



Observatoire ARGA

ARGA Atlas

ARGA PROTECTION MODEL

Author:

Sergei Khrabrykh — President of ARGA, PhD

Organization: Observatoire ARGA, ARGA Atlas

Mailing address: 21 route de l'Aviation, 12 C, 64600 Anglet, FRANCE

Contacts: info@argaobservatory.org, +33 7 58 49 62 27

Website: www.argaobservatory.org, <https://www.arga-atlas.com/>

Anglet, 20 avril 2026

Purpose of the document:

This report is prepared to provide a systematic description of the ARGA Protection Model as a practical legal and institutional architecture of protection in cases involving transnational pressure, abuse of criminal-law and policing mechanisms, extradition, risk of violation of the non-refoulement principle, misuse of INTERPOL channels, arbitrary detention, politically instrumentalised prosecution, compliance-based exclusion, digital profiling and other forms of contemporary transnational repression. The practical purpose of the document is to formulate the ARGA Protection Model not as a declaratory human-rights formula, but as a working scheme of coordinated multi-layer protection in which different fora, procedures and legal tools are used not in isolation but as interrelated elements of a single defensive architecture. For ARGA, this model has direct operational significance, because in the contemporary transnational environment the effectiveness of protection is determined not by the existence of one strong argument, but by the ability to create a legal system of restraint that prevents international cooperation from becoming an infrastructure of rights violation. Current OHCHR materials on transnational repression, official INTERPOL materials on the CCF, UNHCR guidance on non-refoulement, and ECtHR practice on effective remedies and interim measures collectively confirm that fragmented defense is structurally weaker than integrated defense. (ohchr.org, interpol.int, emergency.unhcr.org, ks.echr.coe.int)

CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary
2. Context & Problem Statement / Why This Topic Has Legal and International Significance
3. Legal Framework / Normative and Institutional Framework
4. Mechanisms of Practice / Abuse / Key Mechanisms of Practice, Abuse, or Conflict
5. Case Patterns / Typical Scenarios, Patterns of Development, or Practice Models
6. Risk Assessment / Main Risks, Legal Vulnerabilities, and Problem Areas
7. Institutional Gaps / Institutional Limitations, Gaps, Deficits of Safeguards, or Systemic Weaknesses
8. Practical Guidance / Practical Recommendations and Model of Legal Action
9. Policy Recommendations / Recommendations on Legal and Institutional Approach
10. Conclusion
11. Appendix A. Terminology
12. Appendix B. Risk / Powers / Legal Consequences Matrix
13. Official Sources

1. Executive Summary

The ARGA Protection Model begins from a basic premise: contemporary transnational pressure almost never operates through a single legal channel. It manifests simultaneously or sequentially through criminal prosecution, INTERPOL-related data circulation, extradition procedures, migration and asylum pressure, threat of refoulement, compliance barriers, border friction, digital profiling and administrative restrictions on access. In its March 2026 remarks, OHCHR expressly warns that host States must subject extradition and related forms of cooperation to strict scrutiny and must not automatically trust foreign security narratives where risks of torture, arbitrary detention, denial of justice or persecution exist. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))

In this logic, the ARGA Protection Model represents an integrated architecture of defense based on simultaneous work across several tracks: review of INTERPOL-related data, resistance to extradition, non-refoulement and asylum protection, argumentation concerning fair trial and arbitrary detention, urgent international measures, documentary and reputational positioning, and, where necessary, protection against digitally and compliance-sensitive forms of pressure. INTERPOL officially confirms that the CCF is an independent body through which persons may seek access to, correction of or deletion of data; UNHCR expressly reiterates that non-refoulement prohibits return “in any manner whatsoever” into a situation of serious risk; and ECtHR materials on Article 13 and Rule 39 show that an effective remedy and urgent suspension may be decisive where irreversible transfer is approaching. ([interpol.int](https://www.interpol.int), [emergency.unhcr.org](https://www.emergency.unhcr.org), [ks.echr.coe.int](https://www.ks.echr.coe.int), [echr.coe.int](https://www.echr.coe.int))

The practical meaning of the model is that defense should not wait for one mechanism to fail before activating another. On the contrary, functions must be allocated across fora and procedures from the outset. The CCF does not replace the asylum track. Asylum does not replace extradition resistance. Rule 39 is not the merits case. A fair-trial argument is not identical to an Article 3 risk argument. Yet it is precisely in their coordinated interaction that a real system of legal restraint emerges. The central conclusion of the model is therefore that multilevel coordination is not a tactical luxury but the minimum rational response to multichannel transnational pressure. ([interpol.int](https://www.interpol.int), [ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))

2. Context & Problem Statement / Why This Topic Has Legal and International Significance

Contemporary cases of transnational persecution rarely fit into the boundaries of a single national procedure. A person may simultaneously face risks of detention, extradition, return in violation of non-refoulement, police interest via INTERPOL, denial of access to banking or other services, digital profiling, and the use of security-based narratives against them. OHCHR explicitly links transnational repression to extradition requests, foreign listings, information-sharing and other mechanisms through which a host State may in practice facilitate abuse even while formally acting within the language of inter-state cooperation. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))

The key problem is that institutions of protection, and often practitioners themselves, continue to think in fragmented ways. One legal track handles asylum, another contests extradition, a third writes to the CCF, and a fourth deals with urgent measures or documentary and reputational positioning. Meanwhile, the threat itself operates in an integrated fashion. Materials submitted in 2026 within the OHCHR process on enforced disappearances in transnational repression contexts expressly indicate that weak domestic legal frameworks, extradition mechanisms and criminal-procedural models may fail to ensure adequate implementation of non-refoulement and individual risk assessment. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))

The ARGA Protection Model begins precisely by correcting that diagnostic error. The model treats the individual’s situation not as a set of unrelated proceedings, but as a single legal crisis unfolding across several fora at once. The international significance of the model lies in the fact that it answers not only the question of which argument is strongest, but also the question of what defensive

architecture corresponds to the real architecture of the threat. In a setting where state cooperation, policing channels, digital systems and compliance mechanisms interact faster than isolated legal reactions, integrated defense becomes the only mature strategy. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))

3. Legal Framework / Normative and Institutional Framework

The legal basis of the ARGA Protection Model is plural by design. It is not constructed around one act or one institution. The first track is the human rights and non-refoulement framework. UNHCR defines non-refoulement as the prohibition on expelling or returning, in any manner whatsoever, a person to a territory where life or freedom would be threatened or where another serious protected harm exists. This makes non-refoulement a foundational constraint on extradition, expulsion, transfer and related state action. ([emergency.unhcr.org](https://www.emergency.unhcr.org))

The second track is the Convention-based fair-trial and effective-remedy framework. ECtHR materials on Article 13 expressly confirm the need for an effective remedy before a national authority where an applicant has an arguable Convention claim. Materials on Rule 39 show that the Court may indicate interim measures in exceptional cases of imminent irreparable harm, including extradition or removal cases engaging Articles 2, 3 and, exceptionally, 6. This means that the ARGA Protection Model must combine both ordinary rights litigation and urgent suspension logic. ([ks.echr.coe.int](https://www.ks.echr.coe.int), [echr.coe.int](https://www.echr.coe.int))

The third track is INTERPOL and data review. INTERPOL officially states that the CCF is an independent body ensuring that personal data processed through INTERPOL channels comply with the Organization's rules, and that every person has the right to submit a request for access to data concerning them. This makes CCF review legally distinct from asylum and extradition defense, but strategically connected to both. ([interpol.int](https://www.interpol.int))

The fourth track is anti-arbitrariness and transnational repression scrutiny. OHCHR's 2026 materials and related submissions indicate that extradition, foreign security listings, information-sharing and weak procedural constructions may operate as channels of arbitrary detention, denial of justice, persecution and other abusive consequences. The ARGA Protection Model must therefore include not only formal legality, but also analysis of arbitrariness, institutional abuse, misuse of process and contextual risk. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org), [ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))

4. Mechanisms of Practice / Abuse / Key Mechanisms of Practice, Abuse, or Conflict

The first mechanism to which the ARGA Protection Model responds is channel multiplication. Contemporary persecution may use different legal vocabularies for one and the same coercive purpose: ordinary criminal charges, security framing, allegations of extremism or terrorism, economic disputes, migration removal, INTERPOL-related circulation of data, or administrative complications in access to services. OHCHR expressly warns against undue deference to foreign security narratives and cooperation patterns where rights safeguards are weak. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))

The second mechanism is forum mismatch. Each forum asks a different legal question. The CCF examines compliance of INTERPOL data processing. Asylum asks whether international protection against return is required. Extradition courts assess the legality of surrender and, depending on the jurisdiction, applicable rights-based bars. The ECtHR may assess both the urgent need for temporary protection and substantive Convention claims. If the defense does not properly allocate content across fora, strong material begins to operate in the wrong place, where it cannot produce legal effect. ([interpol.int](https://www.interpol.int), [emergency.unhcr.org](https://www.emergency.unhcr.org), [echr.coe.int](https://www.echr.coe.int))

The third mechanism is temporal asymmetry. Police messaging, detention logistics, extradition calendars, removal schedules and compliance reactions often move faster than rights-protective

institutions. INTERPOL's own public materials acknowledge delays in CCF case processing and measures adopted to address workload; Rule 39 exists precisely because ordinary Strasbourg timing is often insufficient in urgent removal-risk cases. The ARGA Protection Model must therefore be time-layered: one set of actions preserves future merits, another stops immediate harm, and a third builds longer-term legitimacy and evidentiary positioning. ([interpol.int](https://www.interpol.int), [echr.coe.int](https://www.echr.coe.int))

The fourth mechanism is evidentiary fragmentation. The same body of facts often has to be translated into different legal languages: Article 3 risk, flagrant denial of justice, arbitrariness, misuse of INTERPOL channels, refugee protection, unfair prosecution, digital targeting, or abuse of process. The ARGA Protection Model treats this not as duplication, but as necessary legal translation across fora. Without such translation, the case remains rich in facts but poor in procedural effectiveness. ([echr.coe.int](https://www.echr.coe.int), [interpol.int](https://www.interpol.int))

5. Case Patterns / Typical Scenarios, Patterns of Development, or Practice Models

The first typical scenario is a case where extradition, asylum and INTERPOL-related data exist simultaneously. The person faces at once the risk of detention, possible surrender, and the threat of return into an Article 3 harm situation, while INTERPOL-related data or other transnational policing mechanisms increase vulnerability. In such a situation, neither asylum alone nor the CCF alone is sufficient. These are the cases that most clearly illustrate the need for integrated design. ([interpol.int](https://www.interpol.int), [emergency.unhcr.org](https://www.emergency.unhcr.org))

The second scenario is a politically instrumentalised criminal case presented as ordinary law enforcement. OHCHR's 2026 materials show that foreign states may use security or criminal narratives in ways that mask persecution or denial of justice. Here the model requires simultaneous work with abuse-of-process logic, fair-trial deficits, arbitrariness, and non-refoulement where transfer risk exists. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))

The third scenario is fragmented legal success and overall strategic defeat. A person may formulate one strong argument in one forum, yet lose on timing, fail to activate urgent measures, or fail to address the INTERPOL or compliance dimension, with the result that harm still occurs. This recurring problem shows why the ARGA Protection Model proceeds from integrated sequencing rather than isolated wins. ([echr.coe.int](https://www.echr.coe.int), [interpol.int](https://www.interpol.int))

The fourth scenario is a human-rights defender, politically exposed person or business actor facing a hybrid combination of reputational, digital, police and extradition-related pressure. In such cases, the matter does not break down into separate "small issues"; on the contrary, it is cumulative pressure that constitutes the legal reality. The defense model must therefore be designed for cumulative harm and cumulative response. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))

6. Risk Assessment / Main Risks, Legal Vulnerabilities, and Problem Areas

The first risk is strategic mono-dependence. If the defense stakes everything on one forum, it becomes vulnerable to all the systemic limits of that forum. The CCF is limited by mandate and timing. Asylum is limited by its own evidentiary and procedural logic. Extradition courts may not fully absorb the protection dimension. Rule 39 is narrow and urgent by design. For that reason, the ARGA model proceeds from the premise that dependence on a single forum is structurally irrational. ([interpol.int](https://www.interpol.int), [echr.coe.int](https://www.echr.coe.int))

The second risk is late integration. Even strong legal positions lose value if they are activated too late. An effective remedy under Article 13 and the whole logic of Rule 39 matter only if used before irreversible harm occurs. Likewise, even a successful later CCF outcome may arrive after detention,

mobility damage or reputational consequences have already materialized. (ks.echr.coe.int, interpol.int)

The third risk is mistranslation of facts across legal fora. The same fact may have different significance in an asylum file, an extradition brief, a CCF request, an OHCHR communication or an urgent Strasbourg application. If the defense does not master that translation, the facts remain rich but do not become forum-effective legal material. (interpol.int, echr.coe.int)

The fourth risk is procedural fragmentation mistaken for sophistication. Sometimes multiplicity of action is wrongly perceived as an already integrated strategy. In reality, one may have many letters, many proceedings and many motions without having a coherent model at all. The ARGA Protection Model therefore stresses coordination over mere activity. Bureaucratic busyness is not yet a protective architecture. (ohchr.org)

7. Institutional Gaps / Institutional Limitations, Gaps, Deficits of Safeguards, or Systemic Weaknesses

The first systemic weakness is fragmentation between institutions. Refugee law, extradition law, INTERPOL review, domestic criminal procedure, Strasbourg remedies and UN mechanisms speak different legal languages and operate on different timelines. It is precisely this institutional layering that creates conditions in which a person may lose in reality even while several systems are formally “working.” (emergency.unhcr.org, interpol.int)

The second weakness is asymmetry between cooperation and protection. State cooperation, information-sharing and police coordination often move with less friction than human-rights protection. OHCHR’s 2026 remarks emphasize this danger directly, especially in the context of transnational repression and security-related cooperation. (ohchr.org)

The third weakness is remedial incompleteness of individual fora. None of the available fora covers the whole problem by itself. This is not a defect of one mechanism but the structure of the field. That is why the ARGA Protection Model treats institutional incompleteness not as an exception but as the starting condition of strategic design. (interpol.int, echr.coe.int)

8. Practical Guidance / Practical Recommendations and Model of Legal Action

The first step is to begin with integrated mapping, not forum selection. Before choosing the first procedural step, counsel must map the full architecture of risk: extradition exposure, refoulement exposure, INTERPOL and data exposure, detention risk, digital and compliance vulnerabilities, reputational factors, the urgency horizon and available domestic and international remedies. Without this, the defense chooses the forum too early and understands the crisis too narrowly. (ohchr.org)

The second step is to assign functions to fora. The CCF should be used for INTERPOL data review. Asylum and non-refoulement processes should address return risk. Extradition defense should handle surrender legality and rights-based bars. Strasbourg should be considered for urgent or Convention-based intervention where appropriate. UN and OHCHR channels may support broader monitoring, visibility and institutional pressure. The model requires not chaotic parallelism, but functional coordination. (interpol.int, emergency.unhcr.org, echr.coe.int)

The third step is to build one evidentiary core and many legal translations. The aim should be one documentary core file from which different forum-specific pleadings are then developed. This reduces the risk of contradiction and strengthens coherence across the overall defense. (interpol.int)

The fourth step is to manage time as a legal variable. Urgent measures, preventive remedies, filing order and sequencing matter as much as doctrinal strength. A good argument filed after the irreversible event is often merely a well-written autopsy. Crude, yes. Institutionally accurate too. (echr.coe.int)

9. Policy Recommendations / Recommendations on Legal and Institutional Approach

First, States and international institutions must stop assuming that fragmented remedies are adequate for integrated harm. Where pressure is transnational and multichannel, protection design must reflect that reality. (ohchr.org)

Second, legal practice should institutionalize coordinated defense models. This concerns not only ARGAs. Any mature practice in this area must move from forum-by-forum reaction to architecture-based defense. (interpol.int, emergency.unhcr.org)

Third, the ARGAs Protection Model should be understood as a replicable methodological contribution. Its significance lies not in exclusivity, but in the fact that it offers an operational grammar for integrated protection in an era of transnational repression, fragmented fora and accelerated cooperation. (ohchr.org)

10. Conclusion

The ARGAs Protection Model is not a slogan. It is a response to the structural reality that modern transnational harm is multi-forum, multi-speed and multi-language. Where pressure is distributed across policing, extradition, migration, digital and reputational channels, protection must be distributed too, but not chaotically. It must be coordinated. (ohchr.org, interpol.int)

For ARGAs, the principal conclusion is the following. Effective protection in the contemporary transnational environment begins not with choosing one “main” forum, but with recognizing that the threat itself is already organized as a network. The answer to a network should be neither panic nor chaotic activity, but a properly designed legal architecture. That is the core of the ARGAs Protection Model. (emergency.unhcr.org, echr.coe.int)

11. Appendix A. Terminology

ARGAs Protection Model. An integrated multi-level legal model of protection oriented toward a coordinated response to transnational repression, extradition risk, INTERPOL-related exposure, non-refoulement risk and related forms of cross-border harm. It is based on allocation of functions across fora and synchronization of procedural steps. The model is derived from the logic of contemporary international and European institutional practice. (ohchr.org)

Integrated defense. An approach in which different legal mechanisms are used not in isolation but as a coordinated architecture responding to one factual crisis across multiple institutional settings. (emergency.unhcr.org)

Forum-specific translation. Translation of one and the same factual core into different legal languages appropriate to the CCF, asylum, extradition, Strasbourg or UN procedures. (interpol.int)

Protective sequencing. Strategic ordering of procedural acts with regard to urgency, irreversibility and the function of each forum. Particularly important in extradition and refoulement-risk cases. (echr.coe.int)

Institutional incompleteness. A structural feature of the protection field in which no single forum is able to cover the full spectrum of risk and harm. (interpol.int, ks.echr.coe.int)

12. Appendix B. Risk / Powers / Legal Consequences Matrix

Task	Legal risk	Legal limit	Possible consequence	Practical comment
Choose one forum as “main”	Strategic mono-dependence	No single forum covers the whole crisis	Partial protection and overall defeat	Begin with integrated mapping
Mix the questions of different fora	Forum mismatch	Each mechanism answers its own legal question	Loss of argumentative force	Allocate functions across procedures
Act too late	Remedial lag	Urgent and preventive remedies are time-sensitive	Irreversible harm before protection engages	Treat time as part of the law
File many things without coherence	Procedural fragmentation	Activity is not architecture	External busyness without strategic effect	Build one core file, many translations
Ignore the INTERPOL/data dimension	Incomplete exposure assessment	Police data live separately from asylum and extradition	Transnational policing risk remains active	Include CCF/data review where relevant
Ignore the non-refoulement dimension	Return risk under-analysed	Return is prohibited in any manner whatsoever where serious risk exists	Transfer into Article 3 harm or persecution	Integrate asylum/non-refoulement from the start
Assume that one victory solves everything	Overreading isolated success	Individual remedies remain incomplete	Success in one link and harm in another	Test cumulative outcome, not isolated outcome

This matrix reflects the core operational logic of the ARGA Protection Model: protection must be not merely multiple, but coordinated. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))

13. Official Sources

- OHCHR, March 2026 remarks on transnational repression. The principal current source for understanding how extradition, security narratives, information-sharing and foreign pressure interact as channels of modern transnational repression. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))
- OHCHR-related 2026 submissions on enforced disappearances in transnational repression contexts. Important as evidence of institutional concern about weak domestic frameworks, extradition-related risks and failure of individualized protection. ([ohchr.org](https://www.ohchr.org))
- INTERPOL, About the CCF and related CCF materials. Key official sources on the institutional role of the CCF as a data-protection and compliance forum in the INTERPOL system. ([interpol.int](https://www.interpol.int))
- UNHCR, Access to territory and non-refoulement. The basic current source on the broad scope of non-refoulement relevant to extradition, expulsion and transfer contexts. ([emergency.unhcr.org](https://www.emergency.unhcr.org))
- ECtHR, Guide on Article 13 and Interim Measures materials. Important for understanding effective remedies and urgent protection in situations of imminent irreversible harm. ([ks.echr.coe.int](https://www.ks.echr.coe.int), [echr.coe.int](https://www.echr.coe.int))