

August 13, 2014

Emilio Álvarez Icaza L.
Executive Secretary
Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
1889 F St., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20006
U.S.A.

cc. Rapporteurship on Rights of Migrants
Commissioner Felipe Gonzalez

Rapporteurship on the Rights of Persons Deprived of Liberty
Commissioner James L. Cavallaro

Rapporteurship on the Rights of the Child
Commissioner Rosa María Ortiz

Rapporteurship on the Rights of Women; Rapporteur on the Rights of Lesbian, Gay,
Trans, Bisexual and Intersex Persons
Commissioner Tracy Robinson

Re: Request for thematic hearing on immigration detention and alternatives to detention in the Americas

Dear Mr. Álvarez Icaza,

We respectfully write today in observance of Articles 61, 62, and 66 of the Rules of Procedure of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (hereinafter IACHR) in order to request a thematic hearing on Immigration Detention and Alternatives to Detention in the Americas at the 150th Period of Sessions to be held from October 23rd to November 7th, 2014.

This hearing petition is submitted by the International Detention Coalition (IDC) and 162 civil society organizations and experts working in 24 countries in the region. Based on an unprecedented process of prior consultation and regional collaboration, the petitioners will draw attention to the serious challenges that immigration detention poses to effective protection and respect for the rights of migrants in the American States. Since immigration detention is being used more frequently in attempts to deter irregular migration and can often give rise to acts that violate human rights, the petitioners will highlight current trends and challenges with respect to these issues.

The primary goal of the hearing is to identify human rights violations generated by the use of immigration detention in the Americas, and above all, bring to light and share positive practices in preventing mandatory and unnecessary immigration detention through the adoption of alternatives to detention in the first instance.

These trends, challenges and positive practices have been identified in a report prepared for this hearing and that covers 21 member countries of the Organization of American States (OEA). In addition, the petitioners will present strategies and actions that we believe will lead to a strengthening of the right to personal liberty and the adoption of alternative measures in the region. These proposals will be submitted to the IACHR and we trust they will lay the foundation

for continued collaboration between civil society and the IACHR in the short and medium term following the hearing.

Recognizing that this request is consistent with IACHR mandates, it presents an excellent opportunity to address the issue of deprivation of liberty in the context of international migration throughout the Americas region.

I. Importance and justification

Immigration detention and alternatives to detention are extremely timely and of great interest to countries throughout the region, as well as to the Inter-American Human Rights System (IAHRS). Currently, immigration detention is a growing concern not only in North America, but across the Americas.¹ In particular, we see an increased reliance upon detention as a tool for migration management throughout the region, despite increasingly large, complex and precarious migration movements.

Of particular concern is the increasing number of people affected by immigration detention in the region, and yet this has not been accompanied by a corresponding respect for and observance of the human rights of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants. On the contrary, the use of immigration detention tends to sidestep compliance with a number of fundamental international principles concerning security, protection and personal liberty, while instead criminalizing and infringing the rights of migrants, including particularly vulnerable individuals such as children, adolescents, women, LGBTI migrants, asylum seekers, stateless persons, and victims of crime or serious human rights violations, among others.

The significance and potential dimensions of the increased use of immigration detention as a migration management tool have been clearly demonstrated in recent months regarding the situation of unaccompanied migrant children from Central America who are currently in detention or at risk of being detained in the United States and in Mexico.²

The IDC's research and global work in collaboration with our members has shown sufficient empirical evidence to support the fact that immigration detention seriously affects mental health of detained migrants and that alternative measures are not only more humane and compatible with respect and guarantee of human dignity, but are also extremely effective and much less costly than detention.

The IAHRS has taken steps to raise the relevant standards applicable to immigration detention in its thematic reports, country reports, advisory opinions and cases under its jurisdiction.³ Also, a number of concerns regarding immigration detention have been raised in previous thematic

¹ Although the majority of countries in the region do not publish statistical information about immigration detention, we do know, for example, that in Mexico in 2013 there were 86,929 accounts of administrative immigration detention (SEGOB. Boletín Estadístico 2013: Extranjeros Alojados y Devueltos, disponible en: http://www.gobernacion.gob.mx/es_mx/SEGOB/Boletines_Estadisticos); while in the United States approximately 478,000 people were detained in 2012 (DHS Office of Immigration Statistics, dic. 2013. Annual Report: Immigration Enforcement Actions 2012, <http://www.dhs.gov/publication/immigration-enforcement-actions-2012>); in Canada 9,929 people were detained between 2011 and 2012 (CBSA. Fact Sheet. Overview of the CBSA's Immigration Detention Program, October 2012, disponible en: <http://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/media/facts-faits/121-eng.html>); and in Nicaragua, 3,477 people were detained between the year 2007 and September 2013 (Directora de Migración y Extranjería Nicaragua. Public announcement. La Gente. Radio la Primerísima. "Nicaragua una barrera para inmigrantes indocumentados." [online], Last accessed January 10, 2014: <http://www.radiolaprimerisima.com/noticias/151237/nicaragua-una-barrera-para-inmigrantes-indocumentados>).

² Refer to public statements made by the IACHR and also by the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States (OAS), available at <http://www.oas.org/es/cidh/prensa/comunicados/2014/067.asp> and http://www.oas.org/es/centro_noticias/comunicado_prensa.asp?sCodigo=D-008/14 respectively.

³ These include the *Report on Immigration in the United States: Detention and Due Process* (2011), completed by the IACHR, the cases of *Loren Laroye Riebe Star et al. v. Mexico*, *Rafael Ferrer-Mazorra et al. v. United States* and recently, the cases of *Vélez Loor v. Panama*, *Nadege Dorzema et al. v. Dominican Republic*, *Benito Tide Méndez et al. v. Dominican Republic* and *Pacheco Tineo Family v. Bolivia*, sent by the IACHR to the Inter-American Court on Human Rights.

hearings before the Commission, most often in relation to a specific country⁴ or a specific vulnerable group.⁵ Moreover, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights will also address the issue of immigration detention in its Advisory Opinion on Migrant Children, as requested by Mercosur countries.⁶ Thus, addressing the seriousness of the issue from a regional perspective is needed and would strengthen these prior efforts and encourage states to take steps to prevent unnecessary immigration detention and adopt alternatives to detention.

So, in light of the growing challenges facing the rights to liberty, security and personal integrity of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants in the Americas, and with a focus on identifying positive state practices throughout the region, we respectfully request this hearing.

II. Objectives of the Hearing

The specific objectives of the hearing are to:

- a) Highlight the issue of immigration detention in countries across the region where it is practiced or where there exists an imminent risk of immigration detention being adopted either formally or in practice, and in doing so draw attention to the many physical and psychological harms of detention on migrants;
- b) Identify and highlight positive practices with regard to preventing unnecessary immigration detention and implementing alternatives to detention in the 21 countries covered in the hearing, in order to promote their benefits and development in the region;
- c) Present proposals on strategies and actions aimed at strengthening the right to personal liberty and the adoption of other alternative measures.

In order to achieve said objectives, we will present preliminary findings of challenges and positive practices related to the detention of migrants to the IACHR, based on information and a regional mapping coordinated by the International Detention Coalition in the following 21 countries from the region: Argentina, Bahamas, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, the United States of America, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Dominican Republic, and Trinidad and Tobago.

A summary of the critical issues and content we hope to present during the thematic hearing include the following:

1. Numerous policies and practices in the region criminalize irregular migration and enable unnecessary immigration detention in cases of irregular entry, including for particularly vulnerable groups. There remain across the region a number of laws, policies and practices that use different terminology but all effectively promote the use of unnecessary immigration detention, often based solely on an individual's irregular immigration status. In some cases, such as in Belize and the United States irregular entry is treated as a criminal offense. In other cases, such as in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and Mexico irregular entry is an administrative infraction, but may closely resemble a criminal matter in practice. In still other cases, the decision to detain migrants is administrative and largely discretionary, with migrants frequently being

⁴ For example, hearings on the "Human Rights Situation of Haitian Migrant Workers and their families in the Dominican Republic" (150th Period of Sessions; Monday March 24 2014); "Human Rights Situation of Detained and Departed Migrants along the Southern Border of the United States" (144th Period of Sessions; Tuesday, March 27, 2012); "Human Rights and Deportation and Detention Policies of Migrants in the United States" (141st Period of Sessions; Monday, March 28, 2011); and "Human Rights Situation of Migrants in Transit through Mexican Territory" (138th Period of Sessions; Monday, March 22, 2010.).

⁵ See for example "Situation of the Rights of Children in the Context of Migration in the Americas" (147th Period of Sessions; Tuesday, March 12, 2013); and the "Human Rights Situation of Refugees in the Americas" (149th Period of Sessions; Thursday, October 31, 2013).

⁶ Request for an Advisory Opinion on Migrant Children, presented July 7, 2011 by MERCOSUR countries (Brasil, Argentina, Paraguay y Uruguay); available at http://www.ippdh.mercosur.int/backend/Uploads/dirdocumento2_espanol.pdf

detained in police stations or other facilities that, in general, fail to meet international minimum standards of detention conditions and humane treatment.⁷

2. The invisibility of detention limits the exercise of the rights recognized in the *American Declaration of Rights and Duties of Man* and the *American Convention on Human Rights* (hereinafter "American Declaration" and "American Convention", respectively). Immigration detention affects the physical and psychological integrity of individuals⁸ and stands as a serious obstacle to the enjoyment or exercise of other fundamental human rights such as the right to seek and receive asylum, the right to non-refoulement, the right to family unity, access to justice, due process, legal assistance and judicial protection in administrative or judicial proceedings or processes.

3. Immigration detention is executed in such a way that its legality and arbitrariness is questionable. In most cases, administrative immigration detention lacks objective, individualized assessment of its necessity, proportionality and reasonableness. It surpasses the conventional limits of deprivation of freedom, as well as established constitutional and legal limits (including detention for indefinite periods). In addition, administrative immigration detention does not meet minimum standards, and operates outside public scrutiny with lack of information about its application and limited access to places of detention.

4. Due process guarantees are insufficient in immigration cases and immigration detention is not held to judicial review. A lack of due process guarantees and judicial review exacerbates the precariousness with which immigration detention is implemented. In several states it is clear that persons subject to immigration detention do not have due process guarantees and also lack the information necessary to challenge their detention or the ability to effectively and timely seek judicial protection. What's more, immigrant detainees are not automatically brought before a judge or similar authority to review the legality and non-arbitrariness of the detention. Once use of detention has been determined, immigrants do not have the necessary means to appeal, implement legal defense mechanisms or seek judicial protection.

5. Access to facilities or locations used for immigration detention is severely restricted and there is limited independent monitoring and legal assistance. While international organizations like the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) or state human rights institutions often have access to places of detention, civil society organizations, especially those providing legal assistance and representation face great obstacles in accessing migrants, especially when detention takes place in non-gazetted locations or in police headquarters. In many occasions, the broad discretion in authorizing entry leads to arbitrary decision making. Obstacles to independent monitoring by civil society organizations limit access to information about the conditions and reasons for detention, encourage impunity for violations of human rights and effectively negate the right to legal assistance and defense of those arrested and subject immigration proceedings.

6. The region has a number of positive practices with regards to non-detention and alternatives to detention that can be strengthened, expanded and replicated. Currently, some states in the region such as Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Venezuela and Argentina have provisions that prevent unnecessary immigration detention, as well as mechanisms or alternative measures that are particularly applicable to vulnerable individuals. In countries such as Canada and the United States, alternatives to detention and community placement programs

⁷ See, for example: IACHR, *Principles and Best Practices on the Protection of Persons Deprived of Liberty in the Americas*, 131^o Period of Sessions, held March 3-14, 2008.

⁸ Including but not limited to: Momartin, S., Steel Z, Coello M, et al. 2006. "A comparison of the mental health of refugees with temporary versus permanent protection visas." *Medical Journal of Australia*, 185: 357-361; Silverman, S. & Massa E. 2012. "Why Immigration Detention is Unique." *Population, Space and Place*. 18, 677-686; Stuart L., Lustig, M.D. et al. 2004. "Review of Child and Adolescent Refugee Mental Health." *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 43:1: 24-36, y; Steel Z et al. 2006. "Impact of immigration detention and temporary protection on the mental health of refugees." *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 188: 58-64.

have been developed.⁹ In other countries, such as Mexico, legal guarantees exist to prevent the detention of some particularly vulnerable groups, however they may not always be effective in practice. Also, in several states there is a lack of mechanisms to monitor existing alternatives to detention, programs to strengthen the conditions and reception of migrants with dignity in the community, or access to qualitative and quantitative information about the implementation of such alternative measures.

III. Competence of the Commission

The right to personal liberty and personal integrity are enshrined in Articles 7 and 5 of the American Convention; and the rights to a fair trial (Article 8), to judicial protection (Article 25), to seek and receive asylum (Article 22.7), to non-refoulement (Article 22.8), to free movement (Article 22.1), and Articles I, XVII, XVIII, XXV and XXVII of the American Declaration are recognized by the IAHRs as fundamental rights owing to all individuals. They must therefore be respected and guaranteed by States to all people under Article 1.1 of the American Convention and the American Declaration, whether it be migrants in a regular or irregular situation, asylum seekers, refugees or any other persons in the context of international migration.

Regarding the right to personal integrity, fair treatment and personal liberty in the context of human mobility, the Commission has held in various reports and documents as well as in the OAS General Assembly, that “no state should consider an individual’s migration status as a crime in itself or, for that reason, adopt criminal sanctions or those of equivalent effect.”¹⁰ As such, it is necessary that immigration law and policy adopted by States be developed from a presumption of freedom and not a presumption of detention,¹¹ so that non-detention becomes the rule and not the exception. In this way, “detention must be applied only as an exceptional measure and after having analyzed the necessity in each case.”¹² Additionally, the IACHR has affirmed that “[i]n the case of immigration detention, the standard for the exceptionality of pre-trial detention must be even higher because immigration violations ought not to be construed as criminal offenses.”¹³

Also, in relation to alternatives to detention, in its Report on Immigration in the United States, the IACHR stated that it is “convinced that in many if not the majority of cases, detention is a disproportionate measure and the alternatives to detention programs would be a more balanced means of serving the State’s legitimate interest in ensuring compliance with immigration laws.”¹⁴

With regard to the link between the right to personal liberty and the right to judicial guarantees and protection, IAHRs organs have reiterated that “States must ensure, in their domestic law, that everyone has access, without any restriction, to a simple and effective remedy that protects them in the determination of their rights, independent of one’s immigration status.”¹⁵ On this basis, the Commission has stated that the exercise of the right to fair trial and judicial protection of migrants in the context of human mobility can be violated for reasons such as the risk of people being deprived of their freedom when presenting themselves to administrative or judicial bodies¹⁶ and noted with great concern the impact of detention on due process, principally regarding the right of access to a lawyer. Therefore, the Commission has stated that “for a better guarantee of the right to legal representation and therefore due process, it is necessary to have programs more robust alternatives to detention”¹⁷ among other measures.

⁹ See LIRS. *Unlocking Liberty A Way Forward for U.S. Immigration Detention Policy*, 2012, p.p. 27; and CBSA, *Detention Guidelines* available at: <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/manuals/enf/enf20-eng.pdf>.

¹⁰ Organization of American States. *The Human Rights of All Migrant Workers and of Their Families*, AG/RES. 2593 (XL-O/10). 8 June, 2010, par. 5.

¹¹ IACHR. *Rafael Ferrer-Mazorra et al. v. United States*, Report No. 51/01, 4 April 2001, par. 219.

¹² IACHR. *Human Rights of Migrants, International Standards, and the Return Directive of the EU*. 03/08, par. 5

¹³ IACHR. *Report on Immigration in the United States: Detention and Due Process*, 2011, par. 38.

¹⁴ *ibid*, par. 18; see also Interamerican Court for Human Rights. *Vélez Lóor vs. Panama*, Nov. 23, 2010, p 171.

¹⁵ Inter-American Court. *Advisory Opinion OC-18/03, Juridical Condition and Rights of the Undocumented Migrants*, 17 September, 2003, par. 107

¹⁶ IACHR. *Report on Immigration in the United States: Detention and Due Process*, 2011, par. 126

¹⁷ *ibid*, par. 20

In light of the above, in terms of Article 1 of the Statute and Regulations of the Commission, this application is consistent with the competence of the Commission to meet and promote the observance and defense of human rights, specifically those in the context of human mobility, recognized in the American Declaration and the American Convention.

IV. Petition

In consideration of the aforementioned and in accordance with Article 66 of the Regulations of the Commission, we respectfully request this Honorable Commission grant a thematic hearing to analyze and consider in greater detail the challenges, normative standards and positive practices with regards to the promotion and protection of the dignity, liberty and personal security, personal integrity and other rights of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants in the Americas, in the face of state policies and practices that are facilitating or permitting unnecessary immigration detention.

The co-petitioners are convinced of the need to strengthen the promotion, monitoring and protection of the above rights, which are often violated in the context of immigration detention. In this, we count on a process of constructing and consolidating regional migration policies and practices in such a way that immigration detention is truly an exceptional measure and only permissible after assessing its necessity, proportionality, reasonableness on a case-by-case basis, and seeking first to apply alternatives to detention which are less onerous and that do not involve deprivation of liberty.

Given the development of the topic at the IAHRs, the co-petitioners consider that this hearing is an excellent opportunity to advance the visibility of the issue regionally, to study and document the deprivation of liberty in the context of international migration, to promote the generation of qualitative and quantitative information from member States, to strengthen independent monitoring mechanisms, transparency and oversight of places of immigration detention, and to promote compliance with the rules and practice of the principles of exceptionality, legality, necessity, proportionality, and reasonableness. The hearing will also provide the opportunity for the Commission to identify positive practices that can serve as models for the prevention of unnecessary immigration detention and the development and implementation of alternatives to detention, reinforcing adherence to the principles and international human rights framework applicable to the signatories of the American Declaration and the American Convention.

In the event that this hearing petition is granted, and considering the number of organizations that have supported this request, we will coordinate a representative group to participate in the hearing, and as such we ask that the Commission allow us to determine the individual presenters once the hearing is granted. We also respectfully request that an invitation to participate in the hearing be made both to UNCHR so that from their protection mandate they may share their position on the topic of administrative detention in the countries that span the American continent.

Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions or comments, by email gbonnici@idcoalition.org or telephone +52 55 6390-9853.

Sincerely,



Gisele Bonnici
Americas Regional Coordinator (International Secretariat)
International Detention Coalition

Local organizations and individuals

1. f./ Gustavo Palmieri, Director, Centro de Derechos Humanos de la Universidad Nacional de

- Lanús (UnLa) (Argentina)
2. f./ Gabriela Richard Rodríguez, Directora Ejecutiva, Centro Internacional para los Derechos Humanos de los Migrantes (CIDEHUM) (Costa Rica)
 3. f./ Karina Sarmiento, Directora Ejecutiva, Asylum Access Ecuador (AAE) (Ecuador)
 4. f./ Vinicio Sandoval, Director Ejecutivo, Grupo de Monitoreo Independiente de El Salvador (El Salvador)
 5. f./ Veronica B.Y. Aragón y Cesare P.R. Romano, Co-Directores, International Human Rights Clinic of Loyola Law School, Los Angeles (EUA)
 6. f./ Michelle Brané, Director, Migrant Rights and Justice Program, Women's Refugee Commission (EUA)
 7. f./ Carol L. Girón Solórzano, Directora General de Proyectos, Misioneros de San Carlos Scalabrinianos/Pastoral de Movilidad Humana (Guatemala)
 8. f./ Annette Martínez, Director, International Human Rights Clinic of the Inter-American University of Puerto Rico, School of Law, y Instituto Caribeño de Derechos Humanos (ICDH) (Puerto Rico)
 9. f./ Luis Enrique Aguilar, Jefe de Proyectos, Programa Vértice, Comisión Andina de Juristas (CAJ) (Perú)
 10. f./ Blanca Navarrete García, Coordinadora Ejecutiva, Programa de Defensa e Incidencia Binacional de la Iniciativa Frontera Norte de México (México)
 11. f./ Nancy Pérez García, Directora General, Sin Fronteras IAP (México)
 12. f./ Silky Shaw, Field Director, Detention Watch Network (DWN) (EUA)
 13. f./ Janet Dench, Executive Director, Canadian Council for Refugees (Canadá)
 14. f./ Michael Flynn, Executive Director, Global Detention Project (a título individual)
 15. f./ Ndathie Sene (Moustafa), Presidente, Asociación De Residente Senegalesa (ARSA) (Argentina)
 16. f./ Leo Bradley Jr., President of the Human Rights Commission of Belize (Belice)
 17. f./ Enrique August, Liaison, Refugee & Asylum Protection; y Help for Progress (Belice)
 18. f./ Marco Rasguido, Asesor Legal Nacional, Pastoral de Movilidad Humana; y la Conferencia Epsicopal Boliviana (CEB-ACNUR) (Bolivia)
 19. f./ Padre Marcelo Monge, Diretor da Caritas Arquidiocesana de São Paulo, Centro de Acolhida para Refugiados da Caritas Arquidiocesana de São Paulo (Brasil)
 20. f./ Gabriela Cunha Ferraz, Equipe Justiça Criminal, Instituto Terra, Trabalho E Cidadania (ITTC) (Brasil)
 21. f./ Juana Kweitel, Directora de Programas, Conectas Direitos Humanos (Brasil)
 22. f./ Tania Rocio Bernuy Illes, Coordinadora General, Centro de Direitos Humanos e Cidadania do Imigrante, CDHIC (Brasil)
 23. f./ Luis Augusto Bittencourt Minchola, estudiante, Facultad de Derecho, Universidad Federal de Santa Maria (a título individual, Brasil)
 24. f./ Ir. Rosita Milesi, Directora, Instituto Migrações e Direitos Humanos (Brasil)
 25. f./ Julio da Silveira Moreira, Representante, International Association of People's Lawyers (IAPL) (Brasil, México)
 26. f./ Stephanie J. Silverman, Detention and Asylum Research Cluster, Refugee Research Network, Centre for Refugee Studies (CRS) at York University (Canadá)
 27. f./ Paul Clarke, Executive Director, Action Réfugiés Montréal (Canadá)
 28. f./ Miguel Yaksic, SJ, Director Nacional, Servicio Jesuita a Migrantes y Refugiados (Chile)
 29. f./ Delfina Lawson, Profesora Clínica Migrantes y Refugiados, Centro de Derechos Humanos, Universidad Diego Portales (Chile)
 30. f./ Beatriz Eugenia Sánchez, Doctora en Derecho, Profesora de la Universidad de los Andes (a título individual, Colombia)

31. f./ Marco Alberto Romero Silva, Director, Consultoría Para Los Derechos Humanos y el Desplazamiento Forzado (CODHES) (Colombia)
32. f./ Diana Cano Peláez, Directora Ejecutiva, Fundación Esperanza (Colombia)
33. f./ P. Maurizio Pontin, cs, Director, Centro Scalabrini de Migraciones (Colombia)
34. f./ Ilver Garcia Garcia, Secretario Operativo de la Mesa Nacional de Fortalecimiento a Organizaciones de Población en Situación de Desplazamiento Forzado, Fundación social Integral de Colombia (FUSICOL) (Colombia)
35. f./ Gloria Maklouf Weiss, Directora, Asociación de Consultores y Asesores Internacionales (ACAI) (Costa Rica)
36. f./ Laritza Diversent Cambara, Abogada, Centro de Información Legal Cubalex (Cuba)
37. f./ Juan Pablo Albán Alencastro, Profesor del Colegio de Jurisprudencia y Director del Consultorio Jurídico Gratuito de la Universidad San Francisco de Quito (Ecuador)
38. f./ Susana Peñafiel Acosta, Coordinadora General, Centro de Documentación en Derechos Humanos “Segundo Montes Mozo S.J.” (CSMM) (Ecuador)
39. f./ Billy Navarrete, Secretario Ejecutivo, Comité Permanente por la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos (CDH) (Ecuador)
40. f./ Piero Chiara, Coordinador Nacional de Incidencia, Servicio Jesuita a Refugiados (Ecuador)
41. f./ Antonio Baños, Director Nacional, Cáritas El Salvador (El Salvador)
42. f./ Moisés Gómez, Coordinador, Equipo Multidisciplinario de Migraciones (El Salvador)
43. f./ Leonel Flores, Presidente, Instituto Salvadoreño del Migrante (INSAMI) (El Salvador)
44. f./ Cesar Ríos, Coordinador, Mesa Inter-Institucional en Defensa de la Niñez Migrante (El Salvador)
45. f./ Virginia Quintana Salazar, Investigadora tema migratorio (a título individual, El Salvador)
46. f./ Gilma Pérez, Abogada independiente, Experta en temas de Migración y Derechos Humanos (a título individual, El Salvador)
47. f./ Ana Concepción Castillo, Representante legal y coordinadora del área de migración y codesarrollo, Soleterre-ONLUS (El Salvador)
48. f./ Pbro. Mauro Verzeletti, cs, Director Regional SIMN, Misionero de San Carlos Scalabriniano-Arquidiócesis de San Salvador, Scalabrini International Migration Network (SIMN) (El Salvador)
49. f./ Shan Cretin, General Secretary, American Friends Service Committee (EUA)
50. f./ Susan M. Weishar, Migration Specialist, Jesuit Social Research Institute, Loyola University New Orleans (EUA)
51. f./ Raúl Fernando Núñez Marín, Director de la Clínica de Derechos Humanos y Gerente Proyecto HED, American University, Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales, Departamento de Ciencia Jurídica y Política (EUA)
52. f./ Jennifer Johnson, Senior Associate, Latin America Working Group (LAWG) Education Fund (EUA)
53. f./ Michael Evans, Director, Mexico Migration and Freedom of Information Project, National Security Archive (EUA)
54. f./ Mary Meg McCarthy, Executive Director, Heartland Alliance’s National Immigrant Justice Center (EUA)
55. f./ Eleanor Acer, Director of the Refugee Protection Program, Human Rights First (EUA)
56. f./ Brittney Nystrom, Director for Advocacy, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS) (EUA)
57. f./ Jose Luis Gutierrez, Director Asociado, National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean Communities (EUA) y Director de la Federación de Clubes Michoacanos en Illinois (EUA)

58. f./ Lisa Frydman, Associate Director, Center for Gender & Refugee Studies, U.C. Hastings, College of the Law (EUA)
59. f./ Denise Gilman, Co-Director, Immigration Clinic, The University of Texas at Austin School of Law (EUA)
60. f./ Sarah Paoletti, Practice Professor Director, Transnational Legal Clinic, University of Pennsylvania Law School (a título individual, EUA)
61. f./ Shana Tabak, Practitioner in Residence, International Human Rights Law Clinic, American University Washington College of Law (a título individual, EUA)
62. f./ Caroline Bettinger-López, Director, University of Miami School of Law Human Rights Clinic (EUA)
63. f./ Rebecca Sharpless, Directora, University of Miami School of Law Immigration Clinic (EUA)
64. f./ Adina Appelbaum y Justin Simeone, Advocacy Co-Directors, International Migrants Bill of Rights Initiative (IMBR), Georgetown University Law Center (EUA)
65. f./ Megan McKenna, Communications and Advocacy Director, Kids in Need of Defense (EUA)
66. f./ Salvador Sanabria, Chief Executive Officer, El Rescate (EUA)
67. f./ Azadeh Shahshahani, Representante, National Lawyers' Guild (EUA)
68. f./ Judy Rabinovitz, Deputy Director, American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) Immigrants' Rights Project (EUA)
69. f./ Francisco J. Rivera Juaristi, Director, Clínica de Derechos Humanos de la Universidad de Santa Clara, California (EUA)
70. f./ Emily Arnold-Fernández, Executive Director, Asylum Access (EUA)
71. f./ Fabian Morales, Representante, La Federación Guerrerense de Illinois (EUA)
72. f./ Jayshree Jani, Assistant Professor, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Social Work Department (a título individual, EUA)
73. f./ Marc Silver and Lina Srivastava, Directors, "Who Is Dayani Cristal?" Social Impact Strategy, "Who Is Dayani Cristal?" (EUA)
74. f./ Maria Woltjen, Director, The Young Center for Immigrant Children's Rights at the University of Chicago (EUA)
75. f./ Jennifer Nagda, Policy Director, The Young Center for Immigrant Children's Rights at the University of Chicago (a título individual, EUA)
76. f./ Peter Cervantes-Gautschi, Director Ejecutivo, Enlace (EUA y México)
77. f./ Irene Palma, Directora Ejecutiva, Instituto Centroamericano de Estudios Sociales y Desarrollo (Guatemala)
78. f./ Ana Leticia Pirir Toxcón, Representante del Área de Juventud, Asociación Pop No'j (Guatemala)
79. f./ Julia González, Coordinadora Ejecutiva, Mesa Nacional para las Migraciones en Guatemala (MENAMIG) (Guatemala)
80. f./ Leonel Dubon, Director Ejecutivo, Asociación El Refugio de la Niñez (Guatemala)
81. f./ Jean Baptiste Azolin, Coordinador, Groupe d'Appui aux Rapatriés et aux Réfugiés, GARR (Haití)
82. f./ Karen Valladares, Secretaria Ejecutiva, Foro Nacional para las Migraciones en Honduras (Honduras)
83. f./ José Guadalupe Ruelas, Director Nacional, Casa Alianza Honduras (Honduras)
84. f./ David Alexander Figueroa Toruño, Docente e investigador, Maestría en Demografía y Desarrollo, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Investigador Asociado en Honduras de INCEDES Guatemala (a título individual, Honduras)
85. f./ Rosa Nelly Santos, Coordinadora, Comité de Familiares de Migrantes Desaparecidos de

- El Progreso, Honduras (COFAMIPRO) (Honduras)
86. f./ Diego Lorente, Director General. Centro de Derechos Humanos Fray Matías de Córdova, A.C. (México)
 87. f./ Alberto Xicotencatl, Director, Casa del Migrante de Saltillo (México)
 88. f./ Maru Cortazar, Directora Ejecutiva, Appleseed México (México)
 89. f./ Miguel Ángel Pulido Jiménez, Fundar Centro de Análisis e Investigación (México)
 90. f./ Ernesto López Portillo, Director Ejecutivo, Instituto para la Seguridad y la Democracia (Insyde) A.C. (México)
 91. f./ Zhiri Jael Meza Fragoso, Encargada del Área Legal, Servicio Jesuita a Migrantes (México)
 92. f./ Mario Santiago Juárez, Director, i(dh)eas, Litigio Estratégico en Derechos Humanos, A.C. (México)
 93. f./ Irazú Gómez Vargas, Coordinadora del Programa de Asuntos Migratorios, Instituto de Derechos Humanos Ignacio Ellacuría SJ (México)
 94. f./ María Josefina Menéndez Carbajal, CEO México, Save the Children (México)
 95. f./ Santiago Corcuera Cabezut, Representante, Comisión Mesoamericana de Juristas, A.C. (México)
 96. f./ José Antonio Guevara Bermúdez, Director, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de los Derechos Humanos, A.C. (México)
 97. f./ Fabienne Venet Rebiffé, Directora General, Instituto de Estudios y Divulgación sobre Migración A.C. (INEDIM) (México)
 98. f./ Efrain Jimenez, Director General, Federación Zacatecana A.C. (México)
 99. f./ Fabiola Mancilla, Coordinadora, Estancia del Migrante González y Martínez, A.C. (México)
 100. f./ Alejandra Ancheita, Directora Ejecutiva, Proyecto de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales, A.C. (ProDESC) (México)
 101. f./ María Eugenia Anguiano Téllez, Doctora en Sociología, Profesora investigadora titular, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (sede Tijuana) (a título personal, México)
 102. f./ Jorge A. Andrade, Lucero Mendizábal y Andrea P. González, Miembros, Colectivo Ustedes Somos Nosotros (México)
 103. f./ Camilo Pérez Bustillo, Coordinador, Eje sobre Migración, Refugio, y Desplazamiento Forzado del Capítulo México del Tribunal Permanente de los Pueblos (TPP) (México); y Centro Fronterizo sobre Derechos Humanos y Justicia Social, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces NM (Estados Unidos)
 104. f./ Marco Antonio Castillo Martínez, Director, Instituto de Investigación y Práctica Social y Cultural (IIPSOCULTA) A.C. (México)
 105. f./ Atala del Rocío Chávez y Arredondo, Coordinadora Operativa, Asamblea Popular de Familias Migrantes, APOFAM (México)
 106. f./ Nancy Lorena Morrow Celis, Coordinadora de la Clínica Jurídica, Instituto para las Mujeres en la Migración A.C. (IMUMI) (México)
 107. f./ Berenice Valdez Rivera, Miembro, Colectivo Migraciones para las Américas (COMPA) (México)
 108. f./ Lucio Díaz González, Presidente, La Coalición Indígena de Migrantes de Chiapas (CIMICH) (México)
 109. f./ Carolina Ramírez Suárez, Consultora Género y Migración y Representante de AURA A.C Xalapa Veracruz (México)
 110. f./ Víctor Manuel Torres Olivares, Presidente del Consejo Directivo, Babel Sur, Centro de Investigación Política y Alternativas Sociales, A.C. (México)
 111. f./ Andremar Galvan Serrano, Coordinador General, Colectivo de Apoyo para Personas

- Migrantes (COAMI) (México)
112. f./ Wilner Metelus, Representante, Comité Ciudadano en Defensa de los Naturalizados y Afromexicanos (CCDNAM) (México)
 113. f./ Linda Flores Rodríguez, Coordinadora, Por un Chihuahua Libre y Sin Temor (México)
 114. f./ Brenda Valdes, Coordinadora del Programa de Migración, Desarrollo y Ciudadanía Binacional, Iniciativa Ciudadana para la Promoción de la Cultura del Diálogo A.C. (México)
 115. f./ Perseo Quiroz Rendón, Director Ejecutivo, Amnistía Internacional (México)
 116. f./ Pbro. Lic. Pedro Pantoja Arreola, Asesor De Belen, Posada Del Migrante (Casa Del Migrante Saltillo) (a título individual, México)
 117. f./ Alejandra Castañeda, Coordinadora del Observatorio de Legislación y Política Migratoria de El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (a título individual, México)
 118. f./ Gabriela Morales, Mónica Sálmon y Karla Meza, Comité Ejecutivo, Foro Migraciones (México)
 119. f./ Mónica Salmón Gómez, Coordinadora, FM4 Paso Libre (Dignidad y Justicia en el Camino A.C.) (México)
 120. f./ Sair Daniel Pinilla Martínez, Asesor de Abogacía, Oficina Nacional, Aldeas Infantiles SOS México (México)
 121. f./ Omar Ortega García, Coordinador de vinculación e incidencia, Colectivo de apoyo para personas Migrantes COAMI (a título individual, México)
 122. f./ Norma Mendieta, Coordinadora de Incidencia Política, Centro de Atención a la Familia Migrante Indígena A.C. (CAFAMI), de Tlaxcala (México)
 123. f./ Rosa Barranco, Representante, Red Nacional Género y Economía (REDGE) y Mujeres Para El Dialogo (MpD) (México)
 124. f./ Fernando Valadez, Psicoterapeuta y Perito, Colectivo Contra la Tortura y la Impunidad (México)
 125. f./ José Luis Loera, Coordinación, Programa Casa Refugiados A.C. (México)
 126. f./ José Antonio Foronda Farro, Presidente, Prevención, Capacitación y Defensa del Migrante, A.C. (PRECADEM) (México) y Coodinación Jurídica, Eje de Migración, Refugio y Desplazamiento del Tribunal Permanente de los Pueblos (TPP) (México)
 127. f./ Gonzalo Chapela, Coordinador de Políticas Públicas, Red Mexicana de Organizaciones Campesinas Forestales, MOCAF y Red Mexicana contra la Desertificación, RIOD (México)
 128. f./ Leticia Calderón Chelius, Investigadora, Instituto de Investigaciones José María Luis Mora (a título individual, México)
 129. f./ Hna. Leticia Gutiérrez Valderrama, Directora, SMR, Scalabrinianas: Misión para Migrantes y Refugiados (México)
 130. f./ Karina Arias, Secretaria Técnica, Grupo de Trabajo de Política Migratoria (México)
 131. f./ Nicolás Vázquez Ortega, Representante, Asociación Mexicana de Abogados del Pueblo (AMAP) (México)
 132. f./ Miguel Ángel Paz Carrasco/Coordinador General/ Voces Mesoamericanas, Acción con Pueblos Migrantes, A.C. y Coordinación General Guatemala-México/ Mesa Transfronteriza Migraciones y Género (México)
 133. f./ Maria Sirvent, Coordinadora Institucional, Documenta, A.C. (México)
 134. f./ Stephanie Erin Brewer, Coordinadora del Área Internacional, Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez (Centro Prodh) (México)
 135. f./ Cándida Rosa Gómez, Directora, Servicio Jesuita a Migrantes (Nicaragua)
 136. f./ Martha Isabel Cranshaw Guerra, Coordinadora Nacional, Asociación NicasMigrante (Nicaragua)
 137. f./ Jorge Estrada Silva, Coordinador, Red Local Familiares Migrantes de Managua (Nicaragua)

138. f./ Alexandra del Carmen Luna Sándigo, Coordinadora de Pastoral de Movilidad Humana, Cáritas de Nicaragua (Nicaragua)
139. f./ Ana Lorena Alfaro, Directora, Servicio Jesuita a Refugiados (Panamá)
140. f./ Marilina Marichal, Coordinadora Nacional, Grito de los Excluidos Capítulo Paraguay (Paraguay)
141. f./ Pedro Córdova del Campo, Director Ejecutivo, Centro de Derechos y Desarrollo (CEDAL) (Perú)
142. f./ Flora Tristán, Representante, Centro de la Mujer Peruana y la Red Peruana de Migraciones y Desarrollo (Red Pemides) (Perú)
143. f./ Carmen Haydee Matos, Representante, Alianza Peruana De Cooperacion, Fundacion Humanus (Perú)
144. f./ Anali Briceño, Coordinadora, Servicio Jesuita a Migrantes de Perú (Perú)
145. f./ Roque Felix Mendez, Director, Centro Bonó (República Dominicana)
146. f./ Padre Mario Serrano Marte, Red Jesuita con Migrantes (República Dominicana)
147. f./ Mario Serrano, Director Nacional Sector Social de Los Jesuitas, Sector Social de la Compañía de Jesús de la Provincia de Antillas (República Dominicana, Cuba y Miami)
148. f./ Michael Flynn, Executive Director, Global Detention Project (a título individual)
149. f./ Gabriela Cortina, Coordinadora General, Servicio Ecuménico para la Dignidad Humana (Uruguay)
150. f./ Juan Carlos Pacheco, Investigador de derechos humanos, (a título individual, Venezuela)

International and regional organizations and networks

151. f./ Gabriela Rodríguez Pizarro, Ex-Relatora Especial de Naciones Unidas para los Derechos Humanos de los Migrantes, y Secretaría Técnica, Red Regional de Organizaciones Civiles para las Migraciones (RROCM)
152. f./ Jyoti Sanghera, Chief, Human Rights and Economic and Social Issues Section, Research and Right to Development Division, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
153. f./ Rafael Edmundo Moreno Villa, Director, Red Jesuita con Migrantes de Latino América y el Caribe (RJM-LAC)
154. f./ Kerry L. Neal, Child Protection Specialist, Justice for Children, UNICEF HQ
155. f./ Daniel Gonzales, Director del Programa de Migraciones, AVINA
156. f./ Meredith Fabian, Associate Vice President, Latin America, Covenant House International
157. f./ María José Urgel, Directora Adjunta, Oficina para América Latina, Asociación para la Prevención de la Tortura (APT)
158. f./ Mayela Blanco, Coordinadora de Incidencia Política: México y Centroamérica, Global Workers Justice Alliance
159. f./ Pablo A. de la Vega M., Coordinador Regional, Plataforma Interamericana de Derechos Humanos, Democracia y Desarrollo (PIDHDD Regional)
160. f./ Monica Darer, Child Protection Global Initiative, Regional Representative for Latin America and the Caribbean, Save the Children International
161. f./ Andrea Gálvez, Enlace para México, United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW)
162. f./ Camila Espitia Fonseca, Secretaría Técnica, Red sobre Migraciones Forzadas en las Américas