



SHADOW REPORT FOR THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

THE RIGHTS OF MIGRANT PERSONS, REFUGEES AND ASYLUM SEEKERS

In recent years, Argentina has carried out important legal modifications intended to acknowledge the rights of sectors of the population that have been traditionally excluded, accomplishments that were driven by civil society and which we consider should be safeguarded as minimum ceilings of protection so as not to backslide on rights issues.¹ These legal advances have also impacted the lives of migrant persons, since Migration Law 25,871 went into effect in 2004, repealing the decree-law on migration passed during the last military dictatorship in 1981, the so-called “Videla Law”. A few years later in 2010, regulatory decree No. 616/2010 was passed, facilitating the application of Law 25,871 on certain issues.

The repealed Videla Law was based on the logic of national security, which expressly contradicted the basic principles of the Argentine Constitution and the fundamental rights recognized therein for all the country’s inhabitants. That law inherited numerous norms that regulated migration by deporting those who “did not integrate into Argentinean Society”. It also consolidated the idea that “irregular” or “illegal” migrants were the poor who came from neighboring countries and Perú, to whom delinquency, abuse of social benefits, usurpation of land, and other “evils of society” were attributed. This scenario lasted for more than 20 years, so the Videla Law left a deep imprint on the habits of many public officials and agents of justice, who use lack of legal residency in a variety of situations to justify discriminatory or racist practices.

Some plans and programs streamlined the processes of documentation and, while many people still need to have their status regularized, today in Argentina the issue of migratory irregularity does not appear to constitute a problem, at least not for migrants from the MERCOSUR and associated countries. However, it is important to stress that, for people arriving from countries outside the MERCOSUR, such as the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Senegal, other African or Asian countries, (with less significant flows in terms of quantity), migratory regularization continues to represent an enormous challenge, and thus a real limitation of their rights.

Statistics show that in recent years resolutions of permanent and temporary residence have been clearly done with greater speed and transparency. Between 2004 and first half of 2015, a total of 2,332,389 requests were submitted for different categories of residence in the country, of which 2,158,601 were resolved. Of all the residence applications settled, 86.7% (1,870,194) occurred during the period 2008-2015. It is fundamental that

¹ During his recent visit in May 2016, the United Nations Rapporteur expressed his recognition of the Migration Law, stating: “I also want to highlight Argentina’s progressive law on migration, which recognizes migration as a fundamental and inalienable right.”

the new administration, which took office in December 2015, uphold the timeframes and characteristics of these processes.

The expedited process came about, among other reasons, thanks to the territorial approach² programs, whereby the National Migration Agency (Dirección de Nacional de Migraciones (DNM) sent mobile teams to far-reaching places in the country. For this reason, we view with concern that this program has been suspended since the arrival of the new government, given that the possibility of regularized residency is fundamental for migrants who live in Argentina. To be able to have proper documentation carries enormous symbolic weight in that it empowers them to feel like people with rights, in addition to the fact that it is a requirement for effective access such rights as legal work, social security, health care, or to obtain decent housing, and in general as a measure to combat discrimination and xenophobia.

Aside from the significant progress made in terms of legislation and documentary regulation, the Argentine legal system still contains laws and administrative provisions that contradict the paradigm of Law 25,871, either because of norms that plainly establish a distinction between nationals and foreigners, or because at the time different rights were regulated, those regulations were based on the old migration law.

In this sense, despite the progress made by Law 25,871 and its regulatory decree, it is essential to stress the persistence of norms and bureaucratic practices that limit access to human rights guaranteed in international instruments and under the current Migration Law. Measures aimed at adapting domestic legislation to achieve the “effective equality of rights among nationals and foreign persons” are therefore necessary.

Firstly, in our view it is a serious matter that certain groups continue is excluded from regularization policies,³ namely *workers without a contract and the self-employed*. This limitation persists, despite the fact that the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and their Families grants broad content to the category of “migrant worker”; this includes the different social realities that may exist when seeking to sustain basic needs through paid work, including those who are self-employed. Therefore, it stands to reason that such workers are excluded when the norm limits the possibility of legal residency for those who choose the abovementioned types of work and cannot regularize their migratory status using one of these categories.

We have already given accounts in other reports to organizations of the United Nations that, in the case of citizens from Senegal and the Dominican Republic,⁴ the absence of precise regularization criteria based on humanitarian reasons, family, social or work-related roots, or the restrictive interpretation of existing norms for migrant persons of these nationalities, continues to contribute to the increasing number of migrants who are denied access to migratory regulation procedures, once again contradicting the provisions of the Argentine Migration Law. Moreover, this migratory irregularity blocks access to a decent job, leaving people of these

² The territorial approach programs were established in 2013 in order to reach territories far from urban centers. Their goal was to promote awareness of rights, responsibilities, and guarantees in favor of the immigrant population in order to facilitate regularization and documentation throughout the country.

-See note in “Paraguay ñane retá” from April 2015: <http://www.paraguaymipais.com.ar/comunidad-paraguaya/abordaje-territorial-de-la-direccion-nacional-de-migraciones-en-cada-rincon/>

³ Articles 2, 7, and 63 of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers Members of their Families.

⁴ In the case of Haitians, after the fateful earthquake in 2010, the National Immigration Agency has considered this situation when providing residency, mostly for humanitarian reasons, even in cases of rejection at the border or difficulties in accessing residency.

nationalities vulnerable to frequent attacks and persecution by the police, once they decide to earn a living as sidewalk vendors.

Although it is important to highlight that a Special Migratory Regularization Regime for Senegalese Nationals was implemented during the first half of 2013, under which 1,697 residency processes were begun, with 1,391 resolved by January 2014, the documentation status of many Senegalese remains irregular. In the case of Dominicans, between 2004 and 2014, 12,589 regularization processes were initiated, but residency status was only resolved for 6,298 of them. The Special Migratory Regularization Regime for Dominican Nationals implemented in 2013 sought to address this issue, but ended up limiting entry into the country for this population by requiring a consular visa from their country of origin.⁵ The visa requirement increased the number of requirements for entry and residency, placing many people in a position of migratory irregularity, who today have deportation orders.

In the case of Dominican women, the visa requirement puts them in greater danger, given that they are often victims of human trafficking rings that bring them into the country under false promises of work. This requirement has left them much more exposed to the trafficking networks that now charge huge sums to bring them into the country. Worse still, it has come to light that many of these trafficking victims are often denied entry at the border and sent back to their country of origin, having acquired travel debts payable to the trafficking rings. Moreover, in Argentina does not have proper measures been established for their protection to provide these victims with safe, prolonged and adequate refuge, or medical, psychological and social assistance befitting their circumstances (only provided until these women declare in court); free legal counsel (for litigation in both criminal and civil court) and in the victims own language; in addition to coordinated work for their return and reincorporation in their country of origin; or professional training, possibilities of employment; swift, free processing of national IDs and passports; educational alternatives; housing, etc.

We can also underline another situation that places limits on the application of the rights enshrined in **Article 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)** with regard to the protection of the family, and that mainly affects people from the Dominican Republic, India, Nigeria, Senegal, China and Bangladesh. Indeed, at least one hundred people of these nationalities contracted matrimony with Argentine citizens in recent years; nevertheless, the National Migration Agency has rejected their petitions for permanent residency based on these marriages. Without ignoring the other civil effects of matrimony, the National Migration Agency has argued that these are “fraudulent marriages” or “marriages on paper”, declaring them unenforceable under the Migration Law (Law 25,871, Art. 22 and Decree 616/2010, Art. 22 recognize marriage as a criteria for residence). These rejections have affected persons of nationalities that face known difficulties to regularize their migratory status and who had unsuccessfully tried other routes to regularization. This situation affects their rights to form a family due to the risk of deportation given their irregular migratory status, and the impossibility of family reunification for the same reason.

Another situation that has reduced the scope of the guarantees contained in Law 25,871, that also legitimized exclusions and **deportations of parties entering the country**, was Provision 4362/2014, known as the provision on “pseudo tourists” or “false tourists” that was ultimately aimed at legitimizing restrictions on entry and residence for certain groups of migrants, with the greatest impacts in the case of the Colombian

⁵ The number of people from the Dominican Republic who reside in the country as of 2010 was approximately 5,600 with 75% women and 25% men. Although this is a small number of people, this population quadrupled in Argentina in a decade. Taken from: La migración dominicana en Argentina trayectorias en el nuevo siglo 2000-2015. CAREF-OIM. 2015.

community, who have been stigmatized in the media for presumably being drug traffickers.⁶ This provision constitutes a step backward in Argentinean migration policy in that it creates new sanctions that do not exist in the Migration Law, and because it contains rules that promote the discretionary application of the regulations by migration agents.

Another of the limits established in migration regulations came about in the case of the penalization of crimes related to foreigners, due the fact that migration authority continues to not apply Article 29 of Decree 616/2010⁷ (Migration Regulations), which provides that deportation applies only to persons who have a firm criminal conviction. Another type of limitation on Law 25,871 is the *automatic application of impediments provided in the law due to "criminal records"*,⁸ which casts aside the law's objectives to protect the family, reunify the family unit, lay down roots, or to promote the processes of regularization for certain nationalities. In these cases, the decision to order deportation is made without any formal or adequate forum in which to determine an interest in residence in Argentina, as stipulated in Article 61 of the Migration Law, thus constituting uneven and unreasonable application of the law.

Furthermore, on December 4, 2014, when the new Criminal Procedural Code was approved (CPPN, according to its initials in Spanish), Article 35 thereof included a measure for conditional suspension of trial with a specific modality for foreigners. This measure could be applied when a person has been caught *in flagrante delicto*, in accordance with Article 184 of the Code, which provides for a minimum deprivation of liberty of at least THREE (3) years in prison. The application of the process provided for in this article would imply deportation from the country, as long as it does not jeopardize the right to family reunification. Court-ruled deportation entails, without exception, the prohibition of re-entry for no less than five (5) years or no more than fifteen (15).

Under this scheme, the migrant person must face the dilemma of either submitting to a criminal trial and quite possibly preventive detention (considering the lack of roots in the country), and if sentenced, once their term is fulfilled, then being deported from the country under the migration law; or submitting to the conditional suspension of trial and being deported for up to 15 years. In either of these scenarios, the migrant would be deported from the country. Moreover, Article 35 includes an alarming distinction between cases of migrants with regular and irregular status, even though the migration law had eliminated the negative consequences of migratory irregularity on migrant persons' rights. The burden of proof is, in effect, inverted and the foreign person must be the one to prove whether his or her status is legal.

In addition, with respect to the right to **effective judicial recourse** enshrined in Article 2 of the ICCPR, we would also like to highlight that justice in Argentina has been characterized by a high degree of impunity when it comes to pursuing those guilty of crimes committed against migrant persons. In this regard, we must recall

⁶ See article in El País from 7 December, 2014: <http://www.elpais.com.co/elpais/internacional/noticias/preocupante-estigmatizacion-colombianos-argentina>

See article in El Espectador from 29 October, 2014: <http://www.elespectador.com/noticias/elmundo/argentina-infestada-de-delincuentes-colombianos-articulo-524951>

⁷ Article 29 of Decree 616/2010- For the purposes set forth in article 29, paragraphs c), e), f), g), and h) of Law No. 25,871, "convict" shall be understood as a foreigner with a record of a final conviction, and "record" shall be understood as a non-final conviction or final prosecution rendered against the foreigner. Any record or conviction registered in a foreign country shall only be considered when the fact from which it arose constitutes a crime under Argentine law.

⁸ Regarding the impediment established in paragraph C of article 29 of the law.

the 10 years of impunity⁹ in the case of the textile factory on Luis Viale Street, where five children under the age of 15 died (Harry, Luis, Rodrigo, Elías and Wilfredo), along with Juana, 38 and pregnant, all Bolivians, in a fire in one of the many textile factories that operate in the city of Buenos Aires. The trial began on April 18, 2016 – 10 years later. An investigation into the most recent incident faces the same fate in the Paéz case, which occurred in April 2015 in the Flores neighborhood, where another two Bolivian¹⁰ children died and the case has barely been investigated. These situations occur in a context where it is common to find migrants who have been victims of labor exploitation, furthermore where local authorities have scarce or deficient mechanisms to inspect, prevent and protect the victims of such crimes.

There is also impunity in the case of the deaths of two foreign nationals at the Parque Indoamericano. On that occasion, some 1500 families (some of them from bordering countries) occupied the area known as the Parque Indoamericano in protest of the lack of decent housing. When the Buenos Aires city government asked for their eviction, ordered by the local courts, the Federal and Metropolitan police intervened; two people resulted dead and another five were injured. Their families, five years after the events, have still not seen justice done. And although the investigation does remain open, there has been no progress in terms of the demands and there is a high risk that impunity will reign in this case.

The occupation of the Parque Indoamericano shed light on a number of problems, including the vulnerability of families who rent in the city's slums, the impossibility of access to decent housing and the violent response by the State in the face of these social conflicts. This situation has been brought before other organizations of the United Nations, who have already ruled on the case.¹¹ Furthermore, in this scenario of repression and killing of migrants, the mayor of Buenos Aires at the time, Mauricio Macri—now president of Argentina—made some unfortunate statements¹² to the press, tinged with xenophobia and racism in the midst of a difficult situation.

In addition, we are concerned about the **xenophobic attacks on the lives of some migrants**, which go against **Article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights**. For this reason, we want to emphasize a recent case: In March 2016, Senegalese community leader¹³ Massar Ba turned up brutally beaten, and hours later died in a hospital in the city of Buenos Aires. He had filed complaints against the metropolitan police for persecution of Senegalese street vendors.¹⁴ The case was labeled “death by

⁹ See article in Página 12, dated 18 April, 2016: <http://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/sociedad/3-297220-2016-04-18.html>

¹⁰ See article in Página 12, dated 28 April, 2015: <http://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/sociedad/3-271542-2015-04-28.html>

¹¹ The 2011 report by the Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families stated the following: “The Committee notes that the explanation by the delegation from the State considers that removal of the occupants of the Parque Indoamericano of the City of Buenos Aires on 7 December, 2010 was unrelated to the fact that some of the occupants were migrants, but is seriously concerned about the murder of Bernardo Sagueiro, 24, of Paraguay, and that of Rosemary Chura Puña, 28, of Bolivia, during the police operation. It is also concerned that Juan Quispe, 38, of Bolivia, was shot to death on December 9, 2010 during a violent confrontation that occurred in Parque Indoamericano among residents of nearby neighborhoods and the occupants of the park. The Committee is also concerned that the mayor of the City of Buenos Aires, rather than mediating in the conflict, has publicly associated migrants with crimes like drug trafficking.”

¹² See article in La Nación from 10 December, 2010 <http://www.lanacion.com.ar/1332327-macri-califico-la-politica-migratoria-de-descontrolada>.

--See video on Youtube (minute 3:17) with declarations from December 9, 2010: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_sUAktmCZA

¹³ See Cosecha Roja page from 11 March, 2016: <http://cosecharoja.org/aparecio-muerto-un-referente-de-la-comunidad-senegalesa-en-argentina/>

--See video on Crónica Televisión from 13 March, 2016: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s7UdqtXwGTQ&feature=share>

¹⁴ See article from Página 12 from 12 March, 2016: <http://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/sociedad/3-294418-2016-03-12.html>

questionable cause of injured party Massar Ba.” In other words, it is still not considered a homicide. The Senegalese Residents Association tried to file charges as the plaintiff in the case, but the court denied this possibility, alleging that is it not part of the objective and purpose of an association to act in this type of matter.¹⁵

Other cases that have received little visibility, which we have been able to track down in the newspapers, are the deaths of trans persons. One recent case that affected the migrant community happened in February 2016, when the body of La José Salazar,¹⁶ a 34-years old Peruvian, was found in Florencia Varela, in the southern suburbs of Buenos Aires. She was found with her skull crushed, her back broken and knife cuts all over her face. The prosecutor’s investigation includes a hypothesis as to the existence of a “gang of homophobic men” in the area. To be poor, a migrant and belong to the LGBTIQ community offers a full combo of discriminations that ends in social exclusion and sometimes death. Furthermore, the collusion of the justice system by not investigating and punishing these crimes is especially striking in these cases.

We must likewise underline our extreme concern over the ruling by Criminal Court No. 1 of La Plata, Judge Juan José Ruiz presiding. The court that sentenced Claudia, a Trans woman, imposed a heavier sentence because she was a migrant.¹⁷ This decision was based on negative bias transformed into dogmatic statements that were ultimately unloaded into a court ruling. Judge Ruiz pointed out that Claudia had “deceive society’s confidence, paid back the generosity of the Argentine state with ingratitude, and mocked the hospitality it provided.” He added that, “sentences can and should be heavier for foreigners who commit common crimes in the country, regardless of whether this violates the principles of equality before the law and non-discrimination endorsed by our Constitution and International Treaties.” Moreover, during the entire proceedings, Claudia was referred to as “the transvestite person” and “alias Claudia” with stigmatizing arguments that ignore gender identity law 28,743.¹⁸

The proliferation of xenophobic discourse by representatives of the State highlights a scenario of particular concern, given the Argentine state’s obligations when it comes to the **prevention, punishment and eradication of discrimination**. Since some state officials made different statements in recent months to the press, referring to migrants as “*responsible for drug trafficking in the country;*¹⁹ *people who come to sell stolen*

¹⁵ Through action 00982/16 NN Re questionable death of Massa Ba, the court denies the complaint.

¹⁶ See Crónica page from 23 February, 2016: <http://www.cronica.com.ar/article/details/55240/travesti-peruano-aparecio-masacrado-en-la-calle>

¹⁷ See article in Página 12 from 12 May, 2016 <http://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/sociedad/3-299168-2016-05-12.html>

- See article by Agencia de Noticias de Buenos Aires Info Blanco sobre Negro from 11 May, 2016: <http://infoblancosobrenegro.com/noticias/12840-xenofobia-un-juez-platense-agravo-la-condena-a-una-travesti-que-vendia-drogas-por-ser-peruana>

¹⁸ Law 26,743, Article 12 recognizes *Decent Treatment*. “The gender identity adopted by people must be respected, especially in the case of girls, boys, and adolescents who use a different first name than that given on their national identity document. With no other requirement than their request, the chosen first name must be used for subpoenas, records, dockets, summons, and any other procedures or services, both in private and public settings. When the nature of the procedure requires registering the information listed on the national identity document, a system will be used which combines the initials of the first time, the full last name, day and year of birth, and document number. The first name chosen for reasons of gender identity will be added upon request by the interested party. In cases in which the person must be publicly named, only the chosen first name which respects the adopted gender identity must be used.”

¹⁹ See article in La Nación from 08 May, 2014 <http://www.lanacion.com.ar/1688707-miguel-pichetto>

goods;²⁰ or even that “*in general migrants’ objective is to commit crime in Argentina.*”²¹ Or that “*we are infected with foreign criminals.*”²² We observe with concern a set of situations of social and institutional discrimination that affect migrants, especially those from China, Colombia, the Dominican Republic and Senegal.

With regard to social security, **invoking Article 3 of the ICCPR on equality** and the principles of interdependence, indivisibility and complementarity of international human rights standards, we want to point out that migrant persons continue to be excluded from non-contributory pensions. This discriminatory practice blocks access to social security for them, despite the precedent set when the Argentine Supreme Court ruled in 2007, in the Reyes Aguilera case, in favor of granting a pension to a 17-year-old Bolivian girl to cover extreme social contingencies, due to her situation as a person lacking “resources or protection”. However, these rights have not been extended to other migrants in similar conditions.

Another benefit, established by the Argentine State in 2009, was the Universal Allowance per Child (AUH, according to its initials in Spanish), which consists of a monthly, non-contributory social benefit for children and teenagers who are “residents in the Argentine Republic”. This is to be paid to just one parent, legal guardian, executor or relative, related by blood up to the third degree, for each person under the age of 18 in their charge, or without age limit in the case of disabled children. However, the program does have a limit in the case of foreign children, since the decree requires that the child be Argentine, a child of a native Argentine or Argentine by option, either naturalized or with legal residence in the country of at least three years prior to the request. The regulation provided by the National Social Security Administration (ANSES, according to its initials in Spanish) has added new requirements, such as three years residency for foreign parents of Argentine children and, in the case of children born outside Argentina; the three-year residency requirement for those children was also incorporated.

On another matter, **Article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights** establishes the **right to take part in public affairs**, to vote and also to be elected. In Argentina, migrant persons also have the right to vote in some jurisdictions in the country, but only at the municipal and provincial levels – they do not have the right to elect national authorities or the president. For this reason, the migrant community all over the country has started a campaign called “I live here, I vote here” (*Aquí vivo, aquí voto*), to insist that their political and civil rights be granted full recognition. Not being able to elect and be elected in all arenas and in all regions of the country continues to be a limitation for the political participation of migrant persons.

With respect to refugees, we view favorably the passage of Law 26,165 in 2006 on the broad recognition and protection of the rights of this population. However, in practice there continue to be problems with the excessive time it takes the National Commission for Refugees (CONARE, according to its initials in Spanish) to grant refugee status, in particular in the case of Peruvian nationals some of whom have waited over 10 years on the request, without response.

Questions for the State:

²⁰ See article in La Nación from 08 May, 2014 <http://www.lanacion.com.ar/1688707-miguel-pichetto>

²¹ See article in La Nación from 28 October, 2014 <http://www.lanacion.com.ar/1739331-sergio-berni-estamos-infectados-de-delincuentes-extranjeros>

²² See article in La Nación from 19 August, 2014 <http://www.lanacion.com.ar/1719966-sergio-berni-el-fin-de-semana-detuvimos-a-mas-de-60-extranjeros-que-vienen-a-la-argentina-unicamente-a-delinquir>

1. What positive measures is the State taking to guarantee the regularization of people who have been residing in the country – especially those from non-MERCOSUR countries – for some time now, and have not been able to seek recourse in the regularization plans decreed?
2. What concrete measures has the Argentine State taken to guarantee to the full dissemination and implementation of Migration Law 25,871 and its regulatory decree No. 616/2010? In the same sense:
3. What measures has the State taken to educate its public officials and the judicial branch in particular, with regard to the content of Law 25,871 and its regulatory decree No. 616/2010, to thus avoid xenophobic and discriminatory acts and rulings against migrant persons?
4. What measures has the State taken to repeal and change regulations that are contrary to human rights and are affecting the migrant population, especially those related to rejections at the border based on provisions such as the one on “pseudo tourists” and the ones regarding double-criminalization of migrant persons established in Article 5 of the Criminal Procedural Code?
5. What actions are being carried out to guarantee that non-contributory social benefit are being granted to migrant persons who meet all the requirements specified by the National Supreme Court of Justice in the Reyes Aguilera case? Does the State plan to modify existing regulations to adapt them in keeping with that precedent?
6. With regard to people of Senegalese, Dominican and Haitian origin living in Argentina, what administrative measures have been adopted to avoid acts of discrimination against them by security forces?
7. What measures have been taken, if any, to guarantee due process in procedures to grant refugee status?

Recommendations to the State:

1. Work toward full implementation of Law 25,871 and its regulations. Repeal domestic laws and provisions that restrict or pose obstacles to the rights of migrants. In particular, repeal provisions that discriminate against migrants by limiting their access to regular housing and their rights to work in decent conditions and to social security. And for the other side removal of the article 35 of Criminal Procedural Code, it is contributing to the criminalization, discrimination of migrants.
2. Strengthen and provide continuity to the territorial approach programs established by the National Migration Agency to facilitate the documentation of migrant persons in different parts of the country. Facilitate the migratory regularization of people who have contracted legal matrimony in the country and wish to form a family in it, in accordance with the provisions the Migration Law.
3. Train and educate public officials, particularly those of the judicial branch, to avoid repeating xenophobic conduct in the justice system like that of Judge Juan José Ruiz.
4. Guarantee that requests for refugee status are resolved in a reasonable timeframe, such that these people do not remain in a position of asylum-seekers without the rights granted by international treaties as well as by internal law. In the same sense, there must be assistance provided by court order (qualified, free legal-technical translator or interpreter services) at all stages of the procedure. And finally, there needs to be training for State personnel involved in the paperwork as well as in the process of granting Refugee Status.

5. Investigate and properly penalize, in a reasonable timeframe, people who have committed crimes against migrant persons. Judges and prosecutors should receive training on issues related to migrant persons so that existing laws can be made effective.
6. Adopt adequate administrative measures to prevent officials from the security forces implicated in discriminatory acts from continuing to exercise duties in the force.
7. Promote the creation of ethical guidelines in the media to prevent xenophobia and eradicate the use of stereotypes. Furthermore, to encourage the strengthening of the Public Defense of Audiovisual Communication Services that has done outstanding work to register, systematize and control discriminatory audiovisual content.