

# COLLABORATION/RESISTANCE: GOVERNANCE MODELS AGAINST FORCED DISAPPEARANCE

María Teresa Villarreal Martínez\*

**ABSTRACT:** In this work, we examine the array of interaction schemes opened by groups of victims' families and government authorities, as well as the participation of other social actors, both local and international, in order to identify different governance models, build in different ways, from resistance to collaborative work; from the governance of victims to those imposed by the State.

**KEYWORDS:** Governance, forced disappearances, victims, access to justice.

## INTRODUCTION

The forced disappearance of tens of thousand people in Mexico, in the context of the country's war against organized crime which, in 2007, became worse and expanded to encompass the whole territory, has motivated the appearance of dozens of groups of victims 'families that report the authorities' indifference before the problem; demand that their loved ones are found; and fight for the truth to be known. These groups have developed their own repertoire of actions to introduce the problem of forced disappearances into the public agenda, including innovative and extralegal forms for interacting with authorities: a type of governance from the bottom.

The State's responses to this problem have changed through time and different entities in the country, going from denying the problem to working together with family organizations for examining case files and developing protocols, tending to these groups' initiative. However, the vigorous entrance

---

\* PhD in Public Policy (Escuela de Graduados en Administración Pública y Política Pública. Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey). Member of the National Research System (CONACYT, México). Social Research Institute of the Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León. E-mail: teresatesi@gmail.com

of the General Law in matters of Forced Disappearances, Disappearances Committed by Individuals and the National System of People Search in January 2018 has set in motion a series of devices aimed at regulating the participation of family organizations in the investigations and search of their loved ones: a type of governance from the top.

In this work, we examine the array of interaction schemes opened by groups of victims' families and government authorities, as well as the participation of other social actors, both local and international, in order to identify different models of governance, build in different ways, from resistance to collaborative work; from the governance of victims to those imposed by the State, as well as the effect that these dynamics have had in the generation of public policies related to this problem –particularly in the kind of governance drafted in the General Law in matters of Forced Disappearances, Disappearances Committed by Individuals and the National System of People Search approved by the Mexican parliament in October, 2017.

In this paper, we present a general revision of the interaction between government authorities and groups identified between 2001 and 2017. We will then turn our attention to the case of Nuevo León. And, finally, we will analyze the design of participation mechanisms for several actors within said General Law. The information herein is based on press sources, official documents –both from groups and the government– as well as videos shared and spread by these same groups.

This work is part of a research project, “Accountability in the fight against organized crime: The cases of forced disappearance” (*La rendición de cuentas en el combate a la delincuencia organizada. Los casos de desaparición forzada*). This was developed during a post-doctoral stay between 2012 and 2013 at the Historical and Social Research Institute (*Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas y Sociales*) of the Universidad Veracruzana, and on which we have been working ever since then. The novelty of the present text resides in the analysis of the relation between the State and the groups of victims' families, and of the recently approved General Law as well, from a governance perspective.

## ON GOVERNANCE AND PARTICIPATION

The increasingly abundant works on governance define it as a managerial process of society, in which the government, the productive sector and organized society, or the civil and social sector, participate in a coordinated manner, each one of them with more weight and capabilities for influence than the other, depending on the historical development of their social and

government relations within a specific community (Aguilar, 2010; Ospina, 2006; Subirats, 2010; Zurbriggen, 2011). In currently existing governance schemes, participants are never equal, which is why the most powerful groups, the most homogenous and those that enjoy a strategic vision of their own interests are the ones that always accumulate the largest probabilities for success (Graña, 2005). Decisions are built within a community of closed and sealed policies to any influence that does not come from high-level public servants or the private sector involved in the real estate and construction business. This kind of policy communities remains in the shadows, away from the public, which is why their policy management is a lot like a black box that hides the way in which decisions are reached and are only presented to society as an already designed plan or program imposed with no room for modifications whatsoever.

Prats' accuracies are noteworthy in the sense that democratic governance implies a symmetric inclusion, not only of the private and public sectors, but also of the civil and social ones as well. For this, it is necessary for "social interests to have an real opportunity to organize and inform themselves and to participate in the decision-making interactions" (Prats, 2006, p. 28). In this type of governance, the constant symmetric dialogue is the context of the relation between government and citizens.

That is why we cannot talk about just one type of governance, but of several. As for the origin of the initiatives to generate a governance scheme, Tapia Gómez (2007) talks about those that reside among the people; that come "from the bottom" and benefit "those below" when, in adverse circumstances, the State is not capable of dealing with their needs, which is why groups of poor or excluded people organize themselves for solving their situation, forming what is known as "anascopic governances". The type of governance that originates by the initiative of the State or large economic corporations or international organisms are called "reticular governances" and she points that, even these promote network relations among diverse actors, keeping "a vertical perspective –made manifest by their intentions– of legitimizing the prevailing social system; of trying to maintain the *statu quo*" (p. 342). In different terms, these are either "bottom up" or "top down" governances due to their origin, the interests that they serve and the identity of their protagonists.

In the process of public policies, citizen participation constitutes a fundamental element, a condition for the possibility of democratic governance –even a mechanism for social empowerment (Canto, 2008). But we also must recognize that participation can have different significance and effects. It can be limited to give opinions or it can get to watch over and audit management, even redirecting it whenever it deviates from its objectives for the common

good; it can serve to endorse group decisions without objections or it can open the door to considering the needs and points of view of excluded social groups. That is why Peters (2004) warns of the risk that citizen participation is translated in governance as a “pact of simulation” in which civil society organizations lose their autonomy and are only there to legitimize the government’s doings. This risk is also present in the participation of groups of families of forced disappearance victims in the implementation of the National People Search System, as we will see below.

The participation that includes citizens in the definition and design of policies and makes them public always faces strong resistance from those actors used to a reduced and select participation that doesn’t force them to account for their decisions, or to reveal and scrutinize the reasons why a certain public policy is favored and, with it, a certain project or social future. These resistances can become evident when, on the one hand, formal participation channels are opened but, at the same time, the incidence that they can have on the redirection of government action is limited when they try to guarantee the rights of the excluded or more vulnerable members of society. That is why, in the following sections, we revise the actions that the groups of families of forced disappearance victims have implemented by their own initiative, on the one hand, and, on the other, the model of involvement of these groups which was captured in the General Law in matters of Forced Disappearances, Disappearances Committed by Individuals and the National System of People Search.

If being part of public policy is a form of exercising citizenship, then we must recognize the existence of inequalities that prevent the people’s full exercise of their rights. This context must be taken into account when creating institutional forms of participation, since there is a risk that these new instruments become monopolized by those non-government actors that have greater ability and capacity for effective organization and influence which, paradoxically, would turn the institutionalization of citizen participation into another factor that grows and deepens social exclusion.

Citizen councils constitute one of the most used instruments in many countries for formalizing the intervention of non-government actors in public matters, whether in national, state or municipal governments. These are organic mechanisms that imply the insertion of extra governmental actors in the State’s administrative structure without turning them into public servants. In occasions, councils are created in non-systematic ways, but in others, they become part of a public policy of citizen participation that cuts through all of the government’s management. In any case, the institutional design of these

councils offers different possibilities, all related to the degree of the regime and society's democratization, and to the type of citizenship intended to build. Thus, managing councils are created within some societies in which citizens immerse completely in the policy processes: from defining the public problems that will be attended, to the design, implementation and evaluation of public actions. In other societies, councils have an exclusive consultative nature and their suggestions and opinions are not mandatory for the government's authority that holds the final decision on the matters to be dealt, the design and the execution of programs and, sometimes, even the evaluation of their own performance. In a democratic regime, councils would be integrated by using elective mechanisms that include a diversity of interests whereas, in authoritarian regimes, the leader would designate councilmen, giving preference to powerful economic or ideological actors with whom he/she is compromised, leaving common citizens aside.

On the institutionalization of the formal participation of citizens through rules and standards, the question of "how much institutionalization is needed so as to not suffocate social autonomy and, at the same time, not make citizen participation vulnerable" (Cunill, 2008, p. 127) remains to be solved. However, the rules and institutions do not mark the definitive limit of citizen participation since, in the absence of formal channels, citizens can take collective action that forces an democratic opening in a regime. Recent history shows us that this has happened in several nations –including Mexico: citizen mobilizations push for changes that–, gradually, open the way for the inclusion of more social actors in the process of public decision making. In this text, we will also see how, before the State's indifference, some groups of victims' families tried to access the decision making spheres and introduce the problem of forced disappearances into the public agenda, pushing authorities to accept them as spokespeople in the task of justice administration. This type of governance, pushed from the bottom by victims and human rights organizations, is now being taken by the State's institutions for regulating and molding it through the General Law in matters of Forced Disappearances, Disappearances Committed by Individuals and the National System of People Search, as well as by other instruments derived from it for including protocols of how this should be in the different spheres of the National System of People Search and the State's systems. Thus, a revision of the design of these participation mechanisms, their workings and results has become fundamental, as well as the observance of the direction that the participation of the victims' families takes beyond the formalized legal schemes.

## THE GOVERNANCE CREATED BY THE VICTIMS' FAMILIES

From the very first years of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, across different entities in the country, groups have emerged reporting the social effects of the increase in criminal violence and the militarized combat against it that began in the 1990s and became worse by 2007. Particularly, the voices and actions of the groups of victims' families are increasingly standing out, demanding the State to recognize the existence of this problem and to take action, not just to penalize those responsible, but to find those whose freedom has been taken away and to amend the damages inflicted on both direct and indirect victims. Ever since 2001, the creation of these groups follows the geography of violence of the drug dealing cartels and the State's militarized combat against them: Baja California, Sinaloa, Chihuahua, Tamaulipas, Coahuila, Nuevo León, Durango, Veracruz, Guerrero, Michoacán, Oaxaca and Sonora<sup>1</sup> (although recently, similar groups have been created in the State of Mexico, Guanajuato, Jalisco, Morelos, Nayarit, Querétaro, San Luis Potosí, Tlaxcala). In Table 1, there is a list of all identified groups between 2013 and 2018. These organizations have taken their demands and painful indignation to Mexico's streets and squares, because they are convinced that this is not an personal problem that could be solved privately through dealing individually with the State, but one that must be talked about in the public sphere because it hurts society and requires the attention of the government, casting serious doubts over its discourses and institutions that proclaim democracy and human rights, and is an evidence of the government's negligence and –in some cases– complicity of their agents.

The families of forced disappearance victims are indirect victims themselves of this crime. They are the ones that have managed to make way through the indifference of society and the government in order to make this problem visible –which shows that the existing procedures for administrating justice do not work and that the current legal framework neither guarantees the victims' rights nor the search for the truth. These actions have brought these families to the situation's center stage, not as passive receivers of society's sympathies and public assistance, but as active subjects that, in their fight for justice, have become increasingly involved in innovative participatory forms that have empowered them and turned them into important driving forces for change within the legal system and the management of justice administration.

---

1 These federative entities coincide with the places where "joint operatives" between the police and the military took place during the last year in office of President Vicente Fox –between 2005 and 2006– and during the presidential term of Felipe Calderón –between 2006 and 2012.

TABLE 1. COLLECTIVES OF RELATIVES OF MISSING PERSONS (2013-2018)

Collective name	States where they are present
Asociación Ciudadana contra la Impunidad, A. C.	Baja California
Unidos por los Desaparecidos de Baja California, A. C.	Baja California
Asociación Esperanza contra la Desaparición Forzada de Personas y la Impunidad, A. C.	Baja California y Sinaloa
Comité de Madres y Familiares con Hijas Desaparecidas en Cd Juárez	Chihuahua
Familiares Organizadas con Red Mesa de Mujeres	Chihuahua
Familiares organizados con Centro de Derechos Humanos Paso del Norte	Chihuahua
Justicia para Nuestras Hijas, A. C.	Chihuahua
Madres Unidas	Chihuahua
Nuestras Hijas de Regreso a Casa, A. C.	Chihuahua
Alas de Esperanza	Coahuila
Familias Unidas en la Búsqueda y Localización de Desaparecidos de Piedras Negras	Coahuila
Fuerzas Unidas por Nuestros Desaparecidos en Coahuila (FUUNDEC)	Coahuila
Grupo V.I.D.A., Víctimas por sus Derechos en Acción	Coahuila
Colectivo Colibrí	Estado de México
Colectivo de Deudos y Defensores por la Dignidad de Nuestros Desaparecidos	Estado de México
Colectivo de Familias de Guanajuato	Guanajuato
Colectivo de Familiares de Desaparecidos “Siempre Vivos”	Guerrero
Comité de Familiares y Amigos de Secuestrados, Desaparecidos y Asesinados en Guerrero	Guerrero
Los Otros Desaparecidos de Iguala	Guerrero
Familias Unidas por Nuestros Desaparecidos Jalisco (FUNDEJ)	Jalisco
Comité de Familiares de Personas Detenidas Desaparecidas en México ¡¡Alzando Voces!! (Cofaddem)	Michoacán
Frente de Víctimas del Estado de Morelos	Morelos
Víctimas y Ofendidos del Estado de Morelos, A.C.	Morelos
Familias Unidas por Nayarit	Nayarit

*Continued Table 1.*

Collective name	States where they are present
Guerreras en Busca de Nuestros Tesoros	Nayarit
Agrupación de Mujeres Organizadas por los Ejecutados, Desaparecidos y Secuestrados de Nuevo León, (AMORES)	Nuevo León
Fuerzas Unidas por Nuestros Desaparecidos en Nuevo León (FUNDENL)	Nuevo León
Red Eslabones por los Derechos Humanos	Nuevo León, Michoacán, Estado de México, Veracruz
Comité de Familiares de Detenidos-Desaparecidos Hasta Encontrarlos	Oaxaca y Michoacán
Desaparecidos Justicia, A. C.	Querétaro
Unidos Buscando a Nuestros Desaparecidos	San Luis Potosí
Voz y Dignidad por los Nuestros	San Luis Potosí
Desaparecidos del El Fuerte, “Las Rastreadoras”	Sinaloa
Unión de familiares de desaparecidos de Sinaloa en los años 70’s	Sinaloa
Voces Unidas por la Vida	Sinaloa
Colectivo 21 de Mayo	Tamaulipas
Colectivo de Desaparecidos de San Fernando	Tamaulipas
Colectivo de Familiares y Amigos de Desaparecidos en Tamaulipas	Tamaulipas
Colectivo Milynali Red CFC, A.C.	Tamaulipas
Colectivo Jiménez	Tamaulipas
Colectivo Aldama	Tamaulipas
Colectivo Abasolo	Tamaulipas
Colectivo Reynosa	Tamaulipas
Colectivo Nuevo Laredo	Tamaulipas
Buscando a Nuestros Hijos Ausentes Ciudad Victoria	Tamaulipas
Red de Desaparecidos en Tamaulipas	Tamaulipas
De Pie Hasta Encontrarlos, A. C.	Tamaulipas
Búsqueda Colectiva Zona Sur	Veracruz
Buscamos a Nuestras Hijas A.C.	Veracruz



Continued Table 1.

Collective name	States where they are present
Buscando a los Desaparecidos y Desaparecidas Veracruz	Veracruz
Colectivo de Familiares Enlace Xalapa	Veracruz
Colectivo de Familiares de Desaparecidos de Orizaba y Córdoba	Veracruz
Colectivo El Solecito de Veracruz	Veracruz
Colectivo por la Paz Xalapa	Veracruz
Familiares de desaparecidos y desaparecidas de Xalapa	Veracruz
Familiares en Búsqueda “María Herrera” A. C.	Veracruz
Familiares en Búsqueda Coatzacoalcos	Veracruz
Red de Madres Veracruz	Veracruz
Solecito Cardel	Veracruz
Solecito Córdoba	Veracruz
Solecito Veracruz	Veracruz

These are the groups that drive what can already be considered as a social movement made out of victims. Gallagher (2013) stresses that “complex networks of global NGOs working in conjunction with local NGOs and the people’s movements of victims and citizens drive the defense of human rights in Mexico”. However, in the case of forced disappearance victims, before such complex networks, some of the victims’ family members began the fight for making this problem visible by demanding justice on their very own. Once they decided to speak out and take action in public, they formed groups that took collective action. Some of these groups have managed to get support from human rights civil organizations, forming or incorporating more complex networks with actors that sympathize with their cause and demand accountability from their governments in relation to their guarantees of civil rights.

The actions carried by the groups of forced disappearance victims’ families go against the current of indifference of their society and governments, and contribute to lay out the need for social grief in the public sphere for the thousand of victims of crime and the fight against it. The struggle of organized victims –specifically in the case of forced disappearances– is what this essay considers to be an example of non-institutional citizen participation demanding accountability; watching over the work of authorities; applying symbolic

sanctions; presenting legal and public policy proposals. These actions have been seen outside any legal frameworks over at least 15 years (considering that the first of these groups reported in the public media date back to 2001 in Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua; Tijuana, Baja California; and Culiacán, Sinaloa).

The family organizations have made this problem visible in the entities where they carry out their actions, but the placement of this matter in the national agenda did not happen until the caravans organized by the 2011 Movement for Peace with Justice and Dignity (*Movimiento por la Paz con Justicia y Dignidad, MPJD*). The local press of each entity has given different coverage to these groups of families. Among their common activities, stand out the registry of cases that they receive directly or that are published in the media; protest sit-ins –known as *plantones*– in city squares and outside of government offices; press conferences; spreading cases in social media; and investigations of the whereabouts of their loved ones. Among all of these actions, we identified those that could be guided towards the treatment of forced disappearances as a public problem that should be included in the public agenda and for which an integral public policy should be designed. These actions could be grouped in the following way:

- a. *Case registry and documentation.* It includes recollecting the information of their loved ones' cases and of those cases registered in the same federative entity, using data from news in local media and the reports they receive whenever they carry out public events and people approach them to ask them for help in their own cases. In this way, these groups have come to measure this problem with greater accuracy than the government itself. Not only do they keep track of the number of forced disappearances, but also analyze as well, allowing them to detect similarities and tendencies in the different occurrences of this crime. The most polished product of this work is the reports that some of these groups have presented.
- b. *Public denounces.* Sit-in's, protest marches –even fastenings and hunger strikes. These are some of the actions they carry out on the streets, squares and in front of government offices, always carrying posters with the pictures and names of their missing loved ones; with the police patrol car numbers involved in certain cases; pointing the names of neglecting public servants. Aside from the squares and streets, public denounces have also spread extensively through the Internet in blogs, social networks and alternative media. These groups coordinate themselves for presenting these denounces –some even presenting their own official statements regarding certain situations of their struggle.

- c. *Dialogue with the authorities.* In several occasions, these groups have sought communication channels with the state or federal government authorities, but only on very few occasions have they been listened. Some have only managed occasional meetings, while others have even managed to formalize public meetings for analyzing certain cases of forced disappearance. The formal and periodical dialogue experiences between the authorities and the families of forced disappearance victims have been developed by groups in Coahuila and Nuevo León, where they have carried out strategies a little bit more systematic of dialogue through the establishment of periodical tasks forces for tracking the progress of cases. These groups include the United Forces for Our Forced Disappeared in Coahuila (*Fuerzas Unidas por Nuestros Desaparecidos en Coahuila, FUUNDEC*), ever since 2009, and the Group of Organized Women for the Executed, Kidnapped and Forced Disappeared of Nuevo León (*Agrupación de Mujeres Organizadas por los Ejecutados, Secuestrados y Desaparecidos de Nuevo León*) since 2011. Below we will specify the nature of these interaction schemes.
- d. *Push for legal frameworks.* The groups of families of forced disappearance victims have elaborated legal initiatives and have sought for lobbying them in parliaments, although, commonly, they end up resorting to public rallies for pressuring lawmakers to listen their demands. These initiatives fight for the recognition of victims' rights, the classification of the crime of forced disappearance, as well as for several support measures for families that go through a series of economic and social problems because of the forced disappearance of their loved ones and need legal recognition for declaring their absence a forced disappearance, without meaning that they are deceased.
- e. *Search of forced disappearance victims.* Search brigades in the field, occasionally accompanied by government agents, that have led to the discovery of dozens of hidden mass graves all over the country.
- f. *Network creation.* The families of forced disappearance victims build ties with similar groups in different states, looking for the solidarity and accompaniment of other civil organizations so that they can also carry their cause. In 2010, several groups of families formed the National Campaign against Forced Disappearance (*Campaña Nacional contra la Desaparición Forzada*), together with other popular and human rights organizations. In March of 2015, the Movement for Our Disappeared in Mexico (*Movimiento por Nuestros Desaparecidos en México*) was formed by groups of victims' families and organizations that offer their support and accompaniment. In 2016, the National Search Brigade for Disappeared Persons (*Brigada*

*Nacional de Búsqueda de Personas Desaparecidas*), integrated by groups from Guerrero, Coahuila, Sinaloa, Chihuahua and Baja California, dedicated itself to searching human remains and hidden mass graves. Other networks in several states include the “Link” Network for Human Rights (*Red Eslabones por los Derechos Humanos*) and the United Forces for Our Disappeared in Mexico (*Fuerzas Unidas por Nuestros Desaparecidos en México, FUNDEM*). Some state networks have also been formed, like the Citizen Community in Search of the Forced Disappeared in Tamaulipas (*Comunidad Ciudadana en Búsqueda de Desaparecidos en Tamaulipas*).

- g. *Memory building*. Special dates like the 10<sup>th</sup> of May (Mother’s Day); the last week of May in which the World Week of Forced Disappearances is celebrated; August 30, the International Day of Forced Disappearance Victims... These are all special occasions in which groups of families organize public events for reminding society and the authorities of the problem’s current situation and their lack of response before it. The publishing of books and testimonial videos is another form of building a memory of the victims of forced disappearance and not forgetting this national tragedy.

## THE DIALOGUE MODEL PUSHED IN NUEVO LEÓN

Among the many undertaken actions of these groups is the dialogue with authorities for a precise tracking of concrete cases of forced disappearance, with the purpose of reviewing the progress of government investigations and not only demanding them to find and punish the guilty parties but, above all else, to find the victims. The participation of these groups in the investigation process of law administration offices does not follow any established formal channels because laws do not comprehend this sort of involvement –which is why these groups of victims resort to drive these kind of innovations. In some cases, they have been so successful that they have even created semi-formal channels for talking to the authorities: these channels do not exist before the law, but they are carried out in official settings, become formal investigation processes and are made public as legitimate participations. This achievement has a lot to do with the opportunities offered by the context and the capacity of political incidence.

Among the experiences of direct dialogue with authorities, the case that has reached its fullest and most lasting expression is in Nuevo León, where the Group of Organized Women for the Executed, Disappeared and Kidnapped of Nuevo León (*Agrupación de Mujeres Organizadas por los Ejecutados,*

*Desaparecidos y Secuestrados de Nuevo León, AMORES*), accompanied and advised by a NGO, Citizens in Support of Human Rights (*Apoyo a los Derechos Humanos A. C., CADHAC*) has developed a scheme of dialogue and cooperation with the state's attorney general's office ever since 2011. The UN's Task Force on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances considered this liaison as a "good practice" in its September 2015 report (GTDFI, 2015). In general terms, these are formal encounters between families and authorities, in which case files are revised with the purpose of evaluating the progress of several investigations. These are interaction schemes created and modeled by the victims' families themselves as they went along, together with human rights activists that found the disposition of some state authorities to participate. These are extra-legal mechanisms that have introduced groups to the center of the formal spheres where the administration of justice takes place. They have managed to call attention on the urgency of finding the whereabouts of victims –since justice administration has focused on the pursuit of the related crimes and search for the responsible parties, without looking for all the missing people.

This model for dialogue began in 2011. In that year, when violence was at a peak, the Caravan of Solace (*Caravana del Consuelo*) reached Monterrey on June 7<sup>th</sup>, driven by the Movement for Peace with Justice and Dignity (*Movimiento por la Paz con Justicia y Dignidad, MPJD*) headed by the Mexican poet Javier Sicilia and Emilio Álvarez Icaza. After arriving at the square of the Civil College, they listened the testimonies of people looking unsuccessfully for their disappeared family members, without support from the authorities. Sicilia and Álvarez suggested paying a visit to the state's attorney general and, by midnight, then state attorney Adrián de la Garza received a group of families of forced disappearance victims, CADHAC representatives and MPJD members, and committed to show them progress in their matters. That is how a process of dialogue began between the state's attorney general's office and the families of forced disappearance victims advised by CADHAC. This process continues through periodical meetings in which case files are reviewed, proposals are made and agreements are reached for advancing these investigations. Between January of 2011 and January of 2018, 30 meetings of this type have taken place.

Days before each of these encounters between families and the attorney general's office, CADHAC issues a statement broadcasted by the media and in social networks for rallying society to join them on the day of the meeting, marching from the square of La Purísima to the state's attorney general's office, some six blocks away, and wait outside these premises for hearing the results of the meeting. By the end of the meeting, CADHAC issues another statement

to inform if there were any new advances or what new difficulties were found in the progress.

These dialogue meetings are formal, collective, face-to-face encounters between public servants of the state's attorney general office (district attorneys, coordinators, sub-prosecutors and prosecutors) and families of forced disappearance victims (AMORES), accompanied by CADHAC to review the compliance of tasks in the investigation of each case. In each gathering, agreements are reached in relation to new tasks that should be carried out in each case (localizing and questioning witnesses, follow-up of clues, transfer official documents to other government's agencies that could support the finding of victims or gathering new evidences). The families are key informant for investigations to move forward since they are the ones that supply vital facts that could determine their direction. The revision and evaluation of the fulfillment of these commitments is a key part of this dialogue.

The difficulty of passing from a scheme in which victims are not taken into account and their families are left behind to one in which there is a formal dialogue between them and the investigative authorities with the purpose of finding these disappeared persons, is reflected in this statement given by CADHAC's director, Consuelo Morales:

At first, it was horrible. Neither the State nor us trusted each other. The truth is that those first meetings were tense; you could cut the air with a knife. It wasn't until the eighth meeting when they offered us a soda –because we had been working for hours and hours without a break. But gradual changes began taking place. I believe that, basically, changes took place because we were arguing based on facts. It wasn't about going in and blaming public servants just for blaming someone. It was about working, reviewing case files, detecting at which point did investigations stopped and finding how to carryall this work through. It was somewhat technical (from an interview made on August 27, 2012).

With the 2015 change of government, the meetings between families, CADHAC and the state's attorney general's office continued, although in the absence of the state's attorney general and without his direct participation, unlike the years before, in which he had personally attended the creation of 23 task forces between 2011 and 2015. The direct involvement of the state's attorney general, the sub-prosecutors and directors of different areas, favored accountability, since district attorneys and their coordinators presented a report of their work not only before the victims' families, but also before their superiors in the hierarchy. Besides, is there should be any difficulty presented itself in the implementation of tasks, the attorney general was there to offer solutions

that could streamline the investigative work. In 2017, only two meetings of this type took place. During meeting number 28, carried out on April 27<sup>th</sup>, the mechanism for work was reassessed. This is how CADHAC explains what happened in their press release following the meeting:

This time, besides our usual revision, we used a new work model, looking to identify different variables of information for finding people. Even though we will continue to use the case revision method that we had been using up to this point, this new method intends to paint a bigger picture of the social context of violence that has been taking place in our state ever since 2007 and to understand the role that each of the involved actors had in it. We hope that this new path allows us to get closer to the truth and to find justice for the victims of these crimes and their families.

On the celebration of August 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017, the International Day of Forced Disappearance Victims, in a new press release, CADHAC announced the achievements of their dialogues with the authorities:

[...] they increased their attention and resources for the search, reviewed the files of 236 forced disappeared people, 63 people were taken into custody, 22 were sentenced (of which, 18 were police officers) and 169 people were found (94 by way of their DNA; 75, still alive), as well as approved a protocol for immediate searches, just to mention a few. This allowed some families to find their loved ones, mitigating the pain of all other families by giving them a ray of hope. However, from the year 2015 on, there has been a setback from all that had been accomplished. The disappearance cases remain open. Families that haven't found their loved ones yet suffer not only because they do not know where they are, but because everything else that their absence entails: boy and girls without their father or mother; grandmothers that lost their sons or daughters and now must raise their grandsons, aside from living through a serious damage to their economic situation, worsening of health conditions, problems with bank credits and social housing, criminalization of their families, among many other difficulties they must face.

Through periodical dialogues with the Attorney General's Office of Nuevo León (*Procuraduría General de Justicia de Nuevo León, PGJNL*), CADHAC and the victims' families that form AMORES, they detected that the human and technological resources of the ministerial police weren't enough to carry out a field investigation effectively before the enormous amount of forced disappearance cases in the state. That is to say that the political good urgently had to be accompanied by an increase of personnel and technical resources of the state's attorney general's office, both in quality and quantity. To contribute to the creation of search mechanisms, in may 2013, a task force was organized for

elaborating the Search and Investigation Procedure for Forced Disappearance Victims, in which participated Fernando Coronado, representative of the Human Rights Commission of Mexico City; Alan García, from the Mexico Office of the High Commission of the United Nations for Human Rights; Luis Eduardo Zavala from Monterrey's Technological Institute (*Tecnológico de Monterrey*); and Alejandro Valencia, an independent advisor in matters of Human Rights in Colombia, as well as members of the legal team of CADHAC. Other work meetings also took place with members of the PGJNL, until they were able to structure a document that set the procedural guidelines of the state attorney general's office before cases of forced disappearances and set the standards of the actions to be taken. This protocol also encompassed a State Questionnaire for Immediate Search (*Formulario Estatal de Búsqueda Urgente, FEBU*) that is filled by public servants from the Orientation and Report Center (*Centro de Orientación y Denuncia, CODE*) whenever they receive a forced disappearance report. The protocol established the creation of a Unit of Immediate Search which began operations in March, 2014, under the name of Specialized Group of Immediate Search (*Grupo Especializado de Búsqueda Inmediata, GEBI*). This unit relies on full-time specialized and dedicated personnel that searches for forced disappearance victims, with capabilities for responding instantly to any presented report of missing persons, since its objective is to focus completely on the search and location of missing people without regarding under what circumstances did the disappearance occurred. This unit has the responsibility of carrying out all the required tasks of an immediate search of missing persons, from the moment in which the authority receives the report. An evaluation of the GEBI's first year of operations –from March 2014 to March 2015– showed an efficiency of 88% of the received cases (CADHAC, 2015). However with the state's change of government in October 2015, the Procedure of Search and Investigation of Missing People stopped being applied and the GEBI stopped receiving missing person reports. In a new supervision carried out by CADHAC in 2016, the organization found that the GEBI's efficiency had lowered considerably and that its operation even had deviated from its main objective: the setting in motion of the Protocol of Search and Investigation of Missing Persons. CADHAC's assessment of GEBI, published at the beginning of 2017, encompassed the quantitative and qualitative investigation of the GEBI's work from April 2015 to December 2016. It was found that all reports related to involuntary or forced disappearances were not handled by the GEBI but were channeled to different areas of the PGJNL, where the Protocol of Search and Investigation of Missing Persons was not followed, while the GEBI destined its time and resources to handling reports of missing or lost persons. The main conclusion of this assessment



was that the GEBI has drifted away from the main objective for which it was created: to be an efficient and effective mechanism for the immediate search of forced disappearance victims.

After 30 work meetings, some forced disappearances victims have been found alive, but these only happened when their families approached CADHAC immediately and made reports before the authorities during the first hours or days after the event happened. Thanks to this organization's pressure in those cases, it has been possible to find a forced disappearance victim at some police station, even if their presence at those premises had been previously denied by government agencies. Therefore, we cannot talk about a change in the police structure yet since, if it wasn't for CADHAC's intervention, families would be ignored by the authorities whenever they reached them to ask if their loved one was detained by them.

## **GOVERNANCE REGULATED IN THE LAW**

The General Law in matters of Forced Disappearance Victims, Disappearances Committed by Individuals and the National System of People Search, in its 2nd Article, establishes that its objective, among other things, is:

VII. To establish the form of participation of families in the design, implementation, supervision and evaluation of the actions of search and identification of Forced Disappearance Victims and Not-Found People, as well as guaranteeing their contribution in the investigation stages, so that they can include their opinions, receive information and contribute leads or evidences.

Of all the mechanisms set to comply with the aforementioned, the General Law describes the National Citizen Council, an enquiry body of the National System of People Search, which is the higher branch for articulating efforts to search and find forced disappearance victims. Federal and state public servants, and three representatives of the National Citizen Council, according to Article 45, will predominantly integrate this system:

Article 45. The National System is integrated by:

- I. The principal of the Secretariat of the Interior that will preside it;
- II. The principal of the Secretariat of Foreign Relations;
- III. The principal of the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic;
- IV. The principal of the National Commission of Search; who will work as an Executive Secretary;
- V. The principal of the Executive Secretariat of the National System of Public Safety;

- VI. Three people from the Citizen Council that represent each of the sectors that form them;
- VII. The principal of the Federal Police;
- VIII. The principal from the Local Search Commissions, and
- IX. The person that designates the National Conference of Justice Administration.

It is evident that the weight that the Council may have in the decisions made within the System is minimal, since its sessions will be valid with the assistance of the majority of their members –without specifying the need for the Council members to be present. Also, resolutions will be reached through a majority of votes and, in case of a tie, the President will have an additional –and decisive– vote (Article 45). This superior branch is in charge of “dictating the guidelines that regulate the participation of families in the actions of the search” (Article 49, Section XV). Also, in the specific case of family members, their participation is minor, since only one of them can take part in the System’s sessions, since the other two representatives of the Council before the System should be part of organisms of human rights or else, experts in matters related to the General Law. These are the three sectors that form the National Citizen Council.

The Law establishes that the National Citizen Council will be integrated by:

- I. Five members of the victim’s family;
- II. Four well-known and respected specialists in the protection and defense of Human Rights, the search for Forced Disappearance victims or Not Found People or in the investigation and pursuit of the crimes provided by this Law. It will be guaranteed that one of this specialists will always be in forensic topics, and
- III. Four representatives of human rights organizations of civil society. (Article 60).

The Senate is in charge of designating the members “after a public enquiry with the organizations of families, organizations defending human rights and organized groups of victims and experts” in matters of forced disappearances, people search and human rights. Designated people will take over their charge for three years, without the possibility of reelection, without executing public servant positions simultaneously and exercising the charge in honorable fashion, without remunerations nor compensations.

From among its members, the Council will name a committee for the evaluation and supervision of the work developed by the National Search

Commission, a decentralized organ of the Secretariat of the Interior (*Secretaría de Gobernación, SEGOB*), in charge of carrying out the actions of searching for forced disappearance victims and not-found people –National Search Program– in the whole national territory, driving the liaisons between the authorities in charge of the people search tasks and to set the mechanisms for communication, participation and evaluation of civil society and families that contribute to the achievement of the objectives of this very same Commission.

The General Law provides that the members of the System shall supply the information that the Council requires for functioning and SEGOB should provide its needed financial, technical, infrastructural and human resources. The Council can issue recommendations, opinions and proposals, making them available for the System’s members so that they can consider them in their decisions, with no obligation to follow them –but obliged to justify their negative to do so. However, the recommendations above only refer to the integration, guidelines and operation of the National Search Commission –they do not affect the work of other agencies that form the System, like the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic, in charge of the investigation of crimes through the Specialized Prosecutor.

In fact, the Council’s attributions refer to:

- a) Suggestions.
- b) To offer opinions.
- c) To request information.
- d) To supervise.
- e) To contribute to the advance of public policies that result from the Law.
- f) To contribute to the direct participation of families.
- g) To report any detected irregularities before the authorities.
- h) To issue recommendations for the work of the National Search Commissions.

Of all of these attributions, the only ones that could favor a participation that could control the management, policies and programs that result from the General Law are the last two in the list.

As for different forms of participation for families, the mechanisms are yet to be designed. The General Law establishes that the tasks for searching forced disappearance victims will be carried out by the National Search Commission, an decentralized administrative organ of SEGOB, while the investigation of crimes of forced disappearance and disappearance committed by individuals will be carried out by Special Prosecutors in the charge of the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic (*Procuraduría General de la República*,

*PGR*) and the specialized prosecutors created in each federative entity depending of their respective attorney general's offices. This means that the task of searching for victims has been separated from the task of prosecuting the crime. The participation of the victims' families in the tasks of searching and the prosecutor's investigation will be subject to two specific protocols. The System is in charge of drafting the Standardized Search Protocol and the National Conference of Justice Administration and the Standardized Investigation Protocol. Both protocols must comprehend "the mechanisms to keep families informed of the search actions carried out by the authorities" and "the procedures for the participation of families in searches and investigation" (Article 99, Sections XXI and XXIII). In the elaboration of these protocols, the participation of experts in the field, civil society and family members must be taken into account, in compliance with international standards. For the updating of protocols, participatory evaluations by the families are being considered, among many other mechanisms. The General Law is more explicit in the participation of family members in searches, while not so much in tasks of investigating the crimes. Regarding searches, it points that family members and their representatives may accompany and follow-up the search tasks, as well as have access to leads, evidences, proofs and results related to these tasks. Regarding the investigation carried out by the Specialized Prosecutor on crimes of forced disappearances and disappearances committed by individuals, the participation of family members will be restricted by the terms of the National Code of Legal Procedures (*Código Nacional de Procedimientos Penales*). Regarding the access to files, it is pointed that family members can have integral access to search results, and can even have a single free copy of the tasks carried out. In regard to investigation files on crimes of forced disappearances, it is established that family members have the right to access them, without specifying if they can or can't access copies. It is also advised, in Article 137, that the proposals of families regarding tasks can be taken into account by the authorities, but on the contrary, they are only required to explain their negative to follow them.

The participation of family groups and the civil organizations that accompany them is also laid out for the design, implementation, supervision and evaluation of the National Search Program in the charge of the Commission and the National Program of Exhumations and Forensic Identification in the charge of the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic.

Title Four of the General Law is dedicated to the rights of victims. Regarding to their participation, it is indicated that it shall be carried out according to the protocols approved in the matter.

## IMPLEMENTATION GAPS OF THE GENERAL LAW

The General Law came into effect in January, 2018. It began with the process of selecting and designating the principal person of the National Search Commission. On March 7, Roberto Cabrera took office after a procedure during which several candidates were interviewed in sessions with family members that were transmitted in social networks. Cabrera received the guarantee of 166 groups including groups of victims, civil organizations and experts. However, this fact contrasted with the federal government's decision to change the Commission's ascription that –according to Article 50 of the General Law– it is a decentralized organ of SEGOB, but on April 2<sup>nd</sup>, the Federation's Official Journal published an agreement issued by SEGOB in which the National Search Commission would be under the responsibility of the National Public Safety Commissioner, which means that the search for missing persons will be one more task of public safety in conjunction with the Federal Police, the Federal Protection Service and Social Prevention and Rehabilitation –areas also in the charge of the National Public Safety Commissioner.

The integration of the National Citizen Council generated non-conformities among family groups. In Tamaulipas –the entity with the greater number of missing persons registries according to the RNPED–, no representative of the five groups that responded to the invitation from the Senate was selected to be part of the Council (Hernández, April 24, 2018). In the local sphere, the General Law does not specify a deadline for the creation of the Citizen State Councils, which is why a delay would be expected just like it happens in other implementation phases.

In other federative entities, the process of integration of the local search commissions has been somewhat uneven in some cases, aside from the fact that it came in late, since the General Law dictates that these should be integrated during the first 90 days after the law came into effect –which happened on April 16. To this date, there has not been one single Local Search Commission installed in any state.

In Nuevo León, the designation of María de la Luz Balderas Rodríguez on May 23 had the support of the AMORES group, but the group FUNDENL refuted, contending that Balderas hadn't fulfilled the commitments she had with forced disappearance victims' families when she was a prosecutor coordinator of the State's Office of the Attorney General, with even four recommendations<sup>2</sup> of the State's Commission of Human Rights (*Comisión Estatal de Derechos Humanos, CEDH*) due to unjustified delays in investigations related to people disappearance in cases corresponding to Balderas' management

2 Recommendations 52/2013, 6/2017, 7/2017 and 15/2017.

(Robles, May 28, 2018). The call was published on April 13 and did not establish under what mechanisms would the selection of the Commission's principal would be carried out but, thanks to press releases, we know that a jury was formed with representatives from local universities and civil organizations before which three candidates appeared. Finally, the jury selected Balderas, although without informing which evaluation criteria did they follow neither the grades that each candidate got during the selecting process. In Jalisco, on April 24, a call was published, but on May 14, the state's government had to declare it void after the non-conformity protests from civil organizations and groups of victims' families for not being included in the selection process. A second call was then made. By the end of May, there weren't any news on the forming of other local search commissions, but in the State of Mexico, Guerrero, Nayarit and Jalisco, the selection process was on the way, while in other entities like Tamaulipas, Coahuila and Michoacán, groups complained about the delay on the call's publication.

The General Law does not specify to which government area will the local search commissions will depend upon. In some federative entities, this hasn't been specified yet and, in others, the decree to create the corresponding Local Search Commission remains to be announced. For example, in Nuevo León, even though a principal has already been selected, it remains to be determined upon which branch will this Commission depend and its creation to be decreed. Whereas in Jalisco, on April 16, a decree was published, creating the Local Search Commission and indicating that this would be a decentralized organ of the General Secretariat of the Interior. In those same terms, a creation decree was published on April 20 for the Commission in Guerrero and, on April 30, in Nayarit. On April 17, in the State of Mexico, a decree was published creating the entity's People Search Commission as an administrative and decentralized organ of the Secretariat of Justice and Human Rights. On May 3, in Jalisco and in Veracruz, a decree was published creating the Commission as an organ assigned to the General Consolidation Management of the Criminal Justice and Human Rights System that depends on the Subsecretariat of the Interior of the General Secretariat of Interior.

By the end of May, 2018, in more than 20 states the creation of the local search commissions were still to be formalized and its principal was yet to be designated. The National Search System had to be installed by July 16, but this requires all local commissions to already be integrated all over the country, since these are all part of the System. Once the system is installed, there will be guidelines announced for the participation of families in the search of their loved ones that are victims of forced disappearances.

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Before the approval of the analyzed General Law, several federative entities already had protocols and procedures for carrying out immediate searches for victims of forced disappearance: Nuevo León, Estado de México, Veracruz, Colima and there even was an Authorized Procedure by the PGR. Even so, according to the National Registry of Data of Missing or Forced Disappeared Persons (*Registro Nacional de Datos de Personas Extraviadas o Desaparecidas*) there were 4,754 victims of forced disappearance reported in 2016 that are yet to be found and, in 2017, there were 4,973. These are the two years with the largest numbers of registered disappearances of the past decade.

Therefore, the elaboration of search protocols is nothing new in the Law –these already existed and there are no official assessments of their effectiveness other than these growing numbers of forced disappearance victims that remain to be found. We will have to wait for the creation of a new Authorized Search Protocol and an Authorized Investigation Protocol, their set in motion and the results that they obtain for assessing their efficiency.

Still with no legal framework to encompass them, ever since a few years ago, groups of victims' families had constituted themselves in critical networks that managed to make the problem of the thousands of unpunished forced disappearances in Mexico part of the public agenda –as well as the State's indifference and incompetence to stop these crimes that are still reported, day by day; to find the victims; to punish the responsible parties; and to amend the damages caused to all victims of these crimes. One of the most accomplished cases of participation of victims' families and human rights activists "from the bottom" is Nuevo León, where a dialogue developed through 30 formal work meetings with the state's attorney general's office and –even there– the number of victims that remain to be found is overwhelming. Although this dialogues scheme is considered to be a good practice by the UN's WGFID, it cannot be considered as a model adopted by the state's attorney general's office –now district attorney. The prevalence of forced disappearances and the slowness of the investigations of these cases –as proven by the four recommendation made to the state's human rights commission– show that this problem is yet to be admitted as a public problem, as well as the search for answers that constitute lasting policies to stop the problem and facilitate its victims' access to justice.

Although this formal dialogue mechanism with the PGJNL hasn't necessarily been the driving force for finding all the disappeared persons, it has given well founded arguments to families and to the CADHAC to face public servants with detected concrete failures; to point specific areas that require attention; to develop search and investigation protocols; to authorize registries

of cases of forced disappearances; to set-up DNA banks all over the country; to set mechanisms that force telephone companies to give information; and to coordinate work between federal, state and municipal government institutions.

This model of dialogues represents a social and state interface (Gurza and Isunza, 2010) of citizen participation for the families of forced disappearance victims –who are victims as well, although indirect ones– aimed at exercising control and holding authorities accountable over their investigation work. This participation managed to insert itself in the administrative structure where attorney generals operate in order to hold them accountable for the progress of their investigations and watch over their development. This specific form of participation is not contemplated in the legal framework.

With regard to the participation model for families proposed by the General Law, on the one hand, it recognizes the rights and establishes that these must be guaranteed but, on the other hand, it seems to try to fit the ways in which families so far have managed to be part of the search for their loved ones and demand justice into controllable moulds.

It is not clear if once the General Law comes into force, and once the corresponding legal frameworks are created in different federative entities, will the governance scheme created by family groups will continue in Nuevo León, or if these will have to be subjected to formal mechanisms provided by the legal framework which, by the way, seems to focus the participation of families more in searches than investigations. Even though the localization of forced disappearance victims is a priority for groups of victims' families, the pursuit of justice is only accomplished by effective investigations of the related crimes and the punishment of responsible parties by judges and courts. In just prosecution and justice administration lies the guarantee of the right for truth.

Before the General Law's approval, groups of the victims' families had already formed critical networks that managed to introduce themselves into the formal spheres of justice administration with certain degree of prominence and to place their demand to find their loved ones on the table. In that formal sphere, government actors also have their own interests, which could create tensions and even break their relations with these groups. There lies the challenge for the groups of victims' families before governance that comes "from the top" in the General Law: they would have to keep their leading role without giving up their rights, but also without closing the communication channels with government public servants, in order to discover the truth and find their loved ones that have been forcibly disappeared.



## REFERENCES

- Aguilar, L. (2010). El futuro de la gestión pública y la gobernanza después de la crisis. *Frontera norte*, 22(43), 187-213. Recovered on: [http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S0187-73722010000100008](http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0187-73722010000100008)
- CADHAC (2010). *Informe Anual 2009*. Recovered on: <http://CADHAC.org/2009.pdf>
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2011). *Informe Anual 2010*. Recovered on <http://CADHAC.org/2010.pdf> (Retrieved December 27, 2017).
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2015). *Grupo Especializado de Búsqueda Inmediata. A un año de su creación* (March 2014 - March 2015).
- Canto Chac, M. (2008). Gobernanza y participación ciudadana en las políticas públicas frente al reto del desarrollo. *Política y cultura*, (30), 9-37. Recovered on: [http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S0188-77422008000200002](http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0188-77422008000200002)
- Cunill, N. (2008). “La construcción de ciudadanía desde una institucionalidad pública ampliada”. En: Mariani, R. (coord.) (2008). *Contribuciones al debate: Democracia/Estado/Ciudadanía Hacia un Estado de y para la democracia en América Latina*. Vol. II. PNUD-UE, pp. 113-138. Recovered on [http://www.undp.org.mx/Doctos/contribuciones\\_al\\_debate\\_vol\\_ii.pdf](http://www.undp.org.mx/Doctos/contribuciones_al_debate_vol_ii.pdf)
- Gallagher, J. (2013). *Ni las élites ni las masas: la protección de los derechos humanos en el mundo real*, Recovered on: <http://www.opendemocracy.net/open-globalrights/janicegallagher/ni-las-%C3%A9lites-ni-las-masas-la-protecci%C3%B3n-de-los-derechos-humanos-e>
- Graña, F. (2005). *Diálogo social y gobernanza en la era del “Estado Mínimo”*. Montevideo, Organización Internacional del Trabajo. Recovered on: <http://www.cinterfor.org.uy/publicaci%C3%B3n/di%C3%A1logo-social-y-gobernanza-la-era-del-estado-m%C3%ADnimo>
- GTDFI, (2015). *Seguimiento a las recomendaciones en su informe relativo a su visita a México del 18 al 31 de marzo de 2011*. Recovered on: [http://www.hchr.org.mx/images/doc\\_pub/Informe-Seguimiento-GTDFI-NU\\_Mexico-2015.pdf](http://www.hchr.org.mx/images/doc_pub/Informe-Seguimiento-GTDFI-NU_Mexico-2015.pdf)
- Guurza Lavalle, A. E. Isunza Vera, E. (2010). Precisiones conceptuales para el debate contemporáneo sobre la innovación democrática: participación, controles sociales y representación. En: Isunza Vera, E. y Guurza Lavalle, A. (2010), *La innovación democrática en América Latina. Tramas y nudos de la representación, la participación y el control social*, CIESAS-Universidad Veracruzana, México, pp. 19-84.
- Hernández, J. (April 24, 2018), “Excluyen a colectivos del Consejo Nacional. Sistema Nacional de Búsqueda de Personas”, en *El Mañana*, Reynosa. Recovered on: <https://www.elmananacom/excluyen-colectivos-del-consejo-nacional-sistema-nacional-busqueda-personas-tamaulipas-desaparecidos-ong-sistema-nacional-busqueda-personas/4385855>
- Ley General en materia de Desaparición Forzada de Personas, Desaparición Cometida por Particulares y del Sistema Nacional de Búsqueda de Personas*, November 17, 2017.

- Ospina, S. (2006). Gobernanza y liderazgos para el cambio social. *Revista del CLAD Reforma y Democracia*, núm. 35, junio, 2006, pp. 1-17. Recovered on: <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/3575/357533667004.pdf>
- Peters, G. B. (2004). “Cambios en la naturaleza de la administración pública: de las preguntas sencillas a las respuestas difíciles”. In: Pardo, M. del C. (comp.), *De la administración pública a la gobernanza*. México: El Colegio de México. pp. 69-100.
- Prats, J. (2006). *Veinte años de modernización administrativa en los países de la OCDE. Lecciones aprendidas*. Seminario internacional sobre modernización del Estado, October 26-27, 2006, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- Robles, I. (May 28, 2018). *Pide Fundenl invalidar nombramiento de Balderas*. *Reforma*. Recovered on: <https://www.reforma.com/aplicacioneslibre/articulo/default.aspx?id=1405696&md5=d06021ffb93601375063a3db204d8563&ta=0dfdbac11765226904c16cb9ad1b2efe>
- Tapia Gómez, A. (2007). Después del 11-M: la movilización de las víctimas, ¿modelo europeo de política victimal: las gobernanzas? In: *Derechos Humanos y violencia: gobierno y gobernanza el desplazamiento forzado interno en Colombia: un desafío a los Derechos Humanos*, Universidad Externado de Colombia, pp. 323-351.
- Zurbriggen, C. (2011) Gobernanza: una mirada desde América Latina. *Perfiles latinoamericanos*, 19(38), 39-64. Recovered on: <http://www.scielo.org.mx/pdf/perlat/v19n38/v19n38a2.pdf>