

# **Migrants and Refugees in Latin America during COVID-19: An Inclusion/Exclusion Spectrum of Social Protection**

## **Abstract**

The COVID-19 sanitary crisis has put to the test Latin America's already precarious social protection systems. This paper comparatively examines to what extent migrant and refugee populations have been included in social protection programmes in seven countries of the region – Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay – during the COVID-19 pandemic, and what this tells us about the place of migrants' social rights and citizenship in the eyes of the state. Based on 70 semi-structured interviews with representatives of central and local governments, International Organisations, Civil Society and migrant-led organisations across 18 cities, we look at the inclusion (or lack thereof) of migrant and refugee populations in the Non-Contributory Social Transfer (NCST) programmes and other actions undertaken by public and private actors. We argue that there is an inclusion/exclusion social protection spectrum for migrant and refugee populations in pre-existing and new NCST programmes across the seven country-case studies, and that the emerging assemblages of actors providing social assistance, are furthering notions of migrant protection that are contingent and crisis-driven, imposing temporal limitations that often selectively exclude migrants based on legal status. This approach has direct impacts on migrants and refugees' lives, while also shaping the dynamics of migration governance in the region.

**KEYWORDS:** LATIN AMERICA; COVID-19; SOCIAL PROTECTION; MIGRANTS; REFUGEES; MIGRATION GOVERNANCE; INCLUSION; EXCLUSION; MIGRATION POLICY

## Introduction

The COVID-19 sanitary crisis has put to the test Latin America's already precarious social protection systems. The pandemic also hit the region in the midst of one of the largest human displacement in its recent history, with the number of people displaced across borders growing percent in the last decade (UNHCR 2020). States responses this increase in mobility have been characterised by the adoption of multiple *ad-hoc* and temporary measures to manage migration (Acosta, Blouin and Freier 2019; Gandini, Prieto Rosas and Lozano-Ascencio 2019, 2020), producing migrant irregularity (Thayer 2019) and triggering increasing levels of xenophobia across the region (Freier and Vera Espinoza forthcoming). This *ad-hoc* approach to migration governance has been accompanied by a myriad of social protection actions on the part of the state and civil society organisations intended to cope with the emergency, leaving little room for the long-term inclusion of migrants beyond an epistemology of exceptionalism (Menjivar, Ruiz and Ness 2019; Mountz 2020).

It has already been well documented how the pandemic has exacerbated the pre-existing vulnerabilities of the migrant and refugee populations in the region, given their high rates of job informality, overcrowded and precarious living conditions, and in some cases limited access to health services and social protection (Bengochea et al. 2020; The Lancet 2020; Zapata and Prieto in press). Relevant knowledge has also been developed in relation to changes in social protection systems and safety nets in Latin America during COVID-19 (Blofield, Giambruno and Filgueira 2020; Williams and Martinez 2020). Building on this work, this paper explores the different social protection actions undertaken by state and non-state actors to mitigate the socioeconomic impact of the pandemic among migrants and refugees in seven Latin American countries. In particular, it examines to what extent migrant and refugee populations have been included or excluded in social protection programmes during the pandemic and what this tells us about the place of migrants' social rights and citizenship in the eyes of the state.

The paper provides a comparative and in-depth analysis of social protection actions in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay with regards to three key issues: (i) what type of assistance is provided, (ii) who provides the assistance, and (iii) to what extent migrant and refugee populations<sup>1</sup> are included in these responses. We look at the inclusion (or lack thereof) of migrant and refugee populations in the Non-Contributory Social Transfer

---

<sup>1</sup> Through the paper we use the term migrant and refugee populations to refer to all people crossing international borders across the region, without making a distinction by migration status. To reduce wording, we may use the word migrants, without excluding refugees or asylum seekers.

(NCST) programmes and other actions undertaken by governments, International Organisations (IOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs). We draw on more than 70 on-line semi-structured interviews conducted with representatives of the above-mentioned stakeholders.

We argue that the different levels of inclusion of migrant and refugee populations in pre-existing and new NCST programmes across the seven countries analysed, as well as the emerging assemblages of actors providing social assistance, are furthering notions of migrant protection that are contingent and crisis-driven, imposing temporal limitations that often selectively exclude migrants based on legal status. This approach has direct impacts on migrants and refugees' lives, while also shaping dynamics of migration governance in the region.

The article is divided in six parts. In the first section, we discuss the main concepts underpinning our analysis and draw on critical studies on how notions such as humanitarianism, exceptionalism and crisis may undermine migrants' rights and citizenship. In the second section, we outline the methodological approach and the limitations of the study. In the third section, we provide an overview of the legal social and economic rights afforded to migrants and refugees in the studied countries before COVID-19. In the fourth section, we turn to the analysis of pandemic NCST initiatives in each country and the extent to which their design and implementation includes or excludes migrants and refugees. In the fifth section, we propose a typology of emergency assistance in the context of COVID-19 that mobilises knowledge in relation to the articulation of actors providing social protection, the modes of protection and the subjectification of migrants emerging from the pandemic. We conclude by discussing the contribution of this analysis to the understanding of the governance of mobility in Latin America during, and beyond, the pandemic.

## **1. Theoretical Framework**

### *Social protection and migrants' social rights*

Social protection emerged in the 1990s as a policy framework employed to address poverty and vulnerability in Latin America as a result of economic crises and the shift towards structural adjustment policies (Barrientos 2010). From then on, almost all Latin American states have designed different kinds of social protection strategies, mainly geared to poverty reduction. Barrientos (2010) identifies three types of policy strategies depending on whether they focus on mitigating risks, attending needs or relate to entitlements and rights. The United Nations

Human Rights Council emphasises that “human rights obligations relate not only to the final outcome of social protection programmes, which is to ensure the enjoyment of at least minimum essential levels of economic, social and cultural rights, but also to the process through which such programmes are designed and implemented” (Sepulveda and Nyst 2012: 11).

This has several implications for our understanding of social protection policies in the context of migration. First, the existence or absence of formal rights for migrants in the reception countries’ legal frameworks is an important factor in determining the scope of social protection actions. Second, it may also indicate states’ obligations to implement long-term and sustainable, as opposed to exceptional or emergency actions. And third, the existence of formal rights could empower migrants to claim them.

At the same time, the dyad exclusion/inclusion is fundamental to debates on citizenship and migration, as it raises the question on the extent to which migrants should be granted rights. De Lucas (2002) argues that social rights, such as the right to work and to health, are a *sine qua non condition* for migrants’ integration, which can be broadly understood as “the process of becoming an accepted part of society” (Penninx and Garcés-Mascreñas 2016: 14). A first issue with social rights is that this category of rights has been understood as social benefits rather than true rights with real justiciability (De Lucas 2002). A second issue is the criteria of nationality or immigration status to differentiate and stratify people that always generates unequal conditions and, therefore, does not allow equal access to social rights (Asa and Ceriani 2010).

In this context, it is common for states to negotiate to what extent social rights are guaranteed to migrants and refugees (De Lucas 2002). The extension of social rights usually depends on bureaucratic labels such as irregular migrants, refugees, asylum seekers or humanitarian migrants with complementary protection status. The proliferation of new legal categories to face the challenges of increasingly complex mobility flows has created fragmentation (Crawley and Skleparis 2018; Zetter 2007) and has had consequences for access to rights. For Asa and Ceriani (2010), it is urgent to question the concepts of citizenship and national sovereignty that are at the centre of this process of differentiation of rights, far from the universality, progressiveness and dynamism of human rights.

The definitions proposed by Davidson and Castles (2000) of *quasi-citizens*, *denizens* and *margizens* are key to our analysis, as they help to explain the extent to which migrants and refugees are included or excluded from COVID-19 governmental responses. *Denizens* or *quasi-citizens* are foreigners with a legal and permanent resident status, while *margizens*

include a vast group of persons in the margins such as undocumented, asylum-seekers, or legal citizens who have lost their status, among others. Migrants and refugees with temporary permits would qualify as *margizens* as they face numerous barriers for their integration and are denied many rights as non-citizens. Yet, depending on the country, *margizens* may not be completely deprived of rights.

A second debate that frames our analysis is the extent to which social protection actions respond to integral and stable policy frameworks or to discreet emergency actions framed in a humanitarian narrative. Indeed, with the advent of the Venezuelan exodus, the idea of a humanitarian crisis emerged across Latin America. Several studies and some international organisations claimed that massive migration from Venezuela from 2018 was a response to numerous human rights violations and severely deteriorated socioeconomic conditions threatening survival (Freier 2018). Soon after, terms such as “migration in the context of crisis” emerged to explain the drivers of this migration flow, alongside “migration crisis” discourses to justify the exceptionalist nature of the political-institutional responses adopted by many Latin American receiving countries (Freitez 2019; Gandini, Prieto Rosas and Lozano-Ascencio 2019). In fact, many states’ responses to Venezuelan migration before COVID-19 were already framed in a crisis narrative, which justified humanitarian discourses and practices (Herrera and Berg 2019; Ramirez 2020).

Usually, humanitarian action is associated with the work of international and non-profit organisations. However, states are increasingly using the language of humanitarianism in the implementation of policies toward migrants and refugees, in the name of suffering and compassion (Fassin 2012). The consequences of humanitarian perspectives on states’ actions have been widely discussed in the European context (Fassin 2012; Ticktin 2011). Far from being neutral, humanitarian policies may replace a politics of rights and justice with an ethics of suffering and compassion (Fassin 2012). In doing so, humanitarianism tends to construct policy recipients as passive and suffering victims rather than citizens, and avoids the tackling of inequalities. Moreover, humanitarianism puts the suffering body instead of the deserving citizen as a sort of proof to justify state action and intervention (Ticktin 2011).

Discussions around humanitarianism are more recent in Latin America. They address the way in which some policies, while clothed in moral universals and humanitarian imperatives, are ultimately aimed at the management, control, and exclusion of mobile populations (Herrera and Berg 2019; Ramirez 2020; Stang, Lara and Andrade 2020; Finn and Umpierrez de Reguero 2020). Currently, the humanitarian response in the region is strongly connected to the notion of “crisis”, usually associated with displacements from Venezuela and

Central America. However, as some migration scholars have argued, the idea of a migration crisis could become a magnifying lens to decipher existing trends (Cantat, Thiollet and Pécoud 2019), such as humanitarianism, as well as a ‘productive’ word that states can use to justify their actions (Mountz 2020). This is because the crisis narrative that we see taking a hold across the region is key to rendering the responses to mobility as something ‘exceptional’ (Menjívar, Ruiz and Ness 2019; Mountz 2020). In the next sections, we look at how this humanitarian crisis discourse has contributed to disengaging some states from adopting inclusive social protection policies towards migrants, relying instead on exceptional policies mainly geared by international organisations and how these narratives have contributed to a particular subjectification of migrants.

## **1. Data and methodological approach**

Our analysis is based on a comparative assessment of seven country-case studies from Latin America: Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay. The case selection responded to practical reasons related to the authors’ expertise and/or location during the COVID-19 outbreak, as well as methodological considerations. These countries cover a diverse range of assemblages regarding migration policy and social protection of migrant and refugee populations, as well as political-institutional responses to mitigate the socio-economic impacts of the pandemic. However, these countries share in common (i) structural inequalities, (ii) having experienced transformations in their migration dynamics, with some suddenly turning from sending to transit and destination countries, and (iii) undergoing changes in their migration legal framework.

The paper employs a mixed methodology approach that includes collecting and systematically analysing qualitative data and interviews with key stakeholders. On the one hand, we reviewed over forty legal instruments that rule migration in the country-case studies including constitutions, laws, and decrees to examine (i) whether migrants and refugees were explicitly mentioned as subjects of civil rights deserving equal treatment on par with nationals, and (ii) the circumstances under which social and economic rights were granted to them.

On the other hand, we conducted more than 70 semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders (10-15 in each country). These include three distinct groups of actors: representatives from national and local governments, International Organisations (IOs), and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs). IOs included UN agencies, primarily, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), while CSOs included local, national and international non-governmental

organisations (NGOs), religious and non-religious, as well as migrant-led organisations. Here we draw on questions related to modifications in migration and refugee policy and practice during the pandemic, and changes to pre-existing or new programmes and actions to mitigate the social and economic effects of the pandemic among the migrant and refugee populations. The narratives collected in the interviews are imbued throughout the analysis presented in the paper.

Aware of the fact that in the federative states, the local government plays a crucial role in the provision of some social and economic services, apart from the seven capital cities, the fieldwork also included at least one border city in each country for a total of 18 urban contexts. Given the mobility restrictions imposed by COVID-19, the interviews were conducted over the phone or by video conferencing, from June to September 2020. The study received approval by the ethics committees of two authors' higher education institutions.

This study is not devoid of limitations. We identified an absence of national data disaggregated by migration status, nationality or place of birth, to gauge to what extent the migrant and refugee populations effectively accessed the protection provided by NCSTs before and during the pandemic. In fact, during the interviewing process we tried, unsuccessfully, to collect precise data from the informants on the number of applications and benefits granted broken down by any migration identifier. Even harder was to obtain this data disaggregated by age, sex, race and ethnicity, which highlights the importance of pursuing the type of qualitative analysis conducted in this study. This qualitative analysis, in turn, allows us to explore the complexity and nuances of processes, norms, and implementation by type of actor in each country. Future studies should expand the geographical and demographic scope of our analysis trying to integrate an intersectionality approach as much as possible.

## **2. Normative context: migrants' social and economic rights before COVID-19**

The migration dynamics of most Latin American countries have undergone a substantial transformation over the past twenty years. Traditionally an emigration region, Latin America is increasingly becoming a transit and destination area, mainly as a result of the tightening of migration policies and the deterioration of employment markets in traditional destinations (Gandini, Prieto Rosas and Lozano-Ascencio 2020). In parallel with this reconfiguration of flows, changes have been made to the migration frameworks of virtually all countries, to include a human's rights perspective and the Cartagena refugee protection framework (Acosta 2018; Jubilut, Vera Espinoza and Mezzanoti 2021).

Regularisation procedures and access to rights are shared paradigms in the legal frameworks of countries such as Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Uruguay (CELS and CAREF 2020). However, variations appear when looking at migrants and refugees' full guarantee of social and economic rights, ranging from those who recognise them explicitly and comprehensively, to others with unspecified rights, or rights conditioned to having a regular immigration status. In table 1, we propose a classification of legal frameworks on the basis of two criteria: clarity or ambiguity of legal language -if the aforementioned Constitution, laws, and decrees clearly and specifically enumerate immigrants' social rights- and whether guarantee of social and economic rights (health, education, work, food and housing) is conditioned to immigration status.

Following these criteria, we identify three groups of countries. The first group, *legal clarity and full inclusion*, is made up of Uruguay and Brazil, which are characterised by a clear legal framework where migrants and refugees' social rights are fully recognised regardless of migration status and equality before the law is guaranteed. Additionally, these two countries stand out in the regional context for their robust social protection systems, based on an array of contributory and non-contributory social transfers, with the latter targeting households composed by the elderly, children and adolescents (Blofield, Giambruno and Filgueira 2020). In practice, Uruguay requires the possession of an identity card while in Brazil, the ID required to access social protection programmes is not conditioned by legal status, facilitating effective universal access to NCSTs.

#### TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The second group, *legal ambiguity and full inclusion*, is composed only by Ecuador, whose laws, in spite of a certain ambiguity, guarantee the full inclusion of immigrants and refugees and equality of rights between foreigners and Ecuadorian nationals (Table 1). The 2008 Political Constitution and the 2017 Organic Law of Human Mobility recognise the social and economic rights of migrants and refugees regardless of immigration status. However, subsequent decrees introduced some ambiguity to Ecuador's legal framework. For instance, Decree 804 (June 2019) excludes non-Ecuadorian nationals from accessing existing cash transfer programmes.

Finally, the third group, *legal ambiguity and partial inclusion* is composed by Chile, Colombia, Mexico and Peru. The four countries present ambiguity with regards to the rights guaranteed for both regular and irregular migrants, which results in several obstacles to guarantee full and effective inclusion. Constitutions in these countries establish equal civil



rights for all individuals. However, in countries with migration and/or refugee laws some of the basic social rights are limited to regular migrants.

In the case of Chile, several articles of the Political Constitution are implicitly applicable to migrants, and even though irregular migrants are not included in this legal framework, the country has adopted specific decrees and regulations, which aim to guarantee access to education and health, independently of residency status, as well as equal labour rights. In Peru for example, the Refugee Law, inter alia, guarantees labour rights for asylum seekers, and the Migration Law guarantees the right to health, education and work for all migrants, including irregular ones. At the same time, the law states that access to rights depends on specific norms issued by different Ministries, which undoubtedly constitutes a huge barrier to guarantee effective access. For its part, Colombia has given the first steps to resolve institutional gaps regarding migrants' rights through a multiplicity of temporary measures. For instance, access to emergency health services and education is available to irregular Venezuelan migrants, while migrants with a *Permiso Especial de Permanencia* (PEP) have access to health, education and labour. In contrast, Mexican Migration and Refugee law guarantee access to educational and emergency health services to all migrants regardless of their status, but limit economic and social inclusion to regular ones, and allow family reunification only for refugees. In the particular cases of Colombia, Peru and Mexico, contingent circumstances such as the great inflows from, respectively, Venezuela in 2016 and the 2018 Central American Caravans, led to the creation of instruments to regularise (temporarily in some cases) immigrant populations in order to facilitate access to health, education and labour programmes (Gandini, Fernández de la Reguera and Narváez 2020; Gandini, Prieto Rosas and Lozano-Ascencio 2019).

#### **4. Social protection in the context of the pandemic: pre-existing and new programmes**

Table 2 systematises the narratives by the three central actors interviewed in the seven country case studies, with regards to programmes and actions to mitigate the social and economic effects of the pandemic among the migrant and refugee populations. We focus on NCST programmes and actions undertaken by governments, IOs and CSOs, including cash and in-kind benefits such as food vouchers, food baskets, provision or guarantee of goods and/or services. Government programmes are limited to those that were maintained, expanded or created during the pandemic. These include both *Conditional Cash Transfer* (CCT)

programmes – such as *Bolsa Família* (PBF) in Brazil and *Asignaciones Familiares* (AFAM) in Uruguay – and non-conditional new emergency transfers created to respond to the pandemic.

In all the countries analysed, there were pre-existing NCST programmes, and in almost all of them – with the exception of Mexico – new emergency schemes were created (Blofield, Giambruno and Filgueira 2020). However, there is a broad heterogeneity with regards to the degree of inclusion of migrant and refugee populations in both types of programmes. In most countries, access to NCSTs or state aid is conditioned to having an identity card, and in some of them, also being part of social programme registries – which may imply meeting certain income threshold criteria. However, the way in which these programmes have been implemented, especially with regards to compliance with the established requirements, largely determines migrants and refugees' effective access.

At one end of this social inclusion spectrum are Brazil and Uruguay, which have the highest levels of inclusion. In both countries, the benefits of existing programmes – PBF in Brazil, and *Asignaciones Familiares Plan de Equidad* (AFAM PE), *Canasta INDA* and *Tarjeta Uruguay Social* (TUS), in Uruguay – were incremented, and in Brazil, there was a significant increase in coverage – 1,22 million new families were included (Bartholo et al. 2020; Blofield, Giambruno and Filgueira 2020). Additionally, new transfer programmes, respectively, the *Auxílio Emergencial* and *Canasta de Emergencia Alimentaria* (CEA), were created (Table 2). In both pre-existing and recent transfers, effective access to the migrant and refugee populations is guaranteed. In Brazil, the Basic Social Protection System (PSB), which includes health, social assistance and security for low-income families and/or in conditions of social vulnerability, is universal and guarantees protection regardless of immigration status (MDS 2016).

In Uruguay, where an application or valid residency permit are a requirement for accessing NCSTs, most migrants have been regularised through various routes. Social programmes (AFAM PE, INDA and TUS) require an identity card (*cédula de identidad*) – a relatively easy document to obtain. However, due to the slowdown in immigration procedures in the context of the pandemic – a phenomenon common to the entire region – some migrants lacked the required documentation to apply for these programmes. However, this obstacle was overcome by in-person delivery of the CEA and facilitating the acquisition of *cédulas* to the programmes' beneficiaries. The Uruguayan case exemplifies how bureaucratic-administrative requirements can be subordinate to guaranteeing effective access to rights. Thus, in these two countries, where there is full inclusion and clarity in the legal framework regarding the rights of migrants and refugees and an expanded social protection system, effective access to social

protection is verified both in pre-existing and *ad hoc* programmes created to mitigate the effects of the pandemic.

In the other countries analysed, migrants and refugees face a situation of limited inclusion or outright exclusion. In particular, in Chile, Colombia, Peru, Ecuador and Mexico, the central obstacle for effective access to many social protection programmes is the type or lack of documentation, as well as the lack of awareness regarding some procedures and eligibility requirements on the part of bureaucratic agents as well as the migrant and refugee populations.

In the case of Chile, where the main non-contributory transfer program has been maintained and new schemes have been created, the main restriction faced by migrants is the nature of the requirements. In order to access the benefits, you must have a RUT, an identity card, and in some cases, also be registered in the national social protection registry (*Registro Social de Hogares*). Thus, the inclusion of migrants and refugees is conditioned by legal status. Although government interviewees insisted that the criterion for inclusion in pre-existing and new social protection programmes is ‘transversality’ – reaching any vulnerable population – , in practice, only the regularised migrant population has been able to (partially) benefit from these schemes (Freier and Vera Espinoza forthcoming). Migrants with expired identity cards or those with irregular migration status face the greatest difficulties.

Our interviews suggest that in Colombia, Peru, Ecuador and Mexico, migrants and refugees face the greatest difficulties for effectively accessing NCSTs, not only due to the required documentation but also because in some cases, these programmes are restricted to the national population. These are cases of outright exclusion, even for those in possession of some form of legal stay. In Colombia, the *Familias en Acción* (FA) programme is only available to Colombian citizens, while the *Ingreso Solidario* (IS) created during the pandemic, is conditioned to having a regular migration status, including the *Permiso Especial de Permanencia* (PEP) created for the Venezuelan population. JUNTOS, the pre-existing programme in Peru, is only available to migrants and refugees with a residence permit, which excludes a significant portion of migrants with temporary residence, asylum seekers and irregular migrants. Furthermore, the bonuses created in the context of COVID-19, are limited to Peruvian nationals.

Ecuador and Mexico are at the other end of the social inclusion spectrum. In Ecuador, in spite full inclusion of migrant social rights in the legal framework, the pre-existing social protection programme, *Bono de Desarrollo Humano* (BDH), has been limited to Ecuadorian nationals since 2019, and although the new *Bono de Protección Familiar por Emergencia*

(BPFE) emergency support scheme does not explicitly exclude migrants and refugees, in practice this same criterion is applied. Thus, these populations did not have recourse to social protection either prior to the pandemic, or to the schemes designed to mitigate its impacts.

Unlike the other countries analysed, Mexico had ended its long-term CCT programme, *Progresa/Oportunidades/Prospera* (1997-2018), before the pandemic and had created two non-contributory schemes for specific populations: the elderly and the young. The former is limited to Mexican nationals, while the latter, although it formally includes the migrant population, in practice effective access is contingent upon the discretionality of the political-administrative jurisdiction where the benefit is requested. Mexico is the only country analysed where no mitigation measures were implemented to deal with the deleterious social and economic effects of the pandemic.

In recent years, the presence of international organisations such as UNHCR and IOM has been increasing throughout the region, carrying out key actions for the care and protection of migrant and refugee populations, alongside CSOs. As shown in table 2, in the context of the pandemic, IOs had to retool their budgets and action plans to redirect resources, originally allocated to socio-economic integration schemes, towards the expansion of humanitarian assistance programmes.

In all the countries analysed, the initiatives undertaken by the IOs target the entire migrant and refugee populations, while, given budget constraints, their cash transfers schemes are restricted to the most vulnerable. In addition, as stated by our interviewees, in Ecuador, Brazil, Chile, Peru and Uruguay, some funds come already earmarked for the Venezuelan humanitarian response. In Colombia and Mexico, IOs also provide assistance to the returned and displaced national populations. In the context of the pandemic, there was a general relaxation of criteria and requirements for the aid distributed directly or through CSOs in all the countries analysed. For example, the period for receiving cash transfers (normally limited to three months) was extended and aid was granted to CSOs that would normally not meet the legal organisational requirements. In addition, in countries such as Mexico, a network of CSOs, created more than three decades ago, extends throughout the national territory, mainly running shelters that provide accommodation, food, medical care and jobs and education-related services.

#### TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

In sum, during the COVID-19 pandemic, we identified a social inclusion spectrum made up of three groups. At one end of the spectrum, the first group, composed by Brazil and Uruguay, is characterised by the *guarantee and effective access to social rights of migrants*

*and refugees*, where the bureaucratic-administrative structure is subordinated to the effective exercise of rights. The second group is composed by Chile and Colombia, where *regular migration status conditions access to and exercise of certain social rights*, while at the other end of the spectrum, in the third group, composed by Peru, Ecuador and Mexico, *migrants and refugees are explicitly excluded from social protection schemes*.

Although the actions of IOs and CSOs display some commonalities in the countries studied, providing an expeditious, relatively flexible response adjusted to the humanitarian needs generated by the pandemic, their role, *vis-à-vis* the actions of the state, differs between countries, as we discuss below.

## **5. Towards a typology of models of social protection in the context of COVID-19**

The analysis of NCST programmes and initiatives in the seven countries, before and after the pandemic, shows an increase of emergency assistance that is consistent with the increasing needs, and exacerbated vulnerabilities produced by the sanitary-economic crisis. However, who provides the assistance, what type of assistance is provided and the extent to which migrant and refugee populations are included in these initiatives, varies across countries.

It is worth noting that the type of assistance –whether emerging from state-led responses or those funded and distributed by IOs and CSOs, or from the articulation of both – does not differ from pre to post pandemic situations. There is also little variation in the logic of inclusion/exclusion that existed before the pandemic, in terms of who can access social assistance and under what terms. Nonetheless, the examination of migrants' inclusion in NCSTs during the pandemic provides a window for the identification of different models of social protection in the region.

In table 3 we propose a classification of the models of social protection during the pandemic in the seven case studies, in relation to three key aspects: i) the assemblage of actors providing social protection during the COVID-19 pandemic, ii) the modes of protection and, iii) the migrant subjectifications that emerge from these configurations.

### *Assemblage of actors*

This typology considers the articulation of different actors in the provision of social protection, primarily through NCSTs, during the COVID-19 pandemic. We identified three assemblages of actors:

1. State-led with complementary role of IOs and Civil Society
2. IOs-led and complementary role of the state and Civil Society

### 3. Absent state (central), response led by Civil Society and IOs

The articulation and varying roles of the different actors during the pandemic bring to the fore the modes of protection and the systems of governance that may emerge after the pandemic, as we discuss below. While in Brazil, Chile and Uruguay, IOs and CSOs play a complementary role to government actions; in other cases, their role is rather supplementary. In Colombia, they lead social protection efforts and complement the actions of the national government, while in Ecuador, Peru and Mexico they lead protection efforts and make up for the absence of the state.

In Brazil and Uruguay, which already had a structure of social protection prior to the pandemic, central governments have effectively included migrants, regardless of migration status, into the social protection mitigation measures. In turn, IOs and civil society have had a complementary role developing an emergency response aimed to address the basic needs of the vulnerable population. Similarly, Chile developed an emergency response led by the central government that, although in principle does not exclude the migrant population, in practice the eligibility criteria limits access to migrants and refugees who have a regularised status and meet certain criteria (see Table 2). IOs and CSOs have a complementary but crucial social protection role towards all migrants and refugees in the country, and in some cases even including national residents, as evidenced by our interviews. A key aspect to these dynamics is the partnerships that UNHCR and IOM have established with some Chilean municipalities. For instance, UNHCR has worked with the Municipality of Santiago to provide food and shelter and with the Municipality of Estación Central, to provide 200 food baskets, 50 hygiene kits and 40 kits of diapers; while IOM has partnered with some private local businesses to directly deliver food baskets to migrants. The municipalities of Santiago and Arica have also been working closely with NGOs and migrant-led organisations to cover the basic needs of the local migrant population and of those waiting to return to their countries of origin (see Vera Espinoza, Zapata and Gandini 2020).

#### TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

A different type of assemblage is observed in Colombia, where the emergency response (inclusive of migrants) has been led by both the IOs and CSOs, with a complementary role of the state. The central government claims that they have coordinated international cooperation efforts (Presidencia de la República de Colombia 2020), but in practice they have limited their action to providing cash-transfers to a fraction of the resident migrant population (less than 20 thousand Venezuelans) and food baskets to vulnerable families.

In Peru, we identified an absent state in relation to the provision of social protection. The emergency response has been led by IOs, mainly UNHCR and IOM, with a complementary role by CSOs. As in the case of Chile, in Peru we also found that local governments (Tumbes and Tacna) have partnered with IOM and UNHCR. As part of this response, IOs have expanded their vulnerability criteria beyond the migrant population, in an attempt to avoid fuelling the already high levels of xenophobia.

Similarly, in Ecuador, the lack of inclusion of migrant and refugee populations in social protection schemes translates in an absent state to respond to the increasing social needs provoked by the pandemic, where IOs, especially UNHCR and IOM, and CSOs have led emergency assistance efforts. Also, some humanitarian actions such as distributing food and cleaning kits, were carried out by the Pichincha and Carchi local governments and other southern border towns during the most critical months of the pandemic.

Mexico is another country with an absent state in relation to the provision of social protection. This absence should be understood both in relation to the sanitary crisis and to changes in migration policy enacted before the pandemic. The government of Lopez Obrador (2018 – current) embraced enhanced securitisation and deterrent practices as core elements of migration policy<sup>2</sup>, increased institutional instability (through the externalisation of US border controls within the Migration Protection Protocols Programme) and ratcheted up migrant detention. In addition, the pandemic reached Mexico in a context of weak or non-existent social protection programmes for migrant and refugee populations, with NGOs leading the emergency response. IOM and UNHCR have also had an increasingly important role, not only providing NCSTs (such as shelter and cash transfers), but also supporting the range and quality of action of NGOs through capacity building and infrastructure.

In sum, the assemblage of actors varies across countries, and even in countries where social protection systems fully include the migrant population, such as Brazil, the different modes of articulation do not necessarily translate into effective inter-sectorial coordination, as emphasised by our interviewees. These different assemblages of actors may relate, to some extent, to the lack of reception structures in some countries of the region, even in those with progressive legal frameworks, such as Ecuador. This is consistent with changing migration

---

<sup>2</sup> With the arrival of the migrant caravans – between late 2018 and early 2019 –, US President Donald Trump threatened Mexico with trade tariffs unless the Mexican government stopped the flow of Central Americans on route to the United States. Mexico responded by enacting three key migration policy changes: 1) the intensification of the Migrant Protection Protocols; 2) the militarisation of migration control, with the creation of the National Guard and; 3) an institutional reorganisation of migration governance that passed over the responsibility of migration controls from the Ministry of the Interior to the Ministry of Foreign Relations (Gandini forthcoming).

dynamics across the region, with countries transitioning from mainly sending countries (such as Colombia) or transit countries (such as Peru and Mexico) to key –intra-regional–destination countries. Other countries in the region with mixed migration profiles, such as Brazil, Uruguay, Chile and Ecuador, have variable levels of reception structures, evidenced by the different articulation of actors in the provision of social assistance. This in turn, shapes the outcomes in the modes of protection, as we discuss below.

The key role of civil society organisations in providing social protection for migrant and refugee populations in Latin America is long dated, and has been especially forceful since the return to democracy (Avritzer 2007). What is relevant in the current context, is how many of these NGOs and faith-based organisations, albeit their limited resources, have quickly addressed some of the shortcomings in social protection that emerge from the corseted structures of both central governments and IOs, while still closely working with them. In many cases, these organisations have demonstrated a speed for response and organisation that far exceeds that of governments, through the retooling of their budgets and action plans to effectively respond to the pandemic. Equally relevant has been the role of migrant-led organisations at both the local and national levels: interviewees from Ecuador, Chile, Colombia and Peru, highlighted how they diversified their range of action to include the provision of food baskets, *ollas comunes*, advocacy and information campaigns during the pandemic.

Another key point is the relevance of the local level. Municipal governments have been closely working with all the other actors identified in the provision of social protection as they are, alongside the civil society, a focal point of contact for migrant and refugee populations (Bengochea et al. 2020; Vera, Adler and Toro 2020). Although in table 3 we mainly refer to central governments, as the main designers of social protection programmes, in countries such as Ecuador, Chile and Colombia, municipal governments have had a key role in the distribution of the emergency assistance on the ground.

Finally, our interviewees emphasised that the assistance provided by IOs and CSOs in the countries of the region is conditioned by funding and by the temporal limitations that involve an ‘emergency response’, raising questions on the effectiveness of these efforts in relation to migrants’ long term integration. At the same time, these actions, while needed, fail to challenge the exclusionary status quo of current states’ practices in the region, which condition the ‘deservedness’ of protection to a regular status (Ehrkamp and Nagel 2014).



### *Modes of protection*

We identified four modes of social protection, according to the different assemblages of actors in the seven country case studies, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic (Table 3).

*Rights based - adapted in the context of emergency:* Social protection for migrant and refugee populations is integrated into national social protection systems. New programmes emerge to respond to the sanitary-economic crisis, which are complementary to the state's existing safety-net programmes. Access to these programmes is not determined by immigration status, but rather by levels of vulnerability (mainly through the flexibilization of some eligibility criteria). This is exemplified by the cases of Brazil and Uruguay.

*Rights based in principle, contingent in practice:* Social protection for migrant and refugee populations is integrated into national social protection systems, with new emergency programmes complementing the existing safety-net programmes. Access to these programmes is determined by levels of vulnerability, subject to migrant regularisation and specific proof of ID, among other specific requirements. Chile fits this profile.

*Contingent:* In this mode of social protection, emergency programmes, that selectively include migrant and refugee populations, emerge outside of the national social protection system. The emergency response is short-term, targeted and conditioned to levels of vulnerability among these populations. This is exemplified by the cases of Colombia, Peru and Mexico.

*Marginal - contingent:* Migrant populations are not included in national social protection systems, and are actively excluded from emergency responses led by central governments. Migrant and refugee populations are included in programmes developed by IOs and CSOs, based on broad vulnerability criteria. Ecuador fits this profile.

### *Migrant subjectification*

This classification makes reference to emerging subjectifications of migrants, as a result of both the assemblages of actors who provide assistance and the modes of protection identified. For these analytical categories, we draw on notions of (non)citizenship socially attributed to migrants, considering that crossing borders supposes the demarcation of different rights (Balibar 2002). We also consider differentiated configurations of citizenship in practice in relation to access and inclusion (Davidson and Castles 2000), as membership for migrants and refugees is often accompanied “by rituals of entry, access, belonging and privilege” (Benhabib 2004: 1) which are in turn, determined by statuses, rights and participation (Stokke 2013). That is to say, our classification includes different migrant groups with different statuses and thus,

is key for understanding the conditionality and reach of social protection in the current scenario. We identified two broad, and by no means, exhaustive constructions:

1. Migrants are considered as *subject of rights*, regardless of migration status.
2. Migrants are rendered as *humanitarian subjects*, as a result of assistencialist short-term models of protection, as their access is both determined and constrained by the ‘emergency’. Migrants’ access to social protection seems to be understood in line with humanitarian ideas of ‘compassion’ and the externalisation of assistance, as well as determined by residency and/or regular migration status.

In Brazil and Uruguay migrants emerge as subjects of rights, as they are included – without restrictions – in the provision of social protection. This assertion, however, does not provide a full account of migrant and refugee populations’ effective access to a wider range of social, economic and cultural rights in these countries. Yet, the existence of a state that leads the protection response, does not necessarily guarantee migrants’ inclusion as subjects of rights. As evidenced by the Chilean case, migrants’ access to social assistance has been contingent to the emergency and limited to regular migration status, among other conditionalities. In this context, migrants and refugees are tacitly understood as *humanitarian subjects* (Stang, Lara and Andrade 2020).

In countries where there is total or partial absence of the state regarding the protection of migrants and refugees, such as Peru, Ecuador Colombia and Mexico, migrants have been rendered as *humanitarian subjects*, as recipients of humanitarian help from IOs and NGOs, with limited access to long term sustainable solutions. In this regard, the Ecuadorian case is emblematic: although the constitution guarantees equality of rights for nationals and non-nationals, the government closed all avenues for social protection to the migrant community before and during the pandemic.

In the Peruvian case, the construction of migrants as *humanitarian subjects*, in a context of state absence, begins at the design stage of aid initiatives by the IOs, where compliance with the vulnerability requirements defines the target population. As pointed out by our interviewees in Peru, the state uses its sovereign powers to place migrants in a *legal limbo*, so that migrants have recognised rights that are not effectively available in practice.

The five countries where the emerging, and in some cases, continuous construction of migrants as *humanitarian subjects*, evidence a lack of inclusion of migrant and refugee populations in social protection, with consequences beyond this realm alone. On the one hand, the overreliance on regular status as conditionality to access rights and protection reinforces the logic of restrictions seen across the region (Domenech 2011). These selective inclusion

practices tend to reinforce inequalities, and migrants' experiences of precarity and vulnerability, especially in times of crisis. On the other hand, the construction of *humanitarian subjects* establishes contingent policies as the norm, which are tightly linked to the exceptional treatment given to the growing migration flows in the region. This is leading to states' disengagement from their responsibility of social protection to subjects of human rights, relying on non-state actors, externalising, or avoiding the development of policies and practices of inclusion.

## 6. Conclusions

Our analysis shows that the responses to the pandemic developed in the 7 countries studied, reflect a continuity, and further normalisation, of existing practices along a spectrum of inclusion/exclusion that preceded the COVID-19 outbreak, but with new configurations with regards to the assemblages of actors providing social protection. Our proposed typology of models of social protection in the context of the pandemic, varies according to the actors involved, the modes of protection and the conception of migrants as *humanitarian subjects* or *subjects of rights*.

The findings suggest broad heterogeneity and complexity with regard to different degrees of inclusion for these populations, particularly in pre-existing and new NCST programmes. On the one hand, Brazil and Uruguay clearly stand out for having fully inclusive and clear legal frameworks, the enhancement of pre-existing programmes, and the creation of new ones that fully include displaced populations regardless of immigration status. On the other hand, the evidence collected in the other five countries – Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico and Peru – allows us to dwell on the challenges faced in Latin America concerning the tensions and contradictions between somehow advanced legal frameworks, however ambiguous, and policy implementation. It also allows for a better understanding of the articulation of actors in the provision of social protection, as well as the strategies and practices they deploy. We observe a common pattern in which actors prioritise the provision of basic needs, while sacrificing existing plans and programmes, which may negatively impact migrants' medium and long term processes of integration.

The evidence presented here contributes to advancing three key discussions. First, it brings to the fore how global discourses on humanitarian crises and the attendant regional articulation of a "crisis within the crisis" have contributed to the state's disengagement and the deterioration of effective policies of social protection for migrants and refugees in Latin America. That is to say that the socioeconomic mitigation measures put in place to deal with

the sanitary-economic crisis are based on and further affirm notions of protection that are contingent and crisis-driven, with temporal limitations that often selectively exclude migrants based on legal status.

Second, we mobilise understandings about the key role of social rights as a basic condition for the effective integration of migrant and refugee populations within a framework of rights-based citizenship. Third, we have shown the complexities of the nature of policies and practices of migration governance in Latin America. The new legal categories and *ad-hoc* measures that emerged across the region in response to the displacement of Venezuelans and Central Americans, among other international mobilities, have contributed to either produce migrant irregularity or to reinforce practices of exclusion/inclusion that impact on migrants' effective access to social and economic rights. We discuss all these aspects in relation to migrant subjectification as either *subjects of rights* or *humanitarian subjects*. Our intention with the proposed typology is by no means to produce yet another binary understanding of the migrant category. Rather, our analysis sheds light on the current assemblages of actors and the social inclusion/exclusion spectrum that are shaping migrants and refugees' lives in Latin America, through an enhanced understanding of their rights and effective access to social protection during the pandemic. In this way, we contribute to expand a growing body of literature on migration governance in Latin America and on migrants' and refugees' integration, while paving the way to keep exploring the differentiated impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on (im)mobility across the region.

## References

Acosta, D. (2018). *The National versus the Foreigner in South America. 200 Years of Migration and Citizenship Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Acosta, D., Blouin, C., & Freier, L.F. (2019). La emigración venezolana: respuestas latinoamericanas. Fundación Carolina. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/7097487.pdf>. Accessed 22 June 2020

Asa, P., & Ceriani, P. (2010). Migrantes, derechos sociales y políticas públicas en América Latina y El Caribe: la universalidad en juego. In P. Arcidiácono, N. Espejo Yaksic & C. Rodríguez Garavito (Coords.), *Derechos sociales: justicia, política y economía en América Latina* (pp. 331-384). Bogotá: Siglo de Hombre Editores y la eHR.

Avritzer, L. (2007). Sociedade civil, instituições participativas e representação: da autorização à legitimidade da ação. *Dados*, 50(3), 443-464.

Balibar, É. (2002). *Politics and the Other Scene*. London: Verso.

Bartholo, L. et al. (2020). Nota Técnica No.72: As transferências monetárias federais de caráter assistencial em resposta à covid-19: mudanças e desafios de implementação. Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada (IPEA). [http://repositorio.ipea.gov.br/bitstream/11058/10042/1/NT\\_72\\_Disoc\\_As%20Transferencias%20Monet%20c3%a1rias%20Federais.pdf](http://repositorio.ipea.gov.br/bitstream/11058/10042/1/NT_72_Disoc_As%20Transferencias%20Monet%20c3%a1rias%20Federais.pdf). Accessed 13 June 2020

Barrientos, A. (2010). Social Protection and Poverty. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. [https://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/%28httpAuxPages%29/973B0F57CA78D834C12576DB003BE255/\\$file/Barrientos-pp.pdf](https://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BCCF9/%28httpAuxPages%29/973B0F57CA78D834C12576DB003BE255/$file/Barrientos-pp.pdf). Accessed 16 October 2020

Bengochea, J., Cabezas, G., Gandini, L., Herrera, G., Luzes, M., Montiel, C., Prieto, V., Vera Espinoza, M., & Zapata, G. P. (2020). COVID-19 y población migrante y refugiada. Análisis de las respuestas político-institucionales en ciudades receptoras de seis países de América Latina. In F. Vera, V. Adler & F. Toro (Eds.), *Inmigrando: Comprender Ciudades en Transición*, Vol. 3 (pp. 749-782). Buenos Aires: BID.

Benhabib, S. (2004). *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blofield, M., Giamb Bruno, C., & Filgueira, F. (2020). Policy in expansion in compressed time Assessing the speed, breadth and sufficiency of post- COVID-19 social protection measures in 10 Latin American countries. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). [https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/46016/4/S2000593\\_en.pdf](https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/46016/4/S2000593_en.pdf). Accessed 13 October 2020

Cantat, C., Thiollet, H., & Pécoud, A. (2019). Migration as crisis. A framework paper. Hugo Observatory-University of Liège. <https://www.magyc.uliege.be/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/D3.1.-Migration-as-crisis.-A-framework-paper..pdf>. Accessed 15 September 2020

CELS & CAREF. (2020). Laberintos de papel. Desigualdad y regularización migratoria en América del Sur. CELS & CAREF. [https://www.cels.org.ar/web/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/CELS\\_Migrantes\\_digital\\_Final-1.pdf](https://www.cels.org.ar/web/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/CELS_Migrantes_digital_Final-1.pdf). Accessed 13 October 2020

Crawley, H., & Skleparis, D. (2018). Refugees, Migrants, Neither, Both: Categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's "migration crisis". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(1), 48-64.

Davidson, A., & Castles, S. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. New York: Routledge.

De Lucas, J. (2002). La herida original de las políticas de inmigración. A propósito del lugar de los derechos humanos en las políticas de inmigración. *Isegoría*, (26), 59-84.

Domenech, E. (2011). Crónica de una "amenaza" anunciada. Inmigración e 'ilegalidad': visiones de Estado en la Argentina contemporánea. In B. Feldman-Bianco, L. Rivera Sánchez, C. Stefoni & M. Villa (Comp.), *La construcción social del sujeto migrante en América Latina: prácticas, representaciones y categorías* (pp. 31-78). Quito: FLACSO-Ecuador / CLACSO / UAH.

Ehrkamp, P., & Nagel, C. (2014). 'Under the radar': Undocumented immigrants, Christian faith communities, and the precarious spaces of welcome in the U.S. South. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 104, 319–328.

Fassin, D. (2012). *Humanitarian reason. A moral history of the present*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Finn, V. & Umpierrez de Reguero, S. (2020). Inclusive Language for Exclusive Policies: Restrictive Migration Governance in Chile, 2018. *Latin American Policy* 11 (1): 42–61.

Freier, F. (2018) Understanding the Venezuelan Displacement Crisis. *E-International Relations*, June 28, 2018. <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/06/28/understanding-the-venezuelan-displacement-crises/> Accessed 3 September 2020

Freier, F., & Vera Espinoza M. (forthcoming). COVID-19 & Immigrants' Increased Exclusion: The Politics of Immigrant Integration in Chile and Peru. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*.

Freitez, A. (2019). Crisis humanitaria y migración forzada desde Venezuela. In L. Gandini, F. Lozano-Ascencio & V. Prieto Rosas (Coords.), *Crisis y migración de población venezolana. Entre la desprotección y la seguridad jurídica en Latinoamérica* (pp. 33-57). Mexico City: UNAM.

Gandini, L. (forthcoming). Caravanas migrantes: de respuestas institucionales diferenciadas a la reorientación de la política migratoria. *REMHU: Revista Interdisciplinaria da Mobilidade Humana*, 28(60).

Gandini, L., Fernández de la Reguera, A., & Narváez, J. (2020). *Caravanas*. Mexico City: UNAM.

Gandini, L., Prieto Rosas, V., & Lozano-Ascencio, F. (2019). El éxodo venezolano: migración en contextos de crisis y respuestas de los países latinoamericanos. In L. Gandini, F. Lozano-Ascencio and V. Prieto Rosas (Coords.), *Crisis y migración de población venezolana. Entre la desprotección y la seguridad jurídica en Latinoamérica* (pp. 9-32). Mexico City: UNAM.

Gandini, L., Prieto Rosas, V., & Lozano-Ascencio, F. (2020). Nuevas movilidades en América Latina: la migración venezolana en contextos de crisis y las respuestas en la región. *Cuadernos geográficos de la Universidad de Granada*, 59(3), 103-121.

Herrera, G., & Berg, U. (2019). "Migration Crises" and Humanitarianism in Latin America: the case of Ecuador. In N. Sorensen & S. Plambech (Eds.), *Global Perspectives on Humanitarianism. When human welfare meets the political and security agendas* (pp. 31-49). Copenhagen: DIIS.

Jubilut, L.L., Vera Espinoza, M., & Mezzanotti, G. (Eds.). (2021). *Latin America and Refugee Protection: regimes, logics and challenges*. New York: Berghahn Books.

The Lancet 2020. Editorial: COVID-19 will not leave behind refugees and migrants. *The Lancet*, 395(April 4, 2020): 1090.

MDS. (2016). O papel da assistência social no atendimento aos migrantes. Ministério do Desenvolvimento Social e Agrário, Secretaria Nacional de Assistência Social.

[https://www.mds.gov.br/webarquivos/publicacao/assistencia\\_social/Guia/guia\\_migrantes.pdf](https://www.mds.gov.br/webarquivos/publicacao/assistencia_social/Guia/guia_migrantes.pdf).  
Accessed 20 October 2020

Menjívar, C., Ruiz, M., & Ness, I. (2019). *The Oxford Handbook of Migration Crises*. London: Oxford University Press.

Mountz, A. (2020). *The Death of Asylum. Hidden Geographies of the Enforcement Archipelago*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Penninx, R., & Garcés-Mascareñas, B. (2016). The Concept of Integration as an Analytical Tool and as a Policy Concept. In B. Garcés-Mascareñas & R. Penninx (Eds.), *Integration processes and policies in Europe: contexts, levels and actors* (pp. 11-29). New York: IMISCOE / Springer Open.

Presidencia de la República de Colombia. (2020). Balance General a 23 de junio de 2020: El apoyo de los colombianos ha llegado a más de un millón de migrantes provenientes de Venezuela. *Presidencia de la República de Colombia*.

Ramírez, J. (2020). De la ciudadanía suramericana al humanitarismo: el giro en la política y diplomacia migratoria ecuatoriana. *Estudios Fronterizos*, 21, e061.

Sepulveda, M., & Nyst, C. (2012). *The Human Rights Approach to Social Protection*. Oulu: Erweko Oy.

Stang, F., Lara, A., & Andrade, M. (2020). Retórica humanitaria y expulsabilidad: migrantes haitianos y gobernabilidad migratoria en Chile. *Si Somos Americanos. Revista de Estudios Transfronterizos*, 20(1), 176-201.

Stokke, K. (2013). Conceptualizing the politics of citizenship. *PCD Journal*, 5(1).

Thayer, L. E. (2019). Causas y Consecuencias de La Irregularidad Migratoria. In N. Rojas Pedemonte & J. T. Vicuña (Eds.), *Migración en Chile. Evidencias y Mitos de Una Nueva Realidad* (pp. 297–334). Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones.

Ticktin, M. (2011). *Casualties of Care. Immigration and the Politics of Humanitarianism in France*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.



UNHCR. (2020). *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2019*. Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

Vera Espinoza, M., Zapata, G., & Gandini, L. (26 May 2020). Mobility in immobility: Latin American migrants trapped amid COVID-19. *Open Democracy*. Retrieved from <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/democraciaabierta/mobility-immobility-latin-american-migrants-trapped-amid-covid-19/>

Vera, F., Adler, V., & Toro, F. (Eds.). (2020). *Inmigrando: Comprender Ciudades en Transición*, Vol. 3. Buenos Aires: BID.

Williams, A., & Martinez, U. (2020). *Tailoring Adaptive Social Safety Nets to Latin America and the Caribbean*. Washington, DC.: World Bank.

Zetter, R. (2007). More Labels, Fewer Refugees: Remaking the refugee label in an era of globalization. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2), 172-192.

Zapata, G. P., & Prieto, V. (In press). Structural and contingent inequalities: the impact of COVID-19 on migrant and refugee populations in South America. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*.

**Table 1.** Migration Legal Frameworks in selected Latin American countries

Country	Equality before the law			Extension of social and economic rights	Legal framework inclusion of specific social rights
	Implicit	Explicit	Includes irregular migrants		
Brazil		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Constitution [1988] (Art. 5) Migration Law 13,445/2017 (Art. 3, XI) & Refugee Act 9,474/1997. (Art. 5, II)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included	Health, education, labour, social assistance and security (Migration Law, Art. 4)	Legal clarity and full inclusion
Colombia		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Political Constitution (Art. 100). Law 1465/2011: National Migration System. CONPES 9650/2018. Decree 2840/2013 (refugees)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not included, except for emergency health and education	Civil rights (Political Constitution, Art. 100).	Legal ambiguity and partial inclusion
Chile	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Political Constitution [1980] (Art. 19)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refugee Law 20,430/2010 (Art. 13)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included for education, health and labour rights (Oficio ordinario no. 07/1008 (1531); Supreme Decree no.67)	Civil rights (Political Constitution, Art 19); Health, education, labour, social protection (Refugee Law, Art. 13)	Legal ambiguity and partial inclusion

Country	Equality before the law			Extension of social and economic rights	Legal framework inclusion of specific social rights
	Implicit	Explicit	Includes irregular migrants		
Ecuador		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Political Constitution [2008] (Art. 9, 34, 35, 40, 41). Expanded Refugee Registry (2009). Organic Law of Human Mobility (Refugee included) (2017). National Human Mobility Plan (2018). Decree 826. Exception Visa for Humanitarian Reasons (VERHU) (2019).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included	Health, education, labour, social protection (Political Constitution, Art. 3, 34, 35, 40).	Legal ambiguity and full inclusion
Mexico	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Political Constitution [1917] (Art. 1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Migration Law (Art. 8 and 15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refugee, Complementary Protection and Political Asylum Law (Art. 44)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included for health and education services	Health and education for all migrants (Migration Law, Art. 8)  Health, education, labour & identity for refugees and regular immigrants (Migration Law,	Legal ambiguity and partial inclusion

Country	Equality before the law			Extension of social and economic rights	Legal framework inclusion of specific social rights
	Implicit	Explicit	Includes irregular migrants		
Peru	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Political Constitution (Art. 2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Migration law and regulations: Legislative Decree 1350, Supreme Decree 007-2017-IN.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refugee Act: Law 27,891, Supreme Decree 119-2003-RE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included for access to justice, health, education and labour	Art. 15 & Refugee Complementary Protection and Political Asylum Law, Art. 44)  Health, education and labour (Legislative Decree no. 1350, Art. 9; Migration Law & Refugee Act, Art. 14)	Legal ambiguity and partial inclusion
Uruguay	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Constitution of the Republic [1967] (Art. 7 and 8)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Migration Law (18,250/2008) (Art. 7)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Law on the Right to Refuge and Refugees (18,076/2006) (Art. 20)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Included for education and health services and labour	Health, housing, education, labour and social protection (Migration Law, Art. 8 & Law on the Right to Refuge and Refugees, Art. 20).	Legal clarity and full inclusion

Source: Own elaboration based on review of Legal Regulatory Frameworks in each of the seven country case studies.

**Table 2.** Non-Contributory Social Transfers (NCST) during the pandemic in selected Latin American countries by type of provider and inclusion/exclusion of migrant and refugee populations

Country	NCST from national government					NCST from International Organisations (IOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)			
	Inclusion of migrants/refugees					Inclusion of migrants/refugees in IOs programmes		Inclusion of migrants/refugees in CSOs initiatives	
	Main programmes	Status	Requirements for inclusion	Effective inclusion	Reason for exclusion	Main Programmes	Criteria for inclusion	Main Initiatives	Criteria for inclusion
Brazil	<i>Bolsa Família</i> (PBF)	Increase in existing transfer and expansion to new recipients	PBF: Regular migration status [CPF or Valid ID for registration in social programmes registry (CadÚnico). CPF is not conditioned to regular migration status]	PBF: Full inclusion	PBF: Over income threshold	- Cash transfers - Direct food provision - NGO financing of food provision - Hygiene Kits [Personal and Household]	Open to anyone in need (nationals and non-nationals) Most vulnerable individuals/families are prioritised  Some funds are earmarked for humanitarian	-Cash transfers -Direct food provision - Personal and Household Hygiene Kits	Open to anyone in need (nationals and non-nationals)  Most vulnerable individuals/families are prioritised for cash transfers

Country	NCST from national government					NCST from International Organisations (IOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)			
	Inclusion of migrants/refugees					Inclusion of migrants/refugees in IOs programmes		Inclusion of migrants/refugees in CSOs initiatives	
	Main programmes	Status	Requirements for inclusion	Effective inclusion	Reason for exclusion	Main Programmes	Criteria for inclusion	Main Initiatives	Criteria for inclusion
<i>Auxílio Emergencial</i> (AE)	New transfer	Regular migration status [CPF and Valid ID. Expiration dates of government-issued IDs were extended]	Full inclusion [Despite initial implementation problems most migrants and refugees were contemplated]	Digital registration opened to all. In-person cashing-in of benefit requires possession of valid migration or refugee document.			response for Venezuelans		

Country	NCST from national government					NCST from International Organisations (IOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)			
	Inclusion of migrants/refugees					Inclusion of migrants/refugees in IOs programmes		Inclusion of migrants/refugees in CSOs initiatives	
	Main programmes	Status	Requirements for inclusion	Effective inclusion	Reason for exclusion	Main Programmes	Criteria for inclusion	Main Initiatives	Criteria for inclusion
Chile	<i>Subsidio Único Familiar (SUF)</i>	Maintenance	Regular migration status [National ID with 'Unique National Number' RUT. A valid RUT is conditioned to regular migration status]	Limited to regular migrants	Irregular migration status	-Financing for NGOs, municipalities and national government -Cash transfers -Vouchers and direct food provision -Financing of shelters and lodging.	Open to migrants, asylum seekers and refugees Most vulnerable groups are prioritised Venezuelans and vulnerable migration groups are prioritised	-Cash transfers -Direct food provision -Hygiene Kits	Open to migrants, asylum seekers and refugees
	Bonuses and subsidies <sup>1</sup>	New transfers	Regular migration status [Valid national ID with RUT and previous registration in	Limited to regular migrants and population [discretionality]	Irregular migration status and no previous enrolment in NCST				

Country	NCST from national government					NCST from International Organisations (IOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)			
	Inclusion of migrants/refugees					Inclusion of migrants/refugees in IOs programmes		Inclusion of migrants/refugees in CSOs initiatives	
	Main programmes	Status	Requirements for inclusion	Effective inclusion	Reason for exclusion	Main Programmes	Criteria for inclusion	Main Initiatives	Criteria for inclusion
			other NCST programmes]		preexisting programmes				
Colombia	<i>Familias en Acción (FA)</i>	Maintenance	Colombian nationality	Exclusion	Migrants and refugees are not eligible	-Cash transfers -Direct food provision -Hygiene Kits	Open to migrants, asylum seekers and refugees	-Cash transfers -Direct food provision -Hygiene Kits	Most vulnerable individuals/families are prioritised
Colombia	<i>Ingreso solidario (IS)</i>	New transfer	Regular migration status [PEP for Venezuelans]	Limited to regular migrants registered in social programmes registry (SISBEN)	Irregular migration status	-Financing for NGOs, municipalities and national government	Most vulnerable groups are prioritised National, returned and displaced populations were included		



Country	NCST from national government					NCST from International Organisations (IOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)			
	Inclusion of migrants/refugees					Inclusion of migrants/refugees in IOs programmes		Inclusion of migrants/refugees in CSOs initiatives	
	Main programmes	Status	Requirements for inclusion	Effective inclusion	Reason for exclusion	Main Programmes	Criteria for inclusion	Main Initiatives	Criteria for inclusion
Ecuador	<i>Bono de Desarrollo Humano</i> (BDH)	Maintenance	Ecuadorian nationality [since 2019 for BDH]	Exclusion	Migrants and refugees are not eligible	Transfers to NGOs and local governments	Open to migrants, asylum seekers and refugees	-Cash transfers -Direct food provision -Hygiene Kits	Open to migrants, asylum seekers and refugees
Ecuador	<i>Bono de Protección Familiar por Emergencia</i> (BPFE)	New transfer	Ecuadorian nationality [since 2019 for BDH]	Exclusion	Migrants and refugees are not eligible		Most vulnerable groups are prioritised		
Mexico	<i>Benito Juárez</i> (BJ) scholarship for young students	Maintenance	Regular migration status	Limited inclusion [uneven geographical discretionality]	BJ: Uneven criteria for required documentation	-Cash transfers -Hygiene Kits -Financing of shelters and lodging	Flexible criteria for NGO financing	-National network with comprehensive provision of	Open to anyone in need (nationals)

Country	NCST from national government					NCST from International Organisations (IOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)			
	Inclusion of migrants/refugees					Inclusion of migrants/refugees in IOs programmes		Inclusion of migrants/refugees in CSOs initiatives	
	Main programmes	Status	Requirements for inclusion	Effective inclusion	Reason for exclusion	Main Programmes	Criteria for inclusion	Main Initiatives	Criteria for inclusion
Costa Rica	<i>Pensión para el Bienestar de Adultos Mayores</i> (PBAM)	Early disbursement	Mexican nationality	Exclusion	Migrants and refugees are not eligible			services in shelters -Direct food provision -Hygiene Kits	and non-nationals)
Peru	<i>JUNTOS</i>	Expansion of cash transfer to new recipients	JUNTOS: Specific regular migration status	JUNTOS: Limited to migrants and refugee with residency card	JUNTOS: Asylum seekers, temporary residence permit holders, and irregular migrants are not eligible	-Cash transfers -Direct food provision -Hygiene Kits	Open to migrants, asylum seekers and refugees  Most vulnerable	-Cash transfers -Direct food provision -Hygiene Kits	Open to anyone in need (nationals and non-nationals) Venezuelan migrants and

Country	NCST from national government					NCST from International Organisations (IOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)			
	Inclusion of migrants/refugees					Inclusion of migrants/refugees in IOs programmes		Inclusion of migrants/refugees in CSOs initiatives	
	Main programmes	Status	Requirements for inclusion	Effective inclusion	Reason for exclusion	Main Programmes	Criteria for inclusion	Main Initiatives	Criteria for inclusion
	Bonuses <sup>2</sup>	New transfers	Peruvian nationality [Valid national ID]	Exclusion	Migrants and refugees are not eligible		groups are prioritised		refugees are prioritised
Uruguay	<i>Asignaciones Familiares Plan de Equidad (AFAM PE)</i>	Maintenance and increase of existing benefit	Regular migration status [valid national ID issued to asylum and residence permit applicants, <i>cédula de</i>	Limited to regular migrants	Migrants that does not certify having a residence permit application or asylum seeker application are excluded	-Cash transfers -Direct food provision -Hygiene Kits -Financing lodging	Open to migrants, asylum seekers and refugees  Most vulnerable groups are prioritised	NGOs receive support from AIs	Open to migrant, asylum seekers and refugees

INDA

Country	NCST from national government					NCST from International Organisations (IOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)			
	Inclusion of migrants/refugees					Inclusion of migrants/refugees in IOs programmes		Inclusion of migrants/refugees in CSOs initiatives	
	Main programmes	Status	Requirements for inclusion	Effective inclusion	Reason for exclusion	Main Programmes	Criteria for inclusion	Main Initiatives	Criteria for inclusion
Uruguay	<i>Tarjeta Social (TUS)</i>		<i>identidad provisoria]</i>				Venezuelans and vulnerable migrant groups are prioritised		
	<i>Canasta de Emergencia Alimentaria (CEA)</i>	New transfer	Not conditioned to regular migration status	Full inclusion	Administrative challenges for digital registration faced by irregular migrants [These issues were solved through direct provision of food]		Contingent inclusion of nationals		

Source: Own elaboration based on the analysis of interviews conducted in the seven country case studies.

**Table 3. A typology of models of social protection in the context of COVID-19 pandemic**

Country	Assemblages of actors providing social protection to migrants and refugees during pandemic	Modes of protection during the pandemic	Migrant subjectification during pandemic
Brazil	State-led with complementary role of IOs and Civil Society	Rights based - adapted in the context of emergency	Subject of rights
Chile	State led and complementary role of IOs and Civil Society	Rights based in principle, contingent in practice	Humanitarian subjects
Colombia	IOs and Civil Society led and complementary role of the state	Contingent	Humanitarian subjects
Ecuador	Absent state, response led by Civil Society and IOs	Marginal Contingent	Humanitarian subjects
Peru	Absent state, response led by Civil Society and IOs	Contingent	Humanitarian subjects
Mexico	Absent state, response led by IOs and Civil Society	Contingent	Humanitarian subjects
Uruguay	State led and complementary role of IOs and Civil Society	Rights based - adapted in the context of emergency	Subject of rights

Source: Own elaboration based on the evidence presented in Tables 1 and 2.