



Homeland
Security

October 29, 2021

MEMORANDUM TO: Tae D. Johnson
Acting Director
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Troy A. Miller
Acting Commissioner
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Ur M. Jaddou
Director
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Robert Silvers
Under Secretary
Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans

FROM: Alejandro N. Mayorkas
Secretary

SUBJECT: **Termination of the Migrant Protection Protocols**

On January 25, 2019, then-Secretary of Homeland Security Kirstjen Nielsen issued a memorandum entitled “Policy Guidance for Implementation of the Migrant Protection Protocols.” On February 2, 2021, President Biden issued Executive Order (EO) 14010, *Creating a Comprehensive Regional Framework to Address the Causes of Migration, to Manage Migration Throughout North and Central America, and to Provide Safe and Orderly Processing of Asylum Seekers at the United States Border*. In this Executive Order, President Biden directed the Secretary of Homeland Security “to promptly review and determine whether to terminate or modify the program known as the Migrant Protection Protocols.” After completing a comprehensive review as directed by EO 14010, I concluded that the Migrant Protection Protocols (MPP) should be terminated and, on June 1, 2021, issued a memorandum to that effect (the “June 1 memo”).

On August 13, 2021, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas determined that the June 1 memo was not issued in compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) because it failed to address all the relevant considerations. *See Texas v. Biden*, No. 2:21-cv-067,

2021 WL 3603341 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 13, 2021). As a result, the District Court vacated the June 1 memo in its entirety and remanded the matter to the Department for further consideration. *Id.* at *27. The District Court additionally ordered DHS to “enforce and implement MPP *in good faith*” until certain conditions are satisfied, including that MPP be “lawfully rescinded in compliance with the APA.” *Id.* (emphasis in original). The Department is fully complying with the District Court’s order. At the same time, the Department has filed a notice of appeal and continues to vigorously contest several of the District Court’s conclusions.

Pursuant to the District Court’s remand and in continuing compliance with the President’s direction in EO 14010, I have once more assessed whether MPP should be maintained, terminated, or modified in a variety of different ways. In conducting my review, I have studied multiple court decisions, filings, and declarations related to MPP; considered relevant data regarding enrollments in MPP, encounters at the border, and outcomes in removal proceedings; reviewed previous Departmental assessments of MPP, as well as news reports and publicly available sources of information pertaining to conditions in Mexico; met with a broad and diverse array of internal and external stakeholders, including officials from across the federal government working on border management, state and local elected officials from across the border region, border sheriffs and other local law enforcement officials, and representatives from nonprofit organizations providing legal access and humanitarian aid across the southwest border; and considered the impact of other Administration initiatives related to immigration and the southern border. I also examined considerations that the District Court determined were insufficiently addressed in the June 1 memo, including claims that MPP discouraged unlawful border crossings, decreased the filing of non-meritorious asylum claims, and facilitated more timely relief for asylum seekers, as well as predictions that termination of MPP would lead to a border surge, cause the Department to fail to comply with alleged detention obligations under the Immigration and Nationality Act, impose undue costs on states, and put a strain on U.S.-Mexico relations.

After carefully considering the arguments, evidence, and perspectives presented by those who support re-implementation of MPP, those who support terminating the program, and those who have argued for continuing MPP in a modified form, I have determined that MPP should be terminated. In reaching this conclusion, I recognize that MPP likely contributed to reduced migratory flows. But it did so by imposing substantial and unjustifiable human costs on the individuals who were exposed to harm while waiting in Mexico. The Biden-Harris Administration, by contrast, is pursuing a series of policies that disincentivize irregular migration while incentivizing safe, orderly, and humane pathways. These policies—including the ongoing efforts to reform our asylum system and address the root causes of migration in the region—seek to tackle longstanding problems that have plagued our immigration system for decades and achieve systemic change. Once fully implemented, I believe these policies will address migratory flows as effectively, in fact more effectively, while holding true to our nation’s values.

To reiterate what the President has stated previously, the United States is a nation with borders and laws that must be enforced. It is also a nation of immigrants. This Administration is, as a result, committed to the twin goals of securing our borders and offering protection to those fleeing persecution and torture. MPP is neither the best, nor the preferred, strategy for achieving either of these goals. Significant evidence indicates that individuals awaiting their court hearings in Mexico under MPP were subject to extreme violence and insecurity at the hands of transnational criminal organizations that profited by exploiting migrants’ vulnerabilities. It is possible that such humanitarian challenges could be lessened through the expenditure of significant government resources currently allocated to other purposes. Ultimately, however, the United States has limited ability to ensure the safety and security of those returned to Mexico.

Other significant issues with MPP, including the difficulties in accessing counsel and traveling to courts separated by an international border, are endemic to the program's design.

In reaching my determination, I have carefully considered what I deem to be the strongest argument in favor of retaining MPP: namely, the significant decrease in border encounters following the determination to implement MPP across the southern border. Of course, correlation does not equal causation and, even here, the evidence is not conclusive. I have nonetheless presumed, for the sake of this review, that MPP resulted in a significant decrease in irregular border crossings and persons approaching the U.S. border to pursue non-meritorious asylum claims. I still conclude that the benefits do not justify the costs, particularly given the way in which MPP detracts from other regional and domestic goals, foreign-policy objectives, and domestic policy initiatives that better align with this Administration's values.

Importantly, the effective management of migratory flows requires that we work with our regional partners to address the root causes that drive migrants to leave their countries and to tackle this challenge before it arrives at our border. This is a shared responsibility of all countries across the region. MPP distracts from these regional efforts, focusing resources and attention on this singular program rather than on the work that is needed to implement broader and more enduring solutions.

Efforts to implement MPP have played a particularly outsized role in diplomatic engagements with Mexico, diverting attention from more productive efforts to fight transnational criminal and smuggling networks and address the root causes of migration. This was true under the previous implementation of MPP, and it is even more true today given the shared belief that the program should not be implemented without, at the very least, significant improvements. Notably, Mexico has made clear that it will not agree to accept those the United States seeks to return to Mexico under MPP unless substantial improvements are made to the program. But these much-needed efforts to enhance humanitarian protections for those placed in MPP are resource-intensive, exacerbating one of the flaws of the program: the concentration of resources, personnel, and aid efforts on the northern border of Mexico rather than on broader regional assistance efforts that would more effectively and systematically address the problem of irregular migration and better protect our border.

Moreover, the personnel required to adequately screen MPP enrollees to ensure they are not returned to persecution or torture in Mexico, process them for court hearings, and manage their cases pulls resources from other priority efforts, including the ongoing efforts to implement effective, fair, and durable asylum reforms that reduce adjudication delays and tackle the immigration court backlog. Both the Dedicated Docket, designed so that immigration judges can adjudicate cases within 300 days, and the proposed Asylum Officer Rule, which would transfer the initial responsibility for adjudicating asylum claims from immigration judges to USCIS asylum officers to produce timely and fair decision-making, are expected to yield transformative and lasting changes to the asylum system. MPP, which can require unproductive, redundant screenings per case given the many different times individuals are returned to Mexico during the pendency of a single removal proceeding, diverts asylum officers and immigration judges away from these priority efforts. MPP not only undercuts the Administration's ability to implement critically needed and foundational changes to the immigration system, but it also fails to provide the fair process and humanitarian protections that all persons deserve.

Having assessed the benefits and costs of the previous implementation of MPP, including how the program could potentially be improved, I have concluded that there are inherent problems

with the program that no amount of resources can sufficiently fix. Others cannot be addressed without detracting from key Administration priorities and more enduring solutions.

It is, as a result, my judgment that the benefits of MPP are far outweighed by the costs of continuing to use the program on a programmatic basis, in whatever form. For the reasons detailed more fully in the attached memorandum, the contents of which are adopted and incorporated into the decision contained here, I am hereby terminating MPP. Effective immediately, I hereby supersede and rescind the June 1 memorandum, Secretary Nielsen's January 25, 2019 memorandum, and any other guidance or other documents prepared by the Department to implement MPP. The Department will continue complying with the *Texas* injunction requiring good-faith implementation and enforcement of MPP. But the termination of MPP will be implemented as soon as practicable after a final judicial decision to vacate the *Texas* injunction.