



IOM COVID-19 POINTS OF ENTRY ANALYSIS

30 APRIL 2020

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AREA

PUBLISHER

The opinions expressed in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IOM concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

IOM is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. As an intergovernmental organization, IOM acts with its partners in the international community to assist in meeting the operational challenges of migration, advance understanding of migration issues, encourage social and economic development through migration and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

Please send any feedback, comments and suggestions related to the Covid-19 Mobility Tracking dashboards and outputs to the DTM Covid-19 Team at dtm-covid19@iom.int

© 2020 International Organization for Migration (IOM)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the International Organization for Migration (IOM).

COVER PHOTO:

Germany/France border, highway tollgate.

© IOM/ 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

METHODOLOGY & DEFINITIONS	3
NUMBERS AT A GLANCE	5
SITUATIONAL OVERVIEW: EEA Region	7
OVERVIEW BY LOCATION TYPE	8
Airports	8
Blue Border Crossing Points	10
Land Border Crossing Points	12
Areas and sites of interest	14
ANNEX	16

Methodology & Definitions

The Points of Entry Analysis is meant to serve IOM Member States, IOM, UN and voluntary partner agencies, the civil society (including media) as well as the general population in analysing the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on Points of Entry. It is particularly relevant when identifying and addressing specific needs faced by migrants and mobile populations, disproportionately affected by the global mobility restrictions. This report is a regional product that covers countries under the IOM's Regional Office Brussels. The Regional Office Brussels acts as IOM's liaison and coordination office to the European Union and NATO and covers the European Economic Area region (referred to as the EEA region). The EEA region includes following countries, territories and areas: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, German, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The report is based on information provided by IOM field staff, using resources available at the IOM country office level and is accurate to the best of IOM's knowledge at the time of compilation. All information is being constantly validated, including the geo-location and attributes, and through regular assessments and triangulation of information. The updates depend on the time frame within which the information becomes available and is processed by IOM. For this reason, the analysis is always dated and timestamped in order to reflect the reality at a given time. However, as the situation continuously evolves and changes, despite IOM's best efforts, the analysis may not always accurately reflect the multiple and simultaneous restrictive measures being imposed at a specific location.

This report provides an overview and analysis of the data from a regional perspective and is in line with the Global Covid-19 Points of Entry report issued with 30th April 2020 data. For more detailed country-specific information and dataset used for the analysis please visit: <https://migration.iom.int/>.

For further information on the methodology, definitions and explanation please refer to the [Methodology Framework](#).

Regional maps are available [here](#).

The dataset is available [here](#).

Data is collected about the following locations:

- Airports (currently or recently functioning airport with a designated International Air Transport Association (IATA) code)
- Blue Border Crossing Points (international border crossing point on sea, river or lake)
- Land Border Crossing Points (international border crossing point on land, including rail)
- Internal Transit Points (internal transit point inside a given country, territory or area)
- Areas of interest (region, town, city or sub-administrative unit in a given country, territory or area)
- Sites with a population of interest (stranded, repatriated and returning migrants, IDPs, nationals, asylum seekers and regular travellers)

The following operational status is captured for each assessed location:

- Fully operational:
 - Open for entry and exit: all travellers can use the PoE or internal transit point.
- Partially operational:
 - Open for commercial traffic only: only transport of goods is permitted, travellers are not allowed to cross;
 - Closed for entry: travellers cannot use this location to enter the country, territory or area;
 - Closed for exit: travellers cannot use this location to leave the country, territory or area;
 - Open for returning nationals and residents only: the location is open to returning nationals and residents only, including military and humanitarian personnel and other special groups for whom entry and exit is permitted according to national procedures in place.
- Fully closed:
 - Closed for both entry and exit: no one is permitted to use the PoE or internal transit point.
- Other
- Unknown

Methodology & Definitions

The report systematically captures the following types of mobility restrictions in place:

- Movement restricted to this location
- Movement restricted from this location
- Visa requirements have changed for this location
- Certain nationalities are restricted to enter or disembark at this location
- Rules pertaining to identification and/or travel documents needed to enter or disembark at this location have changed
- Medical measures including mandatory quarantine or additional medical checks have been imposed at this location
- Medical certificate confirming a negative COVID-19 test result
- Other
- None

Additionally, more information is collected on areas of interest, specifically concerning whether:

- Public events were cancelled or postponed
- Schools were closed
- Restricted operating hours for public establishments (café, restaurant, etc.) were adopted
- Alternative working arrangements (working remotely, etc.) were implemented
- Movement outside home was restricted
- Lockdown/quarantine measures were enforced by police or military

Affected Populations:

COVID-19 mobility restrictions affect different population categories. For example, for the purpose of this report, stranded migrants are individuals unable to return as a result of mobility restrictions related to COVID-19. This could include economic migrants, students, temporary visa or work permit holders. It could also include other populations such as tourists who may be stranded owing to COVID-19-related travel restrictions. These populations may be seeking repatriation or assistance while remaining abroad.

Other affected populations include regular travellers, nationals, returnees, irregular migrants, internally displaced persons (IDPs), migrant workers and refugees. The various populations are affected in diverse ways across the different types of assessed locations, including but not limited to requirements for additional documentation, temporary relocation, quarantine or medical screening, up to an inability to continue their intended travel.

Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Capacities (COVID-19):

To understand public health emergency preparedness and response capacities with regard to the COVID-19 pandemic additional questions are asked about specific public health interventions in place in the specified locations. These include risk communication and community engagement, infection prevention and control, and measures to detect, manage and refer ill travellers suspected of having COVID-19, such as standard operating procedures, health screening, presence and functionality of a referral system for suspected COVID-19 cases, and the availability of an isolation space for suspected cases.

List of acronyms used throughout the report

- C/T/As: countries, territories or areas
- DTM: Displacement Tracking Matrix
- IDPs: Internally Displaced Persons
- PoE: Point of Entry
- p.p.: Percentage Point¹
- PPE: Personal Protective Equipment
- SOPs: Standard Operating Procedures

Data is geographically aggregated by IOM Regional Offices. The list of countries under each IOM Regional Office can be found here: <https://www.iom.int/regional-offices>

1. Not to be confused with per cent, percentage point (p.p.) refers to an increase or decrease of a percentage rather than an increase or decrease in the raw number.

I. Scope and Coverage: Numbers at a glance

26

Assessed C/T/As

2

Assessed Internal Transit Points²

764

Assessed Points of Entry

190

Assessed Areas and Sites

The current outbreak of COVID-19 has affected global mobility in the form of various travel disruptions and restrictions. To better understand how COVID-19 affects global mobility, IOM has developed a global mobility database to map and gather data on the locations, status and different restrictions at PoEs, globally. This report looks at data for countries in the European Economic Area (EEA) region. It also looks at the impacts on stranded migrants and other populations such as tourists who are affected by the changes in mobility measures using a compilation of inputs from multiple sources, including from IOM staff in the field, DTM reports on flow monitoring and mobility tracking as well as from trusted media sources.

IOM has assessed 4,437 total locations (including PoEs, internal transit points, areas of interest and sites with population of interest) in 173 countries, territories and areas as of April 2020. At the same time, in the **EEA region, 956 locations in 26 countries, territories and areas (C/T/As)** were assessed. Of these, 49 per cent were land border crossing points, 16 per cent airports, 15 per cent of assessed points were blue border crossing points (sea, river and lake ports), 8 per cent were areas of interest and 12 per cent sites with population of interest. Finally, only 2 locations assessed were internal transit points between cities and regions, hence constituting a remarkably small proportion of the percentage of total assessed locations being reflected as 0 per cent. For this reason, the focus area of this report is only on the PoEs, areas of interest and sites of population of interest. More details can be found in annex, Table 1.1.

Of all assessed locations in the EEA region, 34 per cent were reported as fully closed, 44 per cent were reported to be partially operational, and 20 per cent of assessed locations were fully operational. At the same time, 3 per cent of all the assessed locations were unknown (see Table 2 and 2.1).


2. Disclaimer: while Points of Entry mostly refer to international border crossing points, the inclusion of internal transit points in this analysis is to provide a comprehensive overview of internal restrictive measures on affected populations. This is not to suggest a conflation of internal transit points with international border crossing points.

I. Scope and Coverage: Numbers at a glance


Table I: Number of assessed locations by type in the EEA Region

	Airport	Internal Transit Point	Land Border Crossing Point	Blue Border Crossing Point	Area of Interest	Site with Population of Interest
Number of assessed locations by type	150	2	473	141	77	113
% of total assessed locations	16%	0%	49%	15%	8%	12%


Total number of assessed and closed locations




Percentage of assessed locations that are closed



Affected population categories at assessed locations




Operational status of assessed locations




2.Situational Overview: EEA Region

Number and type of restrictive measures imposed at assessed locations in the EEA region



Duration of restrictive measures imposed at assessed locations in the EEA region



3. Overview of Airports

150

Airports assessed in 26 C/T/As

21%

of the assessed airports are closed

14 days to one month

Most common (62%) duration of restrictions imposed

In total, 150 airports were assessed in 26 countries, territories and areas. The operating status of the assessed airports varied but most airports were either partially operational (55% or 83 airports), or fully closed (21% or 32 airports). Similarly, 21 per cent of the assessed airports remained open (32 airports). The information was not available for three of the assessed airports (for more details, see Table 2 and 2.1). Many operational airports were reported to be used to repatriate nationals as well as for the transport of necessary cargo and medical supplies.


The most common mobility restrictions or restrictive measures imposed at assessed airports were landing in and departing from the assessed airport with 77 and 43 per cent of the assessed airports by these measures, respectively (see Table 4.1). Other common restrictive measures imposed at airports were newly introduced medical requirements, such as medical screening, medical certificates or quarantine measures (adopted in 9% of the assessed locations), restrictions imposed on specific nationalities (in 17% of the assessed airports), changes in visa requirements (4%), a medical certificate confirming a negative COVID-19 test result (1%). It is noticeable that other limitations were imposed in 34 per cent of the assessed airports.

As of 30 of April 2020, the most common duration of imposed restrictions at assessed airports was 14 days to one month (62% of the cases), while 16 per cent of them were expected to remain in place for a duration between one to three months. Only 4 and 1 per cent of the restrictive measures were expected to be in place for less than 14 days and more than three months, respectively. In 17 per cent of cases the foreseen duration of the imposed restrictions at assessed airports was reported to be unknown (i.e. information was unavailable).


The restrictive measures imposed at assessed airports had an impact on mobile populations (see Table 3 and 3.1), largely affecting regular travellers (in 82% of assessed locations), nationals (73%), irregular migrants (63%), returnees (42%), migrant workers (37%), refugees (33%), and also IDPs (21%).

Operational status of the assessed airports

- Fully closed
- Fully operational
- Other
- Partially operational



Affected population category at assessed airports



3. Overview of Airports

Public Health Section

The following public health measures were reported in specified airports through IOM’s missions participating in this exercise within the EEA region (for further information, see Table 6).


On risk communication and community engagement, in 90 per cent of the specified airports (55 out of 61 identified airports), information on COVID-19 was provided at the site through leaflets, posters or announcements. Similarly, in 90 per cent of the responses (53 out of 59 identified airports) reported that handwashing stations were available as an infection prevention and control measure.

Health screening through non-contact thermometers was reported by a limited number of the assessed airport where this information was available (3 identified airports). Moreover, 2 assessed locations reported that there was infrastructure in place to support crowd control and ensure safety of screeners.


For the detection, management and referral of ill travellers, standard operating procedures were reported to be in place in 77 per cent of identified airports (47 out of 61 identified airports), while a referral system was reported to be in place in 17 per cent of the identified airports (10 out of 60 identified airport). Finally, the availability of an isolation space for suspected COVID-19 cases, prior to their appropriate referral, was reported by 6 out of 60 specified airports (10% of the total).

Maintaining and enhancing these capacities across various levels (e.g. local, national, regional) can facilitate the detection, assessment, and notification or reporting of events that can together contribute to prompt and effective responses to public health emergencies such as COVID-19.

Public health measures in place at the assessed locations



Available tools/measures in the event of a COVID-19 case at the site



4. Overview of Blue Border Crossing Points (sea-, river and lake ports)

141

Blue Border Crossing Points Assessed in 18 C/T/As

45%

of the assessed blue border crossing points are closed

14 days to one month

Most common (51%) of restrictions imposed (33% were unknown, i.e. information unavailable)

IOM assessed a total of 141 blue border crossing ports in 18 different countries, territories and areas. The operational status of the assessed ports varied with 30 per cent of blue border locations (or 43 locations) which were partially operational, 45 per cent (63 locations) fully closed, and 24 per cent (34 locations) fully operational, (for more details, see Table 2 and 2.1).


The most common mobility restrictions or restrictive measures imposed at ports were disembarkation at and embarkation from a particular port (57% and 61%, respectively), followed by newly introduced medical requirements (9%) such as medical screening, requirement of medical certificates or quarantine measures. Less common restrictive measures imposed at blue border crossing points were restrictions imposed on specific nationalities (in 14% of the assessed locations) and changes in visa requirements (2%). None of the blue border crossing points assessed required specific medical certificate confirming a negative COVID-19 test result. Finally, it is noticeable that in 10 per cent of the assessed ports other mobility limitations were imposed.

The share of restrictions expected to be in place for a period between 14 days and one month was recorded in 51 per cent of the cases. In 14 per cent of assessed locations the expected duration of restrictive measures was recorded as one to three months and in only 1 per cent of assessed locations restrictions were planned to be valid for less than 14 days. Also, in 33 per cent of the assessed port (47 out of 141 assessed ports), the foreseen duration of the restrictive measures was recorded as unknown (i.e. no available information).


The restrictive measures imposed at the assessed ports had an impact on mobile populations (see Table 4 and 4.1), largely affecting regular travellers (in 70% of assessed locations), nationals (57%), irregular migrants (44%), returnees (35%), migrant workers (32%), refugees (29%) and finally IDPs (28%).

Operational status of the assessed blue border crossing points

■ Fully Closed ■ Fully operational
■ Other ■ Partially operational



Affected population category at assessed blue border crossing points



Percentage of Blue Border Crossing Points

4. Overview of Blue Border Crossing Points (sea-, river and lake ports)

Public Health Section

The following public health measures were reported in specified blue border crossing points through IOM's missions participating in this exercise within the EEA region (for further information, see Table 6.1).


On risk communication and community engagement, in 93 per cent of the specified blue border crossing points (50 out of 54 specified locations) information on COVID-19 was provided to travellers at the site through leaflets, posters or announcements. Furthermore, 50 out of 53 blue border crossing points assessed (94% of the identified locations) reported that handwashing stations were available as an infection prevention and control measure.

Health screening through non-contact thermometers was reported in 7 per cent of the assessed blue border crossing points (3 out of 43 assessed locations). Moreover, of the 43 identified locations for which this information was available, only 3 blue border crossing points (7%) had infrastructure in place to support crowd control and ensure safety of screeners.


For the detection, management and referral of ill travellers, standard operating procedures were reported to be in place in 94 per cent of identified blue border crossing points (51 out of 54 identified locations), while a referral system was reported to be in place in 87 per cent of the specified locations (46 out of 53 identified blue border crossing points). Finally, only 6 per cent of the specified blue border crossing points reported the availability of an isolation space for suspected COVID-19 cases (3 out of 53 identified locations), prior to their appropriate referral.

Maintaining and enhancing these capacities across various levels (e.g. local, national, regional) can facilitate the detection, assessment, and notification or reporting of events that can together contribute to prompt and effective responses to public health emergencies such as COVID-19.

Public health measures in place in the assessed locations



Available tools/measures in the event of a COVID-19 case at the site



5. Overview of Land Border Crossing Points

473

Land Border Crossing Points assessed in 24 C/T/As

35%

of assessed land border crossing points are completely closed

14 days to one month

Most common (44%) duration period of restrictions imposed

Among the 473 assessed land border crossing points monitored in 24 countries, territories or areas, the majority of the assessed locations were partially operational or fully closed (44% and 35% of the total, respectively), while 17 per cent of the assessed locations were fully operational (for more information, see Table 2.1).


In total, 164 out of 473 assessed locations were completely closed, corresponding to 44% per cent of the total number of land border crossing points assessed in this region. Limitations on entry to and exit from a land border crossing point were the most frequent restrictive measures used to curb the spread of COVID-19 at land border crossing points: both restrictions were used in 78 and 76 per cent of assessed land border crossing points, respectively (see Table 4.1). Other restrictions that were imposed in the assessed land border crossing points were medical measures, such as quarantine or medical screening (in 19 per cent of the cases), restrictions imposed on specific nationalities (in 22% of the assessed land border crossing points), changes in visa requirements (6%), a medical certificate confirming a negative COVID-19 test result (6%). However, noticeably, other limitations were imposed in 46 per cent of assessed locations.

As of 30 of April 2020, the most common duration of restrictions at assessed land border crossing points was 14 days to one month (44% of the cases), while 16 per cent of them will be in place for a duration between one to three months. Only 8 and 1 per cent of the restrictive measures will be in place for less than 14 days or more than three months, respectively.


The abovementioned measures had an impact on all categories of populations (see Table 3 and 3.1), with regular travellers being the mostly affected at 77 per cent of the assessed land border crossing points, followed by nationals (70%), irregular migrants (46%), returnees (23%), migrant workers (15%), refugees (10%), and finally IDPs (6%).

Operational status of the assessed land border crossing points

- Fully Closed
- Fully operational
- Other
- Partially operational



Affected population category at assessed land border crossing points



Percentage of Land Border Crossing Points

5. Overview of Land Border Crossing Points

Public Health Section

The following public health measures were reported in specified blue border crossing points through IOM's missions participating in this exercise within the EEA region (for further information, see Table 6.2).


On risk communication and community engagement, in 67 per cent of the specified blue border crossing points (60 out of 90 specified locations) information on COVID-19 was provided to travellers at the site through leaflets, posters or announcements. Furthermore, 30 out of 85 land border crossing points (35% of the identified locations) reported that handwashing stations were available as an infection prevention and control measure.

Health screening through non-contact thermometers was reported in 89 per cent of the assessed land border crossing points (17 out of 19 assessed locations). Moreover, of 19 identified locations for which this information was available, a total of 16 land border crossing points (84%) had infrastructure in place to support crowd control and ensure safety of screeners.


For the detection, management and referral of ill travellers, standard operating procedures were reported to be in place in less than half of the identified land border crossing points (36 out of 91 identified locations, 40%), while a referral system was reported to be in place in only 15 per cent of the specified locations (13 out of 86 identified land border crossing points). Finally, only 1 per cent of the specified land border crossing points reported availability of an isolation space for suspected COVID-19 cases (1 out of 86 identified locations), prior to their appropriate referral.

Maintaining and enhancing these capacities across various levels (e.g. local, national, regional) can facilitate the detection, assessment, and notification or reporting of events that can together contribute to prompt and effective responses to public health emergencies such as COVID-19.

Public health measures in place in the assessed locations



Available tools/measures in the event of a COVID-19 case at the site



6. Overview of Areas and Sites of Interest

6.1. Areas of Interest

77

Areas assessed in 13 C/T/As

25%

of the assessed areas have restrictions on public events, school, alternative working arrangements and restricted operating hours (café, restaurant etc.), respectively


In total, 77 areas of interest were assessed in 13 countries, territories and areas. These were locations in different sub-administrative units, such as areas of outbreak of COVID-19 or areas under lockdown/quarantine. Assessed areas consisted of cities, towns and regions. Cancellation of public events, school closures, restricted operating hours for public establishments and alternative working arrangements can be listed as restrictive measures assessed in these areas.

The type of restrictive measures being imposed on the assessed areas in the EEA region varied. Limited restrictive measures were imposed in the EEA region. Although a total of 77 areas of interest was assessed, only 24 of them responded to the question of type of restrictions imposed in the areas of interest. Particularly, in 25 per cent of these specified areas (6 out of 24) public events were cancelled or postponed and schools closed.

Similarly, in 25 per cent of the specified locations alternative working arrangements (working remotely) and restricted operating hours for public establishments (café, restaurant, etc.) were imposed, respectively.

In majority of the areas (88%), the expected duration of restrictions was 14 days to one month, followed by less than 14 days (17% of the cases). Moreover, noticeably, in 8 per cent of assessed areas, the expected duration of restrictions was unknown.

Number and type of restrictions in areas of interest in EEA region



6. Overview of Areas and Sites of Interest

6.2. Sites with Populations of Interest

113

Sites assessed in 17 C/T/As

92%


of the assessed sites have reported cases of stranded foreign nationals

In total, 113 sites were assessed in 17 countries, territories and areas. These sites were selected as they concern populations of interest such as stranded foreign nationals and IDPs. Airports, hotels, temporary reception centers, camps, transit centers and detention centers can be given as examples of assessed sites.

Affected population groups consisted of stranded, repatriated and returning migrants, IDPs, nationals, asylum seekers and regular travellers. In 92% per cent of the assessed sites with populations of interest, foreign nationals were stranded there (104 out of 113 assessed sites), where in 4 per cent there were reported cases of foreign nationals returning to their country of origin (5 sites), while no assessed sites reported that both nationals and IDPs were affected by the restrictive measures.

Number of sites disaggregated by population categories and by IOM region

- Stranded foreign nationals in the country
- Foreign nationals returning to their country of origin (repatriation, deportation, etc.)
- IDPs
- Other



Annex: Tables

Table 1.1: Percentage of assessed locations by type in EEA region

Location type	Percentage of assessed locations
Airport	16%
Area of Interest	8%
Sites of Interest	12%
Land Border Crossing Point	49%
Blue Border Crossing Point	15%
Total	100%

Table 2: Number of assessed location by operational status and type in the EEA region

Location Type	Fully Closed	Partially operational	Fully operational	Other/Unknown	Total
Airport	32	83	32	3	150
Internal Transit Point	0	1	0	1	2
Land Border Crossing Point	164	210	82	17	473
Blue Border Crossing Point	63	43	34	1	141
Total	259	337	148	22	766

Table 2.1: Percentage of locations disaggregated by operational status and type in the EEA region

Location Type	Fully closed	Partially operational	Fully operational	Other/Unknown	Total
Land Border Crossing Point	35%	44%	17%	4%	100%
Internal Transit Point	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%
Blue Border Crossing Point	45%	30%	24%	1%	100%
Airport	21%	55%	21%	2%	100%
Total	34%	44%	19%	3%	100%

Table 3: Number of assessed locations by affected population categories

Location Type	Nationals	Regular travellers	Irregular migrants	Returnees	IDPs	Refugees	Migrant workers	No. of locations assessed
Airport	110	123	95	63	32	50	55	150
Blue Border Crossing Point	81	99	62	49	40	41	45	141
Internal Transit Point	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2
Land Border Crossing Point	333	364	217	110	28	47	72	473
Total	526	588	376	224	100	140	174	766

Table 3.1: Percentage of assessed locations disaggregated by affected population categories

Location Type	Nationals	Regular travellers	Irregular migrants	Returnees	IDPs	Refugees	Migrant workers	No. of locations assessed
Airport	73%	82%	63%	42%	21%	33%	37%	150
Internal Transit Point	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	2
Land Border Crossing Point	70%	77%	46%	23%	6%	10%	15%	473
Blue Border Crossing Point	57%	70%	44%	35%	28%	29%	32%	141
Total	69%	77%	49%	29%	13%	18%	23%	766

Annex: Tables

Table 4: Overview of measures imposed on locations, disaggregated by type of location

Location Type	Mobility restriction (to)	Mobility restriction (from)	Visa change	Restricted nationality	Document change	Medical requirements	Medical certificate confirming a negative COVID-19 test result	Other limitations	None	No. of locations assessed
Airport	116	64	18	25	6	14	2	51		150
Internal Transit Point	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	2
Land Border Crossing Point	369	359	28	104	59	90	27	216	1	473
Blue Border Crossing Point	81	86	2	20	3	12	0	14	1	141
Total	567	510	49	150	68	117	29	282	3	766

Table 4.I: Percentage of different measures disaggregated by type of location

Location Type	Mobility Restriction (to)	Mobility restriction (from)	Visa change	Restricted nationality	Document change	Medical requirements	Medical certificate confirming a negative COVID-19 test result	Other limitations	None	No. of locations assessed
Airport	77%	43%	12%	17%	4%	9%	1%	34%	0%	150
Internal Transit Point	50%	50%	50%	50%	0%	50%	0%	50%	50%	2
Land Border Crossing Point	78%	76%	6%	22%	12%	19%	6%	46%	0%	473
Blue Border Crossing Point	57%	61%	1%	14%	2%	9%	0%	10%	1%	141
Total	74%	67%	6%	20%	9%	15%	4%	37%	0%	766

Table 5: Duration of restrictive measures imposed at assessed locations in the EEA region

Location Type	Less than 14 days	14 days to One Month	1 - 3 months	More than 3 months	Unknown	Total
Airport	6	93	24	2	25	150
Internal Transit Point	1	0	1	0	0	2
Land Border Crossing Point	38	208	75	4	148	473
Blue Border Crossing Point	2	72	20	0	47	141
Total	47	373	120	6	220	766

Table 6: Public Health Section for Airports

Question	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
Handwashing station at the site	53	0	6	59
Health screening with temperature check using non-contact thermometer	3	1	0	4
Information about COVID-19 being provided at site	55	0	6	61
Infrastructure at the site to support crowd control and ensure safety of screeners	2	0	2	4
Isolation space exists for evaluation of any suspect case away from crowds	6	4	50	60
Referral system in place at the site	10	4	46	60
SOPs in place at the site for management and referral of ill travellers	47	5	9	61

Annex: Tables

Table 6.1: Public Health Section for Blue Border Crossing Points

Question	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
Handwashing station at the site	50	0	3	53
Health screening with temperature check using non-contact thermometer	3	2	38	43
Information about COVID-19 being provided at site	50	1	3	54
Infrastructure at the site to support crowd control and ensure safety of screeners	3	0	40	43
Isolation space exists for evaluation of any suspect case away from crowds	3	1	49	53
Referral system in place at the site	46	0	7	53
SOPs in place at the site for management and referral of ill travellers	51	0	3	54

Table 6.2: Public Health Section for Land Border Crossing Points

Question	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
Handwashing station at the site	30	13	42	85
Health screening with temperature check using non-contact thermometer	17	2	0	19
Information about COVID-19 being provided at site	60	3	27	90
Infrastructure at the site to support crowd control and ensure safety of screeners	16	0	3	19
Isolation space exists for evaluation of any suspect case away from crowds	1	21	64	86
Referral system in place at the site	13	5	68	86
SOPs in place at the site for management and referral of ill travellers	36	4	51	91

Table 7: Number of areas of interest in the EEA region

Region	No. of Areas of interest	Percentage
European Economic Area	77	100%

Table 7.1: Number of type of restrictions in areas of interest assessed in EEA region

Region	Public events cancelled or postponed	Schools closed	Restricted operating hours for public establishments (café, restaurant, etc.)	Alternative working arrangements (work remotely, etc.)	Restricted movement	Lockdown/quarantine enforced by police or military	Total areas of interest assessed*
European Economic Area	6	6	6	6	-	-	77

*A total of 77 areas of interest was assessed, while 24 out of 77 responded to the question of type of restrictions imposed in the areas of interest.

Table 7.2: Duration of restrictive measures in areas of interest

Duration	No. of Areas of Interest	Percentage
1 - 3 months	2	3%
14 days to One month	68	88%
Less than 14 days	1	17%
Unknown	6	8%
Total	77	100%

Annex: Tables

Table 7.3: Affected population in the sites of interest

Affect population categories	No of Sites of interest	Percentage of sites
Stranded foreign nationals in the country	104	92%
Foreign nationals returning to their country of origin (repatriation, deportation, etc.)	5	4%
IDPs	-	-
Nationals	-	-
Other	3	3%
Unknown	1	1%
Total	113	100%

Table 7.4: Number of sites with stranded migrants by IOM Region

Region	Stranded foreign nationals in the country	Foreign nationals returning to their country of origin (repatriation, deportation, etc.)	IDPs	Other	Unknown	Total
Southern Africa	3	6	0	1	0	10
South America	22	12	0	0	0	34
Middle East and North Africa	24	9	6	32	13	84
Central and North America and the Caribbean	25	23	1	2	0	51
Central and West Africa	30	29	2	2	0	63
East and Horn of Africa	31	3	6	1	8	49
Asia and the Pacific	39	40	0	18	0	97
South-Eastern Europe, Eastern Europe and Central Asia	54	5	0	1	0	60
European Economic Area	104	5	0	3	1	113
Total	332	132	15	60	22	561