**Contribution for the Special Rapporteur Report on the sale and exploitation of children, including child prostitution, the use of children in pornography, and other materials exhibiting the sexual abuse of children.**

The Grupo de Información en Reproducción Elegida, A.C. (Information Group on Reproductive Choice - GIRE) is a feminist human rights organization working for reproductive justice in Mexico. In 2011, GIRE incorporated assisted reproduction, including surrogacy, as a priority issue, and since then, it has worked with legislators, surrogates and other individuals involved in the practice. To learn more about our work on the issue, visit gire.org.mx.

**Surrogacy as a Human Rights Issue**

The practice of surrogacy poses particularly difficult problems as it involves controversial issues that remain unresolved from a feminist and human rights perspective. In addition, the worldwide increase in the number of people participating in surrogacy agreements has led to complex theoretical and political discussions on various issues such as the rights of the parties involved in the agreements, the rules for determining the parentage of the children who are born through surrogacy and the international legal framework necessary to respond to this global practice.

**Regulation of Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART) in Mexico**

Access to ART implies the exercise of a series of human rights, including the right to found a family, private life (reproductive autonomy), health, and the benefits of scientific progress. To guarantee these rights, regulation and implementation of ART is necessary so that those who cannot become pregnant without medical intervention may have access to them. In Mexico, for decades, thousands of people have resorted to these procedures for various reasons: they are infertile, they are same-sex couples or they are single. However, to date, there is no federal regulation to regulate these procedures and they are therefore provided without adequate sanitary verification or human rights protection.[[1]](#footnote-1)

In Mexico, Article 3 of the General Health Law establishes that the sanitary control of the disposal of organs, tissues and cells is exclusively a federal matter of general health. Therefore, the regulation of ART corresponds to the federal government, and, Article 73 of the Constitution establishes that this type of regulation corresponds to the General Health Law. Nonetheless, in Mexico, as of December 31, 2018, 130 clinics or private and public[[2]](#footnote-2) establishments were in operation, practicing ART with a health license issued by the Federal Commission for Protection against Sanitary Risks (COFEPRIS).[[3]](#footnote-3) As of this date, neither the Congress or the Federal Ministry of Health have met their obligation to establish regulations on the issue that are compatible with advances in medical science and human rights.

However, surrogacy has been regulated in two states: Tabasco and Sinaloa. In 1997, Tabasco introduced a regulation on surrogacy in its civil code, which only contemplated the registration of children born from these agreements. That is, the legislation allowed contracts to exist, but offered no protections to the parties involved, facilitating certain abuses and problems. On January 13, 2016, an amendment to said legislation was approved, which gave rise to new opportunities but at the same time, human rights violations by State authorities. In Sinaloa, a regulation was introduced in 2013 to its family code, which included restrictions for foreigners.

In contrast, Coahuila, Queretaro and San Luis Potosi have included articles in their civil codes that explicitly refuse to recognize any surrogacy agreement. That is to say, they establish that the motherhood of the surrogate will always be presumed and that no agreement that says otherwise is valid. In the rest of the country, the practice remains unregulated.

**The Current Situation in** **Tabasco**

Although the possibility of participating in a surrogacy contract in Tabasco was introduced 22 years ago, the number of individuals and couples from other countries who traveled to the state to carry out contracts of this type increased after 2012 when India -previously the most popular surrogacy destination in the world- modified its legislation to impose restrictions on foreigners and same-sex couples. In 2014, Thailand did the same, which also led -albeit to a lesser extent- to a greater number of cross-border surrogacies in Mexico. In response to this situation, the Tabasco government reformed its local civil code in January 2016 to include chapter 6 bis on surrogacy, with more comprehensive regulation than before.

However, the reform did not clarify what would happen to the contracts signed before this date that would come to fruition after the same. This led the Tabasco government to integrate additional requirements into the civil code for all parties involved in a surrogacy contract –for example, that the intended parents are Mexican-, before the publication of the new legislation. Therefore, those who signed a surrogacy contract before January 2016 faced obstacles in registering their children, because they did not meet the new requirements. The retroactive application of the law is a violation of human rights that, in this case, leads to a situation of generalized legal uncertainty in the state.

In addition, the current regulation in Tabasco that all parties must be Mexican discriminates against foreigners who are permanent or temporary residents in the country, including those in a civil union or married to a Mexican citizen. This restriction, promoted by the Tabasco government as a way to “protect” the women who live in the state, has resulted in a climate of persecution and stigma towards intended parents and the surrogate, as well as a lack of protection for children born from these agreements.

In addition, the regulation refers to the existence of a contracting mother and father, implicitly excluding individuals and same-sex couples from accessing the services, which is discriminatory for reasons of sex and marital status. This limitation is in violation of Article 1 of the Mexican Constitution, jurisprudence issued by the Supreme Court (SCJN) on January 27, 2017 regarding family life between persons of the same sex,[[4]](#footnote-4) and the international treaties to which Mexico is a party. Although the establishment of certain requirements may be justified in the best interest of the minor, as well as the protection of surrogates’ rights, they must be justified or based on an individual or case-by-case evaluation. The prejudices of legislators and public officials should not be incorporated into public policies and norms.

The current regulations also establish certain requirements that, if not met, would nullify the surrogacy contract. These regulations, however, are ambiguous and generate legal uncertainty for the parties involved. For example, while the intervention of agencies or third parties in the agreements is grounds for nullity, ignoring the existence of intermediaries may encourage them to act clandestinely, without any authority being able to control their operation and thus, avoid any abuse that they may incur. (**See Laura’s case: The Consequences of an Informal Agreement. Annex 1**) Therefore, legislation should recognize the existence of these intermediaries and define which institutions should be responsible for their regulation and surveillance, as in cases of adoption in which the intermediaries involved are regulated by the State.

Moreover, what nullity implies in cases of surrogacy contracts in which a woman is already pregnant or, even when grounds for nullity are discovered after a birth that is a result of a contract, should be established. For example, if after a birth by surrogacy it is discovered that the surrogate had participated on more than two occasions in the practice or that the contracting mother exceeded the age limit, what would be the consequences? Would the parties involved be sanctioned? Would it affect the child’s conditions of parentage? The lack of specification of what nullity implies in these cases is a serious omission that can affect surrogates and the children born from these agreements in particular, leaving them in an alarming state of legal uncertainty.

Finally, the civil code establishes the obligation of the contracting parents to pay for all medical expenses derived from pregnancy, childbirth and puerperium, as well as provide insurance for major medical expenses for the surrogate. This is, without a doubt, a positive element that can help protect the life and health of surrogates, who, in most cases, receive inadequate medical services and face obstetric violence and violations of their right to privacy. However, permitting payment exclusively for medical expenses limits the possibility of requesting other types of related expenses, such as transportation, clothing and food. In addition, financial compensation is a reality that must be included in legislation, and not only to ensure the recognition of the will of the parties involved and the reproductive autonomy of women, but also because otherwise, the agreements would most likely be carried out clandestinely, leaving women in a situation of greater vulnerability than they are currently in. By establishing prohibitions for compensation to an onerous surrogacy, potential surrogates are left unprotected under the creation of an altruistic agreement, which opens the possibility to even more serious situations of exploitation.

According to testimonies collected by GIRE, some women who have participated in surrogacy agreements mention that, in practice, their right to information is not respected or guaranteed. In the event that a contract is created, the document is usually explained by the same legal staff of the agency or clinic, who also act as legal counsel to the intended parents.[[5]](#footnote-5) This represents a major conflict of interest. In addition, the majority of surrogates do not receive a copy of their contract, they do not know it exists, or they do not have any way of participating in defining the terms.

Some contracts establish clauses from the beginning that ignore the ability of pregnant women to make intimate decisions about their bodies, for example, establishing that they cannot carry out an abortion, even when their life is in danger. These clauses violate the right of women to decide regarding their own bodies, protected by Article 4 of the Constitution and international treaties to which Mexico is a party. The case of Victoria, where the lack of prenatal care resulted in the loss of the pregnancy, illustrates this situation. (**See Victoria’s case: Lack of Medical Care for a Surrogate. Annex 2.)**

**Criminalization**

Regarding the execution of a remunerated surrogacy agreement, in the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography,[[6]](#footnote-6) it has been established that, when surrogacy is onerous, payment can be considered in compensation for the obligation, since it ends with the delivery of the child born as a result of the pregnancy, to those who made the payment. From a reductionist approach, this modality of surrogacy could constitute the sale of children. However, as expressed in the recent UN Special Rapporteur Report on the sale and sexual exploitation of children, it is feasible that an onerous surrogacy is compatible with the Protocol, and does not involve the sale of children if it is clearly and unambiguously regulated by States. Therefore, it is necessary that the normative framework for surrogacy guarantee the rights of the interested parties to prevent exploitative practices.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Perhaps the most serious effect of Tabasco’s new legislation has been to foster a climate of persecution of surrogates for foreigners, single individuals or same-sex couples. Some surrogates who signed legal contracts in the state before the 2016 reform have been threatened by public officials and, on occasion, face criminal charges for the crime of trafficking in minors.[[8]](#footnote-8) Associating surrogacy with human trafficking and including it within the legal framework that sanctions human trafficking entails criminalizing those involved -intended parents, intermediaries, health personnel involved in procedures and surrogates- who carry out agreements in a free and consensual manner. (**See Marcela’s Case: Forced to Lie. Annex 3)**

On occasion, surrogacy contracts may be signed in contexts of economic and social inequality between surrogates and intended parents, which could affect their ability to decide to participate in them. This is precisely when regulation becomes relevant. The prohibition of surrogacy is not only a measure commonly based on gender stereotypes and prejudices about motherhood, pregnancy and the ability of women to make decisions, but it also results in inadequate measures to protect the parties from the most common abuses. Prohibiting the practice will not make it disappear. Instead, it would encourage its practice clandestinely, where the State cannot offer protections, monitor the conditions of the contracts or ensure that the actions of clinics and agencies are in accordance with the law and human rights.

In general terms, international experience shows that prohibiting surrogacy, far from protecting women, favors their persecution, contributes to further violation of the rights of children born from these agreements and promotes new patterns of abuse. The case of Cambodia is a clear example of this. Following the restrictions imposed in India, Thailand and Nepal for access to paid agreements of this type for foreigners, Cambodia became a new international surrogacy destination. Then, the Ministry of Health published a directive that established the provisional suspension of the practice and its comparison with human trafficking. This guideline, which, in theory, sought to avoid abuses related to the practice and, in particular, the protection of surrogates, led to the arrest of more than 30 surrogates in 2017 who participated in agreements. In December 2018, they were released on the condition that they accept to raise the children born of such agreements as their own.[[9]](#footnote-9)

**Possible Advances**

After the 2016 reform, official public data is expected to demonstrate the magnitude of surrogacy in Tabasco. A positive change introduced in the civil code highlights the responsibility of both the Civil Registry Office and the Tabasco Ministry of Health to register agreements and births by surrogacy in the state.

Under the context of the new regulation, GIRE requested access to public information from both the Civil Registry Office and the Tabasco Ministry of Health. In this regard, the first authority replied that there were 19 notary notices between January 2016 to December 2018 regarding the conclusion of a surrogacy contract in the state.[[10]](#footnote-10) The local Ministry of Health reported that, during the same period, 30 notarial reports were registered; [[11]](#footnote-11) however, neither of the authorities registered information on nationality, age or marital status of the parties involved in the contracts. According to data provided by COFEPRIS, two clinics in the state of Tabasco have an operating license to practice ART.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Finally, current legislation provides that, once agreed between the parties and certified by a public notary, a judge must monitor and approve the content of the contract. The clauses provided in surrogacy contracts are one of the most important elements to define the conditions under which the practice will be carried out and ensure the parties’ completely informed consent. The participation of a judge, as a judicial authority, could help establish an additional filter that monitors both the legality of the contracts and parties’ consent. GIRE asked the Judicial Branch of Tabasco for public information on the number of surrogacy contracts registered in the state. In response, the authority reported that from January 2016 to April 2018, 13 files related to non-contentious trials of ratification of a surrogacy contract were filed.[[13]](#footnote-13) The Tabasco Superior Court denied us access to the public version of these files, considering that they contain confidential information.[[14]](#footnote-14)

In July 2018, Tabasco went through an election process that led to a change in local government. To date, it is not clear if the new administration and the incoming congress have any interest in promoting a change in legislation or public policy regarding surrogacy. On February 15, 2016, the then-Federal Attorney General filed an unconstitutionality claim against the reform of the Tabasco civil code, considering that some of its elements are against the interest of the parties involved.[[15]](#footnote-15) Also, a legal stay is pending resolution by the Supreme Court to determine whether the legal norms that regulate the processes of assisted reproduction in Tabasco give sufficient legal security to the parties involved and if the current regulation in that state violates human rights.[[16]](#footnote-16) The sentences issued by the Supreme Court in these cases may be decisive in establishing criteria that guide the State’s actions regarding the practice of surrogacy in Mexico.

**Acting in the Best Interest of the Child within the Mexican Legal System**

In 2011, Mexico incorporated the principle of the best interests of the child into Article 4 of its Constitution, specifying:

“In all decisions and actions of the State, the principle of the best interest of the child will be observed and complied with, fully guaranteeing children’s rights. Boys and girls have the right to the satisfaction of their needs for food, health, education and healthy recreation for their comprehensive development. This principle should guide the design, execution, monitoring and evaluation of public policies relating to children.”

In Mexico, the General Law on the Rights of Children and Adolescents (LGDNNA), enacted in 2014, in its 2nd article, second paragraph, provides that “The child’s best interest is superior in the decision-making process for debates involving children and adolescents. When different interpretations are presented, the one that most effectively satisfies this guiding principle will be chosen.” The same law mentions in Article 13 that among the rights of children and adolescents is the right to identity and the right to live as a family. It is the responsibility of federal authorities, as well as those from states, municipalities and the territorial demarcation of Mexico City, within the scope of their respective competencies, to adopt the necessary measures to guarantee these rights, without discrimination of any kind or condition.

The Supreme Court, for its part, defined the best interests of children by stating that “... the expression ‘best interest of the child’ (...) implies that the development of the child and the full exercise of his/her rights should be considered as guiding criteria in the elaboration of norms and the application of these in all orders related to the life of the child”.[[17]](#footnote-17)

**The Current Situation of Children in Tabasco**

GIRE has documented the difficulties of intended parents in obtaining a passport for their children born from surrogacy agreements. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (SRE), the federal agency in charge of issuing documents that allow entry and exit from the country, has hindered the emission of passports in cases of two male partners, upon seeing that there is no woman (mother) registered on the birth certificate, under the argument that their intention is to protect children from crimes such as trafficking. **(See Jose’s case: Trapped in Mexico for More than Six Months. Annex 4.)**

Among the cases documented and litigated by GIRE, the most recurring pattern is the denial of birth certificates by the Tabasco Civil Registry Office; an essential requirement to apply for a passport, prove parentage and access basic services such as healthcare. The case of Michael, whose son was held in a shelter by the state Child Welfare Agency for over a month, is illustrative of this pattern. (**See the case of Michael and Valeria: Illegal Retention of a Minor and Criminalization of a Surrogate. Annex 5.)**

**Supreme Court Criteria on the Determination of Parentage in Assisted Reproduction Procedures**

Although the Supreme Court has only pronounced directly on one case regarding the issue of surrogacy, it has developed different criteria related to the determination of parentage, which may have an effect on assisted reproduction in general, and surrogacy in particular.

The Mexican Supreme Court has stated that the right to identity does not only consist of the possibility that the child have information about his/her genetic origin and the identity of his/her parents, but that this right derives into the right to nationality and that his or her caretakers meet nutritional, health, education and healthy recreation needs for their comprehensive development. It is assumed that the ideal situation is for the biological parents to be those who comply with these obligations, but to insist on this relationship in all cases can endanger the adequate development of the child who requires immediate and consistent fulfillment of these needs, directly after birth. It is for this reason, among others, that the best interests of the child and the extrajudicial rules of establishment of paternity and maternity allow in certain cases that persons other than biological or genetic parents assume the paternity or maternity of minors and, therefore, all obligations arising from the same.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Likewise, the Mexican Supreme Court, through a balancing of rights and the protection of the best interest of children, has resolved conflicts arising in specific cases related to ART and surrogacy.

In a 2015 case, the Court determined that, when ART have been used with donated gametes,[[19]](#footnote-19) the first element that must be verified is whether the treatment was carried out individually or as a couple. Then, it is to be determined if there was consent from the person that did not contribute genetic material, because this will influence the parentage of the child born in this manner. The previous provides the authority with the elements to determine the legal consequences, taking into account that the preferred decision will be one that meets the best interests of the child, such as the right to identity. In another case, the Court established that parentage constitutes a child’s right and that the right of the person to achieve a family with blood kinship must be recognized. However, it also recognizes that this is not always possible, either because of the factual reality or because in specific cases, other interests prevail under the law that are considered more legally relevant, as in the case of assisted reproduction through the donation of gametes.[[20]](#footnote-20)

In November 2018, the Supreme Court resolved the first case directly related to a surrogacy agreement,[[21]](#footnote-21) due to the refusal of the local authority to recognize the filial relationship between a same-sex couple and a child born through this agreement in Yucatan, where the practice of surrogacy remains unregulated. Specifically, there are no express rules on the attribution of parentage, nor on the requirements and action of the Civil Registry regarding the birth and presentation of a minor born through these agreements. In this case, the Court ruled that for the recognition of the filial relationship it is necessary to evaluate the procreational will -the desire to assume a child as one’s own, although biologically it is not- and with it, all responsibilities derived from the parentage, on the part of the intended parents.[[22]](#footnote-22) Thus, the Court granted the legal stay for the minor to be registered as the child of the intended parents, considering that in this way, the validity of the child’s right to have an identity and be registered in the Civil Registry is guaranteed; the right of the intended parents to their private life and to procreate through ART, and the right of the surrogate to a private life and free development of the personality.[[23]](#footnote-23)

**Conclusions**

Undoubtedly, surrogacy is a complex issue and its importance in international discussions on reproductive rights will continue. In Mexico, the absence of regulation at the federal level regarding access to and the practice of ART generates legal uncertainty for the parties involved and opens the door to arbitrary and discriminatory acts against those seeking such services. The discussion around surrogacy should consider the possibility of abuse in the context of significant inequality, documented widely in Mexico and elsewhere. However, legal prohibitions, whether of a civil or criminal nature, far from eliminating the practice and its consequences, contribute to placing the parties in a more vulnerable state. Given the existing panorama, clear regulation is required, which avoids discriminating against and injuring the parties under the argument of protecting them, and which recognizes the various complexities of the practice.

In the context of surrogacy, these considerations should lead to a commitment to create domestic and international regulations that guarantee that these agreements can be exercised in the best possible conditions for all parties. To achieve this, it is essential that the voices of the people directly involved in the process are heard, by including those whose experiences, motivations and interests shed light on the theoretical and practical discussions of the issue. Without this, there is a risk of establishing protections based on moral intuitions whose negative consequences are inflicted, precisely, upon those people whose rights were sought to be protected.

GIRE is seriously concerned about the possibility that the United Nations may establish that, in all cases, a surrogacy agreement constitutes the sale of children and in particular, those that include remuneration for surrogates. In this regard, we trust that the Special Rapporteur on the sale and sexual exploitation of children will reject this simplistic position on the issue and take into account the diverse voices involved in the discussion, as well as the international evidence on the consequences of prohibitive practices, in particular on the rights of children and surrogates. We hope that, in issuing her statement, the Rapporteur will take into account the serious risk of equating free and consensual surrogacy agreements with a crime as serious as the sale of children. Far from protecting the interests of children, a prohibitionist stance could have a result contrary to what is intended, leading to the criminalization of surrogates and putting the human rights of children born as a result of these agreements at risk.
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