



HANDBOOK UN HEADQUARTERS



COLEGIO REAL
ROYAL SCHOOL

INDEX

1. LETTERS FROM THE PRESIDENTS

2. COMMITTEE GUIDE

2.1. Topic A:

- 2.1.1. Key Terms**
- 2.1.2. About the UN General Assembly**
- 2.1.3. Introduction**
- 2.1.4. Historical Context**
- 2.1.5. Current Context**
- 2.1.6. Sub-Topics**
- 2.1.7. Guide Questions**
- 2.1.8. Sources**

3. HANDBOOK

- 3.1. Preambulatory and Operative Phrases**
- 3.2. Specific Points**
- 3.3. Specific Motions in Order**
- 3.4. Voting Procedure**
- 3.5. Working Paper Example**

Catalina Garcia Garcia

Honorable Delegates,

It is my great pleasure to welcome you to the UN Headquarters Committee. My name is Catalina García, and I am honored to serve as your President during these exciting days ahead. As an active member of Model United Nations, I expect nothing but excellence from this committee, and I am confident that together we will create a meaningful and memorable experience.

Our topic, *“Immigrant Crime and Legal Impunity Crisis in the European Union,”* is both complex and highly relevant. This issue has affected countless lives and challenges us to balance security, human rights, and international cooperation. In recent years, certain incidents, including acts of terrorism such as the tragic events of November 13, 2015, in Paris, have raised pressing concerns about how immigration systems may be exploited by individuals or groups with malicious intent. These events have sparked intense debate across the EU and the international community, as governments strive to look for adequate solutions while aiming for international peace. As delegates, it is your responsibility to represent your nations with diplomacy, respect, and well-informed arguments while working toward solutions to this pressing global concern.

I encourage you to prepare thoroughly, practice your speaking and negotiation skills, and approach each debate with creativity and an open mind. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to me. I look forward to seeing the passion, leadership, and insight you will bring to this committee.

Sincerely,

Catalina García

President | cgarcia@royalschool.edu.co /



Marialejandra Barrera

Honorable delegates, it is my honor to welcome you to this UN Headquarters Committee and to serve as your President. My name is Marialejandra Barrera, and as a proud junior at Royal School, I am thrilled to greet you all at the start of what promises to be an enriching experience for us all. Our time together will be dedicated to addressing some of the most pressing global issues of our generation. Your presence here reflects not only your dedication to international dialogue but also your commitment to finding creative and constructive solutions for a more just and peaceful world.

What makes this space so valuable is the diversity of thought, background, and perspective that each of you brings. It is through this diversity that we will be able to approach complex challenges with fresh ideas and innovative strategies. I encourage you to listen with respect, engage in debate with an open mind, and collaborate with the spirit of diplomacy that defines the United Nations.

This committee is not only an opportunity to simulate international negotiation but also a chance to grow, to strengthen our voices, and to learn from one another. I am confident that together we will transform dialogue into action and ideas into meaningful outcomes.

I look forward to seeing the passion, creativity, and leadership you will each contribute. Let us make this experience one of learning, respect, and inspiration as we work together to shape solutions for a better world.

If you have any questions or ideas to share, do not hesitate to contact me. I am truly excited to work with each of you.

Marialejandra Barrera Suarez

President | mabarrera@royalschool.edu.co/



2. COMMITTEE GUIDE

Immigrant Crime and Legal Immunity Crisis in the European Union

2.1.1 Key Terms:

1. **Legal Impunity:** Refers to the lack of accountability or protection for individuals who violate laws or human rights, particularly affecting marginalized groups such as immigrants.
2. **Immigration Policy:** The set of laws and regulations governing the entry, stay, and rights of immigrants in a country.
3. **Human Rights:** Fundamental rights and freedoms inherent to all individuals, regardless of nationality or immigration status.
4. **National Security:** The protection of a nation from threats, including terrorism, which often influences immigration policies and public sentiment.
5. **Xenophobia:** An irrational fear or prejudice against people from other countries, often leading to discrimination against immigrants.
6. **Marginalization:** The social process of becoming or being made marginal, or peripheral, often affecting immigrant communities in terms of rights and access to resources.
7. **Refugee Status:** A legal designation for individuals who have fled their home country due to persecution or violence and are granted protection in another country.
8. **Asylum Seekers:** Individuals who seek international protection from persecution and are in the process of applying for refugee status.
9. **Terrorism:** The unlawful use of violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, often used to influence political or ideological goals.
10. **Public Sentiment:** The collective attitudes and beliefs of the general public, which can significantly impact immigration policies and the treatment of immigrants.
11. **Integration:** The process of incorporating immigrants into the social, economic, and cultural fabric of the host country.
12. **Discrimination:** Unjust treatment of individuals based on their

nationality, ethnicity, or immigration status, often resulting in unequal access to rights and opportunities.

2.1.2 About the UN General Assembly

The UN General Assembly (UNGA) is the main policy-making body of said organization. All of its member states are part of the UN General Assembly and each of the 193 has an equal vote. This organ provides a distinctive forum for multilateral debates on a wide range of international matters covered under the Charter of the United Nations.

2.1.3 Introduction:

The issue of the legal impunity for immigrants in Europe has become increasingly prominent in the wake of significant events that have tested the resilience and integrity of the continent's legal and social frameworks. One of the most tragic terrorist attacks in Paris on November 13, 2015, which not only claimed numerous lives and sparked a complex discourse surrounding immigration security and human rights.

2.1.4 Historical Context

The issue of immigrant crime and legal impunity within the European Union (EU) has been a topic of increasing concern and debate over the past decades. The EU, built on principles of unity, free movement, and shared governance, has faced numerous challenges in balancing its humanitarian obligations with the need to ensure security and social cohesion among its member states.

Since the early 2000s, Europe has experienced significant waves of migration, fueled by factors such as political instability, armed conflicts, poverty, and human rights violations in regions like the Middle East, Africa, and parts of Asia. The Syrian Civil War (2011–present), the rise of extremist groups like ISIS, and crises in countries such as Libya and Afghanistan led to an unprecedented influx of asylum seekers and migrants. According to Eurostat, over 1.3 million first-time asylum seekers arrived in the EU during the peak of the 2015 migration crisis. This large-scale movement of people created logistical, political, and social challenges for member states, especially those on the EU's external borders like Greece, Italy, and Spain.

While the majority of migrants and refugees seek safety and contribute positively to European societies, instances of crime committed by a minority of individuals have fueled heated political discourse. Far-right political parties and movements across Europe have capitalized on these incidents to criticize immigration policies, advocating for stricter border controls and even questioning the Schengen Area's principle of free movement. One of the

central issues is legal impunity, where migrants who commit crimes sometimes face complex legal situations due to jurisdictional gaps between EU member states, asylum laws, or lack of cooperation in extradition agreements. This has raised concerns about whether the EU's current legal frameworks are sufficient to address crimes involving migrants while upholding the fundamental human rights enshrined in the EU Charter.

The topic is particularly sensitive because of its dual nature: security concerns versus humanitarian obligations. Governments must balance their duty to protect their citizens with international commitments to protect vulnerable populations such as refugees. Failure to manage this balance has, in some cases, led to public backlash, erosion of trust in institutions, and political polarization within and between EU states. Moreover, tensions have emerged over the responsibility-sharing mechanism within the EU, with countries like Hungary and Poland opposing mandatory migrant quotas, arguing they compromise national sovereignty and security.

The Paris Attacks – November 13, 2015

On November 13, 2015, a series of coordinated terrorist attacks struck Paris, France, marking one of the deadliest assaults on European soil since World War II. The attacks targeted six locations, including the Bataclan concert hall, restaurants, and the Stade de France stadium, leaving 130 people dead and over 350 injured. Investigations revealed that several of the perpetrators were affiliated with the Islamic State (ISIS). Crucially, some attackers were found to have entered Europe by posing as refugees, exploiting weaknesses in the EU's border management systems during the height of the migration crisis.

This tragic event intensified fears surrounding illegal immigration, terrorism, and the misuse of asylum routes by extremist groups. Many critics argued that the Schengen Area's open-border policy and insufficient intelligence sharing among EU states allowed individuals with violent intentions to move freely and prepare attacks. Following the attacks, debates intensified over the link between immigration policies and security risks, with some political leaders calling for stricter vetting procedures, enhanced border controls, and the suspension of Schengen in certain circumstances.

The Paris attacks serve as a stark example of how gaps in the EU's migration and legal frameworks can have devastating consequences, directly connecting to the topic of this committee. While not all migrants are associated with crime or terrorism, this incident highlighted the urgent need for reforms to prevent abuse of humanitarian systems and to ensure accountability for criminal activities.

2.1.5 Current Context:

The European Union is currently facing a complex intersection of migration policy, criminal law, and human rights concerns. Recent legislative initiatives have intensified debates over the so-called “criminalization of migration.” In 2024, EU member states advanced a draft law aimed at combating migrant smuggling by broadening its definition, increasing penalties, and introducing heavy fines. While a humanitarian clause exists, it is non-binding, leaving humanitarian actors and NGOs vulnerable to prosecution. Proposals have also sought to remove the requirement that facilitation of irregular migration be linked to financial gain, effectively criminalizing acts of assistance even when motivated by solidarity. This development has fueled concern over the persistence of “crimes of solidarity,” a term used to describe the prosecution of individuals who provide humanitarian aid to migrants.

Alongside these legal changes, the EU has introduced tougher deportation and detention measures. In March 2025, new regulations extended detention periods for rejected asylum seekers to up to two years, broadened reentry bans to a maximum of 20 years for high-risk cases, and paved the way for establishing “return hubs” outside EU territory to process deportees. These policies are being implemented in parallel with the EU’s new Pact on Migration and Asylum, which is designed to harmonize asylum systems across member states but has been criticized for prioritizing control and deterrence over protection. By October 2025, the EU’s Entry/Exit System (EES) will also become operational, registering the biometric data of non-EU nationals in order to better monitor irregular stays, further strengthening the surveillance infrastructure.

At the same time, public discourse across the Union reflects heightened fears about crime and security linked to migration, despite mixed evidence. Studies show that crime rates among first-generation immigrants are often lower than those of native populations, and that over-representation in statistics can stem from factors such as socioeconomic exclusion and policing practices rather than inherent criminality. Nevertheless, political rhetoric in several countries, including Poland and Italy, has adopted a “zero tolerance” stance, framing migration as a security threat. This dynamic risks deepening public misconceptions and driving policies that are disproportionate to the evidence.

Civil society organizations and human rights advocates have raised serious concerns over this trajectory. They argue that the EU’s expanding criminal law framework undermines humanitarian principles, weakens protections for civil society actors, and erodes trust in legal systems. Demands have grown for binding humanitarian exemptions, clearer safeguards, and “firewall” policies that separate access to basic services from immigration enforcement. Critics warn that without such measures, the European Union faces an “immunity crisis,” in which migrants, aid workers, and communities alike become exposed to injustice under increasingly restrictive and punitive frameworks.

2.1.6 Sub-Topics:

• A. Case study Paris November 13 2015 :

On November 13, 2015, Paris experienced a series of coordinated terrorist attacks planned by ISIS-affiliated extremists. The assaults began near the Stade de France, where suicide bombers detonated explosives during an international football match. Soon after, gunmen attacked several cafés and restaurants in central Paris, firing on civilians. The deadliest incident occurred at the Bataclan concert hall, where attackers killed 90 people during a siege before police intervened. In total, 130 people were killed and more than 400 were injured, making it the deadliest attack in France since World War II.

• B. Criminalization of Humanitarian Aid:

How anti-smuggling laws in the European Union often blur the line between criminal activity and humanitarian action. In several cases, NGOs, volunteers, and citizens who provide shelter, medical care, or rescue operations to migrants have been investigated or prosecuted under legislation originally designed to combat organized crime. While governments justify these measures as necessary to control irregular migration and dismantle smuggling networks, critics argue that they discourage solidarity, weaken civil society, and risk violating international obligations to protect human rights and refugees. The central challenge is to strike a balance between ensuring border security and safeguarding humanitarian principles.

2.1.7 Guide Questions:

1. How do current EU laws address crimes committed by migrants or asylum seekers?
2. Are there gaps in jurisdiction or extradition processes between EU member states that lead to impunity?
3. What role do international treaties, such as the Geneva Convention, play in limiting or guiding legal action?
4. How have open-border policies, like the Schengen Agreement, impacted crime prevention and counterterrorism efforts?
5. Should the EU prioritize stricter border controls, and if so, how can this be done without violating humanitarian principles?
6. How can the EU balance its commitment to protect refugees with the need to safeguard its citizens?
7. What are the ethical and legal considerations when deporting migrants who have committed crimes?
8. How did the 2015 Paris attacks and similar events influence EU migration and security policies?
9. What lessons can be learned from member states with stricter or more lenient policies on immigration-related crime?
10. What role should external actors (e.g., non-EU countries, INTERPOL, NATO) play in addressing this issue?
11. How can intelligence sharing and coordinated policing across EU member states be improved to prevent future incidents?

2.1.8 Sources:

-https://picum.org/blog/blog-category/joint-statements/?utm_source

-https://eulawanalysis.blogspot.com/2025/07/?utm_source

-https://www.thetimes.com/world/europe/article/eu-toughens-deportation-rules-to-fend-off-anti-immigrant-backlash-nrzbncc7v?utm_source

-<https://apnews.com/article/migration-smugglers-eu-ngos-solidarity-726e38855a3fd554891493f5494640c3>

https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/02/migrants-at-the-gate-europe-tries-to-curb-undocumented-migration?lang=en&utm_

Recommendation from the Chair: *We encourage you to watch Netflix's "November 13: Attack on Paris" miniseries, which features a great explanation in chronological order of the attack, featuring the victim's testimonies and visual aid.*

3.HANDBOOK**3.1 PREAMBULATORY AND OPERATIVE PHRASES**

Preambulatory Phrases	Operative Phrases
Acknowledging	Accepts
Affirming	Adopts
Appreciating	Agrees
Approving	Appeals
Aware	Approves
Bearing in mind	Authorizes
Believing	Calls upon
Commending	Commends
Concerned	Considers
Conscious	Decides
Considering	Declares
Convinced	Determines
Desiring	Directs
Emphasizing	Emphasizes
Expecting	Encourages
Expressing	Expresses appreciation
Fully aware	Invites
Guided by	Notes
Having adopted	Proclaim

3.2 SPECIFIC POINTS

RIGHT OF REPLY

To ask for a Right of Reply, the delegate must send a written note to the Chair explaining in what way his/her delegation was offended. The Chair may limit the time accorded to a Right of Reply. A Right of Reply to a right of reply is out of order. This point may not interrupt a speaker.

POINT OF ORDER:

During discussion of any matter, a delegate may rise on a Point of Order to complain of improper parliamentary procedure. The Chair in accordance with these rules shall immediately decide a Point of Order. The Chair may, without subject to appeal, rule out of order those points which, in his or her judgment, are dilatory or improper. This point may interrupt a speaker, however the use of this point should not be driven by the desire to boycott a delegate's intervention.

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE:

A delegate may rise on a Point of Personal Privilege to address a concern over the environment of the committee. Acceptable concerns include the ability to hear the speaker, the temperature of the room, etc. The Chair may, without subject to appeal, rule out of order those points which, in his or her judgment, are dilatory or improper. This point may interrupt a speaker.

POINT OF PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY:

During an intervention, if the current speaker is obstructed by a parliamentary query concerning modus operandi, or parliamentary language, he or she may rise on this special point to consult such doubt through the Chair without altering the flow of her intervention and hence the development of the committee.

POINT OF FOLLOW-UP:

Once the speaker has answered a substantial question from a Point of Information, this point may be used to make a follow-up statement regarding the speaker's response, which is shorter than a regular intervention. The point can only be used once by the

interrogator and can not be used to make another question.

POINT OF INFORMATION:

A delegate may use a Point of Information if they have any question concerning a broad amount of matters in the committee. A Point of Information can be employed in order to resolve the agenda, procedure, and protocol. It may also be used to approach the Chair. This point may not interrupt a speaker.

POINT OF RELEVANCE:

A delegate makes use of a Point of Relevance when they feel that another delegate's intervention is veering off topic and touching matters that are irrelevant for the development of the committee, therefore misusing time needed for discussing the topic of the committee. This point may interrupt a speaker at the Chair's discretion.

POINT TO ADD TO REGISTRY:

With a Point to Add to Registry, a delegate may ask the Chair to write a statement, in the registry of the committee, that was just made by the delegate speaking. This point may interrupt a speaker and the delegate performing it must state the exact complete phrase he or she wants to have written down. After this, the chair asks the delegate speaking if this was what he or she said and if it is, the Chair proceeds to write it down.

POINT OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE:

There is no Point of Order over a Point of Order, so when a Point of Order isn't in order, a delegate uses a Point of Parliamentary Procedure. Delegate must yield in one of the following ways:

YIELD TO THE CHAIR:

This ends a delegate's speech and has the effect of proceeding to the next speaker on the Speakers' List.

YIELD TO ANOTHER DELEGATE:

The delegate may yield any remaining speaking time to the representative of another country. The yielded-to delegate may speak for the time remaining, but may not yield to another delegate.

3.3 SPECIFIC MOTIONS IN ORDER

Motion to open the session:

is the first motion of the day it opens the session this means that it gives start to the committees debate and following protocol

Motion to open the agenda of the day:

This motion is to open the committee with the agenda or topics that were already chosen for the committee, this is the second motion and it looks like the first motion

Motion to start with the opening speeches:

Back in the handbook we already explain the opening speeches, as this motions states the opening speeches comence in alphabetical order.

Motion to start a formal debate:

A formal debate I mainly where your country explains its position and approaches to the committee, it is also a formal debate which there is a order that the chairs writes of those delegations that want to be add it, it is more formal and is normally in the podium, it will always be a formal debate due to the protocol.

Motion to start an informal debate:

An informal debate is where the delegates are freely to move around the committee and the delegates start to debate more comfortably

Motion to start a lobby time:

A lobby time is where certain countries gather to start the working papers or in other cases re state their position.

Motion to suspend session:

This motion usually is done when the lunch or break is about to start. It suspends the session but later it will be open once again.

Motion to start the voting procedures

This is the motion that is done when the delegates already wreck the resolutions and the committee have to vote them in favor of against.

Motion to adjourn

This is the last motion it is to close the committee and go home.

3.4 VOTING PROCEDURE

A) Amendments

An amendment shall not be introduced to a committee until the Chair has approved it. A delegate may move to amend any resolution that has been introduced. Of all the sponsors, the amendment is automatically incorporated into the resolution upon introduction to the Committee. It is not required for the signatories to approve of the amendment. If all the sponsors consider it an Unfriendly Amendment, then it passes to be voted upon by the entire committee. An Unfriendly amendment suspends debate on the resolution. If considered necessary the Chair shall recognize at least one speaker for and one speaker against the amendment. The speakers may yield or take questions. The Chair may apply a time limit. The amendment is then voted upon, unless a delegate moves to extend debate on the amendment.

B) Voting

Prior to the commencement of voting on substantive matters, all members shall take their seats and the doors to the room shall be closed. No one shall be permitted to enter or leave the room during the conduct of the vote. No points may interrupt, except points directly concerned with the conduct of the Voting Procedure (Points of Order). Each country seated in a committee shall have one vote with the exception of observer countries. Countries that abstain from voting shall not be considered in reckoning the totals needed to determine the results of the vote. For a resolution to pass in the Committee, a 50% + 1 majority vote is required.

Except for votes on resolutions, votes shall be taken by placard count, unless otherwise successfully moved. Votes on resolutions shall be by roll call. In a roll call vote, the Chair shall read the name of each member country. The roll call shall be called in ascending alphabetical order. Each delegate, when called upon, must call out: "In Favor", "In Favor with Reasons", "Against", "Against with Reasons", "Abstain", "Abstain with Reason", or "Pass".

Once the roll has been called, the Chair shall call the names of those countries that passed the first time. Those countries will have an opportunity to enter a vote. If a state passes twice, its vote shall be recorded as an abstention. Delegates who, during attendance, answered “Present and Voting” may not abstain when voting for a resolution.

3.5 *WORKING PAPER EXAMPLE*