity Verification..... 20
 - L. INTERPOL SLTD Database 21
 - M. International Watchlists 22
- 6. EXAMINATION OF TRAVELLERS AND TRAVEL DOCUMENT INSPECTION..... 23**
- 7. HUMAN RESOURCE CONSIDERATIONS IN BORDER CONTROL MANAGEMENT 24**
- 8. ASSISTANCE TO STATES 25**



About this Assessment Tool – Scope and Application

The *ICAO TRIP Guide on Border Control Management* (“The Guide”) is practical guidance material for States wishing to improve and develop their BCM¹ with a view of applying traveller identification and risk assessment throughout the phases of the traveller journey.

The Guide is published in two parts:

- **Part 1: Guidance** comprises the detailed, substantive content describing best practice related to the Inspection Systems and Tools and Interoperable Applications available for national BCM, while acknowledging the specific border control challenges faced in different States. ICAO SARPs are referenced throughout the Guide when relevant to a specific topic.
- **Part 2: Assessment Tool** provides high level guidance on consideration by States intending to adopt new technology and processes, optimize existing systems or develop BCM strategies and policies. For the complete list of the ICAO SARPs that apply to each section and topic, the user is invited to refer to *Part 1: Guidance*.

The Assessment Tool is intended to be used by States to self-assess their BCM systems, processes and capabilities or provides a structured framework for technical experts performing a technical assistance mission. For ease of use this Assessment Tool follows the same structure as the *Part 1: Guidance* by including a template corresponding with each of its sections and topics. Each template contains a summary of the main considerations of those sections and topics along with a standard format for users of the Assessment Tool to record their comment, analysis, notes and recommendations.

The *Part 2: Assessment Tool* is the companion document of the *Part 1: Guidance* and should therefore be read and used in conjunction with it.

The Guide can be downloaded at:
<https://www.icao.int/Security/FAL/TRIP/Pages/Publications.aspx>.

Additional TRIP publications and guidance material are also available for download at the weblink referenced in the previous paragraph.

To ask questions or communicate with the Facilitation Section, States are invited to write to: FAL@icao.int.

¹ The acronyms used in the Assessment Tool are spelled out in the *PART 1: Guidance*.

ICAO TRIP and Border Control Management

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The scope of the ICAO TRIP is defined by the relevant SARPs contained in Annex 9 - *Facilitation*, the technical specifications of Document 9303 - Machine Readable Travel Documents, the operation of the ICAO PKD and other TRIP and Facilitation guidance material. Together this framework increases global standardization and interoperability to optimize national BCS for efficient and secure facilitation of international air travel. The elements of the ICAO TRIP Strategy enable traveller identification and risk assessment to be undertaken by States at the different phases of the traveller journey (i.e. pre-departure, pre-arrival, at entry, during stay and at exit).

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details.

CONSIDER

- Are border control agencies familiar with the SARPs of Annex 9 and the technical specifications of Doc 9303 that are relevant to traveller identification and risk assessment?
- Are the Inspection Systems and Tools and Interoperable Applications used and planned by the State able to be integrated into the current or a future national BCS?
- Is there an adequate understanding of MRTD and eMRTD interoperability issues?
- Is the iterative process of traveller identification and risk assessment understood and applied in the processing of travellers at the border?
- Are BCM interventions risk based (e.g. including features that prevent and deter high risk travellers from commencing or continuing travel)?
- Are mechanisms used to allow BCM interventions to be applied across the phases of the traveller journey?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPORTANCE	IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

National Strategies for Border Control Management

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Effective BCM requires a deep understanding of the benefits, risks and threats of the travel environment that a State faces. These insights enable States to identify gaps in their national capacity and capability. This understanding in turn ensures that options for applying technology as solutions in BCM can be evaluated, sequenced and prioritized to meet the needs of the State.

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details.

CONSIDER

- How does the environment faced by the State shape its BCM challenges and its response to them?
 - What historical, geopolitical, social and economic factors have a critical impact on travel to and from the State?
 - Are statistics available to provide insight into travel patterns and growth?
 - Is the State now or in future likely to become a source, destination or transit point for transnational crime in any of its forms and/or mass migration?
- Are the legislative, policy, procedural and ICT systems frameworks available to border control agencies adequate?
 - Are SOPs available to border control officers in printed or digital formats and are these procedures consistent with the border agency strategic planning documents?
 - Is the BCS able to operate effectively and continuously with 24/7/365 availability at all border locations?
- Do the border control agencies understand and meet their obligations to travellers under international law?
 - Is the State a party to UN treaties relevant to travel (relating to refugees, statelessness, trans national crime and human rights)?
- Do the State's border control agencies collaborate effectively together?
 - Is the NATFP in place and operationalized through National Air Transport Facilitation Committee and Airport Facilitation Committee, or similar coordinating bodies?
 - Do border control agencies share resources, systems and data and undertake joint operations at the national, regional and international levels?
 - Does the national passport issuer receive feedback from border agencies about the performance in use of the national MRTDs?
- What is the detail of regional agreements whose provisions include facilitated travel or measures to achieve BCM cooperation?
- Are business continuity and disaster recovery arrangements for the national BCS adequate?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

Inspection Systems and Tools

Inspection Systems and Tools capture, verify, match and record the data in MRTDs and about travellers.

As the BCM arrangements of States develop and mature new Inspection Systems and Tools are added, their functionality is developed and extended, and integration is improved.

As illustrated in the table below, Inspection Systems and Tools can be implemented to different levels of complexity. This complexity is greater when traveller information is obtained and used across the travel continuum (e.g. when visa or ETS data is integrated with the national BCS and when exit controls are introduced).

Advanced BCM arrangements are typically developed over time.

A key question to be answered in border assessments is whether the ambitions of the national border control agencies match their organisational capability and capacity.

The following pages provide more detail of issues relating to assessing the intended implementation by States of the Inspection Systems and Tools described in Chapter 4 of *Part 1: Guidance*.

NATIONAL CAPABILITY & CAPACITY	ADVANCED		D. Visa Biometrics	A. ETS D. ETS biometrics	E. National Biometric watchlist G. ABC
	MATURE	B. eMRTD readers E. Enhanced watchlist search F. Enhanced entry database search	A. Visa D. National ID database Biometrics E. National watchlist of stolen and lost MRTDs	F. Exit database	D. Registered Traveller Programme Biometrics
	BASIC	B. MRTD readers E. Biographic watchlists F. Entry database	B. Full page document readers C. National ID database verification		
		LOW			HIGH
			COMPLEXITY		

Maturity of border control arrangements: Inspection Systems and Tools²

² In the table, the prefix corresponds to the relevant topic in the *Part 1: Guidance*

A. VISAS AND ELECTRONIC TRAVEL SYSTEMS

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Visas and ETS arrangements obtain additional information which allows States to undertake traveller identification and risk assessment prior to travel commencing. Visas and ETS requirements can prevent and deter high risk travellers from attempting travel. At the same time ETS have facilitation benefits – an ETS is obtained quickly and cheaply in online applications and when integrated with iAPI, provide certainty that airlines can allow travel to commence.

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details.

CONSIDER

- Is a visa and/or ETS requirement authorised by national legislation?
- Has consideration of the implementation of visa or ETS arrangements been preceded by a risk and threat assessment, and have project costs and benefits been evaluated?
- Can the visa and ETS database be integrated with the national BCS so that visa information contributes to interventions across the phases of the traveller journey, i.e. during travel, at entry, during stay and at exit?
 - Does the ETS issuance system have 24/7/365 availability and are process exceptions supported by adequate referral resolution arrangements?
 - Are the audit and revenue collection features of visa and ETS issuance robust?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

B. DOCUMENT READERS

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

MRTD and eMRTD document readers are the tool which leverage the interoperability of MRTDs. Document readers allow airlines and national authorities to automate aspects of traveller identification and risk assessment across the different phases of the traveller journey.

The technical specifications of Doc 9303 deal exhaustively with the interoperable features required of document readers.

CONSIDER

- Are MRTD readers deployed at all border locations and used consistently by all border control officers?
 - Are the data accuracy and auditability benefits of document readers accepted and understood by the border officers that use (or will in future use) them?
 - Are the deployed document readers eMRTD capable?
 - Does the document reader interface with the BCS support eMRTD PKI authentication?
 - Does the deployed document reader performance meet ICAO technical specifications is it adequate in terms of speed, accuracy, usability, interoperability and reliability?
- Where full-page readers are deployed, are UV or other full-page images displayed to primary processing officers?
 - Do primary processing staff understand the features and functionality of the document reader and BCS system interface?
 - Are primary processing officers trained in interpreting the full-page images, check sum and other features of the readers that are deployed?
 - Are the additional UV or other full-page images that are displayed used to identify travel documents for referral to secondary examination?
- Is the secondary examination area adequately equipped with appropriate readers for document examination (including eMRTD readers, microscopes, UV and other light sources)?
- If “reference library” or “machine authentication” features are being considered for deployment in future MRTD readers, is the State aware of the inherent strengths and weaknesses of these solutions?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

C. BIOGRAPHIC IDENTITY VERIFICATION

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

A comparison of the biographic details read from the MRTD presented by a traveller with the corresponding details recorded in the passport or national identity card issuance database is a simple and readily achieved foundation for identity verification. Integration of a database extract from national passport into the national BCS can automate this important identity verification check at traveller primary processing.

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details.

CONSIDER

- Do the MRTDs and eMRTDs most commonly presented by travellers meet interoperability SARPs and the technical specifications of Doc 9303?
- Does the national BCS include an automated verification interface between border clearance at entry (and exit) and the national travel document or national identity card database?
- Do border control officers working at secondary examination have read-only access to the national passport or identity card issuance database?
 - Is this interface used to support traveller identification?
- Are the verification interfaces planned or in place authorised in national legislation and inter-agency MoUs and subject to appropriate data protection and privacy controls?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

RECOMMENDATIONS	IMPORTANCE	IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

D. BIOMETRIC IDENTITY VERIFICATION

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Biometric identity verification adds to the assurance of traveller identification and has the important benefit of being readily automated. Biometric identity verification using images read from eMRTDs is the subject of Topic K. This topic is concerned with solutions that obtain the biometric reference image from other sources (e.g. in passport, identity card, visa or ETS issuance, or in registered traveller programs). Biometric identity verification is a key enabling feature for ABC.

CONSIDER

- If a biometric verification system is being considered do border control project officers and decision-makers understand:
 - The mathematics of biometric matching (including the appropriate application of FAR/FRR and FAR concepts); and
 - The cultural and behavioural factors that are critical in designing the traveller to eGate interface?
- Have the risks and threats to be mitigated, the benefits to be gained and the project costs, been evaluated?
- Does national legislation provide authority to border control agencies to collect, store and compare biometric samples?
 - Is an adequate privacy and data protection framework in place?
- Are the processing models and biometric modality being considered for deployment adaptable and appropriate for the State considering implementation?
 - Are biometric reference images available from legacy passport, national identity card or visa systems?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

E. NATIONAL WATCHLISTS

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The application of watchlists enables States to prevent the travel of and/or to refer for secondary examination, travellers who are known targets following prior risk assessment. National watchlists automate one important traveller risk assessment task. National watchlists can be applied by States at the different phases of the traveller journey – directly by States in visa issuance, at entry, during stay and at exit, and indirectly during travel via airline API and iAPI interfaces and at transit by national liaison officers working at foreign airports.

CONSIDER

- Does the scope and size of the national watchlist include targets covering all the traveller risk and threat categories facing the State?
 - Does the national watchlist include biographic targets?
 - Does the national watchlist include national travel documents reported as lost, stolen and cancelled?
 - Are details of national lost, stolen and cancelled travel documents updated frequently into the BCS?
- Does the automated watchlist search functionality of the national BCS incorporate multiple algorithms, reference tables, wildcard search and other solutions to best ensure that watchlist targets are identified notwithstanding name variance, error and deliberate attempts to avoid identification?
- Is the watchlist configurable to accept short term targeting of intelligence targets identified by the application of risk-based profiles?
 - Is the watchlist configuration able to also manage targeting of entity attributes associated with travellers (e.g. vehicles, mobile telephone numbers, email addresses et al)?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

F. ENTRY & EXIT DATABASES

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

A historical database of the prior entry of travellers is on its own a powerful risk assessment tool for States, the value of which increases when analysed in combination with other data sources (e.g. visa/ETS data). For States performing exit controls, the addition of exit data allows States to reconcile traveller arrivals and departures:

- ✓ For foreigners: To identify visa overstayers and accurately determine overstay rates and trends; and
- ✓ For nationals: To determine actual residence and accurately report on emigration.

Aggregated travel data provides important insights into the economic, social and security issues faced by States. For all purposes, the value of historical databases of travel increases with the size of the database and when full national coverage of all border locations is achieved.

CONSIDER

- Is a national database of historical travel available and does the data include:
 - Traveller entry of nationals and foreigners; and
 - Traveller exit of nationals and foreigners; and
 - All border locations for all transport modalities.
- Does the search functionality of the national entry and exit databases compiled by the BCS incorporate multiple algorithms, reference tables, wildcard search and other solutions to best ensure that the arrival and departure records of travellers are identified notwithstanding name variance, error and deliberate attempts to avoid identification?
- Are the reporting and analysis tools capable of disaggregating entry and exit records by a wide range of parameters (e.g. traveller nationality, age, State of origin, State of destination, airline, travel date and travel date range et al)?
- Is traveller entry and exit data the subject of national reporting of aggregated data (e.g. to inform national policies on tourism, labour migration or other travel related issues)?
- Is access to traveller entry and exit databases restricted on a “need to know basis”, auditable and subject to privacy and data protection legislation?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

G. AUTOMATED BORDER CONTROL

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

In high volume applications, where benefits justify the cost of investment, ABC can improve process efficiency for border control agencies, reduce processing time for the traveller while at the same time improving the assurance of traveller identity and automating aspects of the traveller risk assessment. The implementation of ABCs is highly contingent – relying at a minimum on the integration of watchlist searches and biometric identity verification.

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details.

CONSIDER

- Is the ABC well designed and secure:
 - Is the ABC solution an appropriate response to risk and threat, and the subject of a business case that includes a robust cost/benefit analysis?
 - Do the controls and checks completed in ABC transactions assure that the MRTD (or alternative token) being presented is genuine, unaltered and has not been reported lost or stolen?
 - Is the biometric identity verification appropriate, reliable and authorised by law – to ensure that the MRTD or other token remains in the hands of the person to whom it was issued?
 - Have robust disaster recovery and business continuity plans that anticipate and mitigate outages been implemented?
- Is the ABC fully integrated with the national BCS (e.g. so that entry and exit records are automatically added to the BCS database by the ABC sub-system)?
- Are referrals from the ABC subject to proper analysis in secondary examination processes?
 - Are the causes of referrals from the ABC analysed then mitigated by changes in practice and design to reduce their future incidence?
 - Is training of officers responsible for oversight of the ABC adequate?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

Interoperable Applications

Interoperable Applications enable global sharing of data about travellers and their travel documents.

As the BCM arrangements of States develop and mature, new Interoperable Applications are added, their functionality is developed and extended, and integration is improved.

As illustrated in the table below, Interoperable Applications can be implemented to different levels of complexity. This complexity is greater when traveller information is obtained and used across the phases of the traveller journey (e.g. in API, iAPI and PNR).

Advanced BCM arrangements are typically developed over time.

A key question to be answered in border assessments is whether the ambitions of the national border control agencies match their organisational capability and capacity.

The following pages provide more detail of issues in assessing the intended implementation by States of the Interoperable Applications described in Chapter 5 of *Part 1: Guidance*.

NATIONAL CAPABILITY & CAPACITY	ADVANCED		M. INTERPOL nominal data	H. iAPI J. eMRTD PKI authentication K. eMRTD biometric verification	I. PNR M. International Biometric watchlists
	MATURE	M. CUNSCSL	H. API J. National eMRTD issuance	J. ICAO PKD Membership J. NPKD	L. INTERPOL SLTD
	BASIC				
		LOW			HIGH
			COMPLEXITY		

Maturity of border control arrangements: Interoperable Applications³

³ In the table, the prefix corresponds to the relevant topic in the *Part 1: Guidance*

H. ADVANCE PASSENGER INFORMATION AND INTERACTIVE ADVANCE PASSENGER INFORMATION

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

API enables the traveller MRTD data collected by airlines at check-in to be sent to State border control agencies. Obtaining traveller data in advance of arrival allows States to complete risk-based assessments of travellers to identify the travellers whose entry can be facilitated and those that require other interventions. iAPI, an enhanced two-way interface, allows States to prevent travel commencing, by returning a message to the airline at check-in to refuse boarding.

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details. UNSCR 2178 (2014) and UNSCR 2396 (2017), amongst others, calls on States to implement API.

CONSIDER

- Do national border agencies have the mature capability required to receive and analyse API data to undertake traveller risk assessment?
 - For States contemplating an iAPI implementation, are national watchlists and risk targeting arrangements able to operate in real time to make decisions to allow boarding?
- Does national legislation authorise the State to require API data to be provided to them by airlines?
- Are data sharing protocols in place to ensure that API data is collected once, and shared between border agencies (i.e. the single window concept)?
- Can the analysis of API data be sustained on a 24/7/365 basis?
- Is the API solution or proposed API solution an appropriate response to risk and threat, and the subject of a business case that includes a robust cost/benefit analysis?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

I. PASSENGER NAME RECORD

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

PNR enables the data that airlines collect about travellers at the time reservations are made to be sent to border control agencies. Since this data includes sensitive personal information, adequate privacy and data protection is essential. As this data is unverified for traveller identity, significant analysis and data management is required to reliably associate the PNR data with the verified identity of the traveller. Subject to these constraints being adequately managed, PNR data supplements other risk-based assessments to determine the travellers whose entry can be facilitated and those that require other interventions. When used in conjunction with visa/ETS, iAPI and/or liaison officers, traveller risk assessment using analysis of PNR can be used to prevent travel from commencing.

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details. UNSCR 2396 (2017) calls on States to implement PNR.

CONSIDER

- Do State border control agencies have the advanced capability required to receive and analyse PNR data to undertake traveller risk assessment?
 - Can the analysis of PNR data be sustained on a 24/7/365 basis?

- Is the analysis to identify risk-based targets using PNR undertaken in a national targeting centre that includes representatives of agencies responsible for immigration and customs, law enforcement and national security?
- Does the State have the ICT functionality and human capability to analyse PNR data against API, visa and/or entry/exit travel history data to identify and correct the traveller identification errors inherent in airline data to ensure PNR is effective in contributing to traveller risk assessment?
- Does the national legislative framework authorising PNR collection and analysis include privacy and data protection provisions?
 - Does the national legislation authorising the State to require PNR data to be provided to them by airlines meet EU and US legislative requirements - necessary wherever carriers operating in the State have operations in the EU and/or US?
 - Have MoUs with airlines been negotiated and agreed?
- Are data sharing protocols in place to ensure that PNR data is shared by border control agencies (i.e. the single window concept)?
- Is the PNR solution or proposed PNR solution an appropriate response to risk and threat, and the subject of a business case that includes a robust cost/benefit analysis?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

J. PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE ICAO PUBLIC KEY DIRECTORY

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

eMRTD PKI authentication provides an assurance to States that the travel document being presented by the traveller was genuinely issued and remains unaltered. Membership of the ICAO PKD ensures that the digital certificates essential to perform authentication are conveniently and efficiently available to States from a single, central location. Since the ICAO PKD is not designed to support the authentication of individual travellers, a NPKD or similar repository, integrated with the national BCS, must be established by States to support eMRTD PKI authentication at the border. In this way eMRTD authentication contributes to both traveller identification and traveller risk assessment. eMRTD authentication can be applied and relied on across all phases of the traveller journey, provided the required digital certificates are available for comparison.

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details.

CONSIDER

- Have eMRTD capable document readers been at all border locations and are they used consistently?
 - Does the document reader interface with the BCS support eMRTD PKI authentication?
- Is the State a member of the ICAO PKD?
- Is a NPKD or similar repository integrated with the national BCS to support eMRTD PKI authentication at the border?
 - Are robust administrative arrangements in place to ensure that certificate downloads can be sustained on a daily, indefinite basis?
 - Are business continuity and disaster recovery support for PKI downloads from the PKD and the NPKD interface with the national BCS adequate?
- Are there standard operating procedures and sufficient understanding of eMRTD PKI to inform the resolution of “failure to authenticate” transactions at secondary examination?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

K. EMRTD BIOMETRIC IDENTITY VERIFICATION

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Provided eMRTD PKI authentication is performed correctly (see Topic J), States can rely on the biometric images read from eMRTDs to make comparisons with images of the corresponding biometric feature of travellers. Biometric identity verification using reference facial images obtained from eMRTDs is a universal solution, available to all States, in all eMRTDs, and as a result is the most common identity verification solution to be found in eGate deployments globally. Provided eMRTD PKI authentication is undertaken, eMRTD biometric verification can be applied and relied on across all phases of the traveller journey.

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details.

CONSIDER

- Is the biometric identity verification solution integrated with all other functionality of the national BCS?
- Is the border control authority aware of the empirical foundation in probability related to the biometric identity verification and are they capable of setting the system in such way that it represents their risk management strategy (FAR vs FRR)?
- Are sufficient eMRTD document readers and biometric image cameras or capture devices available at border locations to meet traveller demand?
- Are border officers at secondary examination adequately equipped in terms of equipment, skills, knowledge and experience to resolve “fail to verify” instances at biometric verification?
- Does national legislation authorise eMRTD identity verification?
 - Does the national legislation for biometrics also authorise the collection, sharing, retention and disposal of biometric reference images in national eMRTDs and the sample images obtained from travellers?
 - Does the national privacy and data protection legislation adequately protect biometric data from misuse?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

L. INTERPOL SLTD DATABASE

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Checks of the INTERPOL SLTD database provides additional assurance to States that travel documents remain in the hands of the traveller to who they were issued. The INTERPOL SLTD database contributes to traveller identification and risk assessment and can be integrated across all phases of the traveller journey where State interventions are able to be made (e.g. including visa/ETS, API/iAPI, liaison officer, entry, stay and exit).

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details.

CONSIDER

- Is the INTERPOL SLTD database integrated into the watchlist of the national BCS?
 - If not, are the alternative business processes reliable, efficient and workable?
- Are border officers at secondary examination adequately equipped in terms of equipment, skills, knowledge and experience to resolve “match” instances?
 - Are robust 24/7/365 business processes in place to work in partnership with the NCB for INTERPOL to refer matches for resolution to the State of listing?
 - Are the secondary referral processes able to manage the frequent instances of false matches, where travellers use MRTDs previously reported as lost, after the document is found?
 - Are arrangements in place to prevent the departure of nationals using MRTDs previously reported as lost, stolen or cancelled?
- Does national legislation authorise interventions to refuse travel or entry to holders or lost, stolen or cancelled travel documents based on the prime facie evidence recorded in the INTERPOL SLTD database?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

M. INTERNATIONAL WATCHLISTS

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

States have obligations to prevent and combat trans-national crime, including terrorism. A tangible step towards meeting these obligations is the inclusion in national border watchlists of:

- INTERPOL nominal data (broadly the biographical details of the subjects of Red Notices); and
- The CUNSCSL.

In the future, these obligations may extend to include international biometric watchlist targets.

UNSCR 2396 (2017) calls on States to implement biometric watchlists to identify terrorists.

CONSIDER

- Has international watchlist data been added into national watchlists?
 - Are the algorithms and reference table and other features of the watchlist search functions effective in returning likely matches?

or alternatively

- Are international watchlist databases searched using INTERPOL or other system interfaces with the national BCS?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE **IMPLEMENTATION**

	IMPORTANCE	IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

Examination of Travellers and Travel Document Inspection

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Many States still rely largely on a one-step process of identification of travellers and risk assessment performed by primary border officers after the arrival of the traveller at the national border. In more advanced jurisdictions, the implementation of the advanced Inspection Systems, Tools and Interoperable Applications described in Sections 4 and 5 of the *Part 1: Guidance* automate aspects of primary traveller processing. This automation, while effective in dealing with most travellers, generates process exceptions which must be resolved at secondary examination. Resolution of these process exceptions continues, and will continue in future, to involve skills for examination of travellers, and the ability to manually inspect the physical security features of travel documents. The ability to recognise and interpret the physical and electronic security features of travel documents therefore remains critical.

ICAO SARPs apply to this topic. Please refer to *Part 1: Guidance* for details.

CONSIDER

- Do officers working at primary traveller examination perform a role focused on efficient processing, good customer service and the risk-based identification of exceptions for referral to secondary examination?
- Are adequate facilities available to enable secondary examination of travellers close to, but separate from, the booths, ABC eGates and kiosks and other traveller processing infrastructure used at primary examination?
- Do the staffing arrangements allocate dedicated officers to perform the secondary examination of travellers?
 - Is a separation of primary and secondary examination roles maintained in the face of peak processing demands?
- Are officers equipped to undertake travel document inspection?
 - Are border control agency officers working at airports trained in document examination techniques appropriate to their role?
 - Is basic document examination equipment (e.g. magnifying lenses and UV light sources) available to and used by border control officers?
 - Are border operations supported by an adequately equipped and staffed forensic document laboratory?
 - Is there evidence that the document examination laboratory is used for its intended purpose?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

Human Resource Considerations in Border Control Management

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Effective BCM requires strategic insight, organisational capability and capacity, good governance and transparency in border operations. The application of technology which is the major subject of the *Part 1: Guidance* can be ineffective if not enough border control officers are available to complete their work to the required standard; where officers lack skills, knowledge, experience or strategic direction; or where border operations are not adequately controlled or monitored.

CONSIDER

- Does border control agency leadership have adequate exposure to and knowledge of their strategic environment and the BCM options available to mitigate the risks and threats facing their border control agency?
 - Does senior management have opportunities to participate in relevant international events or visit best practice jurisdictions in the region?
- Does border control agency capacity (officers numbers) match the required work to acceptable standards of security, efficient processing and service outcomes for travellers?
 - Are sufficient officers available for flexible deployment by border control agencies to perform traveller clearance at the border to meet both processing peaks and low travel periods?
- Does border control agency capability (officers and management skills, knowledge and experience) match the risk and threat, service delivery and traveller processing challenges facing the agency?
 - How might training and capacity building address capability gaps?
- Are border operations at risk of compromise from corruption or the perception of corruption?
 - Are border operations subject to a Code of Conduct, whistleblower protection and a traveller complaint scheme?
 - Are border agency officers subject to vetting prior to and during their period of employment?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term

Assistance to States

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Participation and engagement in international events relevant to traveller identification and risk assessment in BCM can raise awareness and insight and improve the capability of States. Technical assistance may be available to States through bilateral cooperation and from international organizations.

CONSIDER

- Is the State a member of ICAO?
 - Is the State participating in ICAO TRIP and/or Facilitation events?
 - Is the ICAO Regional Office responsible for TRIP/FAL engaged with national border control agencies?
- Is the State engaged in initiatives or events sponsored by the UN Counter Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate?
- Is the State a member of INTERPOL?
 - Is the NCB engaged with its BCM role in the State?
- Is the State a member of IOM?
 - Is IOM represented by a country office in the State?
 - Has IOM delivered BCM related assistance projects in the State?
- Are there regional assistance mechanisms relevant to BCM?
- Is the State engaged with bilateral partners in BCM projects?
- What priorities for international engagement might the State adopt, given their assessed risk and threat environment?
- Identification of gaps that align with areas of priority interest to potential donors?
- Are there reference materials and other resources from multilateral agencies relevant to the needs of the State?

CURRENT SITUATION

Strengths:
Weaknesses:

RECOMMENDATIONS

IMPORTANCE IMPLEMENTATION

Importance: C = Critical D = Desirable

Implementation: I = Immediate M = Medium Term L = Long Term