



European
Commission

European network of legal experts in
gender equality and non-discrimination

Country report

Non-discrimination

Spain

2022

including summary



Justice
and Consumers

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers
Directorate D — Equality and Union citizenship
Unit D.1 Non-discrimination and Roma coordination

*European Commission
B-1049 Brussels*

Country report

Non-discrimination

Transposition and implementation at national level of
Council Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78

Spain

Ferran Camas Roda*

Reporting period 1 January 2021 – 31 December 2021

2021 Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers

* The author has gratefully built on the reports written until 2020 by the previous expert Lorenzo Cachón.

***Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union.***

Freephone number (*):

00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

LEGAL NOTICE

This document has been prepared for the European Commission however it reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (<http://www.europa.eu>).

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2022

© European Union, 2022

PDF ISBN 978-92-76-49082-1

ISSN 2599-9176

doi:10.2838/19644

DS-BB-22-030-EN-N

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION	17
1 GENERAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK	18
2 THE DEFINITION OF DISCRIMINATION	20
2.1 Grounds of unlawful discrimination explicitly covered	20
2.1.1 Definition of the grounds of unlawful discrimination within the directives	20
2.1.2 Multiple discrimination	24
2.1.3 Assumed and associated discrimination	25
2.2 Direct discrimination (Article 2(2)(a))	26
2.3 Indirect discrimination (Article 2(2)(b))	26
2.3.1 Statistical evidence	29
2.4 Harassment (Article 2(3))	30
2.5 Instructions to discriminate (Article 2(4))	31
2.6 Reasonable accommodation duties (Article 2(2)(b)(ii) and Article 5 Directive 2000/78)	32
3 PERSONAL AND MATERIAL SCOPE	40
3.1 Personal scope	40
3.1.1 EU and non-EU nationals (Recital 13 and Article 3(2), Directive 2000/43 and Recital 12 and Article 3(2), Directive 2000/78)	40
3.1.2 Natural and legal persons (Recital 16, Directive 2000/43)	40
3.1.3 Private and public sector including public bodies (Article 3(1))	41
3.2 Material scope	41
3.2.1 Conditions for access to employment, to self-employment or to occupation, including selection criteria, recruitment conditions and promotion, whatever the branch of activity and at all levels of the professional hierarchy (Article 3(1)(a))	41
3.2.2 Employment and working conditions, including pay and dismissals (Article 3(1)(c))	42
3.2.3 Access to all types and all levels of vocational guidance, vocational training, advanced vocational training and retraining, including practical work experience (Article 3(1)(b))	44
3.2.4 Membership of, and involvement in, an organisation of workers or employers, or any organisation whose members carry on a particular profession, including the benefits provided for by such organisations (Article 3(1)(d))	45
3.2.5 Social protection, including social security and healthcare (Article 3(1)(e) Directive 2000/43)	45
3.2.6 Social advantages (Article 3(1)(f) Directive 2000/43)	48
3.2.7 Education (Article 3(1)(g) Directive 2000/43)	49
3.2.8 Access to and supply of goods and services that are available to the public (Article 3(1)(h) Directive 2000/43)	52
3.2.9 Housing (Article 3(1)(h) Directive 2000/43)	54
4 EXCEPTIONS	56
4.1 Genuine and determining occupational requirements (Article 4)	56
4.2 Employers with an ethos based on religion or belief (Article 4(2) Directive 2000/78)	56
4.3 Armed forces and other specific occupations (Article 3(4) and Recitals 18 and 19 Directive 2000/78)	58
4.4 Nationality discrimination (Article 3(2))	59
4.5 Health and safety (Article 7(2) Directive 2000/78)	60
4.6 Exceptions related to discrimination on the ground of age (Article 6 Directive 2000/78)	61
4.6.1 Direct discrimination	61
4.6.2 Special conditions for younger and older workers	64

4.6.3	Minimum and maximum age requirements	65
4.6.4	Retirement.....	65
4.6.5	Redundancy	69
4.7	Public security, public order, criminal offences, protection of health, protection of the rights and freedoms of others (Article 2(5) Directive 2000/78)	70
4.8	Any other exceptions.....	70
5	POSITIVE ACTION (Article 5 Directive 2000/43, Article 7 Directive 2000/78).....	71
6	REMEDIES AND ENFORCEMENT.....	74
6.1	Judicial and/or administrative procedures (Article 7 Directive 2000/43, Article 9 Directive 2000/78)	74
6.2	Legal standing and associations (Article 7(2) Directive 2000/43, Article 9(2) Directive 2000/78).....	77
6.3	Burden of proof (Article 8 Directive 2000/43, Article 10 Directive 2000/78).....	81
6.4	Victimisation (Article 9 Directive 2000/43, Article 11 Directive 2000/78).....	83
6.5	Sanctions and remedies (Article 15 Directive 2000/43, Article 17 Directive 2000/78).....	83
7	BODIES FOR THE PROMOTION OF EQUAL TREATMENT (Article 13 Directive 2000/43).....	88
8	IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES.....	102
8.1	Dissemination of information, dialogue with NGOs and between social partners	102
8.2	Measures to ensure compliance with the principle of equal treatment (Article 14 Directive 2000/43, Article 16 Directive 2000/78).....	106
9	COORDINATION AT NATIONAL LEVEL.....	107
10	CURRENT BEST PRACTICES.....	111
11	SENSITIVE OR CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES	117
11.1	Potential breaches of the directives at the national level	117
11.2	Other issues of concern	117
12	LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN 2021.....	119
12.1	Legislative amendments	119
12.2	Case law.....	119
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	126
	ANNEX 1: MAIN TRANSPOSITION AND ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION	128
	ANNEX 2: INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS.....	130

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Introduction

There have been great social and political changes in Spain over the past 45 years. Major transformations have taken place in the country's social structure, forming a much more diverse society in ethnic and religious (and other) terms. Two of the major interrelated changes have been a demographic transformation and the conversion of Spain into a country of net immigration.

Between 1975 and 2021 the population has grown from 36 million to just over 47 million (47 385 107).¹

The most interesting data for this report are as follows. First, it should be noted that immigration has played an important role in population growth. At the turn of the century, Spain went from being a country of emigration in the 20th century, with people emigrating to third countries, to a country of immigration, or a destination country for foreign migrants. According to estimates published on 30 June 2021, the number of foreigners resident in Spain stands at 5 922 196. This means that in the first half of 2021 the increase in the resident foreign population as a whole was 2.3 % compared with the same half of last year, reversing the negative trend observed in the first half of 2020 (-2 % year-on-year growth) as a result of the restrictions on international mobility associated with the pandemic situation generated by COVID-19.

Of this foreign population, 54.1 % (3 206 787) have an EU registration certificate for free movement (EU citizens and their family members, even if they are third-country nationals, are entitled to this certificate). Overall, the number of foreigners with a registration certificate and EU free movement status has increased by 2 % compared with 30 June 2020. In addition, 2 313 300 third-country nationals (39 % of the total foreign population) are authorised under the 'general aliens' regime'. Nationals from four countries – Morocco, China, Ecuador and Venezuela – account for more than 50 % of the foreigners in this group, subject to the general aliens' regime. It should also be noted that 79 % of foreigners with authorisation under the general regime have long-term authorisation, which allows them to reside and work in Spain indefinitely under the same conditions as Spaniards. Finally, the last group of foreigners with various types of specific authorisations are British citizens (400 343) and their family members – mainly the *Tarjeta de Identificación de Extranjero* (TIE) (Foreign National Identification Card) issued under the Withdrawal Agreement signed between Spain and the United Kingdom to regulate the entry and residence of British citizens and their family members in Spain following the United Kingdom's exit from the European Union.²

The top 15 countries of origin (accounting for 75 % of the total foreign population) are, in this order, Romania (1 087 922); Morocco (823 708); the United Kingdom (400 343); Italy (363 332); China (230 054); Bulgaria (201 506); Germany (182 175); France (181 155); Portugal (179 424); Venezuela (158 000); Ecuador (146 482); Colombia (144 225); Poland (105 580); Ukraine (94 954); and Pakistan (90 298). In terms of growth in the last 6 months, the British and Colombian groups are particularly noteworthy, with increases of 5 %, well above the average growth of 2 % in this period. However, compared with last

¹ See [Royal Decree 1065/2021](#) of 30 November 2021, declaring official the population figures resulting from the revision of the Municipal Population Register of 1 January 2021. Incidentally, the latest demographic data show a decrease of 65 688 persons in the resident population in Spain between 1 June 2020 and 1 June 2021, which may be attributed to deaths due to the health crisis, but also to migratory flows affected by border closures and reduced mobility, as well as a fall in the number of births.

² Observatorio Permanente de la Inmigración, 31 June 2021, https://extranjerios.inclusion.gob.es/ficheros/estadisticas/operaciones/certificado/202106/nota_analisis_3006_2021.pdf.

year's growth, the growth rate of the British group has remained almost stable, while that of the Colombian group has intensified notably in the first half of 2021.³

The rapid rise in immigration, particularly since the beginning of the 21st century, poses new challenges to Spanish society, including increased risks related to discriminatory practices.

Regarding religion, the survey conducted in December 2021 by the Centre for Sociological Research should be taken into consideration. It found that 58.9 % of the population declared themselves Catholic (down 2.8 % from December 2020); that is, slightly less than two out of every three people living in Spain self-identified as Catholics. That said, 19.9 % considered themselves practising Catholics and 39 % non-practising. Only 2.6 % of the population declared themselves members of another religious faith (mainly Islam and Protestantism). In addition, in 2021, it was found that the agnostic, atheist or indifferent population had reached 37.1 %, far exceeding the number of practising Catholics. In fact, 14.6 % of the population consider themselves atheists (they deny the existence of God); 11.7 % of the population consider themselves agnostics (they do not deny the existence of God, but neither do they rule it out); and 10.8 % define themselves as indifferent.⁴

It is also interesting to note the main data on the distribution of men and women in Spain and the average age. According to data from the National Institute of Statistics, 49.0 % of the people residing and registered in municipalities are men and 51.0 % are women. Among Spanish nationals, there are more women (51.1 %), while among foreigners there are more men (50.1 %).

The average age of the population registered in the municipal census is 43.8 years. More specifically, the average age of Spaniards is 44.7 years and that of foreigners is 36.6 years (38.9 years for EU citizens).⁵ In general, it can be confirmed that the age structure of the foreign population is contributing considerably to the rejuvenation of the Spanish population.

By age, 15.1 % of the population are under 16 years old, 35.5 % are between 16 and 44 years old, 29.7 % are between 45 and 64 years old, and 19.7 % are 65 or older (these last two age groups have increased by three tenths of a percentage point since 2020).⁶ These data enable us to visualise the ageing process of the population living in Spain. According to a report by the National Institute of Statistics on population projections in Spain between 2020 and 2070, if current demographic trends are maintained, the largest age group in January 2021, which is people born between 1970 and 1979 (currently 40-49 years old), would still be the largest group in 2050 (by then aged 70-79). It should be mentioned that the percentage of the population aged 65 or over, which currently stands at 19.6 % of the overall population, would reach a maximum of 31.4 % in about 2050. From then on, it should begin to decrease.⁷

On the other hand, it is worth mentioning the data on the Spanish Roma population in Spain. The report by the Fundación Secretariado Gitano entitled 'Estudio comparado sobre la situación de la población gitana en España en relación al empleo y la pobreza 2018'

³ Observatorio Permanente de la Inmigración 31 June 2021, https://extranjeros.inclusion.gob.es/ficheros/estadisticas/operaciones/con-certificado/202106/nota_analisis_3006_2021.pdf.

⁴ Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, December 2021: https://www.cis.es/cis/export/sites/default/-Archivos/Marginales/3340_3359/3344/es3344mar.pdf.

⁵ Data from 1 January 2021. Avance de la Estadística del Padrón Continuo a 1 de enero de 2021 (Preview of continuous register statistics as at 1 January 2021), Instituto Nacional de Estadística: https://www.ine.es/prensa/pad_2021_p.pdf.

⁶ Data from 1 January 2021. Avance de la Estadística del Padrón Continuo a 1 de enero de 2021 (Preview of continuous register statistics as at 1 January 2021), Instituto Nacional de Estadística: https://www.ine.es/prensa/pad_2021_p.pdf.

⁷ Proyecciones de Población 2020-2070, INE: https://www.ine.es/prensa/pp_2020_2070.pdf.

(Comparative study on the situation of the Roma population in Spain in relation to employment and poverty 2018), states that in the absence of a census of the Spanish Roma population, the study is based on the 'Study-Map on housing and the Roma population, 2015', according to which the Roma population stands at 516 862 people. It is worth noting that the Roma population is much younger than the overall national population, as 66 % of the Roma population are under 30 years of age, while only 30 % of the general population in Spain are under that age. It should also be noted that only 17 % of Roma people have completed compulsory secondary education (ESO), compared with 77 % of the general population.

The Spanish Constitution of 1978 laid down the legal framework of a coexistence governed by democratic principles, making equal treatment and non-discrimination one of the basic pillars of a non-confessional state. Although few actions are brought before the courts, discriminatory practices occur relatively often, on various grounds. These discriminatory practices chiefly affect certain migrant groups and Roma, but also concern grounds such as sexual orientation and disability.

There are several specific social and employment programmes for combating discrimination on various grounds. There are also positive action programmes to combat discrimination in gender and disability. All these programmes are of value, although they are not very effective in their overall impact.

There have been numerous conflicts between the rights of organisations with an ethos based on religion or belief (in particular the Catholic Church, with which Spain signed an agreement in 1976 that is still in force) and other rights to non-discrimination. This has generated a significant amount of jurisprudence in Spain⁸ and notably by the ECtHR.⁹

The great recession suffered by Spain between 2008 and 2014 and the policies that Governments have been implementing to address it have led to a marked change in policy priorities, especially in relation to the labour market. During and after the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020, labour market reform policies to enhance recruitment, job retention and social security have also played an important role.

A new coalition Government was formed on 7 January 2020, comprising the Socialist Party and the Unidas Podemos (a coalition of leftist political parties). On 30 December 2019, both parties signed a Government programme entitled 'Progressive Coalition. A New Agreement for Spain', in which they committed to promoting a package of measures to foster equal treatment, non-discrimination and positive attitudes towards diversity. In particular, they agreed to pass a comprehensive law to address discrimination against LGBTI persons¹⁰ (in this area regarding the sexual orientation of people in Spain, it is worth mentioning the survey conducted by the Spanish Sociological Research Centre in 2021, according to which 93.9 % of respondents declared themselves heterosexual, 2.3 % bisexual, 1.9 % homosexual, 0.1 % asexual and 0.1 % another orientation)¹¹.

The coalition Government also agreed to adopt public policies aimed at improving access and permanence in education and employment for the Roma people. In fact, as an example of good practice also developed in 2021, it should be mentioned that the *National Strategy*

⁸ Constitutional Court judgments 5/1981 of 13 February 1981; 47/1985 of 27 March 1985; 106/1996 of 12 June 1996; and 51/2011 of 14 April 2011.

⁹ See notably *Fernández Martínez v. Spain*, No. 5603/07, 12 June 2014.

¹⁰ In June 2021, the Council of Ministers of the Spanish Government approved the Draft Bill for the real and effective equality of trans people and for the guarantee of the rights of LGTBI people. It is currently being processed following the request for the corresponding reports so that the Government can submit it as a Bill for approval by the Spanish Parliament.

¹¹ See: https://www.cis.es/cis/export/sites/default/-Archivos/Marginales/3320_3339/3325/es3325mar.pdf.

for Roma Equality, Inclusion and Participation 2021-2030 was adopted on 2 November 2021¹² (see section 10).

Finally, as an example of good practice developed in 2021 in Spain in the field of non-discrimination, the Digital Rights Charter, promoted by the Spanish Government, should be highlighted (see section 10).¹³

2. Main legislation

Equality is one of the highest values of the legal system established by the Spanish Constitution of 1978. Article 14 of the Constitution says: 'Spaniards are equal before the law and may not in any way be discriminated against on the grounds of birth, race, sex, religion, opinion or any other condition or personal or social circumstance'. The Constitutional Court has established that age,¹⁴ disability¹⁵ and sexual orientation¹⁶ are included under 'any other condition or personal or social circumstance'.

The most notable international instruments combating discrimination have been ratified during Spain's democratic period since 1976, and these instruments have informed the Constitution and the laws passed since then:

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
- Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol;
- ILO Convention 97 on Migration for Employment;
- ILO Convention 111 on Discrimination (Employment and Occupation);
- the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms;
- Protocol No. 12 to the Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.
- European Social Charter (revised): On 8 June 2021, Spain signed the Instrument of Ratification of the European Social Charter (revised), agreed in Strasbourg on 3 May 1996, which entered into force for Spain on 1 July 2021. In this instrument of ratification, it is proposed that:

'In relation to Part IV, Article D, paragraph 2, of the European Social Charter (Revised), Spain declares that it accepts the supervision of its obligations under the Charter in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Additional Protocol to the European Social Charter developing a system of collective complaints, done at Strasbourg on 9 November 1995.'¹⁷ Subsequently, on 28 June, the "Provisional Application of the Additional Protocol to the European

¹² Government of Spain, *National Strategy for Roma Equality, Inclusion and Participation 2021-2030*, available at: https://www.mdsocialesa2030.gob.es/derechos-sociales/poblacion-gitana/docs/estrategia_nacional/Estrategia_nacional_21_30/Estrategia_aprob_cm_2_nov_ENGLISH.pdf.

¹³ See 'Sánchez presents the Digital Rights Charter with which "Spain is at the international forefront in protecting citizens' rights"' (Sánchez presenta la Carta de Derechos Digitales, con la que "España se sitúa a la vanguardia internacional en la protección de derechos de la ciudadanía"), [lamoncloa.gob.es](https://www.lamoncloa.gob.es), 14 July 2021, available at:

https://www.lamoncloa.gob.es/lang/en/presidente/news/Paginas/2021/20210714_digital-rights.aspx.

<https://www.lamoncloa.gob.es/presidente/actividades/Paginas/2021/140721-derechos-digitales.aspx>.

¹⁴ Constitutional Court Judgment 31/1984, 7 March 1984.

¹⁵ Constitutional Court Decision 269/1994, October 1994.

¹⁶ Constitutional Court Decision 41/2006, February 2006.

¹⁷ Instrument of Ratification of the European Social Charter (revised) (Instrumento de Ratificación de la Carta Social Europea (revisada), hecha en Estrasburgo el 3 de mayo de 1996), *BOE*, No. 139, 11 June 2021, pp. 71274-71327, available at: [https://www.boe.es/eli/es/ai/1996/05/03/\(2\)](https://www.boe.es/eli/es/ai/1996/05/03/(2)); see the 'Provisional application of the Additional Protocol to the European Social Charter establishing a system of collective complaints, done at Strasbourg on 9 November 1995' published in the Spanish Official State Gazette. This Protocol is provisionally applied by Spain from 1 July 2021, the date of entry into force of the European Social Charter (revised): <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2021/06/28/pdfs/BOE-A-2021-10683.pdf>.

Social Charter establishing a system of collective complaints, done at Strasbourg on 9 November 1995” was published in the Spanish Official State Gazette. This Protocol is provisionally applied by Spain from 1 July 2021, the date of entry into force of the European Social Charter (revised).’

Spanish law has developed the principle of equal treatment in various legal fields, mainly labour and criminal law. The main labour legislation is Royal Legislative Decree 2/2015 of 23 October 2015, approving the consolidated text of the Workers’ Statute, which establishes that discriminatory legislative provisions, clauses of collective agreements, individual agreements and unilateral managerial decisions are considered as null and void, and discriminatory acts by employers are specified as very serious offences. Under the criminal law, racism or xenophobia is an aggravating circumstance in the commission of a crime, and several provisions specify racist offences and consider serious discrimination in employment as an offence. There are also anti-discriminatory measures in the administrative, civil and educational spheres.

The transposition of Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78 was made in Chapter III of Title II of Law 62/2003,¹⁸ on fiscal, administrative and social measures. Articles 27-28 contain a general transposition of the definitions of direct and indirect discrimination, harassment and instructions to discriminate. Law 62/2003 was amended in 2014 in relation to the independent body, the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination.¹⁹ Following Law 62/2003, EU directives have been implemented in various other laws and have influenced policy changes in Spain on anti-discrimination legislation for different grounds and in different fields.

Various other laws are relevant. Royal Legislative Decree 3/2015 of 23 October 2015, approving the consolidated text of the Employment Act, establishes that guaranteeing effective equality of opportunities and non-discrimination is the objective of employment policies. Under this decree, public employment services, collaborating entities and employment agencies that manage labour mediation must specifically ensure that both direct and indirect discrimination in access to employment are avoided. Of note in the area of disability is Royal Legislative Decree (RLD) 1/2013²⁰ of 29 November 2013, approving the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion, which regulates all aspects of disability and replaces the three pieces of disability legislation that were in force up to that date. Law 27/2007 of 23 October 2007 recognises ‘Spanish sign languages’ and regulates ‘speech communication aids for the deaf, hard of hearing and deafblind’. Note that the Spanish title of the law has been translated literally into English.²¹

In the area of religion, we can highlight Organic Law 7/1980²² of 7 July 1980, on Religious Freedom, as well as Laws 24, 25 and 26 of 1992, approving the Agreement of Cooperation between the State and the Federation of Evangelical Religious Entities, the Federation of Israeli Communities and the Islamic Commission of Spain, respectively.

Finally, it is worth mentioning a law adopted by one region (autonomous community) of Spain, namely the Autonomous Community of Catalonia. This is an equality law not related to gender equality, on the basis of which may other regions in Spain have adopted their

¹⁸ Law 62/2003 of 30 December 2003 on Fiscal, Administrative and Social Measures (*Ley 62/2003, de 30 de diciembre, de medidas fiscales, administrativas y de orden social*) Official State Bulletin (*Boletín Oficial del Estado, BOE*), 31 December 2003.

¹⁹ Law 15/2014 of 16 September 2014 on the rationalisation of the public sector and other measures of administrative reform (*Ley 15/2014, de 16 de septiembre, de racionalización del Sector público y otras medidas de reforma administrativa*), *BOE*, 17 September 2014, <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2014/09/17/pdfs/BOE-A-2014-9467.pdf>.

²⁰ Royal Legislative Decree (RLD) 1/2013, General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (*Ley General de derechos de las personas con discapacidad y de su inclusión social*), *BOE*, 3 December 2013.

²¹ See the English translation of the law on the Disability Information Service website (Government of the Region of Castile and León) at: <https://sid.usal.es/docs/F3/LYN11795/LEYLSE.pdf>.

²² Organic Law 7/1980 of 5 July 1980 on Religious Freedom, *BOE*, 24 July 1980.

own laws; rather, it is a generic equality law: Act 19/2020 of 30 December 2020. Applicable exclusively on the territory of Catalonia, it aims to prevent any form of discrimination on the following grounds, set out here in general terms: territorial or national origin; sex or gender; sexual orientation or gender identity and any form of LGBTI phobia or misogyny;²³ age; race or ethnic origin; language or cultural identity; ideology or political opinion; religious convictions; social or economic condition; disability; health problems or illness; physical appearance or clothing, or for any other characteristic of the human condition.

Article 2 establishes that the Act shall apply to all natural and juridical persons in both the public and private sector, located or acting within the territory of Catalonia. Accordingly, within the scope of their powers, the Public Administrations must ensure the right to equal treatment and non-discrimination in a broad range of areas.

3. Main principles and definitions

The Spanish Constitution states that Spaniards are equal before the law and that they may not in any way be discriminated against on account of birth, race, sex, religion, opinion or any other condition or personal or social circumstance (Article 14). Moreover, it enjoins the public authorities to promote conditions that ensure that the freedom and equality of individuals and of the groups that they form are real and effective; to remove obstacles that impede or hamper the fulfilment of such freedom and equality; and to facilitate the participation of all citizens in political, economic, cultural and social life (Article 9). The Spanish Constitutional Court²⁴ has ruled that the principle of equality is not breached by action on the part of the public authorities to counter the disadvantages experienced by certain social groups even when they are given more favourable treatment, as the aim is to give different treatment to effectively different situations.

Prohibition of discrimination on various grounds is addressed in the Spanish legal system, and the grounds of unlawful discrimination specified are a person's origin, including racial or ethnic origin, sex, age, marital status, religion or belief, political opinion, sexual orientation, trade union membership, social status or disability.

National law has implemented the duty to provide reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, both in general terms and specifically in the field of employment.

The Criminal Code²⁵ specifies racial or ethnic motives as aggravating circumstances in various offences and misdemeanours.

Organic Law 7/1980²⁶ of 7 July 1980, on Religious Freedom, proclaims the principle of non-discrimination, establishing that religious beliefs shall not constitute a reason for inequality or discrimination before the law. Religious reasons may not be a ground for preventing anyone from performing any work, activity, responsibility or public office.

Law 62/2003 contains a rather minimal – and sometimes not exactly literal – transposition of Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78, covering all grounds of discrimination. The definitions of both direct and indirect discrimination are included, although in the definition of direct discrimination there is no reference to the situation where a person 'has been or would be treated' less favourably, but only to 'present situations of unfavourable treatment'. Harassment is defined and prohibited. Instructions to discriminate are prohibited but not defined in national law. There are legal measures of protection against victimisation, but

²³ This Catalan law does not define 'LGBTI phobia' or 'misogyny', but it does regulate the definition of biphobia: 'the aversion or discrimination against bisexual people'; of homophobia: 'the aversion or discrimination against homosexual people'; and of transphobia: 'the aversion or discrimination against transsexual people' and transphobia: 'Aversion or discrimination against transgender persons'.

²⁴ Constitutional Court Decision 128/1987, 1 July 1987.

²⁵ Organic Law 10/1995 of 23 November 1995 on the Criminal Code, *BOE*, 24 November 1995, modified by Organic Law 1/2015 of 30 March 2015, *BOE*, 31 March 2015.

²⁶ Organic Law 7/1980 of 5 July 1980 on Religious Freedom, *BOE*, 24 July 1980.

only in the field of employment: Law 62/2003 introduces a modification in the Workers' Statute, annulling employers' decisions which constitute adverse treatment of employees as a reaction to a complaint within the company or to any legal proceedings aimed at enforcing compliance with the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination.

There is no explicit mention in Spanish legislation of 'discrimination by perception' or 'discrimination by assumption'.

In the area of disability, RLD 1/2013²⁷ addresses disability discrimination based on 'association'. For other grounds, discrimination by association may be regarded as implicitly covered by the law, and judicial interpretation might be required.

The exceptions to the principle of equal treatment provided for in Spanish legislation are along the lines of those in Article 4 of Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78. As for churches and organisations with a specific ethos, Organic Law 7/1980 on Religious Freedom sets out the right of registered churches and religious communities to lay down their own organisational rules and internal and staff regulations, which may include clauses on the safeguarding of their religious identity and personality, as well as due respect for their beliefs, without prejudice to the rights and freedoms recognised by the Constitution and in particular those of freedom, equality and non-discrimination. In private organisations with a specific ethos, the exemptions apply at three stages of the employment relationship: access to employment; performance of activities in the organisation; and dismissal because of those activities.

There are no specific national rules about multiple discrimination.

4. Material scope

The material scope of the prohibition of discrimination is of a general nature. All the fields mentioned by Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78 are covered by the general principle of equality laid down in Article 14 of the Spanish Constitution. Besides gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or beliefs, disability, age and sexual orientation, other grounds are expressly mentioned in Spanish laws: marital status; place of origin; social status; political ideas; ideology; affiliation to a trade union; language within the State of Spain; and family ties with other workers in the same enterprise. In some fields, especially employment, discrimination is expressly prohibited by current legislation, in both the public and private sectors.

In fields such as social protection, social benefits, education and access to education, and in relation to the supply of goods and services available to the public, including housing, the applicable regulations do not usually contain explicit anti-discrimination clauses, but they are subject to the general principle stated in the Constitution. Law 62/2003 establishes anti-discrimination measures in these fields, but only for discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin.

5. Enforcing the law

The Spanish Constitution provides that all fundamental rights are protected by the ordinary courts of law. Moreover, appeals for protection in respect of such rights may be lodged at the Constitutional Court once ordinary proceedings have been exhausted. As well as having recourse to administrative proceedings (through the Labour Inspectorate and the Education Inspectorate), the conciliation procedures for civil and social matters, the ordinary courts and the Constitutional Court, victims of discrimination may appeal to the ombudsmen if the issue concerns acts by the public administration.

²⁷ 'Royal Legislative Decree' is equivalent to RLD: it is used in this way on p. 7.

The Spanish Constitution entitles any physical or legal person invoking a legitimate interest to be a party to proceedings relating to the violation of fundamental rights and freedoms. Organisations and trade unions are entitled to act on behalf of (but not in support of) victims of discrimination. This general rule (Law 1/2000²⁸ of 7 January 2000, regulating civil procedure, and Law 29/1998²⁹ of 13 June 1998, regulating administrative jurisdiction) also relates to anti-discrimination legislation: in Law 62/2003 (in cases of discrimination on the ground of racial or ethnic origin and only in fields other than employment); in Law 36/2011 on Social Jurisdiction (on grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or beliefs, disability, age or sexual orientation in the field of employment); and in the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RLD 1/2013) (on the ground of disability in the fields of access to and supply of goods and services and employment).

Law 36/2011³⁰ of 10 October 2011, the Law on Social Jurisdiction, in its regulation of capacity and procedural legitimisation, mentions workers or their legitimate representatives if the former are incompetent or if the claimant is a legal entity. Furthermore, this law provides that trade unions may appear in court for and on behalf of their members who authorise them to do so, in order to defend their individual rights.

The Criminal Code includes racist motives as an aggravating circumstance in any offence and penalises, among other acts, incitement to discriminate, dissemination of abusive material, discrimination in public services and professional or corporate discrimination, along with associations promoting discrimination. Racial discrimination is also penalised in the context of offences against employees.

The Civil Procedure Law (Law 1/2000) regulates the burden of proof in court and shifts the burden of proof in certain cases. In the field of anti-discrimination law, Law 62/2003 establishes the possibility of a shift in the burden of proof on the ground of discrimination by racial or ethnic origin (in all fields) (Article 32), and in the field of employment on the ground of discrimination by racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation (Article 36). The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes a shift in the burden of proof on the ground of disability (Article 77).

Sanctions for discrimination have been established in the field of employment for all grounds and for the ground of disability in all fields. In the field of employment, Law 5/2000³¹ of 4 August 2000, on offences and penalties in social matters, was amended by Law 62/2003. Any unilateral decisions by an employer involving unfavourable direct or indirect discrimination on the grounds of age or disability or unfavourable or adverse treatment relating to remuneration and other working conditions, on the grounds of gender, racial or ethnic origin, civil or social status, religion or belief, political ideas, sexual orientation, membership or non-membership of a trade union, adherence to trade union agreements, family ties with other employees or language within the Spanish State, as well as decisions of the employer entailing unfavourable treatment of workers as a reaction to a complaint within the company or to any legal proceedings aimed at enforcing compliance with the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination, are very serious offences. On the ground of disability, the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes a system of sanctions. Legislation establishes a maximum amount for the fines (EUR 187 515 in the field of employment and EUR 1 million in the field of disability discrimination) but does not establish any ceiling for compensation.

There are generally few rulings on racial discrimination in the courts, which usually treat cases as violations of other types of legal right, such as aggression and damage to

²⁸ Law 1/2000 of 7 January 2000 regulating civil procedure, *BOE*, 8 January 2000.

²⁹ Law 29/1998 of 13 June 1998 regulating administrative jurisdiction, *BOE*, 14 June 1998.

³⁰ Law 26/2011 of 10 October 2011 on Social Jurisdiction, *BOE*, 11 October 2011.

³¹ Law 5/2000 of 4 August 2000 on offences and penalties in social matters, *BOE*, 5 August 2000.

property, without taking account of racist motivation. A further complication is that those concerned do not bring many actions, owing to bureaucracy and to the small number of convictions. However, court actions have been brought on account of discrimination – against Roma, immigrants or black Spaniards – that have attracted a degree of public interest.

Situation testing is not expressly provided for in Spanish law, but it is not forbidden either. It might therefore be used as a form of evidence in discrimination cases. Statistical evidence has been used in some judgments, especially in cases of sex discrimination in the employment field.

The main positive action measures in place on a national level are (1) broad social policy measures (such as positive action for Roma or the use of sign language and speech aid systems for persons with disabilities); (2) quotas for persons with disabilities; and (3) some preferential treatment for persons with disabilities (such as access to special employment centres and occupational centres or a preferential right to geographical mobility).

The directives were transposed in Spain in 2003 with no formal social dialogue, either with the social partners or with NGOs.

6. Equality bodies

Law 62/2003 (amended by Law 15/2014 on the rationalisation of the public sector and other measures of administrative reform) established the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination (Consejo para la eliminación de la discriminación racial o étnica). The council was set up on 28 October 2009 and became operational on that date.

Royal Decree 1262/2007 (modified by RD 1044/2009) regulates the composition, competences and regulations of the Council. The council is attached to the Ministry of Equality, it is a collegiate Spanish governmental body, and its functions include the three functions described in Article 13(2) of Directive 2000/43: providing independent assistance to victims; conducting independent surveys; and making recommendations and publishing independent reports. Since the enactment of Law 15/2014, the Council has formally developed its functions 'with independence'.

The council's make-up is of a fundamentally governmental nature, as the law states that it is to be formed by all the ministries with responsibilities in the areas referred to in Article 3(1) of Directive 2000/43, with the participation of the autonomous regions, the local authorities, the employers' organisations and trade unions, and other organisations representing interests related to the racial or ethnic origin of persons. The council consists of a chair and 28 members: 14 are members of the public administration and 14 are social partners and stakeholders. Seven members represent central Government, all with the rank of director general; seven members come from other tiers of government; four members are drawn from among the social partners; and 10 members represent organisations and associations whose activities are linked to the promotion of equal treatment and non-discrimination on grounds of racial or ethnic origin.

In June 2010, the Council launched the Network of Centres of Assistance for Victims of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination, involving seven major NGOs. In 2013, the contract for the provision of services was signed with the Fundación Secretariado Gitano (FSG). To achieve the best service, FSG has outsourced services with six other organisations that specialise in assisting victims of discrimination: ACCEM, Cruz Roja Española, Fundación CEPAIM, Movimiento contra la Intolerancia, Movimiento por la Paz and Red Acoge. From

October 2018 to October 2019 the network assisted with 756 cases: 479 individual and 277 collective.³²

The Council is not yet well known by the public, and its scope for anti-discrimination action is limited, but the formal recognition of its independence by Law 15/2014 and the launch of the network could improve the understanding of its roles and improve its efficiency.

Currently, in addition to the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination, there are other organisations that can facilitate social dialogue: the National Disability Council (which formalises collaboration between associations of persons with disabilities and national Government; this council started its work in 2005), the National Roma Council (a participatory and advisory body on general and specific public policy affecting the integral development of the Roma population in Spain), the Advisory Commission on Religious Freedom (created in 1980, the commission aims to review, report on and present proposals with respect to issues relating to the enforcement of the law, religious discrimination being one of these issues), and the Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants (a collegiate consultative, informative and advisory body on the integration of immigrants).

7. Key issues

Potential breaches of the directives include the following:

- The provision prohibiting direct discrimination does not provide for past and hypothetical discrimination.
- The words 'hostile' and 'degrading' are not included in the definitions of harassment. Judicial intervention can correct this legislative shortcoming.
- It could be said that the requirement to establish a degree of impairment (of 33 % or greater) in order to be protected from disability discrimination and to claim a reasonable accommodation (under General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion, RLD 1/2013) is a potential breach of Directive 2000/78, as the directive does not specify that certain degrees of impairment must be established in order for persons to be recognised as such.

Other issues of concern are:

- The effectiveness of the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination is questionable, because it is made up primarily of Government representatives. This could jeopardise the independence of the Council.
- The legislation based on the directives is not well known or understood by the main players in the legal system. This is one of the main reasons why there have so far been hardly any proceedings in Spain in which these provisions have been applied.
- Given the legislative dispersal of the norms on (shifting) the burden of proof, the differences in their definitions and the jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court, it would be appropriate to merge the definitions into one legal text.
- Notable progress has been made in the fields of disability and sexual orientation, with highly significant legal innovations. However, this notable legal progress has not been accompanied by actual changes in behaviour in society (there has been an increase in cases recorded by the police during 2021).³³
- The situation of teachers of religion in state schools is difficult to resolve because of the international agreement between the Holy See and Spain signed in 1976.

³² The final figures for 2019 and 2020 are not yet known.

³³ See table based on author's elaboration from statistical yearbooks of the Ministry of Interior (Section 6).

Current best practice in Spain includes:

- Positive actions for Roma (racial or ethnic origin in all fields), that alleviate some of the problems suffered by the Roma population.
- Sign languages and speech aid systems (positive action measures on the ground of disability), a pioneering law in its time that has allowed an extensive use of sign language.
- The National Disability Council (for disability in all fields), in which disability organisations can be heard and defend their interests before the administration.

Integral Laws on the rights of gay and lesbian persons (sexual orientation) in five Spanish regions: Andalusia, the Balearic Islands, Catalonia, the Valencian Community and Navarre). Despite these regional laws, it may be necessary to adopt an equality and non-discrimination law with regard to sexual orientation and gender identity issues.

From 2020, the Government started drafting a law for the equality of LGTBI people and for non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and sexual characteristics. In June 2021, the Spanish Government's Council of Ministers approved the report on the Draft Bill on Full and Effective Equality of Trans People and the Guarantee of the Rights of LGTBI People.³⁴ This report on the draft bill aims to ensure that transgender people are no longer classified legally as ill, as already outlined by the World Health Organization. Demands from the LGTBI community are also accepted, such as allowing the filiation of sons and daughters of couples formed by two women without the need for them to be married (according to current legislation, in the case of unmarried couples made up of two women, the non-pregnant woman cannot register the child in common, except if she adopts it; on the other hand, in the case of unmarried couples formed by two men, this situation does not arise: only with the declaration of the man the filiation of the child is already registered; for this reason, a legal amendment is requested according to which, with the single declaration of the non-pregnant woman, she can already register the child in the registry). In addition, conversion, aversion or counter-conditioning therapies aimed at modifying a person's sexual orientation, sexual identity or gender expression are prohibited, regardless of whether the person has given consent. Finally, the report states that the future law must incorporate positive action measures to favour access to employment for LGTBI people, especially transgender women, as well as other equality measures in the workplace.³⁵

In this area, in November 2021, the Spanish Government approved Order SND/1215/2021, of 5 November, amending Annex III of Royal Decree 1030/2006, of 15 September, which establishes the National Health System's common services portfolio and the procedure for updating it, and Annexes I and II of Royal Decree 1277/2003, of 10 October, which establishes the general bases for authorising health centres, services and establishments.³⁶ According to this legislation, which falls within the competence of the Government and does not need to be adopted by the Spanish Parliament, lesbian women, bisexual and

³⁴ As mentioned in footnote 11 above, the Government is currently in the process of approving a Draft Bill that can be submitted to the Spanish Parliament for approval.

³⁵ See the Spanish Government's press release on the adoption of this report: 'Anteproyecto de ley para la igualdad real y efectiva de las personas trans y para la garantía de los derechos de las personas LGTBI' ('Preliminary bill for the real and effective equality of trans people and for the guarantee of the rights of LGTBI people'), *Lamoncloa.gob.es*, 29 June 2021, available at: <https://www.lamoncloa.gob.es/consejodeministros/Paginas/enlaces/290621-enlace-lgtbi.aspx>.

³⁶ Order SND/1215/2021, of November 5, which modifies Annex III of Royal Decree 1030/2006, of September 15, which establishes the portfolio of common services of the National Health System and the procedure for updating, and annexes I and II of Royal Decree 1277/2003, of October 10, which establishes the general bases on the authorisation of health centres, services and establishments (*Orden SND/1215/2021, de 5 de noviembre, por la que se modifica el anexo III del Real Decreto 1030/2006, de 15 de septiembre, por el que se establece la cartera de servicios comunes del Sistema Nacional de Salud y el procedimiento para su actualización, y los anexos I y II del Real Decreto 1277/2003, de 10 de octubre, por el que se establecen las bases generales sobre autorización de centros, servicios y establecimientos sanitarios*), BOE, 9 November 2021, available at: <https://www.boe.es/eli/es/o/2021/11/05/snd1215>.

transgender people with gestational capacity and women without a partner who want to have children alone will once again (after seven years in which they could not do so) be able to have access to assisted human reproduction techniques in the National Public Health System.³⁷

³⁷ The reference to this legislation is mentioned again in section 12.1, and a specific comment will be made in section 3.2.5 below.

INTRODUCTION

The national legal system

The public administration, as defined in the Spanish Constitution (SC)³⁸ of 1978, is structured on three levels: central Government; autonomous communities (regional Governments); and local authorities. Central Government has a series of exclusive powers (SC, Article 149) that include criminal and procedural law, civil legislation, labour and social security law, the basic structure and coordination of healthcare, the basic structure of education and the basic legal system for public administration. The autonomous communities manage some of these fields, such as health and education, and have the power to adopt legal regulations developing or complementing central Government legislation in some fields. In some of the fields mentioned in Directive 2000/43, such as 'social advantages' (i.e. benefits), and access to and supply of goods and services that are available to the public, including housing, all three tiers of government – central, regional and local – have jurisdiction. Conflicts of power between central Government and the autonomous communities are resolved by the Constitutional Court (SC, Article 161).

International treaties signed by Spain are included in the domestic legal system (SC, Article 96). Spain has ratified practically all the international instruments combating discrimination, including Protocol 12 to the ECHR. These instruments can be relied upon before national courts.

Spain is a non-confessional state: the Spanish Constitution clearly proclaims a separation between church and state. In practice, religions are treated in different ways. Catholicism is the dominant religion, and is expressly mentioned in the Constitution.

List of main legislation transposing and implementing the directives

The main pieces of legislation transposing and implementing the two anti-discrimination directives are the following two laws:

Law 62/2003 of 30 December 2003 on Fiscal, Administrative and Social Measures (*Ley 62/2003, de 30 de diciembre, de medidas fiscales, administrativas y de orden social*)³⁹

Date of adoption: 30 December 2003

Grounds covered: Racial or ethnic origin, religion or beliefs, disability, age, sexual orientation

Material scope: Employment, social protection, social advantages (i.e. benefits), education, access to goods and services

General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013, 29 November 2013) (*Ley General de derechos de las personas con discapacidad y de su inclusión social*)⁴⁰

Date of adoption: 29 November 2013

Ground covered: Disability

Material scope: Equal opportunities, non-discrimination and universal access for persons with disability in all fields (employment, social protection, social advantages, education, access to goods and services)

³⁸ Spanish Constitution (*Constitución Española*), BOE, 29 December 1978, [https://www.boe.es/eli/es/c/1978/12/27/\(1\)/con](https://www.boe.es/eli/es/c/1978/12/27/(1)/con).

³⁹ Law 62/2003 of 30 December 2003 on Fiscal, Administrative and Social Measures (*Ley 62/2003, de 30 de diciembre, de medidas fiscales, administrativas y de orden social*), BOE, 31 December 2003) <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2003/12/31/pdfs/A46874-46992.pdf>.

⁴⁰ RLD 1/2013, General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (*Ley General de derechos de las personas con discapacidad y de su inclusión social*), 29 November 2013 (BOE, 3 December 2013), <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2013/BOE-A-2013-12632-consolidado.pdf>.

1 GENERAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Constitutional provisions on protection against discrimination and the promotion of equality

The Constitution of Spain includes the following articles dealing with non-discrimination:

Article 14: 'Spaniards are equal before the law and may not in any way be discriminated against on the grounds of birth, race, sex, religion, opinion or any other condition or personal or social circumstance'.

Age, disability and sexual orientation are not expressly included in Article 14 of the Constitution, but the Constitutional Court ruled that age (Decision 31/1984, 7 March 1984),⁴¹ disability (Decision 269/1994, October 1994)⁴² and sexual orientation (Decision 41/2006, February 2006)⁴³ are included in the generic phrase 'any other personal or social circumstance'.⁴⁴

Article 16: 'Freedom of ideology, religion and worship of individuals and communities is guaranteed, with no other restriction on their expression than that necessary to maintain public order according to the law'.

Article 23(2): Citizens 'have the right to access on equal terms to public office, in accordance with the requirements determined by law'.

Article 49: 'The public authorities shall carry out a policy of preventive care, treatment, rehabilitation and integration of the physically, sensorially and mentally handicapped by giving them the specialised care they require, and affording them special protection for the enjoyment of the rights granted by this Part to all citizens.'⁴⁵

Article 53 introduces guarantees of fundamental rights and freedoms and also of the principle of equality and non-discrimination.

⁴¹ Constitutional Court Decision 31/1984, 7 March 1984, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/docs/BOE/BOE-T-1984-8175.pdf>.

⁴² Constitutional Court Decision 269/1994, 3 October 1994, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/2786>.

⁴³ Constitutional Court Decision 41/2006, 13 February 2006, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/5643>. (See also Constitutional Court Decisions 92/2014 of 10 June 2014 and 157/2014 of 6 October 2014).

⁴⁴ The doctrine of the Constitutional Court on the principle of equality and the prohibition of discrimination (Article 14 CE) was summarised in Constitutional Court Decision 200/2001, 4 October 2001, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/docs/BOE/BOE-T-2001-20621.pdf>.

⁴⁵ The Spanish Constitution approved in 1978 included Article 49 to protect persons with disabilities, but the last 40 years have caused the constitutional text to 'age' due, among other factors, to the approval of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities of 2006. On 7 December 2018, the Spanish Government adopted a draft text to reform this article of the Constitution to adapt it to the 2006 convention. The wording proposed by the Government for Article 49 is based on the work carried out in the commission for comprehensive disability policies of the Congress of Deputies. Furthermore, the Spanish Committee of Representatives of Persons with Disabilities, which had been demanding this change of orientation in the constitutional text for several years, participated in the drafting (the draft amendment is still pending).

In the Government draft, Article 49 of the Spanish Constitution is worded as follows:

1. 'Persons with disabilities are holders of the rights and duties set forth in this Title in conditions of real and effective freedom and equality, without discrimination.'
2. The public authorities shall carry out the necessary policies to guarantee full personal autonomy and social inclusion of persons with disabilities. These policies will respect their freedom of choice and preferences and will be adopted with the participation of organisations representing persons with disabilities. The specific needs of women and girls with disabilities will be particularly addressed.
3. The reinforced protection of persons with disabilities will be regulated for the full exercise of their rights and duties.
4. Persons with disabilities enjoy the protection provided in international agreements that ensure their rights.'

Article 9 provides a positive obligation on the part of public authorities to promote equality, since they have to 'promote conditions that ensure that the freedom and equality of individuals and of the groups that they form are real and effective; to remove obstacles that impede or hamper the fulfilment of such freedom and equality; and to facilitate the participation of all citizens in political, economic, cultural and social life'. This article views positive action and measures promoting equality not as exceptions to the principle of equality but rather as constitutionally legitimate ways to implement equality.

The Constitutional Court⁴⁶ has ruled that the principle of equality is not breached by action on the part of the public authorities to counter the disadvantages experienced by certain social groups 'even when they are given more favourable treatment, for the aim is to give different treatment to effectively different situations'.

Article 10(2) recognises the role of the international treaties on human rights in construing domestic provisions: 'provisions relating to fundamental rights and freedoms recognised by the Constitution shall be interpreted pursuant to the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the international treaties and agreements ratified by Spain'.⁴⁷

These provisions apply to all areas covered by the directives. Their material scope is broader than those of the directives.

These provisions are directly applicable.

These provisions can be enforced against private individuals (as well as against the state).

⁴⁶ Constitutional Court Decision 128/1987, 1 July 1987, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/860>.

⁴⁷ For example, Constitutional Court Decision 41/2006 on sexual orientation discrimination cites international law such as the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (Article 14), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Article 26) and numerous examples of international jurisprudence.

2 THE DEFINITION OF DISCRIMINATION

2.1 Grounds of unlawful discrimination explicitly covered

The following grounds of discrimination are explicitly prohibited in the main legislation transposing the two EU anti-discrimination directives (as listed in the Introduction):

- racial or ethnic origin;
- religion or belief;
- disability;
- age;
- sexual orientation.

2.1.1 Definition of the grounds of unlawful discrimination within the directives

a) Racial or ethnic origin

National law on discrimination (in particular, the Workers' Statute and the Criminal Code) does not define the terms 'racial origin' or 'ethnic origin'.

Neither of the two decisions of the Constitutional Court (STC 13/2001⁴⁸ and STC 69/2007)⁴⁹ which have addressed the issue of racial or ethnic origin provides a definition of 'racial origin' or 'ethnic origin'. The Court refers to 'Romani ethnic origin' (*étnia gitana*) but without defining traits that might characterise it.

b) Religion or belief

Religion is not defined in Spanish legislation. There is, however, a *negative* definition of religion. In other words, legislators have specified only what religion is not, not what it is. Article 3(2) of the Organic Law on Religious Freedom⁵⁰ states that 'activities, intentions and entities relating to or engaging in the study of and experimentation on psychic or parapsychological phenomena or the dissemination of humanistic or spiritual values or other similar non-religious aims do not qualify for the protection provided in this Act'.

The Directorate General for Religious Affairs, under the authority of the Ministry of Justice, used a definition of 'religious organisation': in order for a group or organisation to be properly described as religious, the following prerequisites must be met: (1) belief in the existence of a higher being, transcendent or otherwise, with whom communication is possible; (2) belief in a body of doctrine (dogma) and rules of behaviour (moral rules), somehow derived from this higher being; (3) ritual practice, whether individual or collective (worship), constituting the adherents' institutional means of communication with the higher being.

Consequently, for a long time the practice of the Directorate was to refuse to register religious denominations on the Register of Religious Entities on the ground of these denominations' lack of religious aims. Based on this criterion, the Directorate denied the registration of the Unification Church (Iglesia de la Unificación) in the register of religious organisations, because the Unification Church lacked a true religious nature, and was beyond the scope of protection under the Law on Religious Freedom (according to Article 3(2)). The Unification Church challenged the resolution of the Director-General for Religious Affairs of 22 December 1992 and the judgments of the National Court (Audiencia

⁴⁸ Constitutional Court Decision 13/2001, 29 January 2001, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/4309>.

⁴⁹ Constitutional Court Decision 69/2007, 16 April 2007, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/6036>.

⁵⁰ Organic Law 7/1980, the Organic Law on Religious Freedom (*Ley Orgánica de Libertad religiosa*), BOE, 6 July 1980, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/1980/07/24/pdfs/A16804-16805.pdf>.

Nacional) (30 September 1992) and of the Supreme Court (14 June 1996), refusing to include this church in the register.

However, the situation has changed since Constitutional Court Decision 46/2001.⁵¹ The Court asserted that the administrative resolution violated the right to collective religious freedom because the state, in the activity of registration, can only check that the entity is not excluded by Article 3(2) of the Organic Law on Religious Freedom. Following this Decision, the Government cannot judge the religious character of entities wishing to join the register, and must confine itself to verifying that, in view of their statutes, goals and aims, these entities are not excluded by Article 3(2).

Article 3(2) of the Law on Religious Freedom allows 'sects' to be excluded from the Register of Religious Associations. Registration on the register is voluntary for religious organisations, but it gives them a religious legal personality, which gives their places of worship the right of inviolability and provides some tax benefits. Religious freedom is protected regardless of whether a religious organisation is inscribed on the register. There is no special legislation or specific register for sects.

c) Disability

In Article 4, the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013), which prohibits disability discrimination, provides that they 'Are persons with disabilities who have physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which, in interaction with various barriers, may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others (Article 4(1)) ... For the purposes of this law, persons with a disability shall be deemed to be those with a recognised degree of impairment equal to or greater than 33 %'. In any event, those (under the general system) with a recognised entitlement to social security pensions for permanent disability rated as total, absolute or severe 'shall be deemed to be affected by an impairment equal to or greater than 33 % ... with a recognised entitlement to a retirement pension or a pension for retirement due to permanent incapacity' (Article 4(2)). This provision affects the existing material scope of the law on the social integration of persons with disabilities and covers social benefits, social security, education, work and housing, and access to goods and services.

This definition has two parts, with very different orientations and implications. The first part (Article 4(1)), inspired by the CRPD, is based on the social model of disability and is coherent with the concept of 'disability' established by the Court of Justice of the European Union in joined cases C-335/11 and C-337/11.⁵² The second part (Article 4(2)) retains the medical perspective of disability and has an administrative utility: individuals need to have this degree of impairment in order to claim some rights. It could be said that the need to establish a degree of impairment (of 33 % or greater and which has been officially assessed as such) is potentially in breach of Directive 2000/78, as the directive does not specify that certain degrees of impairment must be established for a person to be recognised as having a disability (see CJEU joined cases C-335/11 and C-337/11).

The jurisprudence, which was well established in Spain, did not accept that an incapacity for work could be considered as a disability (and, therefore, dismissal could not be considered null because it did not amount to discrimination by disability). For that reason, a Spanish judge decided to submit a preliminary ruling before the CJEU. Among other questions, the judge raised the interpretation of the concept of disability in

⁵¹ Constitutional Court Decision 46/2001, 15 February 2001, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/4342>.

⁵² Judgment of 6 December 2012, joined cases of *HK Denmark (Ring)*, C-335/11 HK, and *HK Denmark (Skouboe Werge)*, C-337/11, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A62011CA0335>.

Directive 2000/78/EC. On 1 December 2016, the CJEU delivered its decision on the *Daoudi* case (C-395/15).⁵³

In the synthesis of the answer to the question of the Spanish judge, the Court established 'that Directive 2000/78 must be interpreted as meaning that:

- the fact that the person concerned finds himself or herself in a situation of temporary incapacity for work for an indeterminate amount of time, as the result of an accident at work, does not mean, in itself, that the limitation of that person's capacity can be classified as being 'long-term', within the meaning of the definition of 'disability' laid down by that directive;
- the evidence which makes it possible to find that such a limitation is 'long-term' includes the fact that the incapacity of the person concerned does not display a clearly defined prognosis as regards short-term progress or the fact that that incapacity is likely to be significantly prolonged before that person has recovered; and
- in the context of the verification of that 'long-term' nature, the referring court must base its decision on all of the objective evidence in its possession' (Paragraph 59).

Regarding the sentence that the Spanish judge should issue, the CJEU clarifies three questions. First, the Court noted that it is necessary to determine whether the claimant's limitation is 'long-term'. Second, the 'long-term' nature of the limitation must be assessed in relation to the claimant's condition of incapacity at the time of the allegedly discriminatory act. Finally, if the limitation is found to be 'long-term' the Court recalled that unfavourable treatment on grounds of disability undermines the protection provided for by the directive only in so far as it constitutes discrimination within the meaning of Article 2(1).

After the decision of the CJEU, Social Court No. 33 of Barcelona issued a decision on 23 December 2016 (case 1219/2014) and declared the claimant's dismissal null and void for discrimination on the ground of disability. The judge ruled that, at the time of the allegedly discriminatory act, the claimant's incapacity did not display a clearly defined prognosis as regards short-term progress and thus constituted a long-term limitation. Therefore, his 'temporal incapacity' must be regarded as a disability. The judge further considered that the claimant's dismissal had occurred due to his condition as a person with disability and, therefore, must be declared null by discrimination: 'The dismissal of the injured worker, almost two months after the accident, when he was still on sick leave and had reported that his reinstatement would not be in the short term, constitutes direct discrimination on the grounds of disability' (Para. XI.10).

In 2016, Social Court No. 1 of Cuenca referred another issue to the CJEU concerning the interpretation of the concept of disability in Directive 2000/78. Under Spanish legislation (Workers' Statute, Article 52(d)), an employer is entitled to dismiss an employee on objective grounds for intermittent absences from work, even if justified, if this amounts to 20 % of the employee's working hours in two consecutive months or 25 % of their working hours over four non-consecutive months within a 12-month period. Given that workers with disabilities are more likely to have work absences, the judge asked the CJEU whether the Spanish legislation was in line with the provisions of Directive 2000/78. On 18 January 2018 the CJEU passed judgment,⁵⁴ declaring that Article 2(2)(b)(i) of

⁵³ Judgment of 1 December 2016, *Daoudi*, C-395/15, <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&num=C-395/15>.

⁵⁴ Judgment of 18 January 2018, *Ruiz Conejero v. Ferroser*, C-270/16, <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&num=C-270/16> (Prior to this judgment, there had been two very important previous judgments on the concept of disability (the CJEU judgment of 11 July 2006 (C-13/05, *Chacón Navas v. Eurest*), and that of 11 April 2013 (C 335/11 and C 337/11, *Ring v. Dansk & Werge v. Dansk*). Compared to these earlier judgments, what is important in the judgment under discussion (18 January 2018) is that, as we will see in the text, it assesses whether the dismissal of a worker is discriminatory on the grounds of disability because of the reiteration in the number of short-term absences from work, i.e. 'intermittent absences' or 'intermittent short-term absences' from work).

Directive 2000/78 (indirect discrimination) 'must be interpreted as precluding national legislation under which an employer may dismiss a worker on the grounds of his intermittent absences from work, even if justified, in a situation where those absences are the consequence of sickness attributable to a disability suffered by that worker, unless that legislation, while pursuing the legitimate aim of combating absenteeism, does not go beyond what is necessary in order to achieve that aim, which is a matter for the referring court to assess'.

On 7 March 2018, Social Court No. 1 of Cuenca ruled in Decision 171/2018 that the dismissal of the worker was null and void because there had been 'indirect discrimination' by disability. The ruling of the Cuenca court cites both Directive 2000/78 and CJEU judgment C-270/16.

In 2018, Social Court No. 3 of Barcelona referred another issue to the CJEU about whether the concept of 'workers particularly susceptible to certain risks' (under Article 25 of Law 31/1995, 8 November, on the Prevention of Occupational Risks) is equivalent to the concept of 'disability' within the meaning of Directive 2000/78, as interpreted by the Court. The purpose of Law 31/1995 is to protect the safety and health of workers at work; in this respect, it should be mentioned that Article 25 of Law 31/1995 contains a specific provision for the protection of 'workers especially sensitive to certain risk': these people who are 'especially sensitive' are those workers who 'because of their personal characteristics or known biological state, including those who have a recognised condition of physical, psychical or sensorial disability, are especially sensitive to the risks derived from work.' To this end, 'the employer shall take into account those aspects on assessing the risks and, accordingly, shall take the necessary preventive and protective measures.' The summary of the facts is as follows: a female worker was classified as particularly 'sensitive to risks' (Article 25 of Law 31/1995) in her company and, consequently, the company had to adopt specific occupational risk prevention measures for her; in any case, the worker was dismissed for objective reasons as, due to her condition, she was unable to carry out the work; the Spanish judge who heard the case referred a question to the Court of Justice of the European Union for a preliminary ruling on whether these workers 'sensitive to occupational risks' could be classified as 'persons with disabilities', as in that case discrimination could have occurred.

In its 2019 judgment on Case C-397/18, *D.W. v. Nobel Plásticos Ibérica SA*,⁵⁵ the CJEU ruled that 'Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation must be interpreted as meaning that the state of health of a worker categorised as being particularly susceptible to occupational risks, within the meaning of national law, which prevents that worker from carrying out certain jobs on the ground that such jobs would entail a risk to his or her own health or to other persons, only falls within the concept of 'disability', within the meaning of that directive, where that state leads to a limitation of capacity arising from, *inter alia*, "long-term" physical, mental or psychological impairments which, in interaction with various barriers, may hinder the full and effective participation of the person concerned in their professional life on an equal basis with other workers. It is for the national court to determine whether those conditions are satisfied in the main proceedings.'

Regarding the criteria on the objective dismissal established by the company and applied in the dismissal of D.W., the CJEU indicated in its judgment that this could constitute indirect discrimination if the company has not established a reasonable accommodation for the worker: 'Article 2(2)(b)(ii) of Directive 2000/78 must be interpreted as meaning that dismissal for 'objective reasons' of a worker with disability on the ground that he or she meets the selection criteria taken into account by the employer to determine the persons to be dismissed, namely having productivity below a given rate, a low level of multi-skilling

⁵⁵ Judgment of 11 September 2019, *D.W. v. Nobel Plásticos Ibérica SA*, C-397/18, <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=217624&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=lst&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=501000>.

in the undertaking's posts and a high rate of absenteeism, constitutes indirect discrimination on grounds of disability within the meaning of that provision, unless the employer has beforehand provided that worker with reasonable accommodation, within the meaning of Article 5 of that directive, in order to guarantee compliance with the principle of equal treatment in relation to persons with disabilities, which it is for the national court to determine.'

Subsequently, the judgment issued by Labour Court No.3 of Barcelona of 19 November 2019 found that the worker was 'particularly sensitive to risks' in the workplace⁵⁶ regardless of the corrective measures that could be taken to adapt the work to his/her health condition, confirming that 'he/she was a person with a disability' (as explained above, the Spanish judge had addressed the European Court for a preliminary ruling on whether these workers sensitive to occupational risks could be classified as persons with disabilities.

It was found that the company had not taken sufficient measures to adapt the workplace to the worker. As a result, the judgment ruled that there had been 'indirect discrimination on the grounds of disability' by taking the worker's absenteeism as a criterion for dismissal (a person with disability is more exposed to the risk of having a high rate of absenteeism than a worker without a disability, given that he/she incurs the additional risk of taking sick leave due to an illness related to his/her disability). The judgment ruled that the company's decision was null and void; ordered the reinstatement of the worker; and established a EUR 25 000 compensation payment.

d) Age

The national law on discrimination does not define the term 'age', and neither does the Workers' Statute or the Criminal Code. The courts do not give a definition of 'age'. However, 'age' is commonly understood to mean the number of years attained by an individual, and 'age discrimination' to mean discrimination on the ground of young age or older age.⁵⁷

e) Sexual orientation

The national law on discrimination does not define the term 'sexual orientation', and neither does the Workers' Statute or the Criminal Code. Constitutional Court Decision STC 41/2006, in *PC v. Alitalia Italian Airlines*,⁵⁸ recognises that 'sexual orientation' is a protected ground under Article 14 of the Spanish Constitution. However, the Constitutional Court does not define 'sexual orientation'.

2.1.2 Multiple discrimination

In Spain, multiple discrimination is not explicitly prohibited by law.

However, Organic Law 3/2007 on the Effective Equality of Women and Men⁵⁹ contains the first reference to multiple discrimination in Spanish law. Article 20 provides that 'the public authorities shall, in the preparation of studies and statistics, devise and introduce the

⁵⁶ See on p. 32 the definition of 'workers especially sensitive to certain risk' on the basis of Article 25 of Law 31/1995. As explained there, the purpose of this Law is to protect the safety and health of workers at work.

⁵⁷ For example, Constitutional Court, Decision 66/2015 of 13 April 2015, which accepts that the criterion of being aged over 55 is used as a criterion for the selection of workers affected by a collective dismissal and that this does not constitute age discrimination because of the rigorous demands of justification and proportionality, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/24413>.

⁵⁸ Constitutional Court, Decision 41/2006, 13 February 2006, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/5643>.

⁵⁹ Organic Law 3/2007 of 22 March 2007 for the effective equality of women and men (*Ley Orgánica 3/2007, de 22 de marzo, para la igualdad efectiva de mujeres y hombres*), BOE, 23 March 2007, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2007/BOE-A-2007-6115-consolidado.pdf>.

necessary mechanisms and indicators to show the incidence of other variables whose recurrence generates situations of multiple discrimination in the various spheres of action.’

Turning to case law, Constitutional Court Decision 3/2018 of 22 January 2018⁶⁰ concerned multiple discrimination. A.R.S. was a 67-year-old man with a severe chronic psychosocial disability. He submitted a request to the Community of Madrid to recognise his disability and grant him a place in a specialist residence for persons with psychosocial disabilities. The Government of the Autonomous Community of Madrid recognised the disability as requested, but denied A.R.S. a place in the residence for one particular reason: at 67, he was too old, as the maximum age established in Order 1363/1997, which regulates residences for persons with psychological disability in the Community of Madrid, was 60 years. Order 1363/1997 sets out the requirement ‘to have an age ... between eighteen and sixty years’ in order to access such residences. The rule does not include any exceptions, and no justification for this age exclusion rule is provided, nor has any explanation been provided for the Community of Madrid’s denial of the request made by A.R.S.

The Constitutional Court noted in its decision that the appellant has suffered multiple discrimination. First, this was because of his disability: as a result of the application of the regulation, the appellant lost the right to the medical care he needed for his psychosocial disability. In addition, the identification of an age criterion, which is based on a personal circumstance, imposes a further cause of discrimination in addition to the original one. According to the Constitutional Court, there was therefore multiple discrimination, due to disability and age. The Court consequently declared ‘that his fundamental right to not be discriminated against has been violated on the ground of age and disability,’ and it ordered the Community of Madrid to review the application of A.R.S. for a place in the specialist residence and to ‘issue a new resolution respecting the declared fundamental right’.

2.1.3 Assumed and associated discrimination

a) Discrimination by assumption

In Spain, discrimination based on a perception or assumption of a person’s characteristics, is not explicitly prohibited in national law.

Workers’ Statute, Article 28 of Law 62/2003 (transposing Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78) and the Criminal Code speak only of personal characteristics and not of ‘assumed characteristics’. However, discrimination on the ground of ‘assumed characteristics’ may be regarded as implicitly included in these laws.

b) Discrimination by association

In Spain, discrimination based on association with persons with particular characteristics, is prohibited in national law, but only in the field of disability.

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) formally introduced into Spanish legislation the concept of discrimination by association in the field of disability. RLD 1/2013 defines discrimination by association (Article 2(e)): ‘Discrimination by association exists when a person or group to which they belong is subjected to discriminatory treatment due to their relationship with another by reason of disability’. Article 63 of RLD 1/2013 notes that the principle of equal opportunities for persons with disabilities is infringed when ‘direct or indirect discrimination, discrimination by association’, etc. occur.

⁶⁰ Constitutional Court, Decision 3/2018, 22 January 2018, <https://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/docs/BOE/BOE-A-2018-2459.pdf>.

Although not explicitly covered by anti-discrimination legislation (except for disability), this principle may be assumed to be implicitly covered by Law 62/2003 (Article 28). However, this is a matter to be decided on by judges, considering the CJEU judgment in *Coleman v. Attridge Law and Steve Law*.⁶¹

2.2 Direct discrimination (Article 2(2)(a))

a) Prohibition and definition of direct discrimination

In Spain, direct discrimination is prohibited in national law. It is defined. However, the prohibition is not in full compliance with the directives, because it does not explicitly provide for past and hypothetical comparisons.

Law 62/2003 on Fiscal, Administrative and Social Measures (Article 28(1)(b)) defines direct discrimination as 'where a person is treated less favourably than another in a comparable situation on grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation'.

The expression 'has been or would be treated' (Directive 2000/43 and Directive 2000/78, Article 2(2)(a)) is not included in the Spanish definitions of direct discrimination.

Article 2(c) of the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) states that direct discrimination 'shall be taken to occur where a person is treated less favourably than another in a comparable situation on the grounds of his or her disability'.

b) Justification for direct discrimination

The law does not permit justification of direct discrimination generally, or in relation to particular grounds (excluding specific exceptions stipulated by the directives, for which see Chapter 4).

2.3 Indirect discrimination (Article 2(2)(b))

a) Prohibition and definition of indirect discrimination

In Spain, indirect discrimination is prohibited in national law. It is defined. However, the prohibition is not in full compliance with the directives.

Law 62/2003 defines indirect discrimination as 'where a legal or administrative provision, a clause of a collective agreement or contract, an individual agreement or a unilateral decision, although apparently neutral, would put a person of a certain racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation at a particular disadvantage in relation to others, provided that such provision is not objectively justified by a legitimate aim and the means of achieving that aim are appropriate and necessary' (Article 28(1)(c)).

In the field of disability, the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) also defines indirect discrimination: 'where a legal or administrative provision, a clause of a collective agreement or contract, an individual agreement or a unilateral decision, or a criterion or practice, or an environment, product or service, though apparently neutral, may put a person at a particular disadvantage in relation to others owing to a disability, provided that such provision is not objectively justified by a legitimate aim and means of achieving that aim, are not appropriate and necessary' (Article 2(d)).

⁶¹ Judgment of 17 July 2008, *Coleman v. Attridge Law and Steve Law*, C-303/06, <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&num=C-303/06>.

There are two differences in relation to Article 2(2)(b) of Directive 2000/43 (also included in Directive 2000/78). The first is that the directive refers to a 'provision, criterion or practice', whereas the Spanish law transposing the directives (62/2003) refers to a 'legal or administrative provision, a clause of a collective agreement or contract, an individual agreement or a unilateral decision'. All these situations are referred to as 'provision', and the words 'criterion or practice' are not included. The second difference is that the directive says 'persons' in the plural, whereas the Spanish transposition says 'person' in the singular. This use of the singular generates a certain ambiguity in both Law 62/2003 and RLD 1/2013 as to whether a group of persons is covered as such. These differences in the literalness of the transposition of the directives have no practical legal consequences since the jurisprudence interprets indirect discrimination in the same sense as the European directives.⁶² This need for ordinary courts to take into account EU law when applying Spanish rules has been reiterated by the Constitutional Court (STC 64/1991 of 22 March 1991; 58/2004 of 19 April 2004 and 329/2005 of 15 December 2005).

In 2015, a worker with disability, Ruiz Conejero, was dismissed by his employer following several periods of sickness absence from work. The Spanish Workers' Statute (Article 52(d)), which concerns termination of the contract on objective grounds, provides that the labour contract may be terminated 'for absences from work, albeit justified but intermittent, that amount to 20 % of working hours in two consecutive months provided that total absences in the previous 12 months amount to 5 % of working hours, or 25 % of working hours in four non-continuous months within a 12-month period'. Social Court No. 1, Cuenca (Juzgado de lo Social No. 1 de Cuenca), decided to submit a preliminary ruling to the CJEU. The question was:

'Does Directive 2000/78 preclude the application of a provision of national law under which an employer is entitled to dismiss an employee on objective grounds for intermittent absences from work, even if justified, which amount to 20 % of the employee's working hours in two consecutive months, provided that the total absences in the previous 12 months amount to 5 % of working hours or 25 % of working hours in four non-consecutive months within a 12-month period, in the case of an employee who must be treated as a person with disability within the meaning of the directive when his absence from work was caused by his disability?'

Social Court No. 1 of Cuenca said that workers with disabilities are more exposed to the risk of being dismissed under Article 52(d) of the Workers' Statute than other workers, whether the employer has knowledge of the disability or not. There is a difference in treatment involving indirect discrimination based on disability within the meaning of Article 2(2)(b) of Directive 2000/78 and that difference in treatment cannot be objectively justified by a legitimate aim (unlike the interpretation given by the CJEU in cases C-335/11 and C-337/11, *HK Danmark*, in 2013, where the Danish legislation formed part of a policy for the integration of workers with disabilities). The referring court therefore considers that Article 52(d) of the Spanish Workers' Statute is contrary to Directive 2000/78 and that this provision should, therefore, be amended in order to take account of disabilities.

The CJEU's Judgment C-270/16 of 18 January 2018 in the case of *Ruiz Conejero v. Ferroser*⁶³ answered the question raised by Social Court No. 1 of Cuenca and upheld the approach of the Spanish judge. The Court (Third Chamber) established:

⁶² See, for example, Constitutional Court, Decision 61/2013, 14 March 2013, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/docs/BOE/BOE-A-2013-3797.pdf>.

⁶³ See <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&num=C-270/16> (prior to this judgment of 18 January 2018, there had been two very important previous judgments on the concept of disability (the CJEU judgment of 11 July 2006 (C-13/05, *Chacón Navas v. Eurest*), and that of 11 April 2013 (C 335/11 and C 337/11, *Ring and Skouboe Werge*). Its conclusions are dealt with in the text. Compared to these earlier judgments, what is important in the judgment under discussion, of 18 January 2018, is that it assesses whether the dismissal of a worker is discriminatory on the grounds of disability because of the reiteration in the number of short-term absences from work, i.e. intermittent short-term absences from work.)

'Article 2(2)(b)(i) of Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation must be interpreted as precluding national legislation under which an employer may dismiss a worker on the grounds of his intermittent absences from work, even if justified, in a situation where those absences are the consequence of sickness attributable to a disability suffered by that worker, unless that legislation, while pursuing the legitimate aim of combating absenteeism, does not go beyond what is necessary in order to achieve that aim, which is a matter for the referring court to assess.'

On 7 March 2018, after the CJEU's decision, Social Court No. 1 of Cuenca issued a judgment (case 171/2018) and declared the claimant's dismissal null and void for discrimination on the ground of disability. The judge considers that, in this case, there is indirect discrimination against the claimant, as an apparently neutral business decision -such as the use of the Article 52(d) of the Workers' Statute that allows the dismissal of a worker due to absences from work- causes a situation of particular disadvantage to a person with disability with respect to other workers, because the absences from work are due to illnesses derived from his officially recognised disability. The fundamental argumentation of the judge is that the labour absences that have caused the dismissal of the claimant have occurred, 'exclusively and precisely, for diseases attributable to his disability', even if the employer was not aware of it⁶⁴.

In addition, the Spanish judge, following the judgment of the CJEU, 'considers that there is an evident collision between the Spanish norm and the EU norm, and that, unlike the Danish case, there is no legislative integration element or objective, so a response from the Spanish legislator would be necessary to include in national law ... and, specifically, in Article 52(d)) of the Workers' Statute ... the exception of its application, for the purposes of computing the days of absences from work, to workers who have a recognised disability status, when said temporary disability processes derive from or are linked to the diseases causing the recognition of their disability.'⁶⁵

b) Justification test for indirect discrimination

Law 62/2003 (neither RLD 1/2013) does not specify how indirect discrimination is to be justified. The general provision in Article 2(2)(b) includes the phrase: 'unless [the indirect discrimination] is objectively justified by a legitimate aim and the means of achieving that aim are appropriate and necessary'. The courts must analyse whether the measure is appropriate and necessary to pursue a legitimate aim and whether there is any case law on this issue. In most cases of indirect discrimination, statistics are used as circumstantial evidence.

⁶⁴ This judgment of the Social Court No. 1 of Cuenca was confirmed by the (regional) High Court of Justice of Castilla-La Mancha of 10 April 2019: the dismissal of the worker had been discriminatory because of her disability following the parameters of the CJEU judgment of 18 January 2018. However, this judgment of 10 April 2019 was appealed before the Spanish Supreme Court, which on 22 March 2022 confirmed the interpretation of the discriminatory dismissal in line with the Directive (this judgment was published after the cut-off date for this report).

⁶⁵ As a result of this process, the Spanish Government approved Royal Decree-Law 4/2020 of 18 February 2020 (BOE, 19 February 2020), which repeals the provisions on objective dismissal due to absences from work established in Article 52(d) of the Workers' Statute, approved by Royal Legislative Decree 2/2015 of 23 October 2015. Royal Decree-Law 4/2020 entered into force on 21 February 2020. In the explanatory statement on the Decree-Law, the Government relies on both Directive 2000/78/EC and the CJEU ruling in *Ruiz Conejero*. The Spanish Government points out that this legal reform 'guarantees compliance with the regulations of the European Union and, specifically, of Council Directive 2000/78/EC thus complying with the principle of primacy of European law. In addition, it ensures the adequate and immediate transfer to the Spanish legal system of what is established by the CJEU in its Judgment of 18 January 2018, which admits only on an exceptional, limited and conditioned basis the application of Article 52(d) of the Workers' Statute and subject to a specific analysis of adequacy and proportionality', <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2020/02/19/pdfs/BOE-A-2020-2381.pdf>.

2.3.1 Statistical evidence

a) Legal framework

In Spain, there is legislation regulating the collection of personal data. Since 25 May 2018, the European Regulation on Data Protection (Regulation (EU) 2016/679) has been directly applicable. Subsequently, in December 2018, Organic Law 3/2018 of 5 December 2018, on the Protection of Personal Data and the Guarantee of Digital Rights, was passed.

According to these rules, age and disability are treated very differently from ethnic or racial origin, religion or belief or sexual orientation. Article 9(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 provides that 'Processing of personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person's sex life or sexual orientation shall be prohibited'. Spanish legislation provides that this prohibition cannot be lifted by the data subject. Article 9 of Organic Law 3/2018 on the Protection of Personal Data⁶⁶ establish that 'for the purposes of Article 9(2)(a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, in order to avoid discriminatory situations, the consent of the affected party alone will not suffice to lift the prohibition of the processing of data whose main purpose is to identify their ideology, union affiliation, religion, sexual orientation, belief or racial or ethnic origin'.

As a result, employers may not gather data on the ethnic or racial origin, religion or belief or sexual orientation of their workers. However, there are some exceptions to this general rule, such as those arising from Article 4(2) of Directive 2000/78 for 'churches and other public or private organisations the ethos of which is based on religion or belief'. But these exceptions are only for positions linked to spreading the religious ethos, and not for positions of purely technical expertise or restricted to the pure transmission of (neutral) knowledge in religious schools (see section 4.2, below).

In March 2011,⁶⁷ the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) reiterated its recommendation to Spain 'on the collection of statistical information on the ethnic and racial composition of its population and urges it to conduct a census of their population', to include information on people's ethnic and racial origin. In its last report in 2016,⁶⁸ the CERD noted the progress in gathering statistical data and information on racist and xenophobic incidents in previous years, although deficiencies remain.

The situation is different in the field of disability. Spanish laws not only allow, but also encourage the keeping of records inasmuch as employers (and those in other social fields, such as education) must gather such data about their workforce if they wish to benefit from the various measures for promoting job creation under which persons with disabilities are specially protected.

Data relating to age may be collected with no legal impediments. Such data are compiled from Government files, which is secondary data, or from surveys, which is primary data. Some of the data that provide statistical evidence of social inequality in various fields are

⁶⁶ Organic Law 3/2018 of 5 December 2018 on the Protection of Personal Data and the Guarantee of Digital Rights (*Ley Orgánica 3/2018, de 5 de diciembre, de Protección de Datos Personales y garantía de los derechos digitales*), BOE, 6 December 2018, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2018/BOE-A-2018-16673-consolidado.pdf>.

⁶⁷ UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) (2011), CERD/C/ESP/CO/18-20 (Paragraph 8), http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD/C/ESP/CO/18-20&Lang=En.

⁶⁸ UN CERD (2016), CERD/C/ESP/CO/21-23 (Paragraphs 4 and 6), http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CERD%2FC%2FESP%2F21-23&Lang=en.

used as evidence to justify positive action, but they have never been used in the courts to make a case of possible indirect discrimination.

In Spain, statistical evidence may be admitted under national law in order to establish indirect discrimination.

Although this is not expressly provided for in law, complainants have a right to require or request that respondents provide data that may be necessary for them to determine whether there has been a prima facie case of discrimination.

b) Practice

In Spain, statistical evidence is used in practice in order to establish indirect discrimination. It is not very common, but it is spreading in the Spanish courts. In the civil and administrative fields (the spheres of application of Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78) there are no agencies or authorities that can conduct formal investigations. In criminal cases, the Public Prosecution Service can conduct all investigations that are deemed necessary. Statistical evidence has been used in some judgments, especially in cases of sex discrimination in the employment field, and there is no reluctance to use statistical data as evidence in court.

Constitutional Court Decision 240/1999⁶⁹ used statistical evidence to qualify the failure to grant maternity leave to a female doctor working in Castilla y León as sex discrimination. According to the judgment, the fact that those permissions are granted only to public service doctors and not to temporary doctors can be considered discriminatory, because the former group are almost exclusively men and the latter group are generally women. The ruling upheld the use of situation testing.

As regards access to employment, Decision 1161/2005 of the Superior Court of Cantabria of 14 November 2005 notes the existence of indirect sex discrimination in the selection process of a chemical company. The court concluded that the selection criteria used by the company (regarding the holders of a vocational qualification in a technical branch) generated an adverse impact on women, because they are underrepresented in this field. The court considered a report from expert advisors to be acceptable as evidence and cited the example of reports by the Institute for Women (as this public body was known at the time).

The evolution of the situation in other countries and the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the European Union have played an important role in the presentation of data collection in the Spanish courts.

2.4 Harassment (Article 2(3))

a) Prohibition and definition of harassment

In Spain, harassment is prohibited in national law. It is defined.

Law 62/2003 (Article 28(1)(d)) defines harassment as 'all unwanted conduct related to racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation that takes place with the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person and creating an intimidating, humiliating or offensive environment'. This law is applicable to all persons, in both the public sector and the private sector (Article 27). The full material scope of both directives is covered. On the ground of racial or ethnic origin, it expressly covers education, health, social services and social protection, housing and access to any goods and services,

⁶⁹ Constitutional Court, Decision 240/1999, 20 December 1999, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/3982>.

as well as access to employment, self-employment and professional practice, membership and participation in trade union and business organisations, working conditions, vocational promotion and vocational training (Article 29). On grounds of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, the law expressly covers access to employment, membership and participation in trade union and business organisations, working conditions, professional advancement and vocational training, as well as access to self-employment and professional activity (Article 34).

The Workers' Statute (RLD 2/2015), applicable to salaried workers on all grounds, states (in Article 4(2)(e)) that workers are entitled 'to their privacy and to due respect of their dignity, including protection against harassment on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, and sexual harassment and harassment based on sex'. Besides this, Article 54(2)(g) of the Workers' Statute considers 'harassment on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, towards the employer or the people that work in the enterprise' to be an offence meriting disciplinary dismissal.

In Spain, harassment explicitly constitutes a form of discrimination.

Law 62/2003 (Article 28(2)) and the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (Article 2.f) specify harassment as a form of discrimination.

The words 'hostile' and 'degrading' (Directive 2000/43 and Directive 2000/78, Article 2(3)) are not included in the Spanish definition of harassment.

b) Scope of liability for harassment

In Spain, where harassment is perpetrated by an employee, the employee is liable but the employer is not liable.

Liability for discrimination is personal and only affects individuals or organisations that have committed acts of discrimination, both in civil and criminal law. For example, employers or, in the case of racial or ethnic origin, service-providers such as landlords, schools and hospitals, cannot be held liable for the actions of employees or for the actions of third parties (e.g. tenants, clients or customers). Likewise, trade unions or other professional associations cannot be held liable for the actions of their members.

2.5 Instructions to discriminate (Article 2(4))

a) Prohibition of instructions to discriminate

In Spain, instructions to discriminate are prohibited in national law. Instructions are not defined.

In Spain, instructions explicitly constitute a form of discrimination.

Law 62/2003 (Article 28(2)) provides that 'any instruction to discriminate against persons on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, will be considered discrimination'.

In the disability field, RLD 1/2013 (Article 35(7)) states that 'Any order to discriminate against people on the basis of or by reason of their disability will equally be considered as discrimination.'

Instructions to discriminate may also be considered to be covered by Article 314 of the Criminal Code, which specifies 'causing discrimination' as an infringement against workers'

rights. Article 18 of the Criminal Code includes incitement as a crime, and this may be applied to cases of incitement to discrimination.

b) Scope of liability for instructions to discriminate

In Spain, the instructor and the discriminator are liable. The jurisdictional body must determine the responsibility of each one of them. However, RLD 1/2013 (Article 79(2)) states: 'The liability shall be joint and several when there are several responsible and it is not possible to determine the degree of participation of each of them in the commission of the offence.' The person acting under instruction could, through civil law, seek indemnity against the person who has ordered them to discriminate for the damages that that person has caused to them.

Liability for discrimination is personal and only applies to natural or legal persons who cause discrimination or harassment or who make instructions to discriminate, but we should remember that the instruction to discriminate is a discriminatory act (as expressly noted in Article 28(2) of Law 62/2003 on Fiscal, Administrative and Social Measures).

2.6 Reasonable accommodation duties (Article 2(2)(b)(ii) and Article 5 Directive 2000/78)

a) Implementation of the duty to provide reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities in the area of employment

In Spain, the duty on employers to provide reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities is included in the law and is defined.

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) sets out a duty to provide reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities (Articles 2(m), 40(2) and 63). Article 2(m) defines reasonable accommodation as:

'necessary and appropriate modifications and adaptations of the physical, social and attitudinal environment to the specific needs of persons with disabilities not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, where needed in a particular case effectively, and practice to facilitate accessibility and participation and to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise, on an equal basis with others, of all human rights.'

Article 40(2) states that 'Employers are obliged to take appropriate measures to adapt the job and the accessibility of the company, according to the needs of each specific situation, in order to allow persons with disabilities to access employment, perform their work, progress professionally and have access to training, unless these measures place an excessive burden on the employer.' Article 63 states that 'It is understood that the right to equality of opportunity for persons with disabilities is violated ... when by reason of disability ... [a] breach [occurs] of the requirements of accessibility and of reasonable accommodation'.⁷⁰

The Spanish law therefore establishes a multilevel obligation of a general nature but has not fixed how that obligation might be carried out.

⁷⁰ The Workers' Statute does not provide for a reasonable accommodation duty. Article 38(2) of Law 62/2003 modified an article in Law 13/1982 on Social Integration of the Handicapped (new Article 37), introducing a reasonable accommodation duty. However, Law 13/1982 was superseded by the passing of the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013).

Law 3/2012 on Urgent Measures to Reform the Labour Market⁷¹ has established some positive action measures in favour of persons with disabilities that could be regarded as specific kinds of reasonable accommodation measures. Among them is a preferential right to geographical mobility to protect the health of persons with disabilities: to exercise their right to health protection, workers with disabilities evidencing a need for rehabilitation treatment in another city have a prior right to take another job in the same professional group if the company has another vacancy in a locality where such treatment is more accessible (Article 11(3)). This law also establishes the possibility of making priorities in collective agreements for persons with disabilities, as well as the possibility for them to stay in jobs in cases of redundancy or in relation to measures of geographical mobility (Article 11(4)). These modifications have been incorporated into the Workers' Statute (Article 40).

The reasonable accommodation duty is imposed on both private and public employers and arises if the employer knows of the existence of the disability. In Spain, persons with disabilities do not have a general obligation to inform their employer about their disability; however, if they request a reasonable accommodation, they must notify their employer of their disability (RLD 1/2013, Article 68(2)). When a person with disabilities requests an accommodation, the employer should consider whether it is necessary and 'reasonable'.

The law states that,

'In order to determine whether an accommodation is reasonable ... the costs of the measure, the relevant discriminatory effects for persons with disabilities of the non-adoption of the accommodation, the structure and characteristics of the person, entity or organisation which must implement the accommodation and the possibility of obtaining official funding or other assistance shall be considered.

To this end, the competent public authorities [the Regions of Spain] may establish a system of public subsidies to help cover the costs of the obligation to provide reasonable accommodation' (RLD 1/2013, Article 66(2)).

In relation to the question: 'Is the availability of financial assistance from the state to be taken into account in assessing whether there is a disproportionate burden?' the following aspects should be considered:

(1) As mentioned above, employers are obliged to adopt appropriate measures to adapt the workplace and access of persons with disabilities to the company 'unless these measures imply a disproportionate burden for the employer'.

(2) Article 40(2) of RDL 1/2013 states that, to determine whether the burden is disproportionate, the amount received by the company in 'aid or public subsidies for persons with disabilities' will be taken into consideration. Likewise, financial and other costs entailed by the measure, as well as the company's size and total turnover, will also be considered.

Consequently, the granting of financial aid by the state is a factor to consider in determining whether a disproportionate burden exists when applying measures to adapt a company's workplace and access to it.

(3) To combat discrimination against persons with disabilities in general (i.e. in all areas of employment and beyond), Article 66 of RDL 1/2013 states that reasonable accommodation shall be made 'as long as it does not impose a disproportionate or undue burden'. It also states that, in order to determine whether the accommodation made is

⁷¹ Law 3/2012 of 6 July 2012 on Urgent Measures to Reform the Labour Market (*Ley 3/2012, de 6 de julio, de medidas urgentes para la reforma del mercado laboral*), BOE, 7 July 2012, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2012/BOE-A-2012-9110-consolidado.pdf>.

reasonable, the costs of the measure and any potential official funding or other assistance will be considered. Finally, it sets out that, to this end, the competent public administrations may establish a public subsidy system to help cover the costs of this obligation.

Thus, in the fight against disability discrimination, official financial aid is a factor to be taken into consideration with regard to the proportionality of the measure to provide reasonable accommodation in the workplace.

In some regions of Spain, such as Andalusia and Catalonia, regulations have been adopted on the issue of reasonable accommodation. In Andalusia, for example, Law 4/2017 of 25 September 2017, on the Rights and Care of Persons with Disabilities in Andalusia, sets out that reasonable accommodation to facilitate the access and participation of persons with disabilities to ensure they enjoy or exercise all their rights on equal terms with others should not impose a disproportionate or undue burden. The Autonomous Community of Catalonia passed Act 19/2020 of 30 December 2020, on equal treatment and non-discrimination. Article 4 defines reasonable accommodation as 'the necessary and appropriate modifications and adjustments that, without imposing disproportionate or undue burden, are applied when required in a particular case, to guarantee persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise of all human rights and freedoms on an equal basis with others'. It adds that 'the burden cannot be considered disproportionate if it is sufficiently compensated by measures within the framework of policies in favour of persons with disabilities'.

Although the regulations that establish the obligation of reasonable accommodation are state regulations (RLD 1/2013 and Law 31/1995), subsidies to facilitate their actual implementation depend on the 17 regional Governments.

National law does not provide clearly for a shift in the burden of proof for claims relating to reasonable accommodation. However, Article 77 of Law RLD 1/2013 could allow a judge to shift the burden of proof if a person with disabilities is demanding the right to reasonable accommodation.

Employers are required to consult the person with disabilities in question and may consult other accredited entities specialised in occupational risk prevention services (RD 39/1997, Articles 23-28) about what accommodations would be helpful or appropriate. The need for consultation is deduced from the reference in the law to possible 'discrepancies' between the two parties. The law makes it clear that these possible discrepancies between the worker with disabilities and the employer 'can be resolved through the arbitration system' (RLD 1/2013, Article 66(2)). However, recourse to the arbitration system is voluntary (RLD 1/2013, Article 74(2)).

Employers will be eligible for subsidies or other state funding to help with the costs of accommodation needed by workers with disabilities (RLD 1/2013, Article 40). However, the various regional Governments in Spain (including, in some cases, municipalities, which can provide some subsidies) set different conditions.

In addition to the reasonable accommodation duty foreseen by RLD 1/2013, Law 31/1995 of 8 November 1995 on the Prevention of Occupational Risks⁷² (Articles 14, 15 and 25) and Royal Decree 39/1997 of 17 January 1997 on the Regulation of Prevention Services⁷³ include a duty to provide reasonable accommodation in the specific context of risks to health and safety in the workplace.

⁷² Law 31/1995 of 8 November 1995 on the Prevention of Occupational Risks (*Ley 31/1995, de 8 de noviembre, de Prevención de Riesgos Laborales*), BOE, 10 November 1995, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/1995/11/10/pdfs/A32590-32611.pdf>.

⁷³ Royal Decree 39/1997 of 17 January 1997 on the Regulation of Prevention Services (*Real Decreto 39/1997, de 17 de enero, por el que se aprueba el Reglamento de Servicios de Prevención*), BOE, 31 January 1997, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/1997/01/31/pdfs/A03031-03045.pdf>.

In its judgment of 11 September 2019 on Case C-397/18, *D.W. v. Nobel Plásticos Ibérica SA*,⁷⁴ the CJEU established that some general criteria established for the evaluation of workers and their possible dismissal (such as their productivity being below a given rate, a low level of multi-skilling in the undertaking's posts or a high rate of absenteeism) would constitute indirect discrimination on grounds of disability if the employer has not adopted effective and practical reasonable accommodation measures to adapt the workplace for the disability. Measures may include the adapting of premises, equipment, working patterns and the distribution of tasks, the provision of training and the provision of resources for integration.

b) Case law

During 2021, an interesting judicial conflict was resolved by the Constitutional Court's judgment of 15 March 2021. Specific reference is made to this case in section 12.2 of this report.

Briefly, it can already be said that the main points of the court case were as follows: In April 2013, a lawyer working in the Administration of Justice took office as Court Secretary. In the next few years, inspections carried out by the Administration detected serious problems in the running of the Court due to the Secretary's failure to do his work adequately. The lawyer revealed that he suffered from Asperger's syndrome. He also asked for his right to 'reasonable adjustments' in his workplace to be recognised because the problems relating to his work were due to his disability and could be resolved if adjustments were made. The Administration of Justice failed to respond to the Secretary's requests, which led him to claim he was being discriminated against because of his disability. In relation to the Secretary's claim to have been discriminated against based on Article 14 of the Constitution, the Constitutional Court recognised that the failure to provide reasonable adjustments of the claimant's workplace did indeed constitute discrimination. The Court considered that when a person requests reasonable adjustments to their work due to disability, the request should be attended to from the moment it is made and the extent of the disability proven. The employer's response should be expressly and duly motivated, particularly when the requested adjustments are denied, considering them disproportionate or inappropriate.

c) Definition of disability and non-discrimination protection

The definition of disability for the purposes of requesting reasonable accommodation (both regarding employment and more generally) is the same as for seeking protection from discrimination in general. This means that only those meeting the threshold of 33 % disability are entitled to reasonable accommodation. The person with disability (someone who is officially recognised as a person with disabilities) must inform the employer of his or her disability status in order to request a reasonable accommodation (RLD 1/2013, Article 68(2)). This requirement could potentially be in breach of Directive 2000/78 and is not in line with CJEU joined cases C-335/11 and C-337-11⁷⁵.

⁷⁴ Judgment of 11 September 2019, *D.W. v. Nobel Plásticos Ibérica SA*, C-397/18, <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=217624&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=lst&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=501000>.

⁷⁵ It is interpreted that the requirement to have a certain percentage of disability in order to obtain the implementation of reasonable accommodation could be in breach of the CJEU's judgment of 11 April 2013 in joined Cases C 335/11 and C 337/11, *Ring v. Dansk almennyttigt Boligselskab* (C 335/11), and *Skouboe Werge v. Dansk Arbejdsgiverforening* as it expresses that 'the concept of 'disability' in Directive 2000/78 must be interpreted as including a condition caused by an illness medically diagnosed as curable or incurable where that illness entails a limitation which results in particular from physical, mental or psychological impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder the full and effective participation of the person concerned in professional life on an equal basis with other workers, and the limitation is a long-term one. The nature of the measures to be taken by the employer is not decisive for considering that a person's state of health is covered by that concept'; see paragraph 47: <https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?pageIndex=0&docid=136161&doclang=EN&text=&cid=4511251>.

In Spain, several ground-breaking court rulings in this area made prior to 2020 should be mentioned. It is worth highlighting two Constitutional Court rulings that established the doctrine in relation to this right: one of them is Constitutional Court sentence 10/2014 of 27 January 2014, and the other is CC sentence 3/2018.

In the first ruling, dating from 2014, the conflict arose when the education authorities of an autonomous community resolved that a minor with disabilities should attend a 'special education' state school instead of an ordinary state school. The ruling was upheld by the Constitutional Court, which stated that the education authorities should promote the schooling of minors with disabilities in regular schools, and only when the accommodation for their inclusion was disproportionate or unreasonable should they provide for the schooling of these pupils in special schools. The Court considered that the decision of the authorities was justified, since it took into consideration the minor's special educational needs.

The second Constitutional Court ruling sought to protect a severely mentally person with disability who had been denied an individualised care programme in a government-run care centre for persons with disabilities due to being over 60 years of age. The Constitutional Court found in favour of the person with disability and annulled the decision of the public authorities. The Court observed double discrimination on grounds of age and disability. In relation to the latter, the Court stated that, based on the right to reasonable accommodation, the public authorities should ensure the provision of a care service adapted to the needs of the persons with disabilities, as the authorities had centres for this purpose.

d) Failure to meet the duty of reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities

As stated in Article 2(m) of RLD 1/2013, reasonable accommodation is the necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments of the physical, social and attitudinal environment to the specific needs of persons with disabilities that do not impose a disproportionate or undue burden, when needed in a particular case in an effective and practical manner, to facilitate accessibility and participation and to ensure that persons with disabilities can enjoy or exercise all rights on an equal basis with others.

Article 63 of RLD 1/2013 states that 'the right to equal opportunities' of persons with disabilities is violated when, on the grounds of their disability, there is direct or indirect discrimination, harassment, or failure to comply with the requirements of accessibility, reasonable accommodation and positive action measures. Therefore, it is not expressly stated in this provision that failure to provide reasonable accommodation amounts to discrimination, but rather that it violates the right to equal opportunities. On the other hand, Article 66 goes on to state that measures against discrimination include the provision of reasonable accommodation within the company, but it does not classify failure to provide reasonable accommodation as discriminatory or non-discriminatory.⁷⁶

The breach of reasonable accommodation duties is considered a serious offence (RLD 1/2013, Article 81(3)). Therefore, the public administration may punish the perpetrator with a penalty of up to EUR 90 000 (RLD 1/2013, Article 83(3)). Furthermore, it may impose additional penalties on companies, such as prohibiting access to official benefits (like economic subsidies or any other public aid). If the company persists with its breach of duties on reasonable accommodation, the infringement may be regarded as very

⁷⁶ For a study of this issue, see Gutiérrez Colominas, D. (2018), 'La obligación de realizar ajustes razonables en el puesto de trabajo para personas con discapacidad: origen, evolución y configuración actual. Una perspectiva desde el derecho comparado y el derecho español' ('The obligation to make reasonable adjustments in the workplace for persons with disabilities: origin, evolution and current configuration. A perspective from comparative law and Spanish law'), available at: <https://www.tesisenred.net/handle/10803/565828#>.

serious (RLD 1/2013, Article 81(4)). Consequently, the sanctions may be higher (to a maximum of EUR 1 million).

If the demand reaches a court, it may approve compensation for the claimant (the person with disability). The law does not impose any ceiling for this potential compensation: 'Any payment or compensation to which the corresponding claim may give rise shall not be limited by a previously established ceiling. Compensation for moral damage shall be payable even where there are no damages of a pecuniary nature and shall be set according to the circumstances of the infringement and the seriousness of the injury' (RLD 1/2013, Article 75.2).

- e) Duties to provide reasonable accommodation in areas other than employment for persons with disabilities

In Spain, there is a legal duty to provide reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities outside the area of employment.

The material scope of Law RLD 1/2013, which sets out a duty to provide reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, is: social protection; healthcare; education; employment; telecommunications and the information society; urbanised public spaces, infrastructure and construction; transport; goods and services to the public; relations with public administrations; the administration of justice; cultural heritage; and employment.

As regards social housing, RLD 1/2013 establishes the reservation of social housing for persons with disabilities and ensures its accessibility (Article 32), as well as the refurbishment of housing for persons with disabilities (support for the adaptation of housing to make it accessible for a person with a disability) (Article 33).

On 2 November 2009, the National Court⁷⁷ resolved an interesting case of disability discrimination in the field of education. L.X., a person with physical and intellectual disabilities of 75 %, applied for a scholarship to study law during the academic year 2005-06. The ministry denied the scholarship, using the same standards as applied to other students. The National Court began its judgment by recalling that, 'on 21 April 2008 the Spanish Official Gazette published the Instrument of Ratification of the CRPD, made in New York on 13 December 2006' (although the CRPD was not yet transposed into positive law in Spain, and this did not occur until 2011, with Law 26/2011). The court went on to recall that the CRPD required the introduction of 'reasonable accommodation' in education, and it concluded that it is a reasonable accommodation to modify some scholarship requirements for certain persons with disabilities (for example, the requirement to have obtained an average rating of 5 out of 10 in the previous academic year; this means that the requirements for obtaining the scholarship were set at a lower level). The court therefore ordered the scholarship that L.X. requested to be recognised. This was a highly innovative judgment, because it pointed directly to the CRPD and provided for reasonable accommodation that was not formally established in Spanish law at the time.

The definition of 'disproportionate burden' in this context is the same definition that is used with regard to employment.

- f) Duties to provide reasonable accommodation in respect of other grounds

In Spain, there is a legal duty to provide reasonable accommodation in respect of other grounds in the public sector and the private sector, but only on the ground of religion or belief.

⁷⁷ See National Court (Audiencia Nacional), Appeal 160/2007, 2 November 2009.

Laws 24, 25 and 26 of 1992, approving the Agreement of Cooperation between the state and the Federation of Evangelical Religious Entities, the Federation of Israeli Communities and the Islamic Commission of Spain, respectively, contain specific regulations to ensure reasonable accommodation for employees of these religions. The three agreements contain provisions in the field of employment (religious holidays) and in areas outside employment (special diets).

The weekly day of rest of the Seventh Day Adventist and Jewish communities (Friday evening and all of Saturday) can be granted instead of the day provided by Article 37(1) of the Workers' Statute as the general rule (Saturday afternoon or Monday morning and all of Sunday), but only with the agreement of all the parties, which case law has interpreted as being possible only if this is requested by the employee before the contract is signed.

Moreover, members of the Islamic communities affiliated with the Islamic Commission may request to stop work every Friday from 13.30 to 16.30 and one hour before sunset during Ramadan. This right is also subject to an agreement with the employer, and the hours not worked must be made up. There is some interesting doctrine on this subject in the Madrid High Court's judgment of 27 October 1997. In this case, pursuant to a request for adaptation of working hours, the court – not once referring to the cooperation agreement – stated that, although the courts of first instance should make employers adapt working hours, thus allowing their employees to meet their religious obligations properly, as well as not making them behave in a way incompatible with their beliefs, the worker must show honesty and good faith by indicating his or her religious faith and the special working hours arising from it when applying for the job (Rossell, 2008: pp. 104-107).

In the case of the Islamic Commission and the Jewish community, there is a list of religious holidays that can replace those established in Article 37 of the Workers' Statute, again with the agreement of both parties. As for special diet (adaptation of food to Islamic religious precepts and mealtimes during the Ramadan fast), this possibility is provided only for Muslims interned in public establishments (prisons and other centres) and on military premises, as well as in public and subsidised private schools, where requested, and not as an obligation, since Article 14(4) of the agreement clearly states only that, in such cases, 'attempts shall be made'. In the field of employment, therefore, there are no provisions on this issue.

Some interesting examples of collective agreements can be cited that regulate specific issues related to days off work and the interruption or reduction of the working day for religious reasons. Agreements between employers and employees have been made in which companies offer leave days to their workers based, above all, on their religion and their migrant status. For example, workers are offered the possibility of celebrating traditional or religious festivities. However, taking time off to celebrate religious activities during the working day cannot entail any reduction in the working hours required of all workers.⁷⁸ Moreover, the final decision to grant leave is made by the employer in line with the company's working arrangements. Several business agreements that promote reconciliation between working hours and the working day and the worker's family commitments are also worth mentioning. These include emergency trips to the worker's country of origin for family illness or for designated celebrations, always provided that this is 'feasible in terms of organisation'.⁷⁹

Following the decision of Social Court No. 1 of Palma de Mallorca (Decision 31/2017 of 5 February 2017: see section 3.2.3 of this report), the use of the hijab in employment

⁷⁸ Diversity Management Agreement in a slaughterhouse company in Girona, 2009.

⁷⁹ Diversity Management Agreement in Hotel Majestic SPA Barcelona, 2009; Diversity Management Agreement in Mantylim, S.A., 2008; Diversity Management Agreement in Ferroberica, S.L., 2010; Diversity Management Agreement in ABD, 2009.

may, under certain conditions, be considered as coming under a reasonable accommodation duty based on religion.

3 PERSONAL AND MATERIAL SCOPE

3.1 Personal scope

3.1.1 EU and non-EU nationals (Recital 13 and Article 3(2), Directive 2000/43 and Recital 12 and Article 3(2), Directive 2000/78)

In Spain, there are no residence or citizenship/nationality requirements for protection under the relevant national laws transposing the directives. The personal scope of protection against discrimination is general for all residents.

The seventh additional provision of Law 62/2003, entitled 'Non-applicability to immigration law', states that the articles transposing the directives do not affect the regulations provided 'in respect of the entry, stay, work and establishment of aliens in Spain under Organic Law 4/2000'. This law is applicable only to third-country nationals, not EU citizens. The justification for this provision is based on Article 3(2) of Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78.

However, it should not be forgotten that Law 4/2000 regulates the issues of 'work and establishment', which are liable to be affected by the directives and are not covered by the exclusion outlined in Article 3(2) of the directives. In this regard, several aspects of interest should be considered. First, Law 4/2000 establishes that foreign nationals enjoy fundamental rights and freedoms (including non-discrimination) in the terms laid down in international treaties and in Law 4/2000 itself. It adds that, as a general criterion for interpretation, it is understood that foreign nationals exercise the rights recognised by this law in conditions of equality with Spanish nationals.

Nonetheless, Article 10 recognises the right of only 'resident' foreigners to work; that is, foreigners who have regularised their status because they have obtained the corresponding residence and work permits. Foreigners in an irregular situation are not authorised to reside or work, unlike foreigners who have obtained the corresponding permits. However, in the event that irregular migrants do work, Law 4/2000 recognises that their working conditions must be same as those provided for by law for all workers.

3.1.2 Natural and legal persons (Recital 16, Directive 2000/43)

a) Protection against discrimination

In Spain, the personal scope of anti-discrimination law covers all natural and legal persons for the purpose of protection against discrimination.

The prohibition of discrimination in the Constitution (Article 14), in Law 62/2003 (Article 27(1)) and in the Workers' Statute applies to both natural and legal persons. Article 27(2) of Law 62/2003 provides that measures for the application of the principle of equal treatment under it apply to every person (both natural and legal), in both the public and private sectors.

b) Liability for discrimination

In Spain, the personal scope of anti-discrimination law covers natural and legal persons for the purpose of liability for discrimination.

The situation in respect of liability is the same as that for protection (Law 62/2003, Article 27(2)), in that liability for discrimination is personal and affects individuals or organisations who have committed acts of discrimination. As Rubio-Marín (2004) indicates, for the private sector, the prohibition on discrimination and the violation of workers'

fundamental rights is mainly addressed to the employer, but this can also be made applicable to managers, and presumably to co-workers or the relevant labour union.

3.1.3 Private and public sector including public bodies (Article 3(1))

a) Protection against discrimination

In Spain, the personal scope of national law covers the private sector and the public sector including public bodies for the purpose of protection against discrimination.

The prohibition of discrimination in the Constitution (Article 14) and in the Workers' Statute applies to both private and public bodies. Article 27(2) of Law 62/2003 provides that measures for the application of the principle of equal treatment under it apply to every person (both natural and legal), in both the public and private sectors.

b) Liability for discrimination

In Spain, the personal scope of anti-discrimination law covers the private sector and the public sector including public bodies for the purpose of liability for discrimination.

Law 62/2003 (Article 27(2)) establishes that liability for discrimination is personal and affects individuals or organisations who have committed acts of discrimination.

3.2 Material scope

The material scope of the prohibition of discrimination is of a general nature. All the fields mentioned by Article 3 of Directive 2000/43 on racial or ethnic origin are covered by the general principle of equality laid down in Article 14 of the Spanish Constitution.

Although Directive 2000/78 refers only to the field of employment, discrimination on the grounds on religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation is prohibited in all areas, public and private. This applies not only to the fields mentioned in Directive 2000/43 (social protection, 'social advantages' (i.e. benefits), education, access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including housing), but also to other possible fields, even if there is not an explicit anti-discrimination provision, because of the general and direct applicability of Article 14 of the Constitution.

Therefore, there is a general recognition of the principle of non-discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin in these areas in line with Article 3(1) of Directive 2000/43, and discrimination in these fields is unlawful. However, it could be considered that there has been a violation of the directive, because the law does not provide for any sanctions and is therefore not 'real and effective', although, as will be discussed later, the application of the Penal Code might be possible under judicial interpretation.

3.2.1 Conditions for access to employment, to self-employment or to occupation, including selection criteria, recruitment conditions and promotion, whatever the branch of activity and at all levels of the professional hierarchy (Article 3(1)(a))

In Spain, national legislation prohibits discrimination in relation to conditions for access to employment, to self-employment or to occupation, including selection criteria, recruitment conditions and promotion, whatever the branch of activity and at all levels of the professional hierarchy, for the five grounds, and in both private and public sectors, as described in the directives (Law 62/2003, Article 34). Article 34 makes a specific reference to self-employed workers: in particular, it says that the principle of non-discrimination applies to access to self-employment and professional practice. Consequently, the law

applies to all types of self-employed workers: either ordinary self-employed workers or economically dependent self-employed workers – that is, those who obtain more than 75 % of their income from a single client.

In this field, it is important to mention Law 20/2007 of 11 July 2007, on the Statute of Self-employment Work. This act states that public authorities and those who contract the professional activity of self-employed workers are subject to the prohibition of discrimination (Article 4.3(a)(b)). The ban on discrimination affects both free economic initiative and the hiring of the workers, as well as working conditions. Therefore, contractual clauses that violate the right to non-discrimination or any fundamental right will be null and void and will be deemed not to have been placed in the contract between the self-employed worker and their client.

Article 4(2)(c) of the Workers' Statute (RLD 2/2015) also applies to conditions of access to employment and internal promotion. Article 8(12) of Law 5/2000 considers direct or indirect discrimination in promotion in employment to be a very serious offence and subject to sanctions.

Moreover, Article 2 of Royal Decree-Law 3/2015, which confirms the text of the employment law,⁸⁰ specifies the foremost general objective of employment as being: 'To guarantee real equality of opportunities and non-discrimination, considering the provisions of Article 9.2 of the Spanish Constitution, in access to employment and in actions aimed at providing such access, along with a free choice of profession or trade without discrimination, on the terms provided in Article 17 of the Workers' Statute'.

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes that conditions for access to employment must avoid discrimination, direct or indirect, on the ground of disability (Articles 35-47) and establishes a system of sanctions that mean that the prohibition can be said to be real and effective (Articles 80-88).

All labour regulations affect labour relations in both the private and public sectors.

The employment of civil servants is regulated by the Civil Service Statute, which establishes special standards in the public sector, but all employees are equally subject to the principle of equal treatment.

3.2.2 Employment and working conditions, including pay and dismissals (Article 3(1)(c))

In Spain, national legislation prohibits discrimination in working conditions, including pay and dismissals, for all five grounds and for both private and public employment.

Non-discrimination in employment and working conditions, including pay and dismissals, is expressly recognised in Article 17(1) of the Workers' Statute (RLD 2/2015) (according to the wording that Law 63/2003 introduced into the Statute), which is headed 'Non-discrimination in working relations'. It states:

'all legislative provisions, clauses of collective agreements, individual agreements and unilateral managerial decisions which provide for unfavourable direct or indirect discrimination on the grounds of age or disability, or which provide for unfavourable or adverse discrimination in employment, whether in relation to remuneration, working time, or other working conditions, on the grounds of sex, origin, including

⁸⁰ Royal Legislative Decree 3/2015 of 23 October 2015, which approves the revised text of the Employment Law (*Real Decreto Legislativo 3/2015, de 23 de octubre, por el que se aprueba el texto refundido de la Ley de Empleo*), BOE, 24 October 2015, <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2015/10/24/pdfs/BOE-A-2015-11431.pdf>.

racial or ethnic origin, civil status, social condition, religion or belief, political ideas, sexual orientation, membership or non-membership of a trade union, adherence to trade union agreements, or family ties to other workers in the enterprise, or by reference to the languages of the Spanish state, shall be regarded as void and without effect.'

With the distinction between 'unfavourable direct or indirect discrimination on the grounds of age or disability' and 'unfavourable or adverse discrimination in employment' in relation to other grounds, the provision facilitates positive action in the fields of age and disability. Article 8(12) of RLD 2/2000 on violations and sanctions of labour laws (modified by Law 62/2003, Article 41) considers 'unilateral decisions by the employer which involve unfavourable direct or indirect discrimination for reasons of age or disability or which contain positive or adverse discrimination relating to remuneration, working time, training, promotion, and other employment conditions, on the grounds of sex, origin, including racial or ethnic origin, civil status, social condition, religion or belief, political ideas, sexual orientation, membership or non-membership of a trade union, adherence to trade union agreements, family ties with other workers in the enterprise, or language within the Spanish State' to be very serious infringements.

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes that employment and working conditions must avoid discrimination, direct or indirect, on the ground of disability (Articles 35-47) and establishes a system of sanctions that mean that the prohibition can be said to be real and effective (Articles 80-88).

Two cases are relevant here. The first is the case of a homosexual worker dismissed by Aerolíneas Argentinas in 2008. The worker's complaint was accepted by Madrid Social Court No. 35, which declared the dismissal void and therefore obliged the airline to take the worker back and pay all wage arrears. The judgment ruled that it was proven in the proceedings that the worker's sexual orientation had given rise to various forms of unfavourable treatment, culminating in his dismissal. In his judgment, the judge stated that unfavourable treatment based on sexual orientation was discriminatory, and therefore the worker's dismissal was declared void.⁸¹

The second is the case of a Muslim woman hired by ACCIONA Airport Services to provide customer service at Palma de Mallorca airport, starting in 2007. When she came to work on 21 December 2015, the claimant informed the company of her intention to wear the Islamic veil (hijab) during the working day as an expression of her religious sentiment. The employer imposed seven increasingly serious labour sanctions for using the hijab. In June 2016, the claimant brought an action against the company before Social Court No. 1 in Palma de Mallorca. The claimant maintained that she was being discriminated against since other workers could exhibit necklaces with Christian religious symbols, yet she was not allowed to wear the hijab. The court issued its judgment on 6 February 2017⁸² and declared 'the existence of violation of the fundamental right to religious freedom (of the claimant), and consequently the nullity of the sanctions imposed by the company'. The ruling recognised that the company had the right 'to impose on its employees the use of a uniform', but that 'there are no unlimited rights' and that this right cease, if it clashes with a fundamental right, such as that to religious freedom. In any case, it should be noted from the Spanish judgment that it considers that the company's policy does not imply a policy of religious neutrality, i.e., according to the judgment, the ban on wearing the

⁸¹ Social Court No. 35 of Madrid, Decision 84/2009, 23 February 2009.

⁸² See:

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKewjX3bLT09j5AhUH-hoKHxJGBsEQFnoECAUQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.poderjudicial.es%2Fsearch%2Fcontenidos.action%3Faction%3Dcontentpdf%26databasematch%3DAN%26reference%3D7942475%26links%3D%2522MARI%2520DEL%2520PILAR%2520RAMOS%2520MONSERRAT%2522%26optimize%3D20170224%26publicinterface%3Dtrue&usg=AOvVaw1i1ZeW5USphX3pRixVxdCK>

headscarf does not result from the company's uniform policy; in fact, if one considers that the company had a policy of neutrality, one should apply the judgment of 15 July 2021, C-804/18 and C-341/19 -WABE and MH Müller Handels-, in which the Court clarified that an internal rule prohibiting workers from wearing visible signs of religious beliefs in the workplace can be justified by the employer's desire to pursue a policy of religious neutrality (if a series of conditions are respected).⁸³

Occupational pensions in Spain are governed by RLD 1/2002 of 29 November 2002, which regulates pension plans and funds. Occupational pensions constituting part of pay are designated as 'pension plans by system of employment' (*planes de pensiones por sistema de empleo*). These are plans, whose promoter is an entity or company and whose partners are its employees. The RLD only contains a general anti-discrimination clause that establishes that the pension plan 'must guarantee access as a participant to any natural person who meets the conditions of relationship with the promoter' (Article 5(1)).

In general, pension plans by 'employment system' (sector-specific occupational pension schemes) are established through collective agreements, and they are covered by the anti-discrimination clauses for employment and working conditions laid down in Article 17.1 of the Workers' Statute (RLD 2/2015) and Article 8(12) of RLD 2/2000 on violations and sanctions in labour laws.

3.2.3 Access to all types and all levels of vocational guidance, vocational training, advanced vocational training and retraining, including practical work experience (Article 3(1)(b))

In Spain, national legislation prohibits discrimination in vocational training outside the employment relationship, such as adult lifelong learning courses or vocational training provided by technical schools or universities.

The Workers' Statute (Article 4(2)) recognises promotion and professional training as rights. These are protected against discrimination on all of the grounds included in the directives.

Article 34 and 41 (in the field of labour law) of Law 62/2003 includes this subject in relation to all the grounds of Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78: 'measures are aimed at the real and effective realisation of the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination in relation to access to ... professional promotion and vocational and continuous professional training'. Given the structure of the education and training system in Spain, this text includes all the aspects covered by Article 3(1)(b) of Directive 2000/43.

Law 62/2003 (Article 41) introduced modifications to Law 5/2000 on Offences and Penalties in Social Matters. Article 8 of Law 5/2000 contains a list of very serious infractions in the area of employment. With the revision introduced by Law 62/2003, Article 8(12) considers direct or indirect discrimination in vocational training in employment to be a very serious offence and subject to sanctions.

Organic Law 5/2002 on Qualifications and Vocational Training⁸⁴ states that one of the principles of the national system of qualifications and vocational training is 'access, on equal terms for all citizens, to the various forms of vocational training' (Article 2).

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes that vocational guidance must avoid discrimination, direct or

⁸³ See: <https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=244180&pageIndex=0&doclang=E&S&mode=req&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=2150604>.

⁸⁴ Organic Law 5/2002 of 19 June 2002 on Qualifications and Vocational Training (*Ley Orgánica 5/2002, de 19 de junio, de las Cualificaciones y de la Formación Profesional*), BOE, 20 June 2002, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2002/BOE-A-2002-12018-consolidado.pdf>.

indirect, on the ground of disability (Article 17) and establishes a system of sanctions that mean that the prohibition can be said to be real and effective (Articles 80-88).

3.2.4 Membership of, and involvement in, an organisation of workers or employers, or any organisation whose members carry on a particular profession, including the benefits provided for by such organisations (Article 3(1)(d))

In Spain, national legislation prohibits discrimination in relation to membership of and involvement in workers' or employers' organisations, as formulated in the directives for all five grounds and for both private and public employment.

Article 34 of Law 62/2003 includes this subject in relation to all the grounds of Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78: 'measures are aimed at the real and effective accomplishment of the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination in relation to ... membership of or involvement in organisations of workers or employers ... or to occupation and membership of and involvement in any organisation whose members carry on a particular profession'.

Article 17(1) of the Workers' Statute and Article 8(12) of the Law on Offences and Penalties in Social Matters also include this aspect of equal treatment.

3.2.5 Social protection, including social security and healthcare (Article 3(1)(e) Directive 2000/43)

In Spain, national legislation prohibits discrimination in social protection, including social security and healthcare, as formulated in the Racial Equality Directive. Literally, Article 29 of Law 62/2003 establishes the measures to ensure that the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity is effective in health, social benefits and services, housing (the reference to housing is broad in nature) and, in general, the supply of and access to any goods and services. In any case, Law 62/2003 does not establish specific sanctions in these fields⁸⁵, which means that judicial interpretation is important to establish repressive mechanisms, for example in the criminal law. As will be mentioned later, judges must consider whether Article 512 of the Criminal Code (Organic Law 10/1995)⁸⁶ is applicable ('Those who, in the exercise of their professional or business activities, deny a person a benefit to which they are entitled by virtue of their ... religion or belief, their belonging to an ethnic or race ... their sexual orientation ... or, for reasons of ... disability, incur the penalty of special disqualification for the exercise of profession, trade, industry or commerce and special disqualification for educational profession or trade, in the field of teaching, sports and leisure for a period of one to four years.').

The social security system is based on four principles: universality, unity, solidarity and equality (RLD 8/2015 of the General Social Security Act, Article 2).⁸⁷ Furthermore,

⁸⁵ Although the law prohibits discrimination in the field of social protection, social security and healthcare, no sanctions are proposed, thus making the law ineffective.

⁸⁶ Organic Law 10/1995 of 23 November 1995 of the Criminal Code (*Ley Orgánica 10/1995, de 23 de noviembre, del Código Penal*), BOE, 24 November 1995, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/1995/BOE-A-1995-25444-consolidado.pdf>.

⁸⁷ Widowhood pensions were a focus of litigation in Spain a few years ago. The social security authorities did not recognise the right to a widow's pension for surviving unmarried homosexual partners, because the law did not allow marriage between two people of the same sex. Litigation was brought to the Constitutional Court several times, and it had to rule on whether Article 174(1) of the General Social Security Act (Royal Legislative Decree 1/1994, which was then in force) was discriminatory based on sexual orientation. In its Decision 92/2014 of 10 June 2014, the Constitutional Court accepted that both homosexual couples (not being able to marry) and de facto couples (not having been able to marry legally) were excluded from the widow's pension, and that Article 174(1) of the General Social Security Act was not discriminatory for reasons of sexual orientation. The Court noted, however, that legislators could change that situation if they considered it convenient to do so.

The events that gave rise to this sentence took place in 2002. Three years later, the Spanish Parliament passed Law 13/2005, which modifies the Civil Code regarding the right to marry, allowing the surviving

Article 29(1) of Law 62/2003 states that its purpose is to 'establish measures to ensure that the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin is real and effective in education, health, social benefits and services, housing and, in general, the supply of and access to goods and services'.

In the field of healthcare, Article 3 of General Health Law 14/1986⁸⁸ establishes that 'Public healthcare will be extended to the entire Spanish population. Access and health benefits will be carried out under conditions of effective equality'. This declaration of universality in terms of equality has been regulated in Law 16/2003 on the Cohesion and Quality of the National Health System⁸⁹ (as amended since 2012 and last reformed in 2018). Following the reform introduced by RLD 7/2018 on universal access to the National Health System,⁹⁰ Article 3(1) of the amended Law 16/2003 now establishes that 'They are holders of the right to protection of health and healthcare for all persons with Spanish nationality and foreign persons who have established (legally) their residence in Spanish territory'. Furthermore, Article 3(ter)(1) establishes that 'Foreign persons not registered or authorised as residents in Spain have the right to health protection and healthcare under the same conditions as people with Spanish nationality, as is established in Article 3(1)'.⁹¹

Law 62/2003 does not provide any measure to make the principle of equal treatment 'real and effective', because it does not establish any sanctions if the law is breached. However, judges must consider whether Article 512 of the Criminal Code (Organic Law 10/1995)⁹² is applicable. Article 512 states: 'Those who, in the exercise of their professional or business activities, deny a person a benefit to which they are entitled by virtue of their ... religion or belief, their belonging to an ethnic or race ... their sexual orientation ... or, for reasons of ... disability, incur the penalty of special disqualification for the exercise of profession, trade, industry or commerce and special disqualification for educational profession or trade, in the field of teaching, sports and leisure for a period of one to four years.' The key is whether social protection, social security and healthcare should come under the concept of 'a benefit' (*una prestación*) mentioned in the Criminal Code.

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes that the social protection must avoid discrimination, direct or indirect, on the ground of disability (Articles 48-52) and establishes a system of sanctions that mean that the prohibition can be said to be real and effective (Articles 80-88).

In its Decision 3/2018,⁹³ the Constitutional Court considered a resolution (and the legal provisions on which it was based) of the Community of Madrid to be discriminatory. Under

spouses of gay marriages to request the corresponding widow's pension. Law 40/2007 was passed a few years later. It extended the right to a widow's pension to all stable couples, both heterosexual and homosexual, with certain limitations and requirements; the same amending legislation allows the law to be applied to situations that occurred prior to its entry into force.

⁸⁸ General Health Law 14/1986 of 24 April 1985 (*Ley 14/1986, de 25 de abril de 1986, General de Sanidad*) BOE, 29 April 1986, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/1986/BOE-A-1986-10499-consolidado.pdf>.

⁸⁹ Law 16/2003 of 28 May 2003 on the Cohesion and Quality of the National Health System (*Ley 16/2003, de 28 de mayo, de cohesión y calidad del Sistema Nacional de Salud*), BOE, 29 May 2003, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2003/BOE-A-2003-10715-consolidado.pdf>.

⁹⁰ Royal Decree-Law 7/2018 of 27 July 2018 on universal access to the National Health System (*Real Decreto-ley 7/2018, de 27 de julio, sobre el acceso universal al Sistema Nacional de Salud*), BOE, 30 July 2018, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2018/BOE-A-2018-10752-consolidado.pdf>.

⁹¹ Although both Law 14/1986 (in general terms) and Law 16/2003 (as drafted by RLD 7/2018) formally establish a universal system of access to health in Spain, as other articles of Law 16/2003 introduced some requirements to access healthcare from public funds, there are some groups (albeit very few) that may be excluded from access to the public health system, for example, older legal immigrants who do not work or who do not have social security coverage in their countries of origin. Paradoxically, all undocumented immigrants have the right to access publicly funded healthcare.

⁹² Organic Law 10/1995 of 23 November 1995 of the Criminal Code (*Ley Orgánica 10/1995, de 23 de noviembre, del Código Penal*), BOE, 24 November 1995, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/1995/BOE-A-1995-25444-consolidado.pdf>.

⁹³ Constitutional Court, Decision 3/2018, 22 January 2018, <https://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/docs/BOE/BOE-A-2018-2459.pdf>. An explanation of the case can be seen in Section 2.1.2 (multiple discrimination) of this report.

this resolution, a person with psychosocial disabilities was denied a place in a specialist centre for persons with such disabilities. It was argued that he was over the age of 60, which is the age limit established in a formal regulation of the Community of Madrid. In its decision, the Constitutional Court noted that the appellant had suffered multiple discrimination. First, this was because of his disability: as a result of the application of the regulation, the person lost the right to the medical care he needed because of his psychosocial disability. The identification of an age criterion, which is based on a personal circumstance, introduces a further cause of discrimination. According to the Constitutional Court, there was therefore multiple discrimination, due to both disability and age. The Court consequently declared 'that his fundamental right to not be discriminated against has been violated on the ground of age and disability'.

In 2015 there was a judgment that recognised the right to public assisted human reproduction on the part of a female couple, regardless of their sexual orientation. Law 14/2006 of 26 May 2006 on Assisted Human Reproduction Techniques (AHR) and Royal Decree 1030/2006 of 15 September 2006 expressly exclude any discrimination based on sexual orientation. However, an order of the Ministry of Health (SSI/2065/2014 of 31 October 2014) states that AHR 'will apply to people who have undergone a sterility study'. For female couples, this last clause was discriminatory on the basis of sexual orientation. Tania and Isabel (fictitious names) are a married couple. In April 2014, one of the women began AHR treatment at a private clinic that receives public funds. When Ministerial Order SSI/2065/2014 was published, the clinic suspended the treatment. Social Court No. 18 ruled on 15 September 2015 (Auto 672/2015), condemning the clinic for discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation and noting that the applicant was entitled to AHR treatment by direct application of Law 14/2006. It further ruled that, by not being provided this treatment, the couple had been discriminated against based on their sexual orientation.⁹⁴ However, it has to be said that in 2021 this situation was remedied by Order SND/1215/2021, of 5 November, amending Annex III of Royal Decree 1030/2006, of 15 September, which establishes the National Health System's common services portfolio and the procedure for updating it, and Annexes I and II of Royal Decree 1277/2003, of 10 October, which establishes the general bases for authorising health centres, services and establishments.⁹⁵ According to this legislation, lesbian women, bisexual and transgender people with gestational capacity and women without a partner who want to have children alone will once again (after seven years in which they could not do so) be able to have access to assisted human reproduction techniques in the National Public Health System.

a) Article 3(3) exception (Directive 2000/78)

Law 62/2003 does not contain any specific provisions in relation to the exception in Article 3(3) of Directive 2000/78 on the grounds of religion or belief, age, disability and sexual orientation. Various social security and social protection provisions establish differences on grounds of age, and of other conditions, but not religion or belief, disability, sexual orientation or racial or ethnic origin.

⁹⁴ This judgment was not appealed, and the Ministry has not (yet) amended the Order of 31 October 2014. However, Law 14/2006 and Royal Decree 1030/2006, which regulate AHR, clearly establish that there can be no discrimination based on sexual orientation. Therefore, the Order of 31 October 2014 must be interpreted in this non-discriminatory manner.

⁹⁵ Order SND/1215/2021, of November 5, which modifies Annex III of Royal Decree 1030/2006, of September 15, which establishes the portfolio of common services of the National Health System and the procedure for updating, and annexes I and II of Royal Decree 1277/2003, of October 10, which establishes the general bases on the authorisation of health centres, services and establishments (*Orden SND/1215/2021, de 5 de noviembre, por la que se modifica el anexo III del Real Decreto 1030/2006, de 15 de septiembre, por el que se establece la cartera de servicios comunes del Sistema Nacional de Salud y el procedimiento para su actualización, y los anexos I y II del Real Decreto 1277/2003, de 10 de octubre, por el que se establecen las bases generales sobre autorización de centros, servicios y establecimientos sanitarios*), BOE, No. 268, 9 November 2021, pp. 138007-138012, available at: <https://www.boe.es/eli/es/o/2021/11/05/snd1215>.

The ECtHR held on 3 April 2012, in the case of *Manzanas v. Spain*,⁹⁶ that there had been a violation of Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination) of the ECHR. The case concerned a difference in treatment between priests of the Catholic Church and Evangelical ministers regarding the calculation of their pension rights before 1999. The court agreed with the Government that there had been objective and non-discriminatory reasons for integrating religious ministers into the general social security scheme at different times. However, the refusal to recognise Mr Manzanas's right to receive a retirement pension amounted to a different treatment, the only difference here being one of religious faith. Although the reasons for the delay in bringing religious ministers into the general social security scheme fell within the state's margin of appreciation, the court considered that the Government had failed to justify the reasons why a difference of treatment between similar situations, based solely on grounds of religious belief, had been maintained.

3.2.6 Social advantages (Article 3(1)(f) Directive 2000/43)

In Spain, national legislation prohibits discrimination in social advantages (i.e. benefits), as formulated in the Racial Equality Directive.

The social security system is based on four principles: universality, unity, solidarity and equality (RLD 8/2015 of the General Social Security Act, Article 2). Article 29(1) of Law 62/2003 recognises the principle of non-discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin in social benefits, in line with Directive 2000/43.

However, Law 62/2003 does not provide for sanctions in this area of social benefits. It could be considered that there has been a violation of the directive's requirements regarding sanctions. Judicial interpretation in relation to the repression of such discriminatory conduct is required since this law do not provide specific sanctions in this field.

However, judges must consider whether Article 512 of the Criminal Code (Organic Law 10/1995) could be applied and must decide whether 'social advantages' should be included under the concept of 'a benefit' (*una prestación*) as mentioned in the Criminal Code.

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes that the 'social advantages' must avoid discrimination, direct or indirect, on the ground of disability (Articles 48-52) and establishes a system of sanctions that mean that the prohibition can be said to be real and effective (Articles 80-88).

Any clauses introducing differences of treatment in 'social advantages' on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability or sexual orientation would be discriminatory (Spanish Constitution, Article 14), but not on the grounds of age if the differences are 'objectively and reasonably justified by a legitimate aim'. For example, it is common practice for there to be special discount rates for young people and the elderly for public transport and some private transport.

Beyond the measures established by Law RLD 1/2013, there are some benefits available for persons with disabilities, such as special discounts for transport or in accessing some services at local level. Other social benefits, such as benefits for large families and childbirth benefits, whether national, regional or local, must respect the principle of non-discrimination and should be proportionate to the special circumstances for which they are designed.

Law RLD 1/2013 establishes that services available to the public, buildings and infrastructure should be designed and built in a disability-accessible way.

⁹⁶ *Manzanas v. Spain*, No. 17966/10, 3 April 2012, <http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-110180>.

In Spain, the lack of a definition of 'social advantages' does not raise legal problems.

3.2.7 Education (Article 3(1)(g) Directive 2000/43)

In Spain, national legislation prohibits discrimination in education, as formulated in the Racial Equality Directive.

Article 29(1) of Law 62/2003 recognises the principle of non-discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin in education in line with Directive 2000/43. But this law does not provide any measure to make the principle of equal treatment 'real and effective', because it does not establish sanctions. To be 'real and effective', judicial interpretation is required and judges must consider whether Article 512 of the Criminal Code (Organic Law 10/1995) could be applied and whether education should be included under the concept of 'a benefit' (*una prestación*) mentioned in the Criminal Code.

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes that the education system must avoid discrimination, direct or indirect, on the ground of disability (Articles 16 and 18-21) and establishes a system of sanctions that mean that the prohibition can be said to be real and effective (Articles 80-88).

Equal treatment and non-discrimination have been consolidated as basic principles of education in Spain.

The main Spanish legislation in this area comprises Organic Law 2/2006 on Education (OLE),⁹⁷ modified by Organic Law 8/2013 on Improving the Quality of Education⁹⁸ and, more recently, Organic Law 3/2020 of 29 December 2020.

The new law adopted in 2020, amending the Organic Law on Education, introduces important references to the principle of equality and non-discrimination.

First, with regard to the principles on which the Spanish education system is based, under the new principle set out in Article 1a-*bis*), the education system must be based on quality education for all students without discrimination on grounds of birth, sex, racial, ethnic or geographical origin, disability, age, illness, religion or beliefs, sexual orientation or sexual identity, or any other personal or social condition or circumstance. According to the principle set out in Article 1b), the education system is based on equity, helping to overcome any form of discrimination and affording universal access to education. It shall act as a compensating factor for personal, cultural, economic and social inequalities, especially those stemming from any type of disability, in accordance with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which was ratified by Spain in 2008.

Second, following the amendments to the Organic Law on Education, the new law is aimed at providing education in respect for fundamental rights and freedoms, equality of rights and opportunities between men and women, equal treatment and non-discrimination of people on grounds of birth, racial or ethnic origin, religion, beliefs, age, disability, sexual orientation or identity, illness, or any other condition or circumstance.

Third, the new law lays down that primary education (six-12 years) should contribute to developing children's capacity to know about, understand and respect different cultures, differences between peoples, and equal rights and opportunities for men and women,

⁹⁷ Organic Law 2/2006 of 3 May 2006 on Education (*Ley Orgánica 2/2006, de 3 de mayo, de Educación*), BOE, 4 May 2006, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2006/05/04/pdfs/A17158-17207.pdf>.

⁹⁸ Organic Law 8/2013 of 9 December 2013 on Improving the Quality of Education (*Ley Orgánica 8/2013, de 9 de diciembre, para la mejora de la calidad educativa*), BOE, 10 December 2013, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/12/10/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-12886.pdf>.

without any discrimination against people based on ethnicity, sexual orientation or identity, religion or beliefs, disability, or any other condition.

Fourth, the Baccalaureate (taken from the age of 16) must also contribute to developing students' capacity to promote real equality and non-discrimination based on birth, sex, racial or ethnic origin, disability, age, religion or beliefs, sexual orientation or gender identity, or any other personal or social condition or circumstance.

Fifth, it should also be noted that state inspection interventions in the education system are based on the principle of respect for fundamental rights and public freedoms, on the defence of the common interest and democratic values, and on preventing any conduct that may generate discrimination on grounds of origin, gender, sexual orientation, religious convictions, opinion, or any other personal or social circumstance.

Finally, the new law requires that equal treatment and non-discrimination be addressed at the different stages of basic education (as a general rule, basic education is considered to cover education between the ages of six and 16). It adds that the study of, and respect for, other cultures, particularly those of the Roma and other groups, shall be taken into consideration. The aim is to contribute to appreciating cultural differences and recognising and disseminating the history and culture of ethnic minorities in Spain, thus promoting knowledge about them and reducing the use of stereotypes (41st additional provision).

Although the law establishes the general principle of non-discrimination, it could be considered that there has been a violation of the directive, given that the law does not provide for any sanctions (except in respect of disability), and is therefore not 'real and effective.'

Organic Law 6/2001 on Universities⁹⁹ provides that students are entitled to 'Equal opportunities and non-discrimination on the grounds of sex, race, religion or disability or any other personal or social condition or circumstance'¹⁰⁰ in access to the university, admission to centres, permanence in the university and exercise of their academic rights' (Article 46(2)). This Law does not regulate sanctions in the event of non-compliance with this students' right.

The debate on school 'segregation' has become high profile in Spain, with a large rise in the number of immigrants and foreigners of school age over the past years. Foreign children are mostly concentrated in state schools (as opposed to private schools). There is a consensus in Spanish social research that this concentration cannot be described as 'segregation' (there is no any legal coercion because the parents can choose the school), although the concentration is high due to the fact that most of the parents choose schools close to their home and, therefore, in each school there are people of the same social condition. Public schools are of good quality compared with private schools, and according to several scholars the fact that the school performance of immigrant and Roma pupils is somewhat lower than the rest of the general population is due mainly to the socioeconomic and cultural characteristics of families, rather than the schools (see Garreta 2003; Cebolla 2015).

The OLE provides that 'in no event shall there be discrimination on the grounds of birth, race, sex, religion, opinion or any other personal or social condition or circumstance' (Article 84(3)) (this article of the OLE guarantees the non-discrimination of migrants in

⁹⁹ Organic Law 6/2001 of 21 December 2001 on Universities (*Ley Orgánica 6/2001, de 21 de diciembre, de Universidades*), BOE, 24 December 2001, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2001/BOE-A-2001-24515-consolidado.pdf>.

¹⁰⁰ The Constitutional Court ruled that age (Decision 31/1984, 7 March 1984), disability (Decision 269/1994, October 1994) and sexual orientation (Decision 41/2006, February 2006) are included in the generic phrase 'any other personal or social circumstance' in Article 14 of the Spanish Constitution. See Section 1 (General legal framework) of this report.

Spain in the field of education.) The same protection and equality among Spanish nationals are established by Organic Law 4/2000, which establishes the rights and freedoms of foreigners in Spain. Article 8 of OL 4/2000 establishes a right to education for foreigners (both legal and undocumented) in Spain under the same conditions as for Spanish nationals.

The OLE also provides that the various tiers of government must develop compensatory measures in relation to persons, groups and regions in adverse situations and provide the necessary economic resources and support. 'Groups' refers in particular to Roma people and immigrants. As discussed earlier, the 2020 Education Act has established that the basic education syllabus – i.e. the set of objectives, competencies, contents, pedagogical methods and assessment criteria – take into consideration cultural aspects of the Roma people and other groups and collectives.

The Spanish Committee of Representatives of Persons with Disabilities (CERMI) promoted a series of proposals to make up for or mitigate shortcomings that became apparent during the state of alarm resulting from the COVID-19 health crisis. Above all, it called for guaranteeing the use of accessible technological devices, including through the creation of lending banks; ensuring access to assessment channels, materials and methods; promoting online leisure activities that favour the interaction of students with disabilities with other students; and combating loneliness and isolation aggravated by physical distance. It also called for the creation of a team of locum teachers to provide face-to-face support to students with disabilities in their homes, and to strengthen coordination between teachers, support staff, students and families. The adoption of these measures or mechanisms would be covered by the General Education Act (LO 2/2006). Under this legislation, the education authorities are assigned the task of encouraging students with special educational needs to continue their schooling in an appropriate manner at all compulsory and post-compulsory levels of education. They are also responsible for adapting the conditions for sitting examinations, as set out by law, for persons with disabilities who require this. Also specified is the responsibility of the education authorities to provide the necessary complementary resources, support and provision for special-needs education relating to disability (regulated in Title 2 of the Act).

a) Trends and patterns regarding Roma pupils

In Spain, there are no specific trends and/or patterns (whether legal or societal) in education regarding Roma pupils (including immigrant Roma pupils), such as segregation.

The OLE provides (under Article 74) that schooling for pupils with special educational needs 'shall be governed by the principles of standardisation and integration and shall guarantee non-discrimination and effective equality in access to and continuance in the [mainstream] education system'. The law also provides that the various tiers of government shall develop compensatory actions in relation to persons, groups and regions in adverse situations and shall provide the necessary economic resources and support. 'Groups' refers in particular to Roma people (and immigrants).

As previously stated, Law 3/2020, adopted in 2020, amending the OLE, establishes in its 41st additional provision that the study of and respect for other cultures, particularly the Roma and other groups, will be taken into consideration in the basic education 'curriculum'. In other words, the basic education syllabus (i.e. the set of objectives, competencies, contents, pedagogical methods and assessment criteria) will take into consideration cultural aspects of the Roma people and other groups and collectives. The aim is to contribute to appreciating cultural differences and recognising and disseminating the history and culture of ethnic minorities in Spain, thus promoting knowledge about them and reducing the prevalence of stereotypes. Also addressed is knowledge of historical events and conflicts that have seriously violated human rights, such as the Holocaust and the history of the fight for women's rights.

For the academic year 2020-2021 (according to the latest data released by the Ministry of Education), the total number of pupils with specific educational support needs who received special educational assistance other than that provided in mainstream education amounted to 748 054, representing 9.3 % of the total number of pupils.¹⁰¹ Of these, 227 979 (30.5 %) had special educational needs associated with disability or serious disorders and the remaining 520 075 (69.5 %) had other specific educational support needs. As additional data, it should be noted that the majority of pupils with specific educational support needs are male (63.0 %), a percentage that rises for pupils with special educational needs (69.9 %),¹⁰² with a slight reduction for those with other specific needs (60.1 %). The most frequent disabilities among students with special educational needs are intellectual disabilities (27.4 %), pervasive developmental disorders (26.4 %) and severe behavioural/personality disorders (24.6 %).¹⁰³

No specific legislation has been adopted on the access of Roma children to the education system. Nonetheless, the Government (specifically, the Ministry of Social Rights) has adopted a technical paper of recommendations for action in the health crisis caused by COVID-19, to be used by the social services in segregated settlements and high-risk neighbourhoods. The competent authorities (autonomous communities and city councils) have been asked in this paper to strengthen the role of social and education services, both in the schools themselves and in other support facilities, in order to minimise the impact of the pandemic and the digital divide on children and adolescents. In any case, in 2021, the Fundación Secretariado Gitano (FSG) reported that the pandemic has been a pretext for an increase in anti-Roma discourse; in some cases, discourse that linked the transmission of the virus with the Roma people, and with their supposed non-compliance with health measures, which increased discrimination. In this sense, the report recommends that police forces open dialogue processes to avoid discriminatory controls.¹⁰⁴

3.2.8 Access to and supply of goods and services that are available to the public (Article 3(1)(h) Directive 2000/43)

In Spain, national legislation prohibits discrimination in access to and supply of goods and services, as formulated in the Racial Equality Directive.

Article 29(1) of Law 62/2003 recognises the principle of non-discrimination on the ground of racial or ethnic origin in access to and supply of goods and services that are available to the public, in line with Directive 2000/43. However, this law does not provide any measures to make the principle of equal treatment 'real and effective', because it does not establish sanctions.

¹⁰¹ Students who need extra language tuition are taught in normal classrooms throughout the school year. There are two types of support teachers in education centres: specialists in therapeutic pedagogy and specialists in hearing and language. The latter deal with students who have language difficulties. Teaching can be individualised or in a group, with individualised tuition provided in the normal classroom during classes. This service has been greatly reduced as a consequence of the decrease in the number of support teachers assigned by the educational authorities to each centre. Group care is usually provided to small groups of three or four students, and can take place in the normal classroom, but it is more common for such groups to meet in special small classrooms for part of each school day. For the rest of the time, the students attend classes with the rest of the students. Depending on the centre, the groups are made up of students of different ages who have similar needs, or of students of the same age with somewhat different needs.

In special situations, when there are a significant number of students who have no (or very little) knowledge of Spanish, intensive language training groups are organised, but these students are incorporated as soon as possible into the corresponding normal classes.

¹⁰² Pupils with special educational needs are those pupils assessed as such by the educational guidance teams or services, and who are in need of specific educational support and attention associated with disabilities or serious disorders for part or all of their schooling.

¹⁰³ Source: Ministerio de Educación (2021), *Estadística de las enseñanzas no universitarias. Alumnado con necesidad específica de apoyo educativo. Curso 2020-2021*, <https://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/dam/jcr:ae456755-1f2e-48be-94d4-4e13ab204e8b/notaresumen21.pdf>.

¹⁰⁴ See: Fundación Secretariado Gitano (2021), *Discriminación y comunidad gitana 2021. Informe anual FSG (Discrimination and the Roma community 2021: FSG Annual Report)*, Madrid.

RLD 1/2013 establishes that the goods or services available to the public, public or private, must avoid discrimination, direct or indirect, on the ground of disability (Articles 5 and 29) and establishes a system of sanctions that mean that the prohibition can be said to be real and effective (Articles 80-88). A failure to adapt goods or a service to meet the needs of a person with a disability is a form of discrimination (RLD 1/2013, Article 29(1)). Article 29(3) establishes that differences of treatment in access to goods and services 'will be admissible when justified by a legitimate purpose and the means to achieve it are adequate, proportionate and necessary.'

For its part, Article 511 of the Criminal Code (Organic Law 10/1995) establishes jail sentences, fines and disqualification from holding public office 'to individuals in charge of a public service who refuse a person a benefit (*una prestación*) to which he is entitled due to his ... religion or belief ... belonging to an ethnic group or race ... sexual preference ... or handicap.' Public benefits (*prestaciones públicas*) can take the form of financial benefits (such as pensions or unemployment benefits) or the provision of different services such as education, health care or various social services. When these benefits are in the form of services, they can be implemented directly by public administrations or, in some cases, by private companies. It can be considered that this provision introduces measures that make the prohibition of discrimination in access to public services 'real and effective'. But this provision does not cover private services open to the public. Although Article 29(1) of Law 62/2003 recognises the principle of non-discrimination on the ground of racial or ethnic origin also in the private services open to the public, neither Law 62/2003 nor the Criminal Code have established measures to make the principle of equal treatment 'real and effective' in private sector services open to the public (except in the field of disability where sanctions have been established). That can be considered a potential breach of the Directive 2000/73.

In the access to goods, although the law establishes the general principle of non-discrimination in access to and supply of goods, it could be considered that there has been a violation of the directive, because the prohibition is not 'real and effective', given that it does not provide for any sanctions (except in relation to disability).

An interesting ruling was made in relation to access to services which are available to the public. Air Nostrum, a subsidiary airline of Iberia Líneas Aéreas de España, refused to allow three deaf people on board, on the grounds that they were unaccompanied. It claimed that, according to its flight operation manual, the safety of these persons could be at risk in an emergency. A court of first instance ruled in Iberia's favour, but the Madrid Provincial Court, in judgment No. 211/2009 of 6 May 2009, ruled in favour of the three deaf people, who were represented by the National Confederation of the Deaf and the Spanish Committee of Representatives of Persons with Disabilities. The Madrid Provincial Court deemed this a case of 'indirect discrimination' and noted that Law 51/2003 of 2 December 2003 on Equal Opportunities, Non-discrimination and Universal Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities prevails over Iberia's flight operation manual, and that not allowing these three deaf persons on board may be regarded as 'indirect discrimination' pursuant to Article 6(2) of that law, which transposes Article 2(2)(b) of Directive 2000/78/EC. Although the directive only addresses employment discrimination, Law 51/2003 (now in RLD 1/2013) also covers discrimination regarding access to goods and services. The provincial court ordered Iberia to take steps to ensure that 'the infringement of rights of persons with disabilities ceases and that deaf persons are not discriminated against in its flights'. This was the first court ruling to apply the concept of 'indirect discrimination' in access to goods and services in Spain. The judgment included the EU directives' definition of indirect discrimination and noted that the internal company regulation that the company wanted to apply to prevent access to the flight to the three deaf people was 'an apparently neutral provision ... but could cause a particular disadvantage to these persons because of their disability'.

a) Distinction between goods and services available publicly or privately

In Spain, national law does not distinguish between goods and services that are available to the public (e.g. in shops, restaurants and banks) and those that are only available privately (e.g. those restricted to members of a private association).

3.2.9 Housing (Article 3(1)(h) Directive 2000/43)

In Spain, national legislation prohibits discrimination in the area of housing, as formulated in the Racial Equality Directive.

Law 62/2003 recognises the principle of non-discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin in housing (Article 29(1)), in line with Directive 2000/43. However, this law does not provide any measures to make the principle of equal treatment 'real and effective'. However, judges must consider whether Article 512 of the Criminal Code (Organic Law 10/1995) could be applied and must decide whether 'housing' should be included under the concept of 'a benefit' (*una prestación*) as mentioned in the Criminal Code.

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes that housing must avoid discrimination, direct or indirect, on the ground of disability (Articles 48-52) and establishes a system of sanctions that mean that the prohibition can be said to be real and effective (Articles 80-88).

Furthermore, Article 32 of RLD 1/2013 establishes a housing stock for persons with disabilities and establishes that at least 4 % of homes built in public programmes (*viviendas protegidas*) will be built with a design suitable for persons with disabilities.

Although the law establishes the general principle of non-discrimination, it could be considered that there has been a violation of the directive, given that the law does not provide for any sanctions (except in relation to disability) and is therefore not 'real and effective.'

Article 13 of Organic Law 4/2000, which establishes the rights and freedoms of foreigners in Spain, establishes 'housing rights' for immigrants in Spain: 'Resident foreigners have the right to access public aid systems in the matter of housing ... In any case, long-term resident aliens are entitled to such aid under the same conditions as Spanish nationals.' In other words, all legal immigrants can access social housing and long-term legal immigrants can access public housing aid under the same conditions as the Spanish.

Legal migrants are treated in the same way as Spaniards and nationals of other Member States under anti-discrimination legislation, and they benefit from anti-discrimination law enforcement and implementation in the field of housing on an equal basis with nationals. However, the practical application of the relevant legal provisions could be improved. Immigrants of certain national origins and the Roma tend to congregate in certain districts, which leads to a significant concentration of the population. This situation becomes a problem when it is compounded by poor living conditions, sometimes involving illegal construction or the growth of slum districts. Undocumented migrants do not have the same access to social housing as legal migrants.

a) Trends and patterns regarding housing segregation for Roma

In Spain, there are no patterns of housing segregation and discrimination against the Roma (although the reality is that many Roma live in very concentrated conditions in certain urban and rural areas). Policies that aim to facilitate the accommodation of the Roma are general policies, and integration is now favoured, especially in mixed working-class neighbourhoods. At the end of the Franco dictatorship, most Spanish Roma lived in

substandard housing, much of it illegal and self-constructed (*chabolas*) in the slum suburbs of cities or towns (Cortés, 1995). In the democratic period, numerous actions of relocation (national, regional and local) have radically changed this residential situation, and most of the Roma now live in homes in working-class neighbourhoods of cities and towns, some in areas with high concentrations of Roma and others in more diverse neighbourhoods (Rio 2014). However, due to the economic crisis of 2008 and the social policies that have been implemented, many Roma (like other parts of the population that have suffered the consequences of the crisis more seriously), face eviction and have had to leave their homes because they cannot pay their mortgages. As a result, there has been an increase in substandard housing among the Roma, not because they are Roma, but because, as summarised by the Fundación Secretariado Gitano (FSG, 2013), 'the crisis affects earlier, harder, during more time and with more harmful and lasting effects the people and groups that were already in situations of vulnerability, poverty or social exclusion, as is the case with more than two thirds of the Roma community'. Despite the social gravity of these evictions, for the population in general and for the Roma in particular, there is no violation of the right to respect for private and family life nor a problem of discrimination.

Many Spanish local authorities have carried out generally successful relocation programmes for Roma in towns (moving from the marginal and segregated dwellings that previously occupied new areas to better housing conditions that are more integrated and socially diverse). In some cases, these relocation programmes have encountered opposition from other residents, but in general the administrations succeed in carrying out such rehousing.

4 EXCEPTIONS

4.1 Genuine and determining occupational requirements (Article 4)

In Spain, national legislation provides for an exception for genuine and determining occupational requirements.

Law 62/2003 (Article 34(2)) reproduces the occupational requirement exception of Article 4(1) of the Directive, which provides that: 'Differences based on a characteristic related to any of the causes referred to in the previous paragraph [all the grounds of Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78] do not amount to discrimination when, owing to the nature of the specific professional activity concerned or the context in which it is carried out, such a characteristic constitutes an essential and determinant professional requirement, provided that the objective is legitimate and the requirement is proportionate'.

Prior to the transposition of the directives into domestic Spanish law, Article 17(2) of the Workers' Statute stated that 'exclusions, reservations and preferences in respect of unrestricted employment may be established by law'.

4.2 Employers with an ethos based on religion or belief (Article 4(2) Directive 2000/78)

In Spain, national law provides for an exception for employers with an ethos based on religion or belief.

Article 34 of Law 62/2003 provides for non-discrimination in employment on the ground of religion or belief and amends other laws, such as the Workers' Statute, in this respect, but makes no reference to organisations with an ethos based on religion or belief.

For organisations with a specific ethos, Article 6 of the Organic Law on Religious Freedom states: 'Registered churches, faiths and religious communities shall be fully independent and may lay down their own organisational rules, internal and staff byelaws. Such rules, as well as those governing the institutions that they create to accomplish their purposes, may include clauses safeguarding their religious identity and own personality as well as due respect for their beliefs, without prejudice to the rights and freedoms recognised by the Constitution and in particular those of freedom, equality and non-discrimination'. The third additional provision of Organic Law 2/2006 on Education regulates the situation of teachers of religion at private (religious) centres. In the opinion of the author of this report, taking into consideration CJEU C-414/16 and C-68/17, these provisions are in keeping with Article 4(2) of Directive 2000/78.

As Puente (2004) points out, the scope of these clauses is the regulation of employment relationships in institutions with a specific ethos. In practice, the exemptions operate at three stages of the employment relationship: first, access to employment; secondly, during the performance of an activity within the organisation; and thirdly, dismissal from that activity. At the first stage, before the signature of the labour contract, the general rule is that religious reasons cannot be claimed for preventing anyone from exercising their right to work. Moreover, according to Article 16(2) of the Constitution, nobody may be compelled to make statements regarding his/her religion, belief or ideology, which means that there is a prohibition against asking about the ideology or beliefs of the worker. However, in these organisations, questions about religion and belief, and the requirement that workers accommodate their private lives to the ethos of the enterprise, seem genuine and legitimate if the activity to be performed is linked to the ideological orientation pursued by the organisation. This relates to the situation of religious education teachers in state schools. At the second stage, during the employment relationship, the employees have to show respect for the ideology of the enterprise. This respect for the ideology also includes

out-of-work activities, if they affect this ethos. At the third stage, although the general rule says that a discriminatory dismissal is void, in those organisations with a specific ethos it will not be discriminatory if there has been behaviour hostile to that ethos, taking into account the criteria laid down by the CJEU (e.g. judgment of 17 April 2008, *Vera Egenberger*). In any case, in a changing world, it is important to carefully assess each of the circumstances of a particular employment relationship in order to maintain the balance between the individual aspect of each individual's fundamental right and the postulates of the State's constitutional coherence.¹⁰⁵

- Conflicts between rights of organisations with an ethos based on religion or belief and other rights to non-discrimination

In Spain, there are specific provisions and case law in this area relating to conflicts between the rights of organisations with an ethos based on religion or belief and other rights to non-discrimination in the context of employment.

According to general constitutional doctrine, since the principle of good faith should govern employment relationships (Article 5(a) of the Workers' Statute, RLD 2/2015), employees in ideological or ethos-based organisations can be asked to conform to a minimal extent with the organisation's ethos.¹⁰⁶

Both doctrine and the courts have made it explicit that, even within ideological institutions, one has to distinguish between ideological and neutral employment positions. Only the former are about transmitting the ideology of the institution and thus those in which ideological affinity can be expected.¹⁰⁷ This brings up interesting issues given Catholicism's longstanding rejection of homosexuality, for example. In this respect, especially in relation to private religious schools, the Constitutional Court has considered that, once again, the most relevant factor to be taken into consideration is what the job itself consists of. If the job is strictly linked to spreading the school's ethos, constraints will be more justifiable than if the job consists of developing purely technical expertise or is restricted to the pure transmission of knowledge.¹⁰⁸ According to some academic doctrine, this would allow employers in this kind of institution to inquire about the worker's sexual orientation if the occupational activity is linked to spreading the school's ethos (Vicente 1998). On the other hand, some scholars have pointed out that it is a worker's conduct and not his sexual preferences *per se* that could be seen as violating the institution's ethos, so that it is only when the conduct is notorious and has the capacity to discredit the institution's ethos that measures can be taken (Fernández, 1985).¹⁰⁹ In general terms, this doctrine has been maintained in recent years. In the case of companies with their own ideology (known in Spain as '*empresas de tendencia*'; for example, a religious school), the doctrine and the judges maintain that the workers' performance that is hostile or contrary to the company's ideology can be a cause for dismissal of the worker, but the workers' simple disagreement with the company's ideology is not a valid cause for dismissal if this disagreement has not been made manifest in the teacher's work or in the labour activity.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ See: Arastey, L. 'Jurisprudencia laboral en materia de libertad religiosa' (Labour jurisprudence in matters of religious freedom), in Camas Roda, F. (ed.) (2016), *El ejercicio del derecho de libertad religiosa en el marco laboral* (The exercise of the right to religious freedom in the workplace) Editorial Bomarzo.

¹⁰⁶ Constitutional Court, Decision 47/1985, 27 March 1985, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/427>.

¹⁰⁷ Constitutional Court, Decision 106/1996, 12 June 1996, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/3158>.

¹⁰⁸ Constitutional Court, Decision 5/1981, 13 February 1981, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/5>.

¹⁰⁹ A general analysis of jurisprudence in Spain can be seen in Salas (2014).

¹¹⁰ Camós Victoria, I., 'La gestión de la diversidad religiosa en el ámbito del empleo y las empresas de tendencia' ('The management of religious diversity in the field of employment and '*empresas de tendencia*''), in Camas Roda, F. (ed.) (2016), *El ejercicio del derecho de libertad religiosa en el marco laboral* (The exercise of the right to religious freedom in the workplace) Editorial Bomarzo.

4.3 Armed forces and other specific occupations (Article 3(4) and Recitals 18 and 19 Directive 2000/78)

In Spain, national legislation does not provide for an explicit exception for the armed forces in this regard. However, both Law 8/2006 (for army troops and sailors in the navy) and Law 39/2007 and Royal Decree 35/2010 (for career military) make numerous references to age limits.

For army troops and sailors in the navy (*militares de tropa y marinería*), Law 8/2006 on Troops and Sailors¹¹¹ establishes that, in order to participate in the selection processes for the training courses that require to be followed to join the ranks of the army and navy, applicants must be at least 18 years old but no older than 29 (Article 3(1)(e)). This upper age limit of 29 was challenged before the Supreme Court. However, in its judgment 3842/2012 of 30 May 2012,¹¹² the Supreme Court considered that the maximum age limitation established by law did not generate discrimination because the difference in treatment was justified and covered the proportionality criterion.

The situation is different regarding the rules governing access to career military personnel (*militares de carrera*). The law regulating access to a professional military career in the armed forces (Law 39/2007 of 19 November 2007 on Military Careers)¹¹³ states in Article 56, on 'General requirements for admission to educational training centres' that: 'Entry into military training centres shall be by public competition, [guaranteeing] the constitutional principles of equality, merit and ability ... Applicants must (among other conditions) ... be 18 or older, and not have passed the age limits provided for in the regulations'. Therefore, the law does not establish any upper age limit, although it foresees that such age limits will be established by regulations.

Article 16 of the Regulation on Entry into the Armed Forces, approved by Royal Decree 35/2010¹¹⁴ (partially modified by Royal Decree 378/2014 of 30 May 2014 and also in 2020 by Royal Decree 556/2020 of 9 June 2020), sets 'Age specific requirements', both for troops and sailors (following the provisions of Law 8/2006) and for career military (which were not established in Law 39/2007). The age limits are different for the various corps and ranks in the army (ranging between 21 and 40). At no point does the royal decree offer any justification for the upper age limits.

Three parts of Article 16 of the royal decree were repealed by the Supreme Court Judgment of 9 May 2014.¹¹⁵ In this judgment, the Supreme Court considered that, for the career military of the Intendancy, the Military Legal Corps and Military Intervention, the age limits established in Royal Decree 35/2010 were not adequately justified and had only been established by the royal decree and not in a law. Therefore, the Supreme Court declared 'the nullity of the maximum age limit to participate in the selection processes for admission

¹¹¹ Law 8/2006 of 24 April 2006 on Troops and Sailors (*Ley 8/2006, de 24 de abril, de Tropa y Marinería*), BOE, 25 April 2006, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2006/BOE-A-2006-7319-consolidado.pdf>.

¹¹² Sentencia Tribunal Supremo, Sala Contencioso (Judgment of the Supreme Court, Contentious-Administrative Chamber) 3842/2012, 30 May 2012, <http://www.poderjudicial.es/search/index.jsp>.

¹¹³ Law 39/2007 of 19 November 2007, the Military Career Law (*Ley 39/2007, de 19 de noviembre, de la carrera militar*), BOE, 20 November 2007, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2007/BOE-A-2007-19880-consolidado.pdf>.

¹¹⁴ Royal Decree 35/2010 of 15 January 2010, approving the Regulation of entry and promotion and the organisation of training in the Armed Forces (*Real Decreto 35/2010, de 15 de enero, por el que se aprueba el Reglamento de ingreso y promoción y de ordenación de la enseñanza de formación en las Fuerzas Armadas*), BOE, 16 January 2010, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2010/BOE-A-2010-653-consolidado.pdf>.

¹¹⁵ Judgment of 9 May 2014 of the Third Chamber of the Supreme Court, which annuls Article 16 of the Regulation of entry and promotion and the organisation of training in the Armed Forces, as approved by Royal Decree 35/2010 (*Sentencia de 9 de mayo de 2014, de la Sala Tercera del Tribunal Supremo, por la que se anula el artículo 16 del Reglamento de ingreso y promoción y de ordenación de la enseñanza de formación en las Fuerzas Armadas, aprobado por Real Decreto 35/2010*), BOE, 15 July 2014, <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2014/07/15/pdfs/BOE-A-2014-7473.pdf>.

to military training centres in order to be incorporated, by direct entry, at the official scales' of the these three bodies of the Armed Forces.

Therefore, at present, there is an age limit of 29 for troops and sailors entering the army and navy (established in Law 8/2006), with a different age limit for career military (established in RD 35/2010). However, there is no legal limit in force for entering a military career in three bodies: the Intendancy, the Military Legal Corps and Military Intervention (Supreme Court Judgment of 9 May 2014).

In Spain, national legislation does not provide for an explicit exception for the armed forces in relation to disability discrimination.

On a separate issue, both Law 8/2006 (for army troops and navy sailors) and Law 39/2007 (the Military Career Law) make numerous references to the psychophysical skills that armed forces personnel must have. Law 39/2007, for example, addresses changes in professional destination, retiring from military service and resolving one's commitment with the armed forces. Under this law, proceedings can be begun for military personnel with insufficient psychophysical skills. The law ensures that if, via these proceedings, incapacity is established that entails a limitation on travelling to certain destinations (or taking up postings), equal treatment will be guaranteed in any destination to which the respondent may have access. If permanent disability is declared, the affected person will not continue in his/her destination. Law 8/2016 also sets out that the long-term commitment agreed between military personnel with more than five years of service and the Armed Forces shall end in the event of a lack of psychophysical skills of the former.

4.4 Nationality discrimination (Article 3(2))

a) Discrimination on the ground of nationality

In Spain, national law includes exceptions relating to difference of treatment based on nationality.

The seventh additional provision of Law 62/2003, entitled 'Non-applicability to immigration law', states that the articles transposing the directives do not affect the regulations provided 'in respect of the entry, stay, work and establishment of aliens in Spain in Organic Law 4/2000'. In Spain, nationality (as in citizenship) is not explicitly mentioned as a protected ground in Law 62/2003. Nonetheless, in relation to foreigners, Law 4/2000 on the rights and freedoms of foreigners in Spain and their social integration does establish a prohibition of discrimination on grounds of nationality against foreigners.

b) Relationship between nationality and 'racial or ethnic origin'

The Organic Law on the Rights and Freedoms of Foreigners in Spain and their Social Integration (OL 4/2000) (Article 23(2)) treats 'nationality' and 'racial or ethnic origin' as equivalent when prohibiting discriminatory acts 'against a foreign citizen merely because of his condition as such or because he belongs to a particular race, religion, ethnic group or nationality.'

In 2009, the UN Human Rights Committee (UNHRC) published its views, in which it considered that there had been a violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights by Spain in the case of Rosalind Williams.¹¹⁶ Mrs Williams, an Afro-American originally from the United States, acquired Spanish nationality in 1969. On 1992, a National Police officer asked to see her national identity card. The complainant asked the officer to explain the reasons for the identity check; the officer replied that he was obliged to check

¹¹⁶ UNHRC Communication No. 1493/2009, *Mrs Rosalind Williams Lecraf v. Spain*, 27 July 2009, https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/decision-en_20090812.pdf.

the identity of people 'like her', since many of them were illegal immigrants. The Spanish Constitutional Court, in a decision of 29 January 2001,¹¹⁷ justified the police action because it 'applied the racial criterion merely as indicating a greater likelihood that the person concerned was not Spanish', and because 'what might have been discriminatory would have been the use of a criterion [in this case a racial one] with no relation to the identification of persons for whom the law stipulates this administrative measure, in this case foreign citizens'. Mrs Williams submitted a complaint to the UNHRC. The committee recalled its jurisprudence that not every differentiation of treatment will constitute discrimination, if the criteria for such differentiation are reasonable and objective and if the aim is to achieve a purpose which is legitimate under the Covenant, but in this case 'the criteria of reasonableness and objectivity were not met'. Accordingly, the UNHRC declared that Article 2 of the Convention had been violated.

The UNHRC's views are very significant because they call into question the doctrine established by the Spanish Constitutional Court in 2001, legitimising the use of the racial criterion as a valid indicator of nationality and as reason to assume that a foreigner's presence in Spain is more likely to be irregular. This decision from the Spanish Constitutional Court had also been strongly criticised by human rights organisations and prominent jurists in Spain.

4.5 Health and safety (Article 7(2) Directive 2000/78)

In Spain, there are exceptions in relation to disability and health and safety, as provided for under Article 7(2) of the Employment Equality Directive.

Law 31/1995 on the Prevention of Occupational Risks provides regulations for the protection of workers such as workers with disabilities, who are at particular risk from certain hazards. Article 25 of the law states: 'Employers shall specially guarantee the protection of workers who, owing to their personal characteristics or known biological condition, including those with a recognised physical, mental or sensorial disability (i.e. people who have been officially recognised as persons with disabilities, with 33 % disability or more), are especially at risk from the hazards involved in their work. To this end, employers must take these aspects into account in hazard assessments and, pursuant thereto, shall take the necessary preventive and protective measures'. The law further states: 'Workers shall not be employed in posts in which, in view of their personal characteristics or known biological condition, or duly recognised physical, mental or sensorial disability, they may put themselves, other workers or other persons connected to the company in a dangerous situation, or, generally, where they are patently in a temporary condition unsuited to the psychophysical requirements of their respective posts of employment'.

Article 25 of Law 31/1995 on the Prevention of Occupational Risks was the basis of the question presented by Social Court No. 3 of Barcelona before the CJEU about whether the concept of 'workers particularly susceptible to certain risks' as contained in that article was equivalent to the concept of 'disability' within the meaning of Directive 2000/78. In its judgment on Case C-397/18,¹¹⁸ the CJEU ruled that 'Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation must be interpreted as meaning that the state of health of a worker categorised as being particularly susceptible to occupational risks, within the meaning of national law, which prevents that worker from carrying out certain jobs on the ground that such jobs would entail a risk to his or her own health or to other persons, only falls within the concept of 'disability', within the meaning of that directive, where that state leads to a

¹¹⁷ Constitutional Court, Decision 13/2001, 29 January 2001, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/4309>.

¹¹⁸ Judgment of 11 September 2019, *D.W. v. Nobel Plásticos Ibérica SA*, 11 September 2019, C-397/18, <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=217624&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=lst&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=501000>.

limitation of capacity arising from, *inter alia*, long-term physical, mental or psychological impairments which, in interaction with various barriers, may hinder the full and effective participation of the person concerned in their professional life on an equal basis with other workers. It is for the national court to determine whether those conditions are satisfied in the main proceedings.'

4.6 Exceptions related to discrimination on the ground of age (Article 6 Directive 2000/78)

4.6.1 Direct discrimination

a) Exceptions to the prohibition of direct discrimination on grounds of age

In Spain, national law provides for specific exceptions for direct discrimination on the ground of age. Spanish legislation does not permit general direct discrimination on the ground of age, but the legislation permits differences of treatment based on age for some activities within the material scope of Directive 2000/78. These exceptions must be 'objectively and reasonably justified by a legitimate aim'. To this effect, each difference of treatment on the ground of age must be expressly stated in a law and must be justified by 'a legitimate aim'.

b) Justification of direct discrimination on the ground of age

In Spain, national law provides for justifications for direct discrimination on the ground of age. As developed in point 4.6.4d, consideration should be given to the Tenth Additional Provision of the Workers' Statute Law, entitled 'Clauses in collective agreements referring to reaching the ordinary retirement age', which broadly establishes that collective agreements agreed between employers and workers' representatives may include clauses that enable the termination of the employment contract when the worker reaches an age of 68 years or over with the aim of promoting the extension of working life.

The Spanish courts have had to rule on several occasions regarding the adequate justification or otherwise of certain exceptions in equal treatment on the ground of age, especially in cases related to public employment. The results are disparate, as the courts accept the exceptions in some cases and not in others, and this results in similar situations having different age requirements. In addition to the different situations within the armed forces (see Paragraph 4.3), there are different situations within the police forces. For example, the National Police do not have an actual upper age limit, while the regional police in the Basque Country has an incorporation age limit of 35 years (Ballester, 2010; Solà, 2016).

Above all, three judgments of the Constitutional Court should be highlighted. Judgment 75/1983¹¹⁹ is relevant despite being an old sentence, because it is cited in all subsequent judgments and sets out guidelines for the possible justification of direct discrimination based on age. Moreover, there was a highly relevant dissenting vote in the case. The question before the Court concerned a legal regulation governing a special local regime that the municipalities of Barcelona and Madrid had at that time, and that required officials seeking promotion as local controllers (*interventores*) to be under 60 years old. In this highly contested judgment, the majority of the judges considered that, as long as age was itself a differentiating element, 'a legislative decision that, taking into account that differentiating element and the characteristics of the post in question, objectively sets age limits will be legitimate. This assumes, for those who have passed it, the impossibility of accessing these positions.' With this argument, the majority of the court considered that the rule was constitutional and non-discriminatory because the post of controller in

¹¹⁹ Constitutional Court, Decision 75/1983, 3 August 1983, <https://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/docs/BOE/BOE-T-1983-22275.pdf>.

municipalities of the complexity of Barcelona and Madrid required a minimum period of permanence in office to 'impose oneself on the important tasks that the law forces them to develop.' On the other hand, the (progressive) minority of the Constitutional Court's judges, in their dissenting vote, showed that the regulations establishing a maximum age of 60 years in order to apply to be a municipal controller seemed unconstitutional to them, because such a rule 'is not adequate (for the various reasons indicated) nor proportional for the purpose it pursues', and neither did it respond to a 'justified exceptionality'.

In its Decision 37/2004,¹²⁰ the Constitutional Court declared the last subsection of Article 135(b) of Royal Legislative Decree 781/1986, which approved the consolidated text on the local regime, to be unconstitutional. This precept established that one of the requirements to compete for positions in the local public service was 'not to exceed the age of less than ten years for forced retirement due to age, determined by the basic legislation on public service matters' (that is, not being over 55 years old). The Court unanimously considered that the legislation establishing that age limit was discriminatory and unconstitutional. The Court considered that it was unreasonable to claim that the employment relationship had a certain minimum duration; and furthermore, among other reasons, it highlighted that the Government should have offered arguments to justify a different legal treatment by age, in so far as the only criteria established by the Constitution for joining the public service were based on the principles of 'merit and ability'.

The case of the maximum age at which a person may open a pharmacy as a sole activity has produced several judgments from the Constitutional Court on the provisions of different Spanish autonomous communities. The most recent two of these are 78/2012¹²¹ and 41/2015.¹²² In Decision 78/2012, the Court ruled that it was unconstitutional to give preference to applicants under the age of 65 for opening a new pharmacy, as established by Basque Law 11/1994 on Pharmaceutical Management in the Basque Autonomous Community. Decision 41/2015 concerned a similar situation in the Balearic Islands. In both decisions (and in previous ones), the Court ruled, first, that it was not constitutionally permissible to justify the prohibition contained in the provision concerned by the fact that turning 65 produces a decreased capacity to perform pharmaceutical care; secondly, it could not be determined that the measure met planning and service organisation requirements; and, thirdly, it could not be ascertained that refusal of a license to pharmacists over 65 years of age constituted a positive action measure aimed at balancing the unfavourable position of people starting out in the profession.

For its part, the Supreme Court (in its Decision of 21 March 2011)¹²³ declared Article 7(b) of the rules for the selection process and training of the National Police (approved by Royal Decree 614/1995) to be null. This article provided for a lower limit (18 years) and an upper limit (30 years) to be applied to National Police selection tests. The court considered that the age limit of 30 years is not justified because, together with other requirements (such as physical and psychological tests), it is possible to obtain the result that was sought with that age limit. Currently, one of the requirements for being admitted to the National Police selective tests is to be over 18 years old and not exceed the maximum retirement age – which means that there is no maximum age for joining the National Police).

In 2015, the High Court of Justice of the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country made a request to the CJEU for a preliminary ruling (C 258/15). The request was made in proceedings between Mr Salaberria and the Basque Police and Emergency Services Academy on the latter's decision to issue a notice of competition containing the

¹²⁰ Constitutional Court, Decision 37/2004, 11 March 2004, <https://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/docs/BOE/BOE-T-2004-6131.pdf>.

¹²¹ Constitutional Court, Decision 78/2012, 16 April 2012, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/22845>.

¹²² Constitutional Court, Decision 41/2015, 2 March 2015, <https://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/docs/BOE/BOE-A-2015-3819.pdf>.

¹²³ Supreme Court, Decision 2185/2011, 21 March 2011, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2011/06/06/pdfs/BOE-A-2011-9788.pdf>.

requirement that candidates for police officer posts should be under 35 years old. Unlike case C-416/13 (*Vital Pérez*), in this case the CJEU judgment of 15 November 2016¹²⁴ considered that legislation which provides that candidates for posts of police officers must be under 35 years of age, 'may, subject to the qualification that the referring court should satisfy itself that the information to be obtained from the observations and documents submitted to the Court by the Academy ... is accurate, be regarded, first, as being appropriate to the objective of ensuring the operational capacity and proper functioning of the police service concerned and, second, as not going beyond what is necessary for the attainment of that objective' (Paragraph 48). Furthermore, 'Since the difference of treatment based on age stemming from that legislation does not constitute discrimination under Article 4(1) of Directive 2000/78, there is no need to examine whether it might be justified in the light of Article 6(1)(c) of that directive' (Paragraph 49).

In the field of social security and employment, there are issues that need to be examined from the perspective of possible discrimination on the ground of age. For some social benefits, age is integral to the benefit itself. For others, age is a factor limiting protection and, as such, benefits cannot be granted fully to all citizens. This second situation may give rise to discrimination. In any event, enough justification is required. The justification cited by the law is normally the difficulty experienced by older workers in re-entering the labour market¹²⁵ (Blázquez, 2005).

c) Permitted differences of treatment based on age

In Spain, national law permits differences of treatment based on age for any activities within the material scope of Directive 2000/78.

These exceptions must be 'objectively and reasonably justified by a legitimate aim'.

Some of the differences of treatment based on age are linked to the protection against child labour: children under 18 cannot work at night or work overtime, and they are subject to special regulations regarding weekly rest periods (Workers' Statute, Articles 6 and 37).

Other differences are linked to measures to promote employment: job-training contracts can be agreed with workers aged between 16 and 25 years (Workers' Statute, Article 11).

Spain has adopted the National Youth Guarantee Plan, according to which young people must receive a job or training offer within four months of becoming unemployed or leaving formal education. Young people have to be 16 to 30 years old to be included in this plan under Law 18/2014 of 15 October 2014, approving urgent measures for growth, competitiveness and efficiency. This law establishes certain measures that facilitate registration in the plan and access to training programmes for young people who are persons with disabilities or at risk of social exclusion.

Other age differences arise regarding access to some benefits, such as unemployment benefit (to which workers over the age of 55, among others, have access in some circumstances) (General Social Security Act, Article 274).

d) Fixing of ages for admission to occupational pension schemes

In Spain, national law allows occupational pension schemes to fix ages for admission to the scheme or entitlement to benefits, taking up the possibility provided for by Article 6(2) of Directive 2000/78).

¹²⁴ Judgment of 16 November 2016, *Salaberria Sorondo v. Academia Vasca de Policía y Emergencias*, C-258/15, <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=es&td=ALL&num=C-258/15>.

¹²⁵ For example, Royal Decree-Law 5/2013 of 15 March 2013 on measures to favour the continuity of working life and promote active ageing, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2013/BOE-A-2013-2874-consolidado.pdf>.

Private occupational pensions are covered by Royal Legislative Decree 1/2002 of 29 November 2002, which approves the revised text of the Law on the Regulation of Pension Plans and Funds. Regarding the retirement of workers, the law establishes that financial retirement benefits are acquired when the worker retires in the public system; if this cannot be established, it is understood to have occurred at 65 years of age. However, the receipt of the corresponding benefit can be anticipated from the age of 60.

Royal Legislative Decree 1/2002 has been further developed by Royal Decree 304/2004 of 20 February 2004, which approves the Regulation on Pension Schemes and Funds. Neither of the two pieces of legislation (Royal Legislative Decree 1/2002 and the Regulation) establishes specific ages for joining the scheme (or pension plan). As we noted previously (see 3.2.2), both of them recognise the principle of discrimination in each pension plan that is implemented. In this sense, Royal Legislative Decree 1/2002 sets out that a scheme or occupational pension plan will be non-discriminatory when all the staff employed by the employer/promoter are allowed to join the pension plan. In any case, Royal Legislative Decree 1/2002 (Article 5) states that, when it comes to joining the pension plan, the plan may specify that the worker must have a seniority in the company of less than two years to access it. In summary, any plan may set out that all workers are able to join the plan without any seniority at the company; it may also take some kind of seniority into consideration, but never more than two years from being hired by the employer. This legal provision is fully applicable. In addition, the Constitutional Court resolved (in Judgment 104/2004 of 28 June 2004) that the enforcement of this law by the company cannot distinguish between workers with indefinite contracts, those with permanent contracts and those with fixed-term-contracts.¹²⁶

4.6.2 Special conditions for younger and older workers

In Spain, there are special conditions set by law for older or younger workers in order to promote their vocational integration.

There are many employment policies and programmes, detailed in the national employment plans and on occasion funded by the European Social Fund, with participant age limits, normally designed to favour young people under 25 and older workers. For both groups, there are measures to support training and employment in the form of partially subsidised contracts. In the case of young people, the employment measures are work experience contracts, job-training contracts and subsidised contracts of indefinite duration (Royal Decree-Law 6/2016).¹²⁷

Following its reform in 2020, Law 2/2006 on Education basically encourages education administrations to organise professional training courses aimed at students with special educational needs aged up to 21. The administrations may also organise vocational training programmes for people over 17 who left the education system without any qualifications, in order to enable them to obtain a formal qualification.

In the case of older workers, there are subsidised contracts of indefinite duration for people aged 45 to 55 in some cases, and for those aged over 52 in others. There is also a jobseeker's allowance programme for older workers who are at a particular disadvantage in the labour market (Royal Decree-Law 8/2015).¹²⁸

¹²⁶ See Constitutional Court website: <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/es-ES/Resolucion/Show/5109>.

¹²⁷ Royal Decree-Law 6/2016 of 23 December 2016 on urgent measures to boost the National Youth Guarantee System (*Real Decreto-ley 6/2016, de 23 de diciembre, de medidas urgentes para el impulso del Sistema Nacional de Garantía Juvenil*), <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2016/12/24/pdfs/BOE-A-2016-12266.pdf>.

¹²⁸ RLD 8/2015 of 30 October 2015, approving the revised text of the General Social Security Act (*Real Decreto Legislativo 8/2015, de 30 de octubre, Ley General de la Seguridad Social*), <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2015/BOE-A-2015-11724-consolidado.pdf>.

The unemployment benefit system also makes age distinctions. For example, those aged over 52 who have used up their contributory unemployment benefit are entitled to an unemployment allowance until they reach retirement age, and those aged over 45 with family responsibilities (caring responsibilities) who have used up their contributory unemployment benefit are entitled to a variable allowance depending on certain circumstances. 'Active job-seeking income' is granted to those aged over 45 who satisfy certain conditions (Royal Decree-Law 8/2015).

4.6.3 Minimum and maximum age requirements

In Spain, there are exceptions permitting minimum and/or maximum age requirements in relation to access to employment and training.

The Workers' Statute (Article 6) sets the minimum age for access to employment at 16. This is also the minimum age for access to vocational training.

There is no general rule establishing a maximum working age, since the provision of the Workers' Statute in 1980, setting a maximum age of 69, was declared unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court in 1981.¹²⁹ There is also no maximum age for taking part in vocational training.

The Workers' Statute (RLD 2/2015, Articles 49-56), which regulates dismissal proceedings, applies equally to all workers without distinction of age.

Retirement at 65 is compulsory in the civil service, but civil servants can request an extension to 70 years (RLD 5/2015 of 30 October 2015, on the Civil Service Basic Statute, Article 67¹³⁰ and Law 55/2003 (Article 26) for the personnel of the health services of the public system).¹³¹ Some public professions, such as judges, prosecutors, bailiffs, notaries or university professors, have special regulations, with compulsory retirement at 70 (For example, Organic Law 6/1985 on the Judiciary of 1 July 1985, Article 492).

4.6.4 Retirement

a) State pension age

In Spain, there is a state pension age, at which individuals may begin to collect their state pensions.

Workers may begin to receive a public contributory pension at the age of 67, provided that the other requirements set out by the law are met. Article 205 of the General Social Security Act (RLD 8/2015) establishes that employed workers who have reached the age of 67, or those who are 65 but have contributed for 38 years and 6 months, are entitled to a retirement pension. A minimum 15-year contribution period is also required, of which the last two years must fall within the 15 years immediately prior to the pension request. However, Article 205 of the General Social Security Act will be implemented gradually (the full implementation of this article will be from 2027): there is 'a transitional period' from a pensionable age of 65, which applied until 2013, to the age of 67 (or those who are 65 but have contributed for 38 years and 6 months), which will apply from 2027. In 2020, the pensionable age was 65 (if the worker had contributed for at least 37 years) or 65 years

¹²⁹ Constitutional Court, Decision 22/1981, 2 July 1981, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/22>.

¹³⁰ RLD 5/2015 of 30 October 2015, approving the revised text of the Basic Statute of Public Employees (*Real Decreto Legislativo 5/2015, de 30 de octubre, por el que se aprueba el texto refundido de la Ley del Estatuto Básico del Empleado Público*), BOE, 31 October 2015, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2015/10/31/pdfs/BOE-A-2015-11719.pdf>.

¹³¹ Law 55/2003 of 16 December 2003, of the Framework Statute of statutory staff of health services (*Ley 55/2003, de 16 de diciembre, del Estatuto Marco del personal estatutario de los servicios de salud*) <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2003/BOE-A-2003-23101-consolidado.pdf>.

and 10 months (if the worker had contributed for less than that period) (General Social Security Act, Seventh Transitional Provision). For non-contributory pensions, the retirement age is 65, and other requirements require to be fulfilled (General Social Security Act, Article 369).

The use of age criteria or actuarial standards is not provided for by the law. The so-called 'sustainability factor' has been adopted under the Social Security Law to calculate retirement pensions, although this instrument has been suspended until 2023. However, the General Social Security Act provides for the regulation of this factor. It is aimed at linking the amount of the retirement pension to the evolution of life expectancy among the retirement-age population. The underlying idea is to adjust the amounts received by people who retire in similar conditions but at different times. The sustainability factor will be applied only once when the initial pension amount is determined by the Social Security Institute, taking as a reference the age of 67 years and the mortality rate of the retirement-age population within the Social Security system. The interannual variation of life expectancy needed to calculate the sustainability factor will be reviewed every five years (Article 211 of the General Social Security Act).

The pensionable age (65 in 2020 if the worker had contributed for at least 37 years, or 65 years and 10 months if the worker had contributed for less than that period), may be lowered by the Government for those groups or professional activities where the work is of an exceptionally strenuous, toxic, dangerous or unhealthy nature, and where there are high levels of disease or mortality, or in the case of 'persons with disabilities with a degree of disability equal to or greater than 65 per cent' (General Social Security Act, Article 206). Furthermore, early retirement may be taken from the age of 61, provided that certain requirements specified in the General Social Security Act (Article 207) are met.

If an individual wishes to work beyond the state pension age, retirement can be deferred. In this case, the economic value of the worker's pension may be increased up to a maximum of 4 % (General Social Security Act, Article 210).

It is also possible to begin collecting one's pension voluntarily before retirement age. People must be at least two years short of retirement age and meet certain requirements established by the General Social Security Act (Article 208). Early retirement leads to a reduction in the economic value of the pension.

An individual can collect a pension and still work. It is possible for someone to have a retirement pension and to keep working part-time or on a self-employed basis if their income is below the official minimum wage (14 payments of EUR 900 in 2019)¹³² (General Social Security Act, Articles 213, 214 and 215).

The conditions are the same for women and men.

b) Occupational pension schemes

In Spain, there is a standard age when people can begin to receive payments from occupational pension schemes and other employer-funded pension arrangements. In 2020 this was 65 (if the worker had contributed for at least 37 years) or 65 years and 10 months (if the worker had contributed for less than 37 years) (General Social Security Act, Seventh Transitional Provision).

If an individual wishes to work longer, payments from such occupational pension schemes can be deferred.

¹³² Royal Decree 1077/2017 of 29 December 2017, setting the minimum wage for 2018 (*Real Decreto 1077/2017, de 29 de diciembre, por el que se fija el salario mínimo interprofesional para 2018*), BOE, 30 December 2017, <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2017/BOE-A-2017-15848-consolidado.pdf>.

An individual can collect a pension and still work.

The conditions are the same for women and men.

c) State-imposed mandatory retirement ages

In Spain, there are state-imposed mandatory retirement ages for the public sector, but not for the private sector.

Without prejudice to what will be said later (paragraph d), the retirement age is voluntary in the private sector. The state rule requiring people to retire no later than 69 was declared unconstitutional on the ground of age.¹³³ Civil servants can retire at 65, but they can request an extension to 70¹³⁴ (RLD 5/2015 of 30 October 2015, on the Civil Service Basic Statute, Article 67(3)). This rule also applies to the personnel of the health services of the public system (Law 55/2003, Article 26(2)). Some public professions, such as judges, prosecutors, notaries, bailiffs or university professors, have special regulations, with compulsory retirement at 70. Some public civil servants are included in the General System of Social Security. For them, the retirement age is the same as the age of access to the social security retirement pension (RLD 5/2015, Article 67(4)).

The mandatory retirement age and the possibility of extending working life to 70 years of staff working in public administrations and public health services has given rise to disputes in court. The aforementioned state regulations (RDL 5/2015, Article 67(3) and Law 55/2003, Article 26(2)) can be developed in their areas of competence by the autonomous communities to regulate the regime of staff working in public administrations or in public health services. Many of the cases that go to court have to do with the latter. A good summary of the consolidated doctrine of the Supreme Court is established in judgment 2708/2018.¹³⁵ The content of this sentence can be synthesised in four aspects in relation to the right to request the extension of active life up to 70 years of age among health services personnel:

1. The general rule is the absence of a perfect subjective right to remain active beyond the compulsory retirement age. This was stated by the Constitutional Court in its Court Order 85/2013.¹³⁶
2. On this basis, the Supreme Court considers that Article 26(2) of Law 55/2003 regulates the possibility of requesting the extension of the retirement age, which has been called a 'weakened right' (*derecho debilitado*), which is conditioned to what the Administration decides in the exercise of its power of self-organisation and attending to its needs.
3. This capacity for self-organisation of health administrations must be reflected in the 'human resources management plans' (hereinafter, HRMP) which are the 'basic instrument for their global planning' (according to Article 13(1) of Law 55/2003). They must specify the human resources needs of the health service in a reasoned manner. Based on these HRMP, administrations can deny the request to extend working life up to 70 years or limit it to a shorter period.
4. However, if the HRMP does not exist or has been declared null, the worker has the right to extend his active life until he/she is 70 years old, because the administration's argument to deny that worker's right can only be justified based on the HRMP. The reasons for denying the request to extend the working life must be based on the reasons provided by the HRMP; therefore, the refusal cannot be based on the mere

¹³³ Constitutional Court, Decision 22/1981, 2 July 1981, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/22>.

¹³⁴ See STS 4064/2019 of 16 December 2019, <http://www.poderjudicial.es/search/indexAN.jsp>.

¹³⁵ Supreme Court, Decision 2708/2018, 17 July 2018, <http://www.poderjudicial.es/search/AN/openDocument/7f60c64dbfa6aac2/20180720>.

¹³⁶ Constitution Court Order 85/2013, 23 May 2013, <https://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/docs/BOE/BOE-A-2013-5449.pdf>.

administrative will, but on the HRMP, which is the instrument to which the law entrusts such concretion of that right (even if it is a weakened right) of the worker.

In summary, the right to prolong active life (established in Article 26(2) of Law 55/2003) is not a perfect right that can be understood as a right acquired by the worker, but a 'weakened right' but worthy unless there is a provision to the contrary in the HRMP. Without that HRMP, the right becomes a right that must be recognised.

For these reasons, some judgments of higher justice courts have ruled in favour of the administrations when they have denied a request to extend the active life of a worker based on the provisions of the HRMP. For example, judgment 2544/2018 of the Superior Court of Justice of the Basque Country¹³⁷ in the case of a worker of the Basque Health Service – Osakidetza – who requested to continue working but did not comply with some conditions formally established in the HRMP of Osakidetza. In other cases, the courts have found in favour of the workers because there is no HRMP or because the HRMP has been declared null. This is the case of the Supreme Court Decision 2328/2019¹³⁸ which concerned a worker of the health service of the Autonomous Community of Aragon, whose HRMP has been declared null by the courts. Directive 2000/78 is not cited in any of these judgments nor are specific references made to age discrimination. The conditions are the same for women and men.

d) Retirement ages imposed by employers

In Spain, national law does not permit employers to set retirement ages (or ages at which the termination of an employment contract is possible).

Historically, and in particular from 2015 onwards with the Workers' Statute law (RLD 2/2015), the 10th additional provision has entered into force. It had stated that 'clauses in collective agreements providing for the termination of the employment contract when the worker reaches the normal retirement age specified in the rules of social security are deemed null and void, whatever the extent and scope of these terms'. Subsequently, this rule was amended so that as of 2019, collective agreements may establish clauses that enable the termination of the employment contract due to the worker reaching the legal retirement age established in the Social Security regulations, provided that the following requirements are met: a) the worker affected by the termination of the employment contract must meet the requirements laid down in the Social Security regulations for entitlement to 100 % of the ordinary retirement pension in its contributory form; b) the measure must be linked to coherent employment policy objectives expressed in the collective bargaining agreement, such as improving employment stability by transforming temporary contracts into permanent contracts, hiring new workers, generational replacement or any others aimed at favouring the quality of employment.

Finally, in 2021, Law 21/2021, of 28 December, on guaranteeing the purchasing power of pensions and other measures to reinforce the financial and social sustainability of the public pension system, amended Additional Provision 10 of RLD 2/2015.

In accordance with this new regulation, with the aim of favouring the extension of working life, collective agreements may establish clauses that make it possible to terminate the employment contract when the worker reaches an age of 68 years or over. The forced retirement of the worker may take place if the following requirements are met:

a) That the worker affected by the termination of the employment contract is entitled to 100 % of the ordinary retirement pension in its contributory form.

¹³⁷ Superior Court of Justice of the Basque Country, STSJ PV 3544/2018, <http://www.poderjudicial.es/search/AN/openDocument/37fba3aabb8c5b85/20190220>.

¹³⁸ Supreme Court, Decision 2328/2019, 4 June 2019, <http://www.poderjudicial.es/search/AN/openDocument/eb0feb1d6155e241/20190715>.

b) That the measure of termination of the contract is connected with the objective of generational replacement through the indefinite-term, full-time hiring of at least one new male or female employee.

In addition to the above, the new legislation provides that, 'exceptionally', with the aim of achieving real and effective equality between women and men by helping to overcome occupational segregation by gender, 'the limit in the previous section [68 years or over] may be lowered to the ordinary retirement age [66 years] set by the Social Security regulations when the employment rate of employed women affiliated to the Social Security in any of the economic activities corresponding to the functional scope of the agreement is less than 20 % of the people employed in those activities.'

Consequently, the regulation develops this provision on the economic activities to which the precept refers, as well as the criteria to be met by the person whose employment contract is terminated due to reaching the age set by the agreement in accordance with this second paragraph. In any case, the regulation reminds us that 'each termination of a contract in application of this provision must be accompanied by the simultaneous indefinite-term, full-time employment of at least one woman in the aforementioned activity.'

e) Employment rights applicable to all workers irrespective of age

The law on protection against dismissal and other laws protecting employment rights apply to all workers, irrespective of age, even if they remain in employment after attaining pensionable age or any another age (RLD 2/2015, Workers' Statute).

f) Compliance of national law with CJEU case law

In Spain, national legislation is in line with the CJEU case law on age regarding mandatory retirement.

The CJEU judgment in *Palacios de la Villa v. Cortefiel*,¹³⁹ for example, explicitly accepted that Spanish legislation in this field is in compliance with Directive 2000/78/EC (López 2013).

4.6.5 Redundancy

a) Age and seniority taken into account for redundancy selection

In Spain, national law does not generally permit age to be taken into account in selecting workers for redundancy (RLD 2/2015, Workers' Statute, Article 4(2)). However, in the case of collective dismissals, the Workers' Statute allows for differences between collectives, if this is agreed between the social partners. Article 51(5) establishes that 'Through a collective agreement or agreement reached during the consultation period (which are mandatory and prior to collective dismissal), permanence priorities may be established in favour of groups, such as workers with family responsibilities, older than a certain age or persons with disabilities'.¹⁴⁰ These exceptions are reasonable and are justified by the objective characteristics of these groups.

In Spain, national law permits seniority to be considered in selecting workers for redundancy. Collective bargaining agreements may include clauses (agreed between the social partners) that recognise seniority for different issues within the company: salary

¹³⁹ Judgment of 16 October 2007, *Palacios de la Villa v. Cortefiel Servicios*, C-411/05, <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&num=C-411/05>.

¹⁴⁰ These legal provisions do not guarantee that these groups are protected from dismissal, since they need to be included in the agreements between the social partners.

bonus for seniority or in promotions or dismissals, for example.¹⁴¹ Although not expressly included in Article 51(5) of the Workers' Statute, seniority can be taken into consideration because the list is not exhaustive.

b) Age taken into account for redundancy compensation

In Spain, national law provides compensation for redundancy (Workers' Statute, Articles 49-56). Theoretically, such compensation payments are not affected by the age of the worker, but in practice they are, because their level is linked to the length of time that the worker has worked for the company. For example, in case of dismissal for objective reasons, the worker is entitled to a 'compensation of twenty days per year of service' (Workers' Statute, Article 53(1)), or in case of unfair dismissal, the worker is entitled to a 'compensation equivalent to thirty-three days of salary per year of service' (Workers' Statute, Article 56(1)). Years of service must be understood, following the consolidated doctrine of the Social Chamber of the Supreme Court,¹⁴² to mean 'the entire duration of the contractual employment relationship' even in different types of labour contracts.

The current regulations on this matter are in line with Directive 2000/78. Actual practice in companies may also be said generally to conform to the directive, but in some cases indirect discrimination on the ground of age does occur, and should, where appropriate, be dealt with by the courts.

4.7 Public security, public order, criminal offences, protection of health, protection of the rights and freedoms of others (Article 2(5) Directive 2000/78)

In Spain, national law does not include exceptions that seek to rely on Article 2(5) of the Employment Equality Directive.

4.8 Any other exceptions

In Spain, there are no other exceptions to the prohibition of discrimination (on any ground) provided in national law.

¹⁴¹ See, for example, the collective agreement of Liberty Seguros, Compañía de Seguros y Reaseguros, SA, published in the BOE on 23 January 2019, <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2019/01/23/pdfs/BOE-A-2019-777.pdf>.

¹⁴² Supreme Court, Social Chamber, Sentence No. 494/2018, 10 May 2018, <https://www.iberley.es/jurisprudencia/sentencia-social-n-494-2018-ts-sala-social-sec-1-rec-2005-2016-10-05-2018-47818776>.

5 POSITIVE ACTION (Article 5 Directive 2000/43, Article 7 Directive 2000/78)

a) Scope for positive action measures

In Spain, positive action is permitted in national law in respect of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.

The principle of 'positive action' is rooted in the Spanish Constitution: Article 14 formally recognises equality before the law without discrimination on any of the grounds listed in the Constitution, while Article 9(2) requires the public authorities to promote 'the conditions to ensure that the freedom and equality of individuals and of the groups that they form are real and effective'. The positive action required by Article 9(2) should not be regarded only as a 'legitimate exception', but as a guarantee that the principle of equality is to be made effective. In this respect, the Constitutional Court has repeatedly held that affirmative action is not to be seen as discriminatory. Rather, the court has interpreted that actions by public authorities to remedy the employment disadvantage of certain socially marginalised groups are required by a properly understood commitment to equality.

Positive action has been present in labour, educational and other provisions since the passing of the Spanish Constitution in 1978 (Cachón, 2004).

In relation to employment, the Workers' Statute (Article 17(2)) stipulates that the Parliament may specify 'exclusions, reservations and preference' in employment for certain groups who are at a disadvantage in the labour market. Article 17(3) states that the Government 'may specify measures of reservation, duration or preference in employment'.

In the educational field, the Organic Law on Education of 2006 stipulates two regulations of interest in terms of 'principles'. On the one hand, Article 1 establishes that the Spanish education system is inspired by 'the principle of quality education' for all students, without any discrimination on the grounds of birth, sex, racial, ethnic or geographical origin, disability, age, illness, religion or beliefs, sexual orientation or sexual identity or any other personal or social condition or circumstance (Article 1). On the other hand, Article 80 establishes 'the principle of equality in the exercise of the right to education' (which gives rise to the possibility of establishing positive action measures), and establishes in this sense that 'in order to render effective the principle of equality in the exercise of the right to education, the authorities shall develop compensatory actions aimed at persons, groups and territorial regions with unfavourable situations, and provide the necessary economic resources' (Article 80).

In Law 62/2003, which transposes the directives, Articles 30, 35 and 42 regulate positive action. Article 35 deals with discrimination in employment and in relation to occupation, and provides that, 'with a view to ensuring full equality on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, the principle of equality shall not prevent maintaining or adopting specific measures in favour of certain groups in order to prevent or compensate for disadvantages that they may encounter'. Article 42 provides that 'collective agreements may include measures intended to fight against every form of employment discrimination, to encourage equality of opportunity and to prevent harassment on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation'.

Article 30 of the same Law, referring to the various spheres of employment included in Directive 2000/43 on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, states: 'In order to guarantee full equality irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, the principle of equal treatment shall not prevent the maintenance or adoption of special measures benefiting certain groups, designed to prevent or to offset any disadvantages that they suffer as a result of their racial or ethnic origin'.

In the field of disability, there has been a wide range of positive measures since the implementation, in 1982, of Law 13/1982 on the Social Integration of Persons with Disabilities (now replaced by Law RLD 1/2013). The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) includes such positive action measures in Articles 67 and 68. The aim of positive action is to grant the necessary assistance and protection to persons with disabilities who are more vulnerable,¹⁴³ to provide a quota system and other actions in favour of promoting the integration of persons with disabilities into employment, and to promote equality in order to allow the complete personal fulfilment of persons with disabilities and their total social integration (Article 42 of Law RLD 1/2013). The Constitutional Court has recognised the legality of establishing a quota for persons with disabilities when selecting employees.¹⁴⁴

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) provides a series of positive measures to combat the discrimination suffered by persons with disabilities. The law defines positive action measures as: 'those specific measures oriented to prevent or compensate for disadvantages caused by disability and to accelerate or achieve de facto equality of persons with disabilities and their full participation in the areas of political, economic, social, educational, and cultural work, in response to different types and degrees of disability' (Article 2(g)). Article 67 establishes that:

'1) The public authorities shall take positive action measures to benefit persons with disabilities where there is likely to be a greater degree of discrimination, including multiple discrimination, or a lesser degree of equal opportunity discrimination, such as for women, for children who require more support for the exercise of autonomy or decision making and who suffer more acute social exclusion, and for persons with disabilities who usually live in rural areas.

2) Also, as part of the official policy of family protection, public authorities shall take positive action measures with respect to families when one of their members is a person with disabilities.'

Article 68 of RLD 1/2013 specifies the content of measures for positive action on the ground of disability; these measures may consist of additional support (economic support, technical support, personal assistance, specialised services, special support and services for communication) or rules, criteria or more favourable practices.

It should be mentioned that during 2021, the Draft for a 'Comprehensive' Law on Equal Treatment and Non-Discrimination,¹⁴⁵ was being processed in Parliament, aimed at recognising the right to equal treatment and non-discrimination on the grounds of birth, racial or ethnic origin, sex, religion, conviction or opinion, age, disability, sexual orientation or identity, illness, language or any other personal or social condition or circumstance. One of the novel aspects of this Draft Law is the regulation of the different types of violation of the equal treatment and non-discrimination principle: discrimination, direct or indirect; discrimination by association and unintentional discrimination; multiple or intersectional discrimination; denial of reasonable accommodation; harassment, inducement, order or instruction to discriminate; retaliation or failure to comply with positive action measures deriving from normative or conventional obligations. Also included is a definition of positive

¹⁴³ Persons with disabilities who are more vulnerable are defined in RLD 1/2013 (Article 67(1)): 'persons with disabilities susceptible to being subjected to a greater degree of discrimination, including multiple discrimination, or to a lesser degree of equal opportunities, such as women [and] children, who need more support for the exercise of their autonomy or for free decision-making and those who suffer from a greater social exclusion, as well as persons with disabilities who habitually live in a rural environment.'

¹⁴⁴ Constitutional Court, Decision 269/1994, 3 October 1994, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/2786>.

¹⁴⁵ See: Comprehensive Law Proposal for equal treatment and non-discrimination (*Proposición de Ley integral para la igualdad de trato y la no discriminación*) (122/000121), available at: https://www.congreso.es/web/guest/proposiciones-de-ley?p_p_id=iniciativas&p_p_lifecycle=0&p_p_state=normal&p_p_mode=view&iniciativas_mode=mostrarDetalle&iniciativas_legislatura=XIV&iniciativas_id=122/000121.

action measures: 'positive actions are considered to be differences in treatment aimed at preventing, eliminating and, where appropriate, compensating for any form of discrimination in its collective or social dimension. Such measures shall be applicable for as long as the situations of discrimination which justify them persist and shall be reasonable and proportionate with regard to the means of their implementation, the objectives they pursue and the deadlines they must meet.'

Furthermore, as mentioned above, a Draft Bill for the real and effective equality of trans people and for the guarantee of the rights of LGBTBI people¹⁴⁶ is also being prepared: a state strategy for the social inclusion of trans people is to be adopted as part of this Draft Bill. Priority will be given to positive action measures in the fields of employment, education and health.

b) Quotas in employment for persons with disabilities

In Spain, national law provides quotas for the employment of persons with disabilities.

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) lays out different systems for workplace integration for persons with disabilities. One of them is integration into the ordinary work system by a quota system: at least 2 % of the workforces of public and private companies with 50 or more employees must be persons with disabilities (who have been officially recognised as having at least a 33 % impairment) (Article 42). For the public administration, RLD 5/2015 of 30 October 2015 establishes that 'In offers of public employment a quota will be applied of not less than 7 % of vacancies to be filled by persons with a disability ... by which 2 % of the staff employed by the state administration will be reached progressively, provided that they pass selection' (Article 59).

Companies have the possibility of avoiding the requirement to reserve quotas for workers with disabilities (by performing various actions specifically provided for in Law RLD 1/2013, Article 42, and Royal Decree 364/2005 of 8 April 2005, which regulates the alternative exceptional compliance of the reserve quota in favour of workers with disabilities - these measures do not include paying a fee per unfilled quota place) but, if they violate the legal obligation, they can be sanctioned by the Labour Inspectorate with fines of up to EUR 6 250 in total (RLD 5/2000 on Offences and Penalties in Social Matters, Articles 15 and 40). The annual report of the Inspectorate of Labour and Social Security does not provide inspection results in this area. There is no publicly available information regarding the enforcement of the quota in practice.

¹⁴⁶ See: Preliminary Bill for the real and effective equality of trans people and for the guarantee of the rights of LGBTBI people (*Anteproyecto de Ley para la igualdad real y efectiva de las personas trans y para la garantía de los derechos de las personas LGBTBI*), available at: <https://www.igualdad.gob.es/servicios/participacion/audienciapublica/Documents/APL%20Igualdad%20Trans%20+LGTBI%20v4.pdf>.

6 REMEDIES AND ENFORCEMENT

6.1 Judicial and/or administrative procedures (Article 7 Directive 2000/43, Article 9 Directive 2000/78)

- a) Available procedures for enforcing the principle of equal treatment

In Spain, the following procedures exist for enforcing the principle of equal treatment: judicial, administrative and alternative dispute resolution such as mediation.

Judicial procedure

The Spanish Constitution provides that all fundamental rights are protected by the ordinary courts of law (Article 53). This protection will be made effective, in the first place, by a special preferential and summary procedure that is regulated by the main procedural laws for all types of jurisdiction: civil (Law 1/2000 of 7 January 2000 on Civil Procedure),¹⁴⁷ criminal (Criminal Procedure Law of 14 September 1882, modified by Law 8/2002 of 24 October 2002), labour (Law 36/2011 of 10 October 2011 regulating Social Jurisdiction) or administrative (Law 29/1998 of 13 July 1998 regulating the administrative courts).¹⁴⁸ Moreover, appeals for protection in respect of such rights may be lodged at the Constitutional Court once ordinary proceedings have been exhausted (Organic Law 2/1979 of 3 October 1979 on the Constitutional Court, modified by Organic Law 6/2007 of 24 May 2007). The Organic Law on the Rights and Freedoms of Foreigners in Spain and their Social Integration (OL 4/2000) stipulates that foreigners are entitled to legal aid on the same conditions as Spaniards.

Conflicts regarding either private sector employment or the hired personnel of public entities (who are subject to labour law) are resolved by the social jurisdictional branch, composed of the specialised single-instance social and labour courts (*juzgados de lo social de única instancia*), the first instance and appeal chambers specialising in social and labour law (*las salas de lo social de los Tribunales de primera y segunda instancia*), the regional high courts (*Tribunales Superiores de Justicia*), the National Court (Audiencia Nacional) and the social and labour chamber of the Supreme Court (Sala de lo social del Tribunal Supremo).

When the conflicts are due to an action by the administration that is subject to administrative and not labour law, the jurisdictional branch that is competent is the administrative jurisdiction (*jurisdicción contencioso-administrativa*), which requires the prior exhaustion of whatever administrative procedures there may be, and which is formed by the first-instance and appellate administrative courts (*juzgados y tribunales contenciosos administrativos, en primera y segunda instancia*), and by the administrative chamber of the Supreme Court (sala de lo contencioso-administrativo del Tribunal Supremo).

The Supreme Court (Tribunal Supremo), the highest instance within the ordinary judiciary, is responsible for judging appeals in order to reconcile contradictory decisions by lower courts. Its decisions are binding and thus constitute a source of law; therefore, its judgments should be followed by the lower courts.

All the cited judicial procedures are binding but are subject to possible appeals to higher courts.

¹⁴⁷ Law 1/2000 of 7 January 2000 on Civil Procedure (*Ley 1/2000, de 7 de enero, de Enjuiciamiento Civil*), BOE, 8 January 2000, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2000/01/08/pdfs/A00575-00728.pdf>.

¹⁴⁸ Law 29/1998 of 13 July 1998 regulating the administrative courts (*Ley 29/1998, de 13 de julio, reguladora de la Jurisdicción Contencioso administrativa*), BOE, 14 July 1998, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/1998/07/14/pdfs/A23516-23551.pdf>.

Administrative procedure

There are administrative procedures for civil and social matters that can be used by all victims of discrimination, irrespective of the ground concerned. Victims of discrimination may also appeal to the ombudsmen, at both national and regional level, when the issue concerns acts by public bodies.

In matters of employment and social security, victims of discrimination may appeal to the Employment Inspectorate (Law 42/1997 of 14 November 1997 on the Inspectorate of Labour and Social Security) and in matters of education to the Education Inspectorate (Organic Law 2/2006 of 3 May 2006 on Education). This applies to both employment and education with regard to both the private and public sectors.

The administrative procedures are binding but can be appealed to the courts.

Conciliation procedure

There are also conciliation procedures for civil and social matters.

As regards employment, Articles 63 to 68 of Law 36/2011 of 10 October 2011 regulating Social Jurisdiction provide a compulsory conciliation procedure, which is to be followed before any judicial appeal is lodged.

The General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes a voluntary system of arbitration to solve conflicts that may arise in matters of equal opportunities and discrimination (Article 74).

Conciliation procedures are not binding.

b) Barriers and other deterrents faced by litigants seeking redress

There are costs and other barriers that may act as deterrents to litigants seeking redress.

In Spain, it is mandatory in a lawsuit (although not in conciliation procedure) to use a lawyer (who defends the individual claimant or defendant) and a solicitor (who represents them and is responsible for all formal issues in court), which significantly complicates the process. Indeed, court proceedings are often long and complex. If the litigants win the action, the judge, following the guidelines established in Article 394 of Law 1/2000 on Civil Procedure, may require the respondent to pay their lawyer's costs.

If the litigants cannot afford a lawyer, they may request a duty lawyer free of charge, as the Spanish Constitution (Article 119) guarantees legal aid for those who 'have insufficient means to litigate.' Legal aid is governed by Law 1/1996 of 10 January 1996 on Free Legal Aid. However, Royal Decree-Law 3/2013 of 22 February 2013, amending the fees regime for the administration of justice and the legal aid system, amended Law 1/1996 and tightened the income and wealth conditions for entitlement to free legal assistance. In addition, this law raised fees significantly for appeals before the courts, which could pose difficulties in securing adequate access to justice, especially in the case of resources for the higher courts.

The costs of legal aid are assumed mainly by the regional Governments (not by the national Government).

In Spanish law, the time period for pursuing proceedings is equivalent to the time limit for submitting legal actions in the different jurisdictions. Therefore, personal actions in civil proceedings must be started within 15 years, unless there is a provision regarding a special time limit (Article 1964, Civil Code). No personal action may be started in civil proceedings

once the aforementioned time limit has expired. In proceedings relating to employment and occupations, time limits for legal actions expire within 20 days, one year or three years, depending on the type of action being taken (Articles 59 and 60 of the Worker's Statute). In administrative court proceedings, the appeal in front of the court must be lodged within two months in all cases, except in cases of implicit (agency) action (*silencio administrativo*) (i.e. when the public administration fails to take action) where the term is of six months, or in cases of irregular material intervention by the administration (*vía de hecho*), where the term expires within 10 or 20 days if there has not been a request from the administration. The day on which these terms start depends on the action in question (see Article 46 of Law 29/1998 Regulating the Administrative Courts). In administrative matters, the terms and conditions are provided by specific laws.

c) Number of discrimination cases brought to justice

In Spain, statistics are available on the number of cases related to discrimination that are brought to justice.

Following the recommendation made by the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) in 2011 on the collection and publication of data on discrimination in Spain, the Spanish Government approved its 'Comprehensive strategy against racism, discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance' (November 2011), and the Ministry of the Interior approved a 'Protocol of action for the Security Forces for hate crimes and convicts that violate the legal norms of discrimination' (2014). The Ministry of the Interior publishes data on hate crimes and discrimination (the source of the data does not allow differentiation between hate crimes and discriminatory acts); these data cover complaints reported to the police and indicate whether they have been resolved by the police (when the police have been able to identify those responsible, that does not necessarily mean that the individuals were prosecuted and convicted of a hate crime). In 2016, 1 272 complaints were made to the police, with 1 419 complaints in 2017, 1 476 in 2018, 1 598 in 2019 and 1 334 in 2020 (compared with 2019, there has been a decrease of 16.5 % in known facts recorded (police forces include hate crimes or hate incidents as facts); however, there has been a significant increase in cases in the following areas: persons with disabilities; discrimination on grounds of illness; anti-Gypsyism; sex/gender discrimination; and generational discrimination. In the other areas there has been a decrease in the number of cases. On the other hand, it should be noted that the number of cases clarified and resolved (facts firmly known by the police leading to prosecution) by the police is particularly high for complaints of racism and sexual orientation, and lower for cases related to people's disability and religious practices).

The grounds for the complaints were as follows:

Reason for making a complaint	Complaints					Complaints resolved by police				
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Religion	47	103	69	66	45	33	62	30	39	25
Disability	262	23	25	26	44	200	19	20	20	26
Sexual orientation	230	271	256	278	277	166	204	182	199	212
Racism/Xenophobia	416	524	531	534	485	254	323	334	395	386

Anti-Gypsyism	*	*	*	14	22	*	*	*	10	14
Ideology	*	*	*	596	326	*	*	*	259	161
Anti-Semitism	*	*	*	5	3	*	*	*	2	1
Others	31 7	49 8	71 4	79	132	164	251	319	717	102
Total	1 27 2	1 41 9	1 4 76	1 598		817	859	885	988	927

Others: aporophobia; gender discrimination; generational discrimination; discrimination on grounds of illness

*These fields were included in 'Others'; in 2019 and 2020, they have been differentiated.

Source: Author's elaboration of data in statistical yearbooks of the Ministry of the Interior (2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020, released in the year 2021).¹⁴⁹

In June 2010, the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination launched the Network of Centres of Assistance for Victims of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination, involving seven NGOs. The network assisted with 631 cases in 2016; 646 cases in 2017; and 729 cases in 2018 (see section 7, below). Between 1 January and 12 October 2019 (latest published data), the Assistance and Guidance Service for Victims of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination registered a total of 588 cases, of which 378 are individual cases and 210 are collective.

d) Registration of national court decisions on discrimination cases

In Spain, discrimination cases are not registered as such by national courts. Consequently, data are not available (apart from the data held by the Ministry of the Interior and by the Council: see previous paragraphs).

The courts' databases collect the judgments of the main courts without publishing them according to their subject matter (e.g. in discrimination cases). Each court judgment is accompanied by a summary. When accessing the databases, the reader must consult the summary to check whether the case involves discrimination. No option or application is available that allows direct access to summaries that incorporate cases dealing with discrimination. A search for summaries and judgments must be conducted beforehand.

6.2 Legal standing and associations (Article 7(2) Directive 2000/43, Article 9(2) Directive 2000/78)

a) Engaging in proceedings on behalf of victims of discrimination (representing them)

In Spain, associations, organisations and trade unions are entitled to act on behalf of victims of discrimination.

On racial or ethnic origin, Law 62/2003 (Article 31) provides that 'legal entities legally authorised to defend legitimate collective rights and interests may engage on behalf of the claimant, with his or her approval, in any judicial proceedings in order to make effective the principle of equal treatment based on racial or ethnic origin'. This article means, therefore, the legitimisation of legal entities to engage in civil proceedings and in administrative court proceedings, but not in labour proceedings or in pre-judicial administrative matters. This legitimisation may be interpreted as widening the provisions

¹⁴⁹ See: <http://www.interior.gob.es/web/servicios-al-ciudadano/delitos-de-odio/estadisticas>.

regulating the procedural defence in Law 1/2000 of 7 January 2000 on Civil Procedure (Article 11 and 11-*bis*) and in Law 29/1998 of 13 June 1998 Regulating the Administrative Courts (Articles 18 and 19). The legitimisation (in Law 62/2003) only applies, however, in cases of discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin and only in fields other than employment.

On disability, the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013), which applies to access to and the supply of goods and services (telecommunications and the information society, urbanised public spaces, infrastructure and construction, transport, goods and services to the public, relations with public administrations, the administration of justice, cultural heritage) and to employment, provides, in Article 76, that legal entities that are legally authorised to defend legitimate collective rights and interests may engage on behalf of and in the interests of the person who authorises them to do so in proceedings in order to make effective the principle of equal treatment, defending the individual rights of those persons to whom the effects of this engagement will apply. This engagement does not affect the individual standing of victims of discrimination and may be interpreted with respect to its inclusion in pre-judicial administrative proceedings.

Articles 22 and 64 of RLD 1/2013 provide that the law's provisions regarding the safeguard and effectiveness of the measures contained within it have a supplementary character in respect of the provisions that are contained in other specific laws regarding equal treatment in the field of employment and occupation.

In the field of employment, the provisions of the Law on Social Jurisdiction remain in force for the defence of victims of discrimination on all the grounds contained in the directives. Article 20 of Law 36/2011 of 10 October 2011, the Law on Social Jurisdiction, in its regulation of representation and procedural defence, stipulates that trade unions may appear in court on behalf of and in the interests of member workers who authorise them to do so in order to defend their individual rights. However, this only applies to trade unions. Workers who are not members of any trade union may be parties to proceedings by themselves or may confer their representation to the solicitor's agent, to a social worker member of a professional organisation or to any person who is fully able to exercise his/her civil rights – or, if they wish, to a solicitor. The assistance of a lawyer is not mandatory during the pre-judicial proceedings (Article 21(1)).

Legal entities may also act on behalf of victims of discrimination in criminal proceedings. The Criminal Code of 1995 (modified by Organic Law 1/2015), under Articles 314, 510, 511 and 512, provides that crimes of discrimination are punishable by imprisonment and fines (Articles 314 and 510) or by special disqualification from the exercise of public service, a profession etc. (Articles 511 and 512). Article 510 also punishes hate crimes.

Claims in respect of discrimination are normally processed on behalf of and with the authorisation of the victim by an organisation, such as NGOs working with Roma or immigrants, in cases of discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, or by organisations working with other groups that may have been discriminated against on the grounds of disability, sexual orientation, age or religion or belief.

Under national law, the terms and conditions that are required in order for associations to engage in proceedings on behalf of claimants are regular ones. That means that there are no special terms and conditions that must be met for associations to engage in these proceedings.

In order to acquire legal status, trade unions must, according to Article 4 of Organic Law 11/1985 of 2 August 1985 on Trade Union Freedom, be registered with the corresponding public office. According to Article 35 of the Civil Code, public legal entities of public interest and private legal entities do not need to be registered to be considered

as constituted legally or in a valid way. With regard to private legal entities, Chapter II of Organic Law 1/2002 of 22 March 2002, which regulates the rights of associations, contains the conditions that such associations must meet in order to be legally constituted. Associations that have been legally constituted have legal status and have the right to register, but they are not obligated to register in the register of associations.

Law 62/2003 and RLD 1/2013 only provide that legal entities must be legally authorised to defend legitimate collective rights and interests in order to be able to engage in proceedings on behalf of the claimant(s) with his/her/their approval. The proof of the authorisation is in their valid constitution according to OL 1/2002. The legitimate interest relates to the victim on whose behalf the association may engage in any judicial procedure (see section d, below, regarding class actions to understand the difference between the legitimisation of associations under Law 62/2003 and Law RLD 1/2013 in order to act on behalf of victims of discrimination and the provisions relating to consumers and users associations under Article 11 of the Law on Civil Procedure).

According to the jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court and the Supreme Court, a legitimate interest may be held by those who find themselves in an individualised legal situation that is different from the legal situation of other citizens with respect to the same matter. 'Legitimate interest' means the capacity of being a party in the proceedings, and it focuses on the existence of a qualified and specific interest that relates to obtaining an advantage or avoiding or eliminating potential harm if the lawsuit filed by the party is upheld by a judgment.¹⁵⁰ Therefore, the upholding of the lawsuit must have legal utility for the claimant.¹⁵¹ The legitimate interest may be individual or collective, direct or indirect, present or future (if the harm to be avoided or eliminated, and against which the lawsuit has been filed, is imminent), but it must be concrete and true (real). This means that the legitimate interest of a party in the proceedings presupposes that the judgment has had or may have a direct or indirect impact on their legal situation. This impact must be real and not just hypothetical.¹⁵²

Law 62/2003 and Law RLD 1/2013 say only that the entities would need the authorisation of the victims to act on their behalf, but they do not specify the form of the authorisation.

The same happens in Article 20 of Law 36/2011 on Social Jurisdiction. It appears that the general regulations for all jurisdictions regarding the authorisation of the solicitor's agent and the solicitor to engage in proceedings on behalf of the victim of discrimination may apply to the authorisation of the entities acting to this end, given that such an entity engages in proceedings through a solicitor member of the association, who will act only with the approval of the claimant (see Articles 24 and 25 of Law 1/2000 on Civil Procedure). However, Article 20(2) of the Law on Social Jurisdiction provides that, in the lawsuit, the trade union must prove the membership of the worker and must prove that it has communicated to the member worker its intention to open the proceedings. The authorisation of the worker member will then be presumed, except when there is a statement by the worker denying it.

In cases where obtaining formal authorisation is problematic because the victim lacks the capacity to sue – for example, in the case of minors or persons under guardianship – the general regulations settled in Articles 7 and 8 of Law 1/2000 on Civil Procedure may apply in all jurisdictions (Article 16(4) of the Law on Social Jurisdiction, Article 18(1) of Law 29/1998 Regulating the Administrative Courts). Article 7 of Law 1/2000 on Civil Procedure provides that natural persons who lack capacity to sue must appear at the trial by means of a representative or with the assistance, authorisation or defence required by

¹⁵⁰ Supreme Court, Decision 2733/2003, 4 March 2003.

¹⁵¹ Constitutional Court, Decisions 60/1982 of 11 October 1982 and 7/2001 of 7 January 2001, among others, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/102>; <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/4303>.

¹⁵² Supreme Court, Decision 873/2003, 11 February 2003.

law. If nobody represents or assists the natural person in appearing at the trial, the court, by judicial order, will designate a defence lawyer to assume representation and defence until there is another person who can assume representation or assistance (Article 8 of Law 1/2000 on Civil Procedure). The authorisation to engage in proceedings on behalf of a victim who lacks capacity to sue will be given by his/her representative or by the person who must assist, authorise or defend him/her in compliance with the law. Only individuals holding a law degree can defend a person in court.

Some civil society organisations are active in this field, are visible and stimulate public discourse on equality, but the number of litigations on discrimination cases is small.

b) Engaging in proceedings in support of victims of discrimination (joining existing proceedings)

In Spain, associations, organisations and trade unions are not entitled to act in support of victims of discrimination. Article 31 of Law 62/2003 includes the words 'on behalf' ('on behalf of the claimant, with his or her approval'), but not 'or in support', as stated in Article 7(2) of Directive 2000/43. Neither may associations intervene in support of the claimant in civil cases (Law 1/2000, Articles 11 and 11-*bis*).

c) *Actio popularis*

In Spain, national law allows associations, organisations and trade unions to act in the public interest on their own behalf, without a specific victim to support or represent (*actio popularis*).

Under Spanish law, *actio popularis* is a constitutional right – not a fundamental right – that must be developed by a law that may limit it. Under Spanish law, *actio popularis* is only possible in criminal proceedings. Nevertheless, there are already many voices in this area who defend the thesis of the exercise of *actio popularis* in administrative court proceedings, and also constitutional jurisprudence, in which this possibility has been recognised. At the moment, outside the criminal law, *actio popularis* in administrative court matters has only been recognised in the case of the Zoning Act of 20 June 2008. However, for the purpose of this report, we shall concentrate only on *actio popularis* in criminal law.

Actio popularis in criminal proceedings is provided for under Article 101 of the Law regulating Criminal Procedure. *Actio popularis* may only be exercised against public crimes and, under Spanish law, most crimes, including discrimination crimes, are public. The Constitutional Court has stated¹⁵³ that not only private but also public legal entities may be considered as citizens in order to interpret the possibility of exercising *actio popularis*. Legal entities may therefore exercise *actio popularis* in cases in which discrimination or a hate crime (see above) has been committed.

d) Class action

In Spain, national law does not allow associations, organisations and trade unions to act in the interest of more than one individual victim (class action) for claims arising from the same event.

It is not possible for associations to act through a class action in the interest of more than one individual victim of discrimination for claims arising from the same event. Apart from under the provision in Article 11 of Law 1/2000 on Civil Procedure, which allows consumers' and users' associations to take action in the form of a quasi-class action to protect the rights and interests of consumers and users who are members of these associations, as

¹⁵³ Constitutional Court, Decision 175/2001, 26 July 2001, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/4471>.

well as to protect the general interests of consumers and users, class actions or other forms of lawsuit similar to them are not allowed in civil proceedings under Spanish law (Carrasco and González 2001).

Although the texts of Article 76 of RLD 1/2013 and Article 31 of Law 62/2003 deal with the defence of legitimate collective rights and interests, and Article 17 of the Law on Social Jurisdiction mentions the possibility of trade unions and employers being authorised to defend their own financial and social interests, this should not be misinterpreted as allowing for the possibility of class actions in civil proceedings as, in all these cases, the wording is very different from the provisions of Article 11 of the Law on Civil Procedure.

6.3 Burden of proof (Article 8 Directive 2000/43, Article 10 Directive 2000/78)

In Spain, national law requires a shift of the burden of proof from the complainant to the respondent.

The basic law of reference in this field is the Law on Civil Procedure (Law 1/2000). This law regulates the burden of proof in court and provides, as a general rule, that the burden of proof is for the claimant (Article 217(2)) but sets the shift in the burden of proof in certain cases (Articles 217(3), 217(4) and 217(5)). The law also establishes that 'the court shall consider the availability and ease of proof corresponding to each of the parties to the dispute' (Article 217(6)). The reversal of the burden of proof under Law 1/2000 has been qualified by the court, which has stated that this fails to be a real reversal of the burden of proof, as both parties have obligations. That is, once the claimant proves 'the existence of discrimination-founded indications' (i.e. the probability), it is for the defendant to prove 'the justification of the measures adopted and their proportionality'.¹⁵⁴

In the field of anti-discrimination law, the most important provisions are contained in Law 62/2003 and RLD 1/2013:

- General burden of proof on ground of discrimination by racial or ethnic origin: Law 62/2003, which transposes EU Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78 in Spain: 'In those civil and administrative proceedings in which from the facts alleged by the claimant one may conclude the existence of well-founded evidence of discrimination on the ground of racial or ethnic origin, it shall be for the respondent to give an objective and reasonable and sufficiently proven justification of the measures adopted and their proportionality' (Article 32).
- Burden of proof in the field of employment on ground of discrimination by racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation: Law 62/2003 provides that: 'In those civil and administrative proceedings in which from the facts alleged by the claimant one may conclude the existence of well-founded evidence of discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation (in the employment field), it shall be for the respondent to give an objective and reasonable and sufficiently proven justification of the measures adopted and their proportionality' (Article 36).
- General burden of proof on ground of discrimination by disability: the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establishes a shift in the burden of proof when there is evidence of discrimination based on disability: 'In those proceedings in which from the facts alleged by the claimant one may conclude the existence of well-founded evidence of discrimination on the ground of disability, it shall be for the respondent to give an objective and reasonable and sufficiently proven justification of the conduct and the measures adopted and their proportionality' (Article 77).
- National law does not provide clearly for a shift in the burden of proof for claims relating to reasonable accommodation. However, Article 77 of Law RLD 1/2013 could

¹⁵⁴ See, for example, the judgment of the Superior Court of Justice of Galicia of 23 November 2012.

allow a judge to shift the burden of proof if a person with disabilities is demanding the right to reasonable accommodation.

Article 40 of Law 62/2003 amended the existing labour standard procedure at the time, and the current law on social litigation procedure (Law 36/2011) also established a shift in the burden of proof. Article 96 of Law 36/2011 states that: 'In those proceedings in which allegations exist, on the part of the claimant, of indications which are founded in discrimination for reason of sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, it shall rest with the respondent to provide sufficient proof of the objective and reasonable justification of the measures taken and of their proportional nature'. This article is applied increasingly widely in employment cases. For example, it began being applied in cases of sexual harassment and bullying when bullying was related to gender; but it now also applies in cases of bullying in general.

There is an important difference in the rules on the burden of proof on different grounds. In the case of discrimination on the grounds of sex, in order for a shift in the burden of proof to be produced, the standard requires only that the claimant's claims are based on discriminatory actions (or omissions/the failure to act, that can be considered discriminatory 'actions') based on sex: 'In proceedings in which the plaintiff's claims are based on discriminatory actions based on sex, it is for the defendant to prove the absence of discrimination in the measures adopted and their proportionality' (Article 13 of Organic Law 3/2007 and Article 217(5) of Law 1/2000). However, for all other grounds, anti-discrimination laws require that one may conclude from the facts alleged by the claimant that well-founded evidence of discrimination exists. That is, in cases of discrimination on grounds other than sex, there is a requirement for the claimant to present facts, whereas in the case of discrimination on the ground of sex, it appears from the literality of the law that the courts should always apply a shift in the burden of proof.

The Constitutional Court has established case law on the burden of proof, which should avoid this potential difference between discrimination based on sex and other grounds of discrimination. The most recent judgment on this matter by the Court (STC 31/2014)¹⁵⁵ recalled its consistent doctrine in relation to a case of sex discrimination (after the coming into force of OL 3/2007). The Court noted that, in order for a reversal of the burden of proof to occur, it 'is not enough simply for the actor to qualify the measure as a discriminatory measure'; it is also necessary 'to establish the existence of evidence that generates reasonable suspicion, an appearance or a presumption in favour of its claim'. Only then, when the latter happens, the defendant assumes 'the burden of proving the existence of sufficient real and serious reasons to qualify the decision as reasonable' (STC 98/2003).¹⁵⁶

We should briefly recall what the Constitutional Court stated in STC 144/2006¹⁵⁷ (and repeated in STC 31/2014): 'Any facts that are clearly indicative of the likelihood of injury of a substantive right, and those that have sufficient entity to reasonably open the hypothesis of an infringement of a fundamental right, will have probative aptitude ... But they must unavoidably exceed the minimum threshold of that necessary connection, because the claim cannot be based on purely rhetorical arguments or lack of accreditation of core elements for the connection itself with the claim'.

Therefore, a literal interpretation of the rules in Spain gives a greater facility for a shift in the burden of proof in sex discrimination cases (Article 13 of Law 3/2007 and Article 217(5) of Law 1/2000). However, the Constitutional Court (and the Supreme Court) have

¹⁵⁵ Constitutional Court, Decision 31/2014, 24 February 2014, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/23819>.

¹⁵⁶ Constitutional Court, Decision 98/2003, 2 June 2003, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/4873>.

¹⁵⁷ Constitutional Court, Decision 144/2006, 8 May 2006, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/5746>.

established a common doctrine as to the rules that should govern the shift in the burden of proof in cases of discrimination on any grounds, and if there has been a violation of fundamental rights.

6.4 Victimisation (Article 9 Directive 2000/43, Article 11 Directive 2000/78)

In Spain, there are legal measures of protection against victimisation, but only in the field of employment.

Before the transposition was carried out, the Workers' Statute (Article 55(5)) declared those dismissals that were related to any of the grounds of discrimination that are covered by the Constitution or by the legal system, or which entailed the violation of workers' fundamental rights and freedoms, to be invalid.

Law 62/2003 (Article 37) introduced changes to the Workers' Statute and to Law 5/2000 on Offences and Penalties in Social Matters. The new version of Article 17(1) of the Workers' Statute stipulates the nullity of administrative regulatory provisions, clauses in collective agreements or contracts, agreements or unilateral decisions of an employer that has discriminated on all the grounds of the directives. Furthermore, a new paragraph has been added to Article 17(1), which states that 'the decisions of an employer that amount to adverse treatment of workers as a reaction to a complaint within the enterprise or to any legal proceedings aimed at enforcing compliance with the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination shall likewise be void of effect.'

Similarly, Law 62/2003 (Article 41) introduced modifications to Law 5/2000 on Offences and Penalties in Social Matters. Article 8 of Law 5/2000 contains a list of very serious infractions in the area of employment. With the revision introduced by Law 62/2003, Article 8(12) now covers – in addition to discriminatory decisions – decisions that 'amount to adverse treatment of workers as a reaction to a complaint within the enterprise or to any legal proceedings aimed at enforcing compliance with the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination.'

There are no legal provisions concerning the victimisation of persons other than the claimant, as might be the case for witnesses, but judges should also apply victim protection to them.

There is a full reversal of the burden of proof when victimisation is directed towards a trade union representative if the worker claims 'anti-union conduct' by the employer (STC 2/2009).¹⁵⁸

6.5 Sanctions and remedies (Article 15 Directive 2000/43, Article 17 Directive 2000/78)

a) Applicable sanctions in cases of discrimination – in law and in practice

Sanctions have been established in Spain only in the field of employment for all the grounds (RLD 5/2000) and for the ground of disability in all fields (RLD 1/2013), but not in the other fields covered by Directive 2000/43 on grounds of racial or ethnic origin, except in the Criminal Code (Organic Law 10/1995, Article 512, that judges must consider whether can be applied in some cases of discrimination).¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁸ Constitutional Court, Decision 2/2009, 12 January 2009, <http://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/docs/BOE/BOE-A-2009-2491.pdf>. The shift in the burden of proof is not applied in all types of victimisation cases.

¹⁵⁹ Law 62/2003, which transposed the directives, modified Law 5/2000 and the disability law in force at the time (Law 13/1982; replaced by RLD 1/2013) to better comply with the directives, mostly by making it more evident that discrimination on the grounds specified by the directives, including harassment and victimisation, is a very serious infraction.

Spanish legislation complies only partially with the obligation to establish sanctions against discriminatory acts, because it only establishes sanctions for all grounds in the area of employment. Compensation has been established for victims in the field of disability, but this is not the case for the other fields.

Field of employment in all grounds

The Law on Offences and Penalties in Social Matters (RLD 5/2000 of 4 August 2000) establishes financial sanctions for offences in employment and social matters by natural or legal persons or by private and public sector employers (when these infractions affect employees in the service of the various tiers of public administration), for employment relations (Articles 5-10) and for employment (Articles 14-17), and it also establishes responsibilities and further sanctions (Articles 39-41). In view of the duty regarding those whose rights are infringed or affected, the RLD sets out three types of seriousness of an offence: 'minor', 'serious' or 'very serious'. The penalties for these three types of seriousness of an offence can be imposed to three different degrees: minimum, average and maximum. The amounts of the sanctions range from a minimum of EUR 60 to a maximum of EUR 187 515. The level of the fine is set in consideration of factors such as negligence and the intention of the offender, fraud or collusion, failure to abide by previous warnings and requests by the inspectorate, business turnover, the number of workers or other persons concerned, harm caused, and quantity defrauded. Additionally, some very serious sanctions are made public.

RLD 5/2000 includes discrimination under all grounds of the directives in employment relations among the 'very serious' infringements: 'unilateral decisions of the employer leading to unfavourable direct or indirect discrimination on the ground of age or disability, or unfavourable or adverse treatment relating to remuneration, working time, training, promotion, and other working conditions, on the grounds of sex, origin, including racial or ethnic origin, marital status, social condition, religion or belief, political ideas, sexual orientation, membership or non-membership of a trade union, adherence to trade union agreements, family ties with other employees, or language of the Spanish State, as well as decisions of the employer leading to unfavourable treatment of the workers as a reaction to a complaint within the enterprise or to any legal proceeding aimed at enforcing compliance with the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination' (Article 8(12)).

RLD 5/2000 includes discrimination in employment among the 'very serious' infringements: 'to establish employment conditions, be it through advertisements, broadcasting or in any other way, that amount to unfavourable or adverse discrimination in access to employment on the grounds of sex, origin, including racial or ethnic origin, age, marital status, disability, religion or belief, political ideas, sexual orientation, trade union membership, social condition or language of the Spanish State' (Article 16(2)).

RLD 5/2000 also includes sanctions for harassment as a very serious infringement in the context of employment relations: 'harassment on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation when it takes place within the scope of management authority, whoever the agent may be, provided that, when the employer is aware of it, the latter does not undertake the necessary measures to prevent such infractions.' (Article 8(13-bis)).

The sanctions for all these 'very serious' discrimination infringements are fines ranging from EUR 6 251 to EUR 187 515, as qualified in the minimum, average or maximum grade.

In the field of employment, the Law on Social Jurisdiction (Law 36/2011) sets out a special procedure for violations of the fundamental rights and civil liberties that are enshrined in the Constitution (Title II, Chapter XI). This procedure covers the acts of discrimination or harassment that are specified in the directives. If the court judgment rules in favour of the claimant in respect of an act of discrimination or discriminatory harassment, the court will

declare that act void, will require the previous state of affairs to be restored and will provide for 'reparation of the consequences of the act, including any appropriate compensation' (Article 183). That is, the law requires compensation (reparation and monetary damages) for victims of discriminatory acts, the amount of which is to be set by the court. If the court finds a breach of the reasonable accommodation duty, the court will require the employer to comply with reasonable accommodation and will impose a penalty within the limits set by law.

Moreover, the Criminal Code is applicable. Article 314 provides for 'imprisonment from six months to two years or a fine of 12 to 24 months' (with a daily fee that can range from EUR 2 to EUR 400) for those 'that do not restore a situation of equality in accordance with the law when required to do so or following an administrative penalty, making good any corresponding financial loss' when employers have been convicted for 'serious discrimination in a public or private workplace, against a person for reason of their ideology, religion, belief, ethnicity, race or nationality, gender, sexual orientation, family situation, illness or disability, maintenance of legal or workers' union representation, relationship with other company workers, or for use of any official languages of the state of Spain'.

Disability

In addition to the sanctions established on the ground of disability in the field of employment by RLD 5/2000, Articles 83-88 of the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013) establish a system of sanctions for discrimination on the ground of disability in other fields. RLD 1/2013 establishes that 'the right to equal opportunities of persons with disabilities is violated ... when, due to disability, there are direct or indirect discrimination, discrimination by association, harassment, non-compliance with the requirements of accessibility and of making reasonable adjustments, as well as non-compliance with positive action measures legally established' (Article 63). Consequently, the law defines any infringements of the rights of persons with disabilities as 'administrative offences'. These offences may be 'minor', 'serious' or 'very serious'. The penalties for these three types of offence can be imposed to three different degrees: minimum, average and maximum. Offences are punished with fines ranging from a minimum of EUR 301 to a maximum of EUR 1 million. The criteria taken into account when setting the level of fine are the offender's intention, negligence, fraud, non-compliance with prior warnings, business turnover and the number of people affected.

RLD 1/2013 states, in general terms, that 'discriminatory acts or omissions that directly or indirectly involve less favourable treatment of the person with a disability in relation to another person who is in a similar or comparable situation' are serious offences (Article 81(3)(a)), and that 'all conduct of harassment related to the disability' is a very serious offence (Article 81(4)(a)).

Failure to comply with quotas or alternative measures for promoting the employment of persons with disabilities is sanctioned with a fine of EUR 626 to EUR 6 250. For any employer that fails to observe the quota of places for workers with disabilities, the fine increases in line with the number of workers for whom the quota is not met; it can be increased by up to 50 % in cases where five or more workers with disabilities are affected (RLD 5/2000, Articles 15 and 40). Unlike other labour sanctions, the sanction for breach of the quota for persons with disabilities is not graded, although it can be aggravated by repeated non-compliance.

Since 2015, penalties included in the Criminal Code for various offences are now more serious when they are committed against persons with disabilities: illegal detention (Article 166 of the Criminal Code), prostitution (Article 188), child pornography (Article 189) and abandonment of a child (Article 619).

Criminal Code

Criminal Code (Organic Law 10/1995, 23 November 1995) specifies, as a general aggravating circumstance, the commission of any offence 'motivated by racism, anti-Semitism or any other kind of discrimination relating to the victim's ideology, religion or belief, the ethnic group, race or nation to which he belongs, his gender or sexual orientation, or any illness or disability from which he suffers' (Article 22).

The Criminal Code expressly punishes offences against fundamental rights and civil liberties. To accommodate (and transpose) Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OL 1/2015¹⁶⁰ has amended the Criminal Code, in particular Articles 510, 511 and 512, which provide for imprisonment for racist crimes and xenophobia. In line with the Council framework decision, Law 10/1995 on the Criminal Code (reformed by OL 1/2015) defines two different groups of conduct:

- Actions of incitement to hatred or violence against certain groups or individuals because of their membership of a group on racist, anti-Semitic or other grounds related to ideology, religion or belief, family status, membership of an ethnic group, race or nation, national origin, sex, sexual orientation or gender identity, gender, illness or disability; this also includes the development or production of writings that incite racism or discrimination; and acts of denial or glorification of crimes of genocide.
- Acts of humiliation or contempt against such groups or individuals and glorification or justification of crimes committed against them or their members with a discriminatory motivation.

Article 510 of the Criminal Code provides for prison sentences of one to four years and a fine (the fine is calculated as a number of days, which can range from 6 to 12 months, with a daily fee ranging from EUR 2 to EUR 400) for any person who publicly encourages, promotes or incites, directly or indirectly, hatred, hostility, discrimination or violence against a group or part of it or against a person because of their membership in it on racist, anti-Semitic or other grounds relating to ideology, religion or belief, family situation, its members forming part of an ethnic group or race, their national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, illness or disability, or for any person 'disseminating defamatory information' about groups with these same characteristics. A person who injures the dignity of people through actions involving the humiliation of, contempt for or the discrediting of any such groups will be punished with imprisonment from six months to two years and a fine of 6 to 12 months. Article 511 provides prison sentences of six months to two years, a daily fine of 12 to 24 months (with a daily fee that can range from EUR 2 to EUR 400) and disqualification from public office or employment for a period of one to three years for 'any individual responsible for a public service who denies the provision of a service to a person entitled thereto on the grounds of his ideology, religion or belief, national origin, gender, sexual orientation or family situation or any illness or disability from which he suffers', or where these acts are committed on the same grounds against an association or the members thereof.

If any of these acts are committed by a public servant, they will be disqualified from public office or employment for a period of two to four years. Article 512 stipulates disqualification from the exercise of a profession, trade, industry or business, for a period of one to four years, for 'those who, in the exercise of their professional or business activity, deny the provision of a service to a person entitled thereto on the grounds of his ideology, religion

¹⁶⁰ Organic Law 1/2015 of 30 March 2015 amending Organic Law 10/1995 of 23 November on the Criminal Code (*Ley Orgánica 1/2015, de 30 de marzo, por la que se modifica la Ley Orgánica 10/1995, de 23 de noviembre, del Código Penal*), BOE, 31 March 2015, <http://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2015/BOE-A-2015-3439-consolidado.pdf>.

or belief, his forming part of an ethnic group, race or nation, his gender, sexual orientation or family situation or any illness or disability from which he suffers’.

b) Compensation – maximum and average amounts

Legislation establishes a maximum amount for the fines (EUR 187 515 in the field of employment and EUR 1 million in the field of disability) but does not establish any ceiling for compensation. RLD 1/2013 expressly states that ‘compensation or reparation which may give rise to the corresponding claim shall not be limited by a ceiling set a priori’ (Article 75(2)).

There is no information available regarding the average amount of compensation awarded to victims of discrimination.

c) Assessment of the sanctions

National law does not comply with the directives because sanctions have been established in the field of employment for all the grounds and for the ground of disability in all fields but have not been established in the other fields covered by Directive 2000/43.

There is no information concerning the extent to which the available sanctions have been shown to be effective, proportionate and dissuasive, as is required by the directives. In the author’s opinion, the penalties provided by law are proportionate, but they are neither effective, nor dissuasive. They are proportionate because the laws establish a ranking of offences (minor, serious and very serious) and penalties (minimum, medium and high grade), but they are not effective or dissuasive, because many cases of discrimination and violation of the law still occur, although not all of them reach the courts.

7 BODIES FOR THE PROMOTION OF EQUAL TREATMENT (Article 13 Directive 2000/43)

- a) Body designated for the promotion of equal treatment irrespective of racial/ethnic origin according to Article 13 of the Racial Equality Directive

The Spanish body designated for the promotion of equal treatment irrespective of racial or ethnic origin is the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination (Consejo para la eliminación de la discriminación racial o étnica) ('the Council').

Law 62/2003 of 30 December 2003 on Fiscal, Administrative and Social Measures¹⁶¹ (Article 33) (as amended by Article 18 of Law 15/2014 of 16 September 2014)¹⁶² established the Council. Royal Decree 1262/2007 of 21 September 2007¹⁶³ (modified by Royal Decree 1044/2009 of 29 June 2009)¹⁶⁴ regulates its composition, competencies and regulations.

The council is the only body that corresponds to the requirements of Article 13 of Directive 2000/43 (as is explicitly recognised in Law 15/2014). Although it was formally created by Law 62/2003, which came into force on 1 January 2004, it was set up on 28 October 2009 and became operational on that date.

In 2018, the Spanish Parliament discussed the Comprehensive Bill for Equal Treatment and Non-discrimination. The bill set up mechanisms for the creation of an Authority for Equal Treatment and Non-discrimination (Autoridad para la igualdad de trato y no discriminación) ('the Authority'). In 2019, the bill was withdrawn due to the dissolution of Parliament. In January 2020, a new coalition Government was formed, comprising the Socialist Party and the Unidas Podemos (a coalition of leftist political parties). One of the laws in the new Government programme is the Comprehensive Bill for Equal Treatment and Non-discrimination, which is expected to provide for the creation of the Authority for Equal Treatment and Non-discrimination. In January 2021, the Government submitted a proposal for a Comprehensive Law for Equal Treatment and Non-Discrimination, which was approved for processing as a Draft Law.¹⁶⁵ In 2021, this draft of the future law was still being processed for approval by the Spanish Parliament. The Authority would fulfil the requirements of the equality body provided for in the directives (the future Authority would undertake the functions related to the anti-discrimination and equality directives that have been adopted; in fact, it is a draft law which aims to give a global scope to the fight against discrimination and to unify, in a single law, the fight against discrimination on the grounds of birth, racial or ethnic origin, sex, religion, conviction or opinion, age, disability, sexual orientation or identity, illness, language or any other personal or social condition or circumstance). It would be an independent body and the law would set the legal basis for the effective performance of its duties. This would include the functions required by the

¹⁶¹ Law 62/2003 of 30 December 2003 on Fiscal, Administrative and Social Measures (*Ley 62/2003, de 30 de diciembre, de medidas fiscales, administrativas y de orden social*), BOE, 31 December 2003, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/1978/12/29/pdfs/A29313-29424.pdf>.

¹⁶² Law 15/2014 on the rationalisation of the public sector and other measures of administrative reform.

¹⁶³ Royal Decree 1262/2007 of 21 September 2007, which regulates the composition, competencies and regulations of the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination (*Real Decreto 1262/2007, de 21 de septiembre, por el que se regula la composición, competencias y régimen de funcionamiento del Consejo para la Promoción de la Igualdad de Trato y no Discriminación de las Personas por el Origen Racial o Étnico*), BOE, 3 October 2007, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2007/10/03/pdfs/A40190-40195.pdf>.

¹⁶⁴ Royal Decree 1044/2009 of 29 June 2009 (*Real Decreto 1044/2009, de 29 de junio, por el que se modifica el Real Decreto 1262/2007, de 21 de septiembre*), BOE, 23 July 2009, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2009/07/23/pdfs/BOE-A-2009-12210.pdf>.

¹⁶⁵ See: Comprehensive Law Proposal for equal treatment and non-discrimination (*Proposición de Ley integral para la igualdad de trato y la no discriminación*) (122/000121), available at: https://www.congreso.es/web/guest/proposiciones-de-ley?p_p_id=iniciativas&p_p_lifecycle=0&p_p_state=normal&p_p_mode=view&iniciativas_mode=mostrarDetalle&iniciativas_legislatura=XIV&iniciativas_id=122/000121.

directives, as well as others, such as mediation, investigation of cases of discrimination on the Authority's own initiative, and intervention in litigation, training and so on.

In addition to the Council (and the Institute for Women and Equal Opportunities, which is recognised as the equality body for matters of gender discrimination), there are three other bodies worth noting:

1) Regarding Roma people, Royal Decree 891/2005¹⁶⁶ set up the National Roma Council (Consejo Estatal del Pueblo Gitano) 'as a collegiate participatory and advisory body on general and specific public policy affecting the integral development of the Roma population in Spain' (Article 1). Its overriding purpose is 'to promote participation and cooperation by Roma associations in the development of general policy and the promotion of equal opportunities and treatment for the Roma population' (Article 2). Its functions therefore include 'drawing up opinions and reports on draft legislation and other initiatives related to the Council's purposes ... and that affect the Roma population, and, in particular, the development of regulations on equal opportunities and equal treatment' (Article 3). Of the 40 members forming this council, half are from central Government and the other half are representatives of Roma associations. The council was set up and has been running since 2006. It has no specific budget, as it is an official advisory body. The measures it recommends are to be implemented by other bodies.

Among other associations and foundations, the Fundación Secretariado Gitano is present in the Council. There are also other entities related to the defence of Roma rights, such as the Kethané platform; Movimiento por la Paz, el Desarme y la Libertad (Movement for Peace, Disarmament and Freedom); Unión Romaní; Fundación Juan Ciudad; Federación de la Mujer Rural – FEMUR; Asociación de Enseñantes con Gitanos; Asociación Nacional Presencia Gitana; and the Instituto Romaní para Asuntos Sociales y Culturales.

2) The Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants (Foro para la Integración Social de los Inmigrantes), created by Law 4/2000,¹⁶⁷ is a collegiate consultative, informative and advisory body concerned with the integration of immigrants. It consists of 10 representatives of the public administration, 10 representatives from immigrants' associations and 10 representatives of social support organisations, including trade unions and employers' organisations with an interest and involvement in the field of immigration.¹⁶⁸ The Spanish Secretary of State for Migration's Resolution of 7 September 2021 lists the entities that form part of the members of the Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants in representation of immigrant and refugee associations and social support organisations.¹⁶⁹

3) After a new Government was sworn in at the beginning of 2020, the Council for the Participation of Lesbian, Gay, Trans, Bisexual and Intersex Persons (LGTBI) was created

¹⁶⁶ Royal Decree 891/2005 of 27 July 2005 setting up the National Roma Council (*Real Decreto 891/2005, de 22 de julio, por el que se crea y regula el Consejo Estatal del Pueblo Gitano*), BOE, 26 August 2005, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2005/08/26/pdfs/A29622-29625.pdf>.

¹⁶⁷ Organic Law 4/2000 of 11 January 2000 on the Rights and Freedoms of Foreigners in Spain and their Social Integration (*Ley Orgánica 4/2000, de 11 de enero, sobre derechos y libertades de los extranjeros en España y su integración social*), BOE, 12 January 2000, <http://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2000/BOE-A-2000-544-consolidado.pdf>.

¹⁶⁸ Royal Decree 3/2006 of 16 January 2006 on the make-up, competences and procedural rules of the Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants (*Real Decreto 3/2006, de 16 de enero, por el que se regula la composición, competencias y régimen de funcionamiento del Foro para la integración social de los inmigrantes*), BOE, 17 January 2006, <http://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2006/BOE-A-2006-625-consolidado.pdf>.

¹⁶⁹ See: Resolution of September 7 2021 of the Secretary of State for Migration, which publishes the entities proposed and excluded to cover the Spokespersons of the Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants on behalf of immigrant and refugee associations and of social support organisations (*Resolución de 7 de septiembre de 2021, de la Secretaría de Estado de Migraciones, por la que se publican las entidades propuestas y excluidas para cubrir las Vocals del Foro para la Integración Social de los Inmigrantes en representación de las asociaciones de inmigrantes y refugiados y de las organizaciones sociales de apoyo*), BOE, 22 September 2021, available at: https://boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2021-15348.

(see Order IGD/577/2020 of 24 June 2020). In 2021, this Order was modified by the new Order IGD/506/2021, of 20 May 2021,¹⁷⁰ with the aim of including LGTBI civil society organisations among the members eligible for Council membership; and also, to broaden the composition of the Council's Standing Committee so that both the diversity units of Spanish universities and business organisations and the LGTBI working groups or sections of trade union organisations have their own seat on the Committee.¹⁷¹

The purpose of this Council is to institutionalise collaboration and strengthen permanent dialogue between public administrations and civil society in matters related to equal treatment and non-discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, and to ensure the participation of LGTBI people and their families in all areas of society.

b) Political, economic and social context of the designated body

The Spanish Government extended the 2019 budget to 2020 and, in 2020, the Government approved Law 11/2020 of 30 December on the General State Budget Law for 2021. This law created a special programme (No. 232D) on equal treatment and diversity, financing it with EUR 1 800 020. Of this, EUR 500 000 was granted to the State Council for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, and another EUR 500 000 to the LGTBI Council. The specific budget of the National Disability Council has not been published, but the General State Budget Law for 2021 has endowed not-for-profit entities with EUR 5 225 000. At the end of 2021, specifically on 28 December 2021, Law 22/2021, of 28 December, on the General State Budget for 2022, was passed. In the General State Budget Law for 2022, the Secretary of State for Equality and Non-Discrimination is expected to receive EUR 1 059 130 towards current expenditure; EUR 62 000 in transfers to institutions for training and awareness-raising on equal treatment and ethnic-racial diversity, and on affective-sexual, family and gender diversity and the promotion of LGTBI rights, and EUR 1 300 000 in investments¹⁷² (at the time of publication of this report, March 2022, the allocation to the Council for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the LGTBI Council has not yet been published).

The General State Budget allocated EUR 211 430 to the Fundación Secretariado Gitano for the economic and financial support of its central structure in 2021. The same budget is proposed for the year 2022 according to Law 22/2021 of 28 December 2021 on the General State Budget for 2022.¹⁷³

¹⁷⁰ See: Order IGD/506/2021 of May 20 which modifies Order IGD/577/2020, of June 24, which creates the Participation Council for lesbian, gay, trans, bisexual and intersex (LGTBI) and regulates its functioning (*Orden IGD/506/2021, de 20 de mayo, por la que se modifica la Orden IGD/577/2020, de 24 de junio, por la que se crea el Consejo de Participación de las Personas lesbianas, gais, trans, bisexuales e intersexuales (LGTBI) y se regula su funcionamiento*), BOE, 27 May 2021, available at: https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2021-8813.

¹⁷¹ In accordance with this new regulation, the Council's Standing Committee now has one member representing the General State Administration (Ministry of Equality); one member representing the autonomous communities and the most representative association of local authorities at the national level; one member representing the diversity units of Spanish universities; one member representing business organisations; one member representing LGTBI working groups or sections of trade union organisations; and two members representing LGTBI foundations, organisations, associations, federations or confederations.

¹⁷² See: 'Presupuestos Generales del Estado 2022: Presupuesto aprobado' ('General State Budgets 2022: Approved budget'), available at: <https://www.sepg.pap.hacienda.gob.es/Presup/PGE2022Ley/MaestroTomos/PGE-ROM/TomosSerieRoja.htm>, and specifically 'Presupuesto por programas y memoria de objetivos. Tomo XX (Sección 30) (Programme budget and goals - Volume XX, Section 30)', available at: https://www.sepg.pap.hacienda.gob.es/Presup/PGE2022Ley/MaestroTomos/PGE-ROM/doc/L_22_E_G30.PDF.

¹⁷³ See: 'Presupuesto por programas y memoria de objetivos. Tomo XIX (Sección 29)' (Programme budget and goals - Volume XIX, Section 29), available at: https://www.sepg.pap.hacienda.gob.es/Presup/PGE2022Ley/MaestroTomos/PGE-ROM/doc/L_22_E_G29.PDF. In addition, according to Law 22/2021 of 28 December 2021 on the General State Budget for 2022, the Platform for Social Action, an NGO, received EUR 652 086 in economic support

Regarding the National Roma Council (Consejo Estatal del Pueblo Gitano), as a collegiate participatory and advisory body on general and specific public policy affecting the integral development of the Roma population in Spain, it has to be stated that between 2014 and 2019, it suffered a cut in its budget between 2014 (EUR 723 000) and 2019 (EUR 483 510). Note, however, that these cutbacks cannot be considered disproportionate given the overall restrictions on the budget of the public administration over these years.

On the other hand, in July 2020, the Spanish Government approved an agreement for the distribution of credit for comprehensive social intervention projects for the care, prevention of marginalisation and integration of the Roma people, with an endowment of EUR 412 500. This distribution will be managed by the regions and municipalities and this budget will be used to finance projects presented by any entity in the protection of the Roma people. The purpose of this budget is to meet the needs of the most disadvantaged Roma people and to promote the development of the Roma population within the framework of the commitments assumed by the Government in the *National Strategy for the Inclusion of the Roma population in Spain 2012-2020* (in any case, it should be noted that a new strategy was approved in 2021 –the *National Strategy for Roma Equality, Inclusion and Participation 2021-2030*–, which will be discussed later in section 10.2).

Finally, at the end of 2021, specifically on 28 December 2021, Law 22/2021, of 28 December, on the General State Budget for 2022, was approved.

The budget for 2022 includes, in general, a number of objectives to implement a specific programme for equal treatment and non-discrimination. The law therefore includes the following objectives (incorporating specific measures):¹⁷⁴

- 1) To promote and develop the cross-cutting application of the right to equal treatment and non-discrimination of persons by enhancing the social response to situations of discrimination. This general measure includes specific measures for the training of professionals and the creation of means of dissemination.
- 2) To promote the work of the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination.
- 3) To promote and develop the Programme of Activities for the implementation of the International Decade for People of African Descent (2015-2024) proclaimed by United Nations resolution 68/237.
- 4) To promote respect for and recognition of the diversity of LGBTI persons.

from the General State Budget for 2021 to finance its central structure and that of its associates: Movimiento por la Paz, el Desarme y la Libertad (Movement for Peace, Disarmament and Freedom); Unión Romani (Romani Union); Fundación Juan Ciudad (Juan Ciudad Foundation); Federación Nacional de la Mujer Rural – FEMUR (Spanish Federation of Rural Women); Asociación de Enseñantes con Gitanos (Association of Teachers with Gypsies); Asociación Nacional Presencia Gitana (Gypsy Presence); and Instituto Romani para Asuntos Sociales y Culturales (Roma Institute for Social and Cultural Affairs). In 1989, a specific budget item was created within the General State Budget to finance this programme. Since then, this financial support has been distributed through collaboration agreements with the autonomous communities, which provide co-funding. For the year 2022, the general state budgets have also allocated budgets to entities such as the Kethané platform (EUR 40 000); Movimiento por la Paz, el Desarme y la Libertad; Unión Romani; Fundación Juan Ciudad; FEMUR; Asociación de Enseñantes con Gitanos; Asociación Nacional Presencia Gitana; and Instituto Romani para Asuntos Sociales y Culturales (EUR 63 860).

¹⁷⁴ See: 'Presupuestos Generales del Estado 2022: Presupuesto aprobado' ('General State Budgets 2022: Approved budget'), available at: <https://www.sepg.pap.hacienda.gob.es/Presup/PGE2022Ley/MaestroTomos/PGE-ROM/TomosSerieRoja.htm>, and specifically 'Presupuesto por programas y memoria de objetivos. Tomo XX (Sección 30) (Programme budget and goals - Volume XX, Section 30)', available at: https://www.sepg.pap.hacienda.gob.es/Presup/PGE2022Ley/MaestroTomos/PGE-ROM/doc/L_22_E_G30.PDF.

c) Institutional architecture

In Spain, the designated body does not form part of a body with multiple mandates. The Spanish council has the sole mandate of combating discrimination on grounds of racial or ethnic origin.

d) Status of the designated body – general independence

i) Status of the body

- As regards its legal status and personality, the Council has the following characteristics:
 - it is a collegiate Spanish governmental body;
 - the Council is attached to the Ministry of Equality, but is not part of the ministry's hierarchical structure;
 - its make-up is of a fundamentally governmental nature, as the law states that the Council is to be formed by all ministries with responsibilities in the areas referred to by Article 3(1) of Directive 2000/43, with the participation of autonomous regions, local authorities, employers' organisations and trade unions, and other organisations representing interests related to people's racial or ethnic origins. Royal Decree 1262/2007 (modified by Royal Decree 1044/2009) specifies its composition.
- Currently, the Council consists of a chair and 28 members. The only person who is appointed specifically to the Council as such is the chair, who, as specified in Royal Decree 1044/2009 (Article 4), is appointed by the Ministry of Equality 'from among persons of widely recognised prestige in the field of promoting equal treatment and combating discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin. He/she shall be appointed for a term of three years.'

Of the 28 seats on the Council, 14 are members of the public administration and 14 are social partners and stakeholders. They are distributed as follows:

- a) Seven members representing central Government, all with the rank of director-general, from the following ministries:
 - 1) Directorate General for Equality of Treatment and Diversity (which is to hold the Council's second vice-chair);
 - 2) Ministry of Justice;
 - 3) Ministry of the Interior;
 - 4) Ministry of Education;
 - 5) Ministry of Labour, Migration and Social Security;
 - 6) Ministry of Health, Consumption and Social Welfare; and
 - 7) Ministry of Development (Secretary of Housing).
- b) Seven members from other tiers of government: four from the autonomous regions and three from local authorities;
- c) Four members from among the social partners: two representing employers' organisations and two representing trade unions;
- d) Ten members representing organisations and associations whose activities are linked to the promotion of equal treatment and non-discrimination on grounds of racial or ethnic origin.

These last two groups of members (social partners and stakeholders) elect the person holding the Council's first vice-chair.

The council chair and members' posts are unpaid positions: they receive no remuneration or compensation for the meetings that they take part in. Only travel expenses are paid. Royal Decree 1267/2007 (Article 9) specifies the reasons for cessation of membership of the Council. This Article does not affect the chair. It is necessary to distinguish three positions: (1) the chair, (2) representatives of the administration and (3) representatives of organisations.

1. Chair: He/she is the only person appointed as such to the Council by the Ministry of Equality. The royal decree does not establish any causes for the removal of the chair of the Council. Therefore, the chair may be freely removed by the minister who appointed them with no requirement for any motivation. That is, the Government can dismiss the chair of the Council if he/she is not in line with its policies, in particular if he/she specifically expresses dissent over the Government's actions.

2. Representatives of the administration can be members of the Council, depending on the positions they hold in the public administration with the rank of director-general. The directors-general are appointed by royal decree by the Council of Ministers on the proposal of the minister of the department. They can be freely removed by the same procedure (Article 18 of Law 6/1997 of 14 April 1997, on the Organisation and Functioning of Central Government). This law does not establish any causes for the removal of a director-general: they may be freely removed by the Government with no requirement for any motivation. That is, the Government can dismiss members of the Council who are general directors if they are not in line with its policies.

3. Representatives of organisations can only be dismissed for the reasons expressly provided for in Article 9 of Royal Decree 1267/2007. They cannot be dismissed on the ground of dissent over the Government's actions.

The council cannot be said to have a board or commission, as it is a body in which decisions are taken by a plenary session with the participation of all its members. The council has a non-executive standing committee, which deals with formalities and prepares the Council's plenary sessions. It is made up of the chair, the two vice-chairs and a member from each of the four groups of members.

With this set-up, the Council cannot be said to be in line with the ECRI general recommendation 2, on specialised bodies to combat racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and intolerance at national level of 13 June 1997, and the European Commission Recommendation on Standards for Equality Bodies of 22 June 2018.

- Funding: the resources for the functioning of the Council come exclusively from the general budget of the Spanish public administration.
- Its power to recruit and manage staff: the Council has no capacity to recruit and manage personnel. The council has a secretary's post for a civil servant, at the Directorate General for Equality of Treatment and Diversity (Ministry of the Equality). In addition, when necessary, other civil servants belonging to this directorate provide part-time services to the Council (secretariat, coordination of working groups, management outsourcing, technical assistance, preparation of minutes, etc).
- Accountability: the Council is accountable before the Ministry of the Equality.

ii) Independence of the body

The set-up provided by Law 62/2003 (Article 33) was very similar to that of some existing governmental consultative bodies. However, Law 15/2014 (Article 18) recognises that the Council exercises its functions 'with independence'. Therefore, it may be said that the Council can be regarded as independent de jure, because it is established as such by a Law (Law 15/2014 amending Law 62/2003).

The council cannot be regarded as independent de facto, among other reasons because of the presence of Government representatives among its members: half of its members are formally representatives of the public administration; the seven representing central Government are of the rank of director-general (appointed by the Council of Ministers); these Government representatives are full members of the Council with full speaking and voting rights in all areas.

In addition, the Council cannot be seen as an independent body in structural terms, for various reasons: it cannot choose its own staff (because the Council secretariat is a part of the public administration itself, being a department of the Ministry of Equality), and it has no infrastructure of its own. It cannot be said that the Council conforms to the provisions established in the UN Paris principles (Principles relating to the Status of National Institutions, adopted by General Assembly Resolution 48/134 of 20 December 1993), especially due to two requirements in the 'Composition and guarantees of independence and pluralism': its composition and its lack of infrastructure. Furthermore, the Council also does not conform to the European Commission Recommendation on Standards for Equality Bodies of 22 June 2018.

e) Grounds covered by the designated body

The council has competence only in relation to the ground of racial or ethnic origin. In practice this means that the equality body deals with discrimination against migrants. The council, however, does not treat migrants as a priority issue.

The areas covered by the Council are: education, health, benefits and social services, housing, the offer of and access to any goods and services—including access to employment, self-employment and professional practice—affiliation to union or business organisations, working conditions, and the promotion of professional and vocational training (Law 62/2003, Article 33).

f) Competences of the designated body – and their independent exercise

i) Independent assistance to victims

In Spain, the designated body formally has the competence to provide independent assistance to victims on ground of racial or ethnic origin (Law 62/2003, Article 33, as modified by Law 15/2014, Article 18).

To fulfil this competence, the Council has the Network of Centres of Assistance for Victims of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination, under the coordination of the Fundación Secretariado Gitano (FSG) and involving seven NGOs (FSG, ACCEM, Cruz Roja Española, Fundación CEPAIM, Movimiento contra la Intolerancia, Movimiento por la Paz, el Desarme y la Libertad and Red Acoge). These NGOs work independently but follow a formal protocol established by the Council, handling cases for possible victims of discrimination on request or dealing with situations that have been identified by the NGOs themselves. The next step is assessment of whether there are any 'clear indications' of direct or indirect discrimination (when it has been found that a person or people have been effectively treated 'differently and worse' because of their racial or ethnic origin). If there are any such indications, the recommendations may include (1) negotiation, (2) mediation, (3) legal support, (4) psychological support, or (5) complaint. The performance of the NGOs is not subject to scrutiny by the Council in relation to matters of substance. The NGOs draw funding from the Council for these interventions.

The network works on a two-year contract with the Spanish public administration (most recently October 2017-October 2019) and received funding of EUR 482 369 for this period. The network's financial resources and staffing levels appear to be adequate. After October 2019, however, the network (and in particular the Victims of Discrimination

Assistance and Counselling Service) continued to operate until the signing of the corresponding contract with the public authority for the provision of its services in March 2020 (the corresponding contract for the period 2020-2022 has not been published yet).¹⁷⁵

The council has a free helpline for victims (900 203 041), and a website is also available: www.asistenciavictimasdiscriminacion.org.

De jure, the Council has the competence to provide independent assistance to victims, but it is difficult to assess to what extent the Council is actually exercising this function independently, given the factors mentioned in previous paragraphs (half of its members are Government representatives, and the staff of the Council themselves form part of the public administration). The possibility of providing independent legal assistance to victims has been addressed via the Network of Centres of Assistance for Victims of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination.¹⁷⁶

It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of the Council in relation to the 'independent assistance to victims.' The network provides an important service of advising and accompanying victims.

In 2021, the *2020 Annual Performance Report on the Victims of Discrimination Assistance and Counselling Service* was published by the Council for the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination. The annual performance report contains the data and analysis collected by the registered entities from 26 March to 31 December 2020 (It should be highlighted that this report refers only to cases of racial or ethnic discrimination dealt with by the Service during 2020). In this period, the Service attended or dealt with a total of 569 cases of racial or ethnic discrimination (assuming that the latest published figures for January and October 2019 found 588 cases of discrimination, the number of cases of discrimination brought to the attention of the Service remains stable). Nevertheless, between 26 March and 31 December 2020, there were 569 cases registered, of which 307 (54 %) were individual cases and 262 (56 %) group cases. The total number of persons assisted in both individual and collective cases 'with specific direct victims' was around 1 664 persons. However, according to the report, there are a number of difficulties in identifying victims of discrimination in collective cases that affect an indeterminate group of people or population groups.

In addition, the aforementioned report states that of the 569 cases registered, a total of 385 cases (68 %) have been closed. Of these, 217 were for reasons of compliance or non-compliance with administrative deadlines, because the discriminating agent could not be contacted, time delays, etc.; in all, 117 were found to be positive (although it is not known what the resolution consists of); 87 by decision of the victim or complainant; 72 were found unresolvable; 29 by passive decision of the victim; in 21 cases no discrimination was found; 9 by court judgement and 4 were finally made a police or prosecutor's complaint (another 13 are still to be classified due to the unavailability of the victim or victims for unknown reasons).¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁵ Council for the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination, *Memoria anual de resultados del Servicio de asistencia y orientación a víctimas de discriminación 2020 (2020 Annual Performance Report on the Victims of Discrimination Assistance and Counselling Service)*, November 2021, available at: https://igualdadynodiscriminacion.igualdad.gob.es/novedades/novedades/2021/pdf/Memoria_anual_2020.pdf.

¹⁷⁶ This possibility was suggested by Cachón (2009) as a way for the Council to provide assistance to victims, as long as the service is suitably managed. If this assistance is provided by these organisations in a way that is not dependent on the public administration, then it can be described as independent.

¹⁷⁷ Council for the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination, *Memoria anual de resultados del Servicio de asistencia y orientación a víctimas de discriminación 2020 (Annual Performance Report of the Victims of Discrimination Assistance and Counselling Service 2020)*, November 2021, available at: https://igualdadynodiscriminacion.igualdad.gob.es/novedades/novedades/2021/pdf/Memoria_anual_2020.pdf.

The ideas set out in previous reports should in any case be maintained. In reports from previous years, it was noted that one indicator that the Council is not in fact providing effective assistance to victims is the fact that the vast majority of registered cases do not reach the network at the initiative of the victims but are picked up by experts from the organisations that make up the network. This allows us to make a positive judgment of these organisations (which seek to identify cases of discrimination on grounds of race or ethnic origin), while highlighting the ineffectiveness of the Council itself. It should also be noted that there is little documentation published on the Council's website.

However, from the *2020 Annual Performance Report on the Victims of Discrimination Assistance and Counselling Service*, published in 2021, it is interesting to note a series of considerations:

1. It is stated in the report that people who were victims of individual incidents of discrimination are most frequently found in the 18-25, 26-35 and 36-45 age brackets, representing a total of 67 % of cases of discrimination.
2. The report states that in 194 incidents of discrimination (34 %), the victims were women and in 141 incidents (25 %) the victims of discrimination were men.
3. It is of undoubted interest to note that, among the cases of individual discrimination identified, the Roma population (39 %), the Latino population (22 %), the Maghreb/Near Eastern population (18 %) and people of African descent (8 %) are the most represented. Along these lines, according to the report, in the 569 cases registered and analysed, the Service attended to people of more than 48 different nationalities, with the most significant being people of Spanish nationality in 352 cases (62 %), Moroccan nationality in 41 cases (7 %), and Colombian nationality in 24 cases (4 %). As the report concludes, 'contrary to the mistaken popular belief that racism is suffered by foreigners, the different forms of racial or ethnic discrimination affect, above all, people who, despite having Spanish nationality, belong to ethnic or racial minority groups that have traditionally been discriminated against.'
4. In general, the profile of people who have experienced racial or ethnic discrimination corresponds to people in low-skilled professions or workers in catering services or shop assistants, with primary and secondary education, most of them unemployed. The areas where most individual cases of discrimination occurred were access to goods and services with 72 cases (20 %), employment with 52 cases (14 %) and housing with 47 cases (13 %).
5. The report highlights that in general terms, the incidents of discrimination recorded by the Service's organisations were due to direct discrimination (85 %). Only 10.5 % were cases of indirect discrimination, and 3.1 % were situations of discriminatory harassment

Finally, two main conclusions of the report should be noted:

a) According to the Report, 'there is still a lack of knowledge on the part of society regarding the anti-discrimination legislation in force, a fact that has repercussions for the victims, who do not know the scope of their rights or the mechanisms for reporting and receiving assistance, sometimes accepting discrimination as an everyday occurrence. There is also a need for greater awareness and understanding in society in order to avoid discriminatory attitudes.' The author would like to point out that the report makes no mention of the Spanish Law against racial discrimination (Law 62/2003). It is also proof that, even by the the Assistance and Counselling Service that issued the report, the Spanish law is not cited, discussed or analysed.

b) The report states that 'It is necessary to continue to involve key actors in the fight against discrimination through appropriate training activities, and it is necessary to

promote the application of Directive 2000/43/EC and other applicable legislation on discrimination and hate crimes.'

c) Finally, the author would like to point out that the report highlights the limited effectiveness of Spanish anti-discrimination legislation, especially when it comes to sanctioning perpetrators of discrimination and repairing the damages suffered by the victims. According to the report, 'it is necessary to pass laws such as the Comprehensive Equal Treatment Act and other regulatory mechanisms and tools that allow progress in the fight against racial or ethnic discrimination and facilitate the work of the Assistance and Counselling Service attached to the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination in fulfilling its mandate.'

ii) Independent surveys and reports

In Spain, the designated body has the competence to conduct independent surveys and publish independent reports (Law 62/2003, Article 33 as modified by Law 15/2014, Article 18).

The most recently published study by the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination is a report entitled *Potential victims' perception of discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin-2020*.¹⁷⁸

As stated in the report itself, its main objective is to gain insight into how the perception of possible victims of discrimination due to racial or ethnic origin has evolved over time in Spain. This is a continuation of the studies conducted in 2010, 2011 and 2013. The uniqueness and added value of the study lies in the fact that ethnic and racial discrimination is addressed based on potential victims' subjective perception. This study aspires to be a unique tool to be used throughout Spain to measure how discrimination, a particularly complex phenomenon, is perceived.

Among other conclusions of interest, it may be highlighted that the Roma and Maghreb populations believe that they are seen in the worst light. The perceived image of the Maghreb group has worsened in comparison with the 2013 report; people who were born in Spain and/or have Spanish nationality perceive higher levels of racism, and this perceived level decreases as the number of years spent in the country increases; physical features and skin colour are the main motives for discriminatory behaviour, followed by cultural elements and religious beliefs and practices at a considerable distance, but gaining relative importance; this means that the main grounds for racial discrimination are the victim's skin colour and physical features. Less numerous are allegations of racially motivated discrimination on the basis of the victim's culture or religious beliefs. The study shows that many people suffer from multiple discrimination and, in some cases, what has been called intersectional discrimination: when specific stereotypes about certain ethnic groups are compounded by personal characteristics such as one's gender, level of education and income. Examples include discourse that sexualises women from certain groups, or the difficulties certain subgroups have in finding employment because they are seen as unfit for certain jobs.

Finally, the report concludes that the work carried out by organisations and public institutions fighting discrimination is still not very well known. Important work is being carried out at national level and by NGOs and associations to disseminate and support human rights and support the complaints process. However, the report states that we should question the effectiveness of these initiatives judging by the fact that, in 2013, only 2 out of 10 people had heard of any of these institutions.

¹⁷⁸ See Council for the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination, *Executive Summary: Potential Victims' perception of discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin*, available at: https://igualdadynodiscriminacion.igualdad.gob.es/destacados/pdf/05-PERCEPCION_DISCRIMINACION_RACIAL_RESUMEN-EN.pdf.

It is difficult to assess to what extent the Council is exercising this function independently. The council can produce analyses and reports with contributions from the various organisations involved. They may be proposed by NGOs or experts independently, but they must be formally approved by the Council (and half of whose members are Government representatives).

On the other hand, it cannot be said that there is any real popular, political or even academic debate in Spain on equality and diversity, or on the role of the Council in the fight against discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin. It has only been through the discussion of the Comprehensive Bill for Equal Treatment and Non-discrimination in the Parliament in 2018 that the role of the Council and the need to create an Authority for Equal Treatment and Non-Discrimination have become part of the political debate.

iii) Recommendations

In Spain, the designated body has competence to issue recommendations on discrimination issues (Law 62/2003, Article 33 as modified by Law 15/2014, Article 18). In addition, Royal Decree 1262/2007 assigns other competences that can also be interpreted as the possibility of making recommendations:

- a) analyse the regulations in relation to equality of treatment and non-discrimination on ground of racial or ethnic origin, proposing initiatives for their adoption or modification;
- b) present initiatives and formulate recommendations in relation to plans or programmes to promote equality of treatment and non-discrimination by racial or ethnic origin.

In 2019 (and in 2015) the Council approved a recommendation on the eve of an election campaign. The council approved the recommendation 'Avoid the use of discriminatory, racist or xenophobic discourse in electoral campaigns' (*Evitar el uso de discursos discriminatorios, racistas o xenófobos en las campañas electorales*). This recommendation has not had a major impact.

iv) Other competences

In its definition of the Council's functions, Royal Decree 1262/2007 assigns other competences that are not included in the directive. It provides that the Council may:

- a) advise and report on indirect anti-discrimination practices in its various spheres of action;
- b) promote informative, awareness-raising and training activities and any others that may be required to promote equal treatment and non-discrimination;
- c) establish information exchange and cooperation relationships with similar international, national, regional or local bodies or institutions; and
- d) establish cooperation and partnership mechanisms with other bodies, entities and high-level institutions working to defend fundamental rights.

All these functions could be of great interest to the Council and could significantly enrich its sphere of action.

Although the launch of the Network of Centres of Assistance for Victims of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination in 2010 and the formal recognition of its independence by Law 15/2014 may have improved the public's understanding of its roles as well as boosting its effectiveness, it appears that the Council remains unknown by the general public. According to a report of 2017 of the FRA,¹⁷⁹ Spain's anti-discrimination body is the least well known in the entire

¹⁷⁹ FRA (2017), *Second European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey, Main results*.

EU; as such, its potential for anti-discrimination action is limited. One of the reasons is that the Council was without a chair from September 2015 until October 2018 and did not hold any meetings in 2016, 2017, and almost all of 2018. Following the appointment of its new president in 2018, the Council has increased its visibility.

g) Legal standing of the designated body

In Spain, the designated body does not have legal standing to:

- bring discrimination complaints on behalf of identified victims to court;
- bring discrimination complaints on behalf of non-identified victims to court;
- bring discrimination complaints *ex officio* to court;
- intervene in legal cases concerning discrimination, for example as an *amicus curiae*.

h) Quasi-judicial competences

In Spain, the body is not a quasi-judicial institution.

i) Registration by the body of complaints and decisions

In Spain, the body does not itself handle complaints or make decisions (by ground, field, type of discrimination, etc). However, the body does register the number of complaints relating to racial or ethnic origin that have been addressed by the network of assistance centres, which was created by the Council in 2010. These data concern 'inquiries received' by the network, both formal and informal (phone calls, emails with questions, items in the newspapers, etc). The data record complaints filed as a 'racist incident' as defined in Recommendation 11 from ECRI (Paragraph 14): 'any incident which is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other person'.

The data on complaints addressed by the network are available to the public because they are published in the network's annual reports. Cases may be individual (incidents in which a person has felt discriminated against) or collective (incidents in which a group or collective has felt discriminated against). The disaggregation of the data from March 2020 to December 2020 can be seen in the following table.

	2016 (January- December)	2017 (January- December)	2018 (January- December)	2019 (Oct. 2018- Oct. 2019)	2020 (March 2020 – December 2020)
<i>Total</i>	631	646	729	756	569
Individual	381	370	416	479	307
Collective	250	276	313	277	262

Source: Annual reports of the Network of Assistance Centres of the Spanish Council.¹⁸⁰

In the individual cases of discrimination detected, the Roma population (39 %), the Latino population (22 %), the Maghreb/Near Eastern population (18 %) and people of African descent (8 %) are the most represented.

¹⁸⁰ See Council for the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination, *Memoria anual de resultados del Servicio de asistencia y orientación a víctimas de discriminación 2020 (Annual Performance Report of the Victims of Discrimination Assistance and Counselling Service 2020)*, November 2021, available at: https://igualdadynodiscriminacion.igualdad.gob.es/novedades/novedades/2021/pdf/Memoria_anual_2020.pdf. (Data for 2021 is not yet available).

There were higher numbers of discriminatory acts in the fields of employment and access to goods and services among individuals, with discriminatory acts via the internet and other media highest among collective complaints (see following table).

Complaints addressed by the network in 2020 (March 2020-December 2020) by ethnic or racial origin of the victim and by field of discrimination. This data was published in November 2021.¹⁸¹

	Individual	Collective
Total	307	262
<i>Ethnic or racial origin of the victim</i>		
Roma people	121	195
Maghreb	55	12
Africa	26	4
Latin America	69	8
Others	36	43
<i>Field of discrimination</i>		
Access to goods/services	72	36
Employment	52	12
Housing	47	22
Health	37	5
Public spaces	32	27
Education	28	15
Internet	5	142
Others	91	36

Source: *Annual Performance Report on the Victims of Discrimination Assistance and Counselling Service*, published in 2021 (*Memoria anual de resultados del Servicio de asistencia y orientación a víctimas de discriminación*).

j) Roma and Travellers

The council may conduct formal general investigations into discrimination against the Roma, but this is not necessarily a priority issue. Among the members of the Council, there are two Spanish Roma organisations, the Fundación Secretariado Gitano and the Unión Romaní, which are very active associations in this field. It is noteworthy that the Fundación Secretariado Gitano coordinates the Victims of Discrimination Assistance and Counselling Service for the Council for the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination.

In this regard, it should be noted that the Fundación Secretariado Gitano has published its 17th annual report on discrimination and the Roma Community, for 2021.¹⁸² The report includes 364 cases of discrimination and anti-Gypsyism registered and handled by the FSG. The cases registered by the FSG are found in areas such as communication, with bad practices in the media and internet – a total of 129 cases; in social networks – a total of 29 cases; in employment – 28 cases; in access to goods and services – 64 cases; in police services – 25 cases; in education – 27 cases; in housing – 31 cases; in health – 8 cases; and in others (including the most extreme cases of hate crimes) – 23 cases. With regard to the profile of the victims, it can be seen that discrimination affects mainly young Roma between the ages of 16 and 30, and women, who account for 148 of the 257 victims identified.

¹⁸¹ Council for the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination, *Memoria anual de resultados del Servicio de asistencia y orientación a víctimas de discriminación 2020 (Annual Performance Report of the Victims of Discrimination Assistance and Counselling Service 2020)*, November 2021, available at: https://igualdadynodiscriminacion.igualdad.gob.es/novedades/novedades/2021/pdf/Memoria_anual_2020.pdf.

¹⁸² See the Fundación Secretariado Gitano website: <https://www.gitanos.org/actualidad/archivo/134812.html>.

The report presents a series of recommendations such as the need to pass a comprehensive law on equal treatment and non-discrimination; the approval, during 2022, of a State Action Plan against Racism, in application of the EU Anti-Racism Action Plan for 2020-2025 and following the guidelines indicated by the European Commission; training in anti-discrimination law and the Victims' Statute for all key actors in this field: the judiciary, the prosecution, the legal profession, and law enforcement agencies; the provision of adequate resources to all institutions involved in combating racial or ethnic discrimination; and the establishment and adequate funding of specialised programmes providing comprehensive support to Roma women, especially the most vulnerable, with a view to empowering them to exercise their rights against intersectional discrimination and gender-based violence, improve their academic and vocational training, participate in the labour market, improve their self-esteem and self-confidence, as well as overcome traditional gender roles.

8 IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

8.1 Dissemination of information, dialogue with NGOs and between social partners

- a) Dissemination of information about legal protection against discrimination (Article 10 Directive 2000/43 and Article 12 Directive 2000/78)

Spain has undertaken some campaigns to disseminate anti-discrimination rules. It cannot be said that there have been major campaigns to spread awareness of the anti-discrimination rules that have had significant effects. However, there has been a marked improvement in anti-discrimination awareness, especially in areas such as gender, disability and sexual orientation.

On the other hand, the Spanish Government and the Council for the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination have also carried out several publicity campaigns of interest in the field of non-discrimination on the grounds of racial and ethnic discrimination:

1) During 2021, the Council for the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination has carried out a publicity campaign to raise awareness of the Council's channels of assistance for victims of discrimination.¹⁸³

2) The Spanish Ministry of Equality launched the Anti-Racism Week on 17 March 2021 to mark the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.¹⁸⁴ Within the framework of this Anti-Racism Week, the Council of Ministers of the Spanish Government adopted an Institutional Declaration on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.¹⁸⁵ In this Declaration, the Spanish Government recognises that there is a need for more detailed knowledge of the situation of racism in Spain. For this reason, it admits that a more precise diagnosis, more statistics, surveys and studies are needed in order to carry out a complete analysis of the degree of access of migrants, Roma, Africans and people of African descent, Asians, Arabs and other population and ethnic groups to economic and social rights, such as housing, education and training, employment and health care.

- b) Measures to encourage dialogue with NGOs with a view to promoting the principle of equal treatment (Article 12 Directive 2000/43 and Article 14 Directive 2000/78)

In the field of disability, the National Disability Council (Consejo Nacional sobre la Discapacidad) was established by the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013). The council has 15 members representing various bodies within national Government, 15 members representing associations of persons with disabilities of various kinds and four expert advisors. Its functions include the issuing of reports, of a mandatory, non-binding nature, on draft regulations affecting equal opportunities, non-discrimination and universal accessibility. It is therefore a body with powers in the field of equal treatment in employment and occupations in line with

¹⁸³ See: 'Campaña #DENUNCIAELRACISMO del Consejo para la Eliminación de la Discriminación Racial o Étnica' (#DENUNCIAELRACISMO campaign by the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination), 20 December 2021, available at: https://igualdadynodiscriminacion.igualdad.gob.es/novedades/novedades/2021/Carteles_denuncia_el_racismo_Consejo.htm.

¹⁸⁴ See: 'Igualdad celebra la Semana Antirracista con motivo del Día Internacional para la Eliminación de la Discriminación Racial' (Ministry of Equality celebrates Anti-Racist Week on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination), *lamoncloa.gob.es*, 17 March 2021, available at: https://www.lamoncloa.gob.es/serviciosdeprensa/notasprensa/igualdad/paginas/2021/170321-discriminacion_racial.aspx.

¹⁸⁵ See: 'Declaración institucional con motivo del Día Internacional de la eliminación de la discriminación racial' (Institutional declaration on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination), *lamoncloa.gob.es*, 16 March 2021, available at: <https://www.lamoncloa.gob.es/consejodeministros/Paginas/enlaces/160321-enlace-declaracion.aspx>.

Directive 2000/78, implementing the provisions of the directive's Articles 13 and 14. Despite this council's major role in relation to disability in Spain, it does not meet the criterion of being an 'independent mechanism' as provided by Article 33 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

The Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants, created by Law 4/2000, is a collegiate, consultative, informative and advisory body in the field of immigrant integration. It consists of 10 representatives of the public administration, 10 representatives of immigrants' associations and 10 representatives of social support organisations, including trade unions and employers' organisations with an interest and involvement in the field of immigration.¹⁸⁶

The Advisory Commission on Religious Freedom was created by the Organic Law on Religious Freedom (OL 7/1980). It was subsequently regulated by Royal Decree 932/2013, of 29 November 2013, with the aim of reviewing, reporting on and presenting proposals on issues relating to the enforcement of the law, religious discrimination being one of these issues. Representatives of churches, denominations and religious communities or federations, appointed by the Ministry of Justice, participate in this body. In 2021, the Law was modified by Royal Decree 371/2021, of 25 May, in order to attach this body to the Ministry of the Presidency, Relations with Parliament and Democratic Memory. Historically, issues affecting the Catholic Church have been dealt with by the Ministry of Justice. The new legislation has changed this tradition and all religious issues have passed to the Ministry of the Presidency (which is also competent in matters of constitutional relevance, analysis of the quality of norms, historical and democratic memory, etc.). In any case, the change had been requested by some religious minorities. The idea was that, as these competences were located in a cross-cutting ministry (the Ministry of Presidency), it would be easier to coordinate policies related to the exercise of this fundamental right of religious freedom.¹⁸⁷

- c) Measures to promote dialogue between social partners to give effect to the principle of equal treatment within workplace practices, codes of practice and workforce monitoring (Article 11 Directive 2000/43 and Article 13 Directive 2000/78)

Collective agreements between representatives of employers' organisations and trade unions are used to implement the principles of the directives.

On 30 January 2003, representatives of the Spanish Confederation of Employers' Organisations (CEOE), the Spanish Confederation of Small and Medium-Sized Companies (CEPYME) and the trade unions, Comisiones Obreras (CCOO) and the Unión General de Trabajadores (UGT), signed the Multi-industry Agreement for Collective Bargaining 2003 (ANC 2003). This agreement set out the criteria to serve as guidelines at the various levels of collective bargaining in Spain in 2003, and it was renewed for subsequent years until the agreement for 2018-2020. Chapter V (entitled 'Criteria relating to employment, internal flexibility, professional qualification and equal treatment in employment') contains sections on 'Equal treatment in employment', as 'The situation in employment and unemployment is uneven. Certain groups of workers have greater difficulty in finding work, either because of socio-cultural factors or prejudices or because of labour market conditions.'

Collective bargaining should help to remedy any inequality through the application of the principle of equal treatment as expressly provided for in employment law, and through the promotion of specific actions aimed at eliminating direct or indirect discrimination. The

¹⁸⁶ This body is regulated by Royal Decree 3/2006 of 16 January 2006 on the make-up, competences and procedural rules of the Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants.

¹⁸⁷ See: Rossell, J. 'Organismos Administrativos para la Gestión de la Libertad Religiosa' ('Topic 11: Administrative bodies for the management of religious freedom'), available at: <https://riucv.ucv.es/bitstream/handle/20.500.12466/1441/Tema%2011.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

general clauses on equal treatment in collective agreements are appropriate instruments for helping to combat possible discrimination.

General measures may be taken for some groups: in the case of women, through access to employment, vocational diversification and promotion; in the case of young people, through the promotion of stable employment for the young; in the case of immigrants, through the application of the same conditions that apply to other workers; and in the case of workers with disabilities, by promoting their integration into employment.

Although it would be necessary to analyse collective negotiations in various sectors and companies to see how the ANC is being implemented, the inclusion in the ANC of the anti-discrimination clause in line with Article 11(2) of Directive 2000/43 must be described as positive.

For the period 2018-2020, the social partners have signed the Fourth Agreement for Employment and Collective Bargaining.¹⁸⁸ The agreement includes among the objectives of collective agreements 'compliance with the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination in employment and working conditions, as well as the promotion of equal opportunities between women and men'. Although the only explicit reference relates to discrimination on the ground of sex, the clause can be applied to other grounds of discrimination.

d) Addressing the situation of Roma and Travellers

The National Roma Council has been appointed at a national level specifically to address Roma issues (see section 7 of this report).

The Roma Development Plan, which was adopted each year from 1989 to 2013, was a programme of action for social development and for the improvement of the quality of life of Roma in Spain. The 'National Roma Integration Strategy in Spain 2012-2020' derives from COM(2011)173. The strategy relates to four key areas for social inclusion: education, employment, housing and health. In each of these, targets have been set. In addition, the strategy provides complementary lines of action in social action, participation, improving knowledge about the group, women's equality, non-discrimination, promotion of culture and special attention to Roma who have come from other countries. Since the adoption of the 'National Roma Integration Strategy in Spain 2012-2020', the Government has approved two operative plans: for 2014-2016, and for 2018-2020.¹⁸⁹ This operational plan also had four key areas of action: education, employment and economic activity, housing, and health.

In 2021, several reports were produced by the Spanish Government (Ministry of Social Rights and 2030 Agenda) to assess the implementation of the *National Strategy for the Inclusion of the Roma population in Spain 2012-2020*.¹⁹⁰ The first was the *Progress Report 2018-2020 on the National Strategy for the Social Inclusion of the Roma Population 2012-*

¹⁸⁸ Resolution of 17 July 2018 on the Directorate General of Employment, for the recording and publishing of the IVth Agreement for Employment and Collective Negotiation (*Resolución de 17 de julio de 2018, de la Dirección General de Trabajo, por la que se registra y publica el IV Acuerdo para el Empleo y la Negociación Colectiva*, BOE, 20 June 2015, [https://www.boe.es/eli/es/res/2018/07/17/\(1\)](https://www.boe.es/eli/es/res/2018/07/17/(1))).

¹⁸⁹ Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality, 'National Strategy for the Social Inclusion of the Roma Population 2012-2020 Operational Plan 2018-2020' (Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad, 'Estrategia Nacional para la Inclusión Social de la Población Gitana 2012-2020 Plan Operativo 2018-2020'), https://www.mscbs.gob.es/ssi/familiasInfancia/PoblacionGitana/docs/PlanOperativo2018_20PG.pdf.

¹⁹⁰ See this Strategy in Section 7.

2020.¹⁹¹ The second was the *Final Evaluation Report of the National Strategy 2012-2020*.¹⁹² Both reports were published by the Spanish Government in October 2021.

The *Progress Report 2018-2020* acknowledges that the health situation resulting from COVID-19 has had an impact on all strategic areas (education, employment, culture, citizen participation, etc.). For example, the report found that the majority of the actors consulted for the report (53 %) considered that the effects of COVID-19 have greatly impeded the access of Roma children and young people to education; 52 % believe that the pandemic has created greater difficulties in accessing jobs; 49.6 % believe that COVID-19 has had a significant impact on loss of employment and 59.8 % believe that it has contributed to a high degree to the increase in poverty. Finally, 50.4 % of the actors consulted admit that the circumstances of the pandemic have significantly paralysed training actions. This *Progress Report 2018-2020 of the National Strategy for the Social Inclusion of the Roma Population 2012-2020* is also important with regard to a certain amount of information concerning budgetary aspects: the *Progress Report 2018-2020* points to a greater budgetary allocation by the state and the regions aimed at the Roma population; for example, the report notes that EUR 33.4 million has been allocated to measures specifically aimed at the Roma population, which represents an increase in state contributions of 7.7 % compared with 2019, and an increase of 8.2 % compared with 2018. The area with the greatest budgetary weight in measures specifically aimed at the Roma population is at state level: employment (51.2 % of the budget) and at regional level: social inclusion (38.2 % of the budget).

However, the second report, the *Final evaluation report of the National Strategy 2012-2020*, states that the strategy has been underfunded. It says that state resources have remained stable, but that they are insufficient to reduce the disadvantages of the Roma population and bring their living conditions closer to those of the Spanish population as a whole. The report notes that there has been a general improvement in the areas of education and housing, but not in the areas of employment and health outcomes. Finally, the report warns that many objectives that are relevant in the 2012-2020 Strategy must be maintained in the next strategy approved in 2021 (see section 10 of this report), especially the increase in the educational level of Roma youth (academic success in secondary education being fundamental), greater employment of the entire Roma population of working age and the activation of Roma women, guaranteeing the quality of housing in Roma households (both internally and in terms of the equipment of their environments), definitively eradicating shanty towns and tackling health problems, mainly among Roma men and women.

It should be noted that one of the main findings of both reports is that there has been a general improvement in the areas of education and housing, but not in the areas of employment and health outcomes. In any case, it should also be mentioned that a significant number of Roma from Romania have arrived in Spain.¹⁹³ This group of recent Roma immigrants has settled in Spain under the intra-EU human mobility framework. Even if they are included in the measures of the triannual Roma operative plan, in general, this recent group of Roma immigrants face worse living and working conditions than Spanish Roma. Although there have not been any significant social tensions associated with the

¹⁹¹ See *Estrategia Nacional para la Inclusión Social de la Población Gitana 2012-2020: Informe de progreso 2018-2020* (National Strategy for the Social Inclusion of the Roma Population 2012-2020: Progress report 2018-2020), 4 October 2021, available at: https://www.mdsocialesa2030.gob.es/derechos-sociales/poblacion-gitana/docs/estrategia_nacional/po_18_20/Informe_de_progreso_18_20.pdf.

¹⁹² See: *Estrategia Nacional para la Inclusión Social de la Población Gitana 2012-2020: Informe de evaluación final* (National Strategy for the Social Inclusion of the Roma Population 2012-2020: Final strategy evaluation report) 4 October 2021, available at: https://www.mdsocialesa2030.gob.es/va/derechos-sociales/poblacion-gitana/docs/estrategia_nacional/evaluacion_final/Informe_final_strategia_Nacional_12-20_04.10.21.pdf.

¹⁹³ As at 31 December 2020, 1 079 726 Romanian citizens resided in Spain; a significant proportion of them are Roma, but it is impossible to specify the number because there is no official record that reflects the population's ethnicity; only nationality is registered.

Roma of Romania in Spain, as has been the case in other EU countries, there have been some cases of discriminatory acts.

8.2 Measures to ensure compliance with the principle of equal treatment (Article 14 Directive 2000/43, Article 16 Directive 2000/78)

a) Compliance of national legislation (Articles 14(a) and 16(a))

In Spain, there has been no explicit transposition of Article 14(a) of Directive 2000/43 and Article 16(a) of Directive 2000/78, because Law 62/2003, which transposed the directives into Spanish legislation in 2003, did not explicitly include the transposition of these two articles. However, Article 14 of the Spanish Constitution and its sustained interpretation by the Constitutional Court are enough to guarantee the legal protection required by the two directives.

Article 14 of the Spanish Constitution declares the general principle of equality and non-discrimination: 'Spaniards are equal before the law and may not in any way be discriminated against on the grounds of birth, race, sex, religion, opinion or any other condition or personal or social circumstance'. The doctrine of the Constitutional Court on equal treatment and non-discrimination has been forcefully reiterated (STC 41/2006; 144/2006; 31/2014). In addition, the Constitutional Court has reiterated that ordinary courts must take EU law into account when applying Spanish rules (STC 64/1991; 58/2004; 329/2005). Therefore, the courts must guarantee legal protection to persons demanding the implementation of the principle of non-discrimination by not applying any national legal provisions or regulations contrary to this principle. In the field of employment, the Workers' Statute establishes the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination in relation to all grounds of Directive 2000/78 (as well as on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin). Article 4(2)(c) of the Workers' Statute provides that workers have the right

'not to be directly or indirectly discriminated against for employment, or once employed, for reasons of sex, marital status, age ... racial or ethnic origin, social status, religion or belief, political ideas, sexual orientation, affiliation or not to a union, as well as by reason of language, within the Spanish State. Nor can they be discriminated against because of disability, provided they are in a position to perform the job or employment in question.'

There are no laws, regulations or rules still in force that are contrary to the principle of equality on the grounds specified in the directives.

b) Compliance of other rules/clauses (Articles 14(b) and 16(b))

Article 14 of the Spanish Constitution and its sustained interpretation by the Constitutional Court are enough to ensure that contracts, collective agreements, internal rules of businesses and the rules governing independent occupations, professions, workers' associations or employers' associations that are contrary to the principle of equal treatment may be declared null and void.

Article 17(1) of the Workers' Statute declares the regulation precepts, clauses of collective agreements, individual pacts, and unilateral decisions of discriminatory employers to be 'null and void'. This article can be considered to comply with the requirements of Article 14(b) of Directive 2000/43 and Article 16(b) of Directive 2000/78 in relation to contractual clauses in employment.

9 COORDINATION AT NATIONAL LEVEL

Although the transposition of European directives is the responsibility of the Ministry of Justice under the coordination of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the department that drew up the texts transposing Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78 in 2003 was the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Directorate General for Labour).

Since 2020, the department responsible for implementing anti-discrimination policies under Directive 2000/43 has been the Ministry of Equality. Amongst other functions, this ministry is responsible for proposing and implementing Government policies aimed at eliminating all forms of discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or ideology, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, disability, or any other personal or social condition or circumstance. This ministry is structured around two state secretariats, one of which is the Secretariat for Equality and against Gender Violence. This secretariat is responsible for the 'proposal of policy measures' aimed at guaranteeing equal treatment and non-discrimination of persons regardless of their sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or ideology, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, disability, or any other personal or social condition or circumstance. Two general directorates depend on the Secretariat of State for Equality and against Gender Violence: the Directorate-General for Equal Treatment and Ethnic and Racial Diversity, and the Directorate-General for Sexual Diversity and LGBTI Rights (see Royal Decree 455/2020 of 10 March 2020, by which the basic organic structure of the Ministry of Equality is set out. It should be noted that the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination is attached to the Directorate-General for Equal Treatment and Ethnic and Racial Diversity.

To conclude, this department has a general duty to monitor the implementation of Directive 2000/43 (independently of the duties of other ministerial departments in their respective fields). The Directorate-General of Equal Treatment and Ethnic and Racial Diversity is also responsible for developing regulations applicable to the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination.

With respect to the area covered by Directive 2000/78, which 'lays down a general framework for combating discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation as regards employment and occupation', the ministry in charge of implementing anti-discrimination policies is the Ministry of Labour and Social Economy. This is established by Royal Decree 499/2020 of 28 April 2020, which sets out the basic organic structure of the Ministry of Labour and Social Economy. According to this law, the Ministry of Labour and Social Economy is the department responsible for proposing and executing the Government's employment policy. Several state secretariats report to the ministry, one of which is the State Secretariat of Labour and Social Economy, and the Directorate-General of Labour reports to this secretariat. Amongst other functions, this Directorate has the technical and legal support necessary to 'draft, approve, transpose and implement' directives and other Community or international legal instruments in the areas of competence of the Directorate-General of Labour. Thus, the Ministry is responsible for anti-discrimination policies in the workplace on the grounds of religion or beliefs, disability, age or sexual orientation covered by Directive 2000/78.

Finally, and aside from employment, the ministry responsible for implementing policies to support persons with disabilities is the Ministry of Social Affairs and the 2030 Agenda. Royal Decree 452/2020 of 10 March 2020, which sets out the ministry's basic organic structure, states that it is responsible for proposing and implementing government policies in social rights and social welfare, family, diversity, child protection, social cohesion, care for dependent or persons with disabilities, adolescents and youth, and animal protection. In this regard, the Directorate-General for Disability Support Policies is included in the Ministry's organisational structure.

The anti-discrimination policies covered by this report are under the implementation of the aforementioned ministries. However, we should note that there are other departments with responsibilities in matters of racial or ethnic discrimination, both in ministries and in other tiers of government, such as the autonomous communities and town councils.

However, Spain is a decentralised state, and its regions (autonomous communities), can pass laws on the subject of non-discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation. The autonomous communities that have adopted laws on this subject are the Community of Madrid, the Valencian Community, Andalusia, Aragon and Cantabria. Catalonia has adopted a general law on equal treatment and non-discrimination.¹⁹⁴

Anti-racism and anti-discrimination National Action Plan

On 4 November 2011, the Spanish Government approved the 'Comprehensive strategy against racism, discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance' (still in force in 2021).

The 'Comprehensive Strategy against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance' adopted by the Spanish Government in 2011 was based on three chapters (also known as general challenges) of interest: firstly, the implementation of analysis and information systems to understand the evolution of racism, and on the subject of judicial or legal-penal action with regard to racism; secondly, the promotion of coordination and cooperation with institutions and with civil society; and thirdly, comprehensive protection for the victims of racism (see Cachón, 2012).

Each of these chapters or general challenges should focus on different areas of action: education, employment, health, housing, media, Internet, sports and raising awareness of racism. The Strategy stresses the need to establish mechanisms for evaluating and monitoring the policies that should be developed to meet these objectives. To monitor the Strategy, the General Directorate for the Integration of Immigrants of the Spanish Government's Ministry of Labour and Immigration was entrusted with preparing follow-up reports containing statistical data on racial discrimination, as well as monographic reports on the Strategy's areas of intervention (the Strategy assigned the Spanish Observatory against Racism and Xenophobia the task of preparing these reports).

As a result of this strategy, the Institutional Cooperation Agreement to fight against racism, xenophobia, LGBTI-phobia and other forms of intolerance was adopted in 2015 and renewed in September 2018. The Agreement was signed by judicial bodies and various ministries of the Spanish Government. The Agreement's main objective is to support and

¹⁹⁴ See: 1. Comunidad de Madrid, Law 3/2016, of July 22, on Comprehensive Protection against LGBTI phobia and Discrimination for Reasons of Sexual Orientation and Identity in the Community of Madrid (*Ley 3/2016, de 22 de julio, de Protección Integral contra LGTBIfobia y la Discriminación por Razón de Orientación e Identidad Sexual en la Comunidad de Madrid*), BOE, No. 285, 25 November 2016, available at <https://boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2016-11096&p=20160810&tn=1>; Comunidad Valenciana, Law 8/2017, of April 7, comprehensive recognition of the right to gender identity and expression in the Valencian Community (*Ley 8/2017, de 7 de abril, integral del reconocimiento del derecho a la identidad y a la expresión de género en la Comunitat Valenciana*), BOE, No. 112, 11 May 2017, available at: [https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?lang=en&id=BOE-A-2017-5118&tn=1&p=.](https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?lang=en&id=BOE-A-2017-5118&tn=1&p=;); 3. Andalucía, Law 8/2017, of December 28, to guarantee the rights, equal treatment and non-discrimination of LGBTI people and their families in Andalusia (*Ley 8/2017, de 28 de diciembre, para garantizar los derechos, la igualdad de trato y no discriminación de las personas LGTBI y sus familiares en Andalucía*), BOE, No. 33, 6 February 2018, available at: <https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2018-1549&p=20180115&tn=1>; 4. Aragón, Law 18/2018, of December 20, on equality and comprehensive protection against discrimination based on sexual orientation, expression and gender identity in the Autonomous Community of Aragon (*Ley 18/2018, de 20 de diciembre, de igualdad y protección integral contra la discriminación por razón de orientación sexual, expresión e identidad de género en la Comunidad Autónoma de Aragón*), BOE, No. 50, 27 February 2019, available at: <https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2019-2712>; 5. Cantabria, Law 8/2020, of November 11, Guaranteeing the Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Trans, Transgender, Bisexual and Intersex Persons and Non-Discrimination on the Ground of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (*Ley 8/2020, de 11 de noviembre, de Garantía de Derechos de las Personas Lesbianas, Gais, Trans, Transgénero, Bisexuales e Intersexuales y No Discriminación por Razón de Orientación Sexual e Identidad de Género*), BOE, No. 322, 10 December 2020, available at: <https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2020-15880>.

collaborate with all institutions in strategies, plans and activities against racism, xenophobia, LGBTI-phobia and all forms of intolerance, placing the support and defence of the victims of hate crimes, discrimination and intolerance at the centre. Specifically, this Agreement provides for knowledge enhancement and research activities, as well as the systematic analysis of proceedings and the monitoring of complaints, investigative proceedings conducted by the Public Prosecutor's Office, court proceedings initiated, and sentences and reparations for victims. It also includes the joint organisation and implementation of training and awareness-raising activities in this field.

This Agreement was the result of the Strategy's first general challenge: an understanding of the evolution of racism. Under the Agreement, the signatory institutions pledge to cooperate inter-institutionally to carry out the following activities: training and awareness-raising activities against racism and xenophobia; collection of data on complaints and criminal offences; academic research and publications; exchange of publications and information between organisations.

In 2015, the Government published its *Report on the evaluation and monitoring of the comprehensive strategy against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance*. There are no more recent evaluation reports of the plan.

Nevertheless, it is worth considering the Recommendation of the Council for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CEDRE) of December 2021. This CEDRE Recommendation is aimed at encouraging the reporting of situations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, anti-Gypsyism, anti-black racism and related intolerance, and special protection for victims in vulnerable situations.¹⁹⁵

This Recommendation is intended to make it easier for victims of racial discrimination to file complaints in the social and judicial sphere. It advocates increasing the training of law enforcement agencies, intensifying the promotion of awareness-raising campaigns by the competent authorities, and amending immigration legislation to better protect undocumented migrants from sanctioning procedures.

On the other hand, in July 2021, the Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants published a Communiqué on the risk of normalising hate crime.¹⁹⁶

The Forum expressed its deep concern about the growing rise of hate speech and racist attitudes and also its concern about the risk of normalising acts and attitudes that have never been part of Spanish society or have been only very residual in the past. It noted that over the last few years, strategies have been insufficient to ensure inclusion and coexistence. It therefore proposed a number of measures, including: an update of the National Strategy against Racism, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance with concrete objectives, a financial budget, a timeframe for implementation and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms; awareness-raising and information campaigns with objective data, carried out by entities and public administrations, which demonstrate the benefits of a plural and diverse society based on nationality or origin; increased vigilance through existing independent bodies for assistance to victims of discrimination based on racial or

¹⁹⁵ Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination, 'Recomendación del CEDRE sobre fomento de la denuncia de situaciones de racismo, discriminación racial, xenofobia, antisemitismo, antigitanismo, racismo antiafro y otras formas conexas de intolerancia y especial protección de víctimas en situación de vulnerabilidad' (CEDRE Recommendation on promoting the reporting of situations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, anti-Gypsyism, anti-African racism and other related forms of intolerance and special protection for victims in situations of vulnerability), 17 December 2021, available at: https://igualdadynodiscriminacion.igualdad.gob.es/novedades/novedades/2021/pdf/Recomendacion_del_CEDRE_sobre_fomento_de_la_denuncia_y_especial_proteccion_de_victimas_aprobada_en_el_Pleno_del_Cons_ejo_del_17_de_diciembre.pdf.

¹⁹⁶ See: Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants, 'Comunicado Del Foro Para La Integración Social De Los Inmigrantes Ante El Riesgo De Normalización Del Delito De Odio' (Communiqué of the Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants in the Face of the Risk of Normalisation of Hate Crime), 30 July 2021, http://www.foroinmigracion.es/ficheros/declaraciones/2021/comun_racismo_fisi_30_07_21.pdf.

ethnic origin; a commitment by public administrations to denounce and condemn hate crimes and to repudiate and eradicate them in official bodies, especially those that represent the will of the people.

In the author's opinion, the aforementioned strategies or agreements have not been effective. Proof of this is the recognition by organisations such as the Forum for the Social Integration of Immigrants of the growing increase in situations of racism and hate speech. In fact, the Forum notes that 'over the last few years, strategies have been insufficient to ensure inclusion and coexistence'. There are several reasons for this: the failure to plan specific objectives, or to set clear deadlines for achieving them, or lack of accountability in the failure to achieve the strategies' overall objectives (in the author's view, the same could be said of the Roma Strategy).

10 CURRENT BEST PRACTICES

1. Regarding the use of artificial intelligence (AI)¹⁹⁷ to improve the effective implementation of the national legislation transposing the directives, the following four actions taken by Spain in relation to artificial intelligence during 2020 should be noted:

a) The National Artificial Intelligence Strategy promoted by the Spanish Government in 2020.¹⁹⁸ For the purpose of this report on Spain, it should be noted that the Strategy provides for appropriate measures to develop AI based on ethical principles, including inclusion and non-discrimination.

Of particular interest is the creation of the Spanish Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council in 2020.¹⁹⁹ This Council is made up of Spanish and international experts of worldwide prestige and representatives from the fields of science, economics and the social sciences. Its scope of analysis and consultation ranges from developing and monitoring the National Artificial Intelligence Strategy to analysing the implications of climate change in the workplace, fundamental rights, the fight against discrimination, and equal access in the use of technologies.

b) In 2020, a Charter of Digital Rights was drawn up by the Spanish Government and was submitted to public consultation. The final text resulting from this process was subsequently published.²⁰⁰ The first version of the Charter recognised the right to equality, non-discrimination and non-exclusion in digital environments.

Recently, in July 2021, the Spanish Government officially presented the Digital Rights Charter.²⁰¹

The Charter is not regulatory in nature, but aims to recognise the challenges in application and interpretation of adapting rights to the digital environment, as well as proposing principles and policies relating to rights in digital scenarios. It also proposes a reference framework for Government action so that navigating in the digital environment can be undertaken by exploiting and developing all of its possibilities and opportunities while minimising its risks. The Charter also seeks to contribute to ongoing reflection at European level and, in doing so, lead an essential process at the global level to guarantee humane digitalisation that puts people at the centre.

Particularly important in the Charter are the rights relating to artificial intelligence, also to algorithmic non-discrimination and the right of the individual to request human supervision or intervention.

¹⁹⁷ 'Artificial intelligence' refers to systems that display intelligent behaviour by analysing their environment and taking action – with some degree of autonomy – to achieve specific goals (see Commission Communication on artificial intelligence for Europe (COM(2018)237), at <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2018%3A237%3AFIN>). For a more detailed definition of AI, see EU High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence (AI HLEG), 'A Definition of AI. Main Capabilities and Disciplines', available at: https://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=56341. See also *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence - A European approach to excellence and trust*, Brussels, 19 February 2020, COM(2020) 65 final.

¹⁹⁸ See: <https://www.lamoncloa.gob.es/presidente/actividades/Documents/2020/021220-ENIA.pdf>.

¹⁹⁹ Order ETD/670/2020 of 8 July 2020, creating and regulating the Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council.

²⁰⁰ See: https://portal.mineco.gob.es/RecursosArticulo/mineco/ministerio/participacion_publica/audiencia/ficheros/SEDIACartaDerechosDigitales.pdf

²⁰¹ See: 'Sánchez presents the Digital Rights Charter with which "Spain is at the international forefront in protecting citizens' rights"' (Sánchez presenta la Carta de Derechos Digitales, con la que "España se sitúa a la vanguardia internacional en la protección de derechos de la ciudadanía"), *lamoncloa.gob.es*, 14 July 2021, available at: https://www.lamoncloa.gob.es/lang/en/presidente/news/Paginas/2021/20210714_digital-rights.aspx.

The Charter includes six main categories of rights, covering all areas of uncertainty and risk: (1) rights of freedom; (2) rights of equality; (3) rights of participation and shaping the public space; (4) rights of the working and business environment; (5) digital rights in specific environments; (6) and rights of guarantees and efficiencies.

(1). In the area of rights to freedom, the Charter states that digital transformation processes, the development and use of digital technology, as well as any scientific and technical research related to them, or making instrumental use of them, 'shall be encouraged to take into account the need to guarantee human dignity, fundamental rights, non-discrimination, the free development of the personality and shall be directed towards achieving the common good'.

(2). In the area of equality rights, the Charter establishes several rights, including the right to equality and non-discrimination in the digital environment and the right of access to the internet.

Regarding the former, the Charter states that the right and principle of equality inherent to all persons shall be applicable in digital environments, 'including non-discrimination and non-exclusion'. The Charter adds that, in particular, it will promote effective equality of women and men in digital environments; it will encourage digital transformation processes to apply a gender perspective by adopting, where appropriate, specific measures to ensure the absence of gender bias in the data and algorithms used.

Regarding the right of access to the internet, the Charter states that: 'Under the conditions set out in European and national regulations on universal provision of electronic communications services, universal, affordable, quality and non-discriminatory access to the internet shall be promoted for the entire population'.

(3). On the issue of Participatory Rights, the Charter states that it should be a priority objective of public authorities to ensure that providers of internet access services process data flows in a fair manner without discrimination, restriction or interference (and that such fair processing is carried out regardless of the sender and receiver, the content accessed or distributed, the applications or services used or provided, or the terminal equipment used).

It also states that any process of political participation, public or private, carried out by technological means must guarantee conditions of equality and non-discrimination in participation, institutional loyalty and fair and balanced competition.

The Digital Charter also establishes that, in relation to the digital rights of citizens in their relations with public administrations, it will promote universality, neutrality and non-discrimination (particularly on grounds of gender) in the technologies used by public administrations, and will encourage inter-governmental availability of applications whose intellectual property rights are held by public administrations, except in cases of special protection by law.

It is worth noting that in 2021 a law of interest to the European Union was adopted in this matter. In the field of electronic communications between citizens and public services, Royal Decree 203/2021 of 30 March, approving the Regulations and Functioning of the Public Sector through Electronic Means was passed. This Royal Decree establishes that the public sector must respect the principle of user accessibility, understood as the set of principles and techniques to be respected when designing, building, maintaining and updating electronic services to ensure equality and non-discrimination in access for users, in particular persons with disabilities and the elderly.

(4). A specific measure on artificial intelligence concerning the use of algorithms at work is proposed in the Framework of Workplace and Business Environment Rights. The Charter

states that: 'The development and use of algorithms and any other equivalent procedures in the field of work shall in any case require a data protection impact assessment which shall include in its analysis the risks related to the ethical principles and rights relating to artificial intelligence contained in this Charter and in particular the gender perspective and the prohibition of any form of direct and indirect discrimination, with particular attention to reconciliation rights.'

The approval of Royal Decree-Law 9/2021, of 11 May, which amends the revised text of the Workers' Statute Law, approved by Royal Legislative Decree 2/2015, of 23 October, to guarantee the labour rights of people dedicated to delivery in the field of digital platforms, should be brought up in this area.

This Law recognises the right of workers' representatives in companies to be informed by the company of the parameters, rules and instructions on which algorithms or artificial intelligence systems that affect decision-making that may affect working conditions, access to and maintenance of employment, including profiling, are based.

(5). In the field of digital rights in specific settings, the Charter states that conducting scientific and technological research that may have an impact on human beings must respect their dignity and guarantee to all persons, without discrimination, respect for their integrity and their other rights and fundamental freedoms in the application of biology and medicine.

The Charter also adds a number of rights in relation to artificial intelligence. It states that artificial intelligence systems must ensure a people-centred approach and their inalienable human dignity, and they shall pursue the common good and ensure compliance with the principle of nonmaleficence.

In addition, the development and lifecycle of artificial intelligence systems must guarantee the right to non-discrimination, whatever its origin, cause or nature, in relation to decision-making, use of data and processes based on artificial intelligence.

(6). Finally, in the field of digital rights in the use of neuro-technologies, the Charter states that '2. In order to guarantee the person's dignity, equality and non-discrimination, and in accordance, where appropriate, with international treaties and conventions, the law may regulate those cases and conditions of use of neuro-technologies which, beyond their therapeutic application, aim to increase cognitive capacity or stimulate or enhance people's abilities.'²⁰²

c) Mention should also be made of the Artificial Intelligence Strategy promoted and adopted by the regional Government of Catalonia in 2020, with the aim of deploying a specific action programme to strengthen artificial intelligence system in Catalonia. In terms of non-discrimination, the Strategy indicates that universal access to AI systems must be guaranteed through inclusive designs and equal work. It adds that, whenever possible, identifiable and discriminatory bias should be eliminated at the information-gathering phase.²⁰³

d) In the labour field, reference should also be made to the Collective Bargaining Agreement for the banking sector. In this agreement between the banking employers' association and workers' unions, a chapter has been included on the digital rights of the

²⁰² See: 'Carta Derechos Digitales' (Digital rights charter), available at: https://www.lamoncloa.gob.es/presidente/actividades/Documents/2021/140721-Carta_Derechos_Digitales_RedEs.pdf.

²⁰³ Rivas-Vallejo, P. (2021), 'Discriminación algorítmica: detección, prevención y tutela' (Versión provisional) ('Algorithmic discrimination: detection, prevention and protection' (interim version)), University of Barcelona, available at: <http://www.iuslabor.org/wp-content/plugins/download-monitor/download.php?id=415>.

workforce. One of these rights is the right of workers faced with 'artificial intelligence' and the use of algorithms. Specifically, Article 80.5 recognises the right of workers to non-discrimination in relation to decisions and processes, where these are based solely on algorithms.²⁰⁴ No specific complaint mechanism is foreseen. The worker may go to court if this right is violated. The courts must protect this right as it is enshrined in a collective agreement (collective agreements have the force of law).

2) The Royal Decree 203/2021 of 30 March, approving the Regulations and Functioning of the Public Sector through Electronic Means has been approved. This Royal Decree establishes that the public sector must respect the principle of user accessibility, understood as the set of principles and techniques to be respected when designing, building, maintaining and updating electronic services to ensure equality and non-discrimination in access for users, in particular persons with disabilities and the elderly. On the other hand, the approval of Royal Decree-Law 9/2021, of 11 May, amends the revised text of the Workers' Statute Law, approved by Royal Legislative Decree 2/2015, of 23 October, to guarantee the labour rights of people dedicated to delivery in the field of digital platforms. This Law recognises the right of workers' representatives in companies to be informed by the company of the parameters, rules and instructions on which algorithms or artificial intelligence systems that affect decision-making that may affect working conditions, access to and maintenance of employment, including profiling, are based.

3) It is worth mentioning that in December 2021, the Council for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CEDRE) passed a Recommendation: this CEDRE Recommendation is aimed at encouraging the reporting of situations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, anti-Gypsyism, anti-black racism and related intolerance, and special protection for victims in vulnerable situations.²⁰⁵

This recommendation is intended to make it easier for victims of racial discrimination to file complaints in the social and judicial sphere. It advocates increasing the training of law enforcement agencies, intensifying the promotion of awareness-raising campaigns by the competent authorities, and amending immigration legislation to better protect undocumented migrants from sanctioning procedures.

2. Public support plans for Roma (racial or ethnic origin in all fields)

The National Roma Council is a participatory and advisory body on general and specific public policy affecting the integral development of the Roma population in Spain. Its overriding purpose is to promote participation and cooperation by Roma associations in the development of general policy and the promotion of equal opportunities and treatment for the Roma population. Of the 40 members forming the Council, half are from central Government and the other half are representatives of Roma associations. The council has been running since 2006, and has reported on various Government projects, such as the 'Roma Operative Plan 2018-2020', and subsequently, the approval in 2021 of the *National*

²⁰⁴ Resolution of 17 March 2021, published in: https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2021-500.

²⁰⁵ See: Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination, 'Recomendación del CEDRE sobre fomento de la denuncia de situaciones de racismo, discriminación racial, xenofobia, antisemitismo, antigitanismo, racismo antiafro y otras formas conexas de intolerancia y especial protección de víctimas en situación de vulnerabilidad' (CEDRE Recommendation on promoting the reporting of situations of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, anti-Gypsyism, anti-African racism and other related forms of intolerance and special protection for victims in situations of vulnerability) 17 December 2021, available at: https://igualdadynodiscriminacion.igualdad.gob.es/novedades/novedades/2021/pdf/Recomendacion_del_CEDRE_sobre_fomento_de_la_denuncia_y_especial_proteccion_de_victimas_aprobada_en_el_Pleno_del_Cons_ejo_del_17_de_diciembre.pdf.

Strategy for Roma Equality, Inclusion and Participation 2021-2030, approved on 2 November 2021.²⁰⁶

The Roma operational plan for 2018-2020 (and other plans since 2013) had put in place a programme of action for social development and for the improvement of the quality of life of Spanish Roma. The objectives were: to improve the quality of life of the Roma population and implement the principle of equal opportunities in their access to systems of social protection; to encourage Roma participation in public and community life; to promote better coexistence among different social and cultural groups; to strengthen Roma associations; and to combat discrimination and racism towards the Roma (see sections 7(a) and 8.1 of this report).

The *National Strategy for Roma Equality, Inclusion and Participation 2021-2030*, approved on 2 November 2021, is structured along three axes: first, social inclusion, which addresses the strategic lines of education, employment, housing and essential services, health and poverty, social exclusion and the digital divide. The second axis, on equal opportunities and non-discrimination, includes action lines on anti-Gypsyism and non-discrimination, equality between men and women and against violence against women, and the promotion and recognition of Roma culture. The last axis, on participation and empowerment, includes the participation of the Romani population and the Romani association movement as lines of action.

With regard to the *Roma Strategic Framework for Equality, Inclusion and Participation 2021-2030*, it must be said that in its second recommendation (on equal opportunities and non-discrimination), the need to recognise 'anti-Gypsyism' as a structural phenomenon is established, and as such, it must be tackled through proactive, positive action or special policies. The Strategy states that the state should establish 'effective mechanisms and actions to combat the multiple and structural discrimination experienced by the Roma population, from an intersectional approach'.

In developing this general objective, the Strategy states that regulatory frameworks and public policies against racial discrimination, racism and related intolerance will be promoted, such as the future Equal Treatment Act and the National Action Plan against Racism and Discrimination. On the other hand, existing mechanisms for the support and protection of victims of racism, anti-Gypsyism, hate crimes and racial discrimination will be strengthened, such as the Council for the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination, as well as other mechanisms such as the National Office for Combating Hate Crimes or the Labour Inspectorate, paying special attention to those subgroups of the Roma population in which conditions that increase vulnerability and the risk of discrimination and social exclusion intersect, such as: sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, disability status, migrant or refugee status, ethnicity, nationality, disease, race or age.

On the other hand, in the fight against racism and discrimination against the Roma population, the *Roma Strategic Framework for Equality, Inclusion and Participation 2021-2030* contains two objectives which, in the author's opinion, will involve adopting positive action measures:

a) To reduce and prevent anti-Roma discrimination and intolerance and anti-Gypsyism, including stigmatisation, intersectional and multiple discrimination, anti-Roma hate crimes and hate speech. In this respect, percentages are proposed to reduce rates of spontaneous discrimination (i.e. discrimination suffered directly by Roma people or witnessed by Roma people), and to reduce rates of documented discrimination (defined as discrimination of

²⁰⁶ Government of Spain, *National Strategy for Roma Equality, Inclusion and Participation 2021-2030*, https://www.mdsocialesa2030.gob.es/derechos-sociales/poblacion-gitana/docs/estrategia_nacional/Estrategia_nacional_21_30/Estrategia_aprob_cm_2_nov_ENGLISH.pdf.

which the authorities are aware, occurring in different areas, such as employment, health, or in dealing with neighbours or local public administration).

b) To strengthen the empowerment of victims of discrimination, intolerance and anti-Gypsyism in the exercise of their rights, guaranteeing their assistance, guidance and specialised support. Targets are also set to achieve awareness among the Roma of their rights and of the organisations that can advise them.

3. Sign languages and speech aid systems

Law 27/2007 Recognising Sign Languages and Speech Aid Systems recognises Spanish Sign Language as the language of those deaf persons in Spain who freely decide to use it, along with the learning, knowledge and use thereof. It also provides and guarantees support for communication by deaf, hearing-impaired and deaf-blind persons. This law, apparently the first of its kind in Europe, responds to a long-standing demand from Spanish associations representing deaf, hearing-impaired and deaf-blind persons. Its aim is to facilitate access to information and communication by deaf persons, considering their heterogeneity and their specific needs (see section 5(a) above).

4. National Disability Council (for disability in all fields)

The National Disability Council was established by the General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion (RLD 1/2013). The council has 15 members representing various bodies within national Government, 15 members representing associations of persons with disabilities of various kinds and four expert advisors. Its functions include the issuing of reports, of a mandatory, non-binding nature, on draft regulations affecting equal opportunities, non-discrimination and universal accessibility²⁰⁷. The council has played an important role in the formulation of the Spanish legislation on disability (see section 7(a) above).

5. The Comprehensive Law on the rights of gay and lesbian persons (in some regions) (sexual orientation)

Five regions in Spain have very similar integral laws on the rights of LGBTI people in general: Andalusia, the Balearic Islands, Catalonia, the Valencian Community and Navarre. For example, Catalan Law 11/2014 for Guaranteeing the Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex People and Eradicating Homophobia, Biphobia and Transphobia establishes the conditions under which their rights are real and effective; it facilitates their participation in 'all areas of social life' (the law establishes specific intervention measures in relation to education,²⁰⁸ culture, free time and sport, media, health, social activities, public order, deprivation of liberty, participation and solidarity, and the labour market); and it contributes to overcoming stereotypes that negatively affect the social perception of these persons. The law was designed as a comprehensive law, inspired by Directive 2000/78, but it has now gone further. The law has been prepared with significant collaboration and consensus between associations in this field, and it has contributed considerably to raising the level of awareness of rights within the LGBTI community in Spain.

²⁰⁷ The work of the Council, through one of the Council's service providers, the Spanish Documentation Centre, produces interesting reports, such as, for example, the most recent ones on persons deprived of their liberty or mental health. See: <https://www.cedid.es/>.

²⁰⁸ For example, in the field of education, it has been ruled that, in relation to the content of school materials, school sports activities, children and young people's free time, training resources and training for mothers and fathers, emotional and sexual diversity should be taken into account, any type of discrimination should be avoided, and measures should be made available for preventing and addressing bullying that LGBTI people may be subjected to in the school environment.

11 SENSITIVE OR CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

11.1 Potential breaches of the directives at the national level

The most important points where national law is in breach of the directives are the following:

- The provision prohibiting direct discrimination does not cover past and hypothetical discrimination. This is a potential breach of Article 2(2)(a) of both directives.
- The words 'hostile' and 'degrading' are not included in the Spanish definitions of harassment. Judicial intervention can correct this legislative shortcoming, but this is a potential breach of Article 2(2)(c) of both directives.
- Sanctions and compensations have been established only in the field of employment (for all grounds) and for the ground of disability (in all fields). National law does not provide for any sanctions or compensations for discrimination on the ground of racial or ethnic origin in the areas of education, social protection, social advantages, access to goods and services, and housing. But in these areas judicial interpretation may be applicable regarding Criminal law. This judicial interpretation of the Criminal law is not applicable for access to goods and access to private services. This absence of sanctions in some areas is a potential breach of Article 15 of Directive 2000/43/EC.
- The principle of protection against victimisation is transposed, but only in the field of employment. This is a potential breach of Article 9 of Directive 2000/43/EC.
- Law RLD 1/2013 (Article 4(2)) provides that 'Persons who have been recognised as having a degree of disability equal to or greater than 33 % shall be considered as persons with disabilities.' This state of affairs must be recognised by an official body, and it could be argued that this point is in breach of Directive 2000/78, which makes no such provisions. This restricted definition of 'persons with disabilities' applies to all common legislation, and applied for the purposes of recognising the right to reasonable accommodation. This is a potential breach of Article 5 of Directive 2000/78/EC.

11.2 Other issues of concern

- The directives were transposed into national law with no dialogue either with the social partners or with the NGOs. This led to a formal transposition with shortcomings and difficulties of application in some cases, due to a lack of sanctions (except in the field of employment and on the ground of disability, in which there are sanctions).
- This legislation based on the directives is not well known or understood by the main players in the legal system. This is one of the main reasons why there have been hardly any proceedings in Spain in which these provisions have been applied. The author of this report has previously described the process as a 'hidden transposition' (Cachón, 2004).
- The effectiveness of the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination is questionable, because it is made up primarily of Government representatives. This could jeopardise the independence of the Council (although this is formally recognised by the law). The council lacks a strategy.
- The study by the Council for the Elimination of Racial or Ethnic Discrimination is a report entitled *Potential victims' perception of discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin-2020*, which concludes that the work carried out by organisations and public institutions fighting discrimination is still not very well known
- As stated in the Victims of Discrimination Assistance and Counselling Service report, mentioned above, the lack of knowledge on the part of society of the anti-discrimination legislation in force persists. This has repercussions for the victims, who

do not know the scope of their rights or the mechanisms for lodging complaints and receiving assistance, and who sometimes accept discrimination as an everyday occurrence.

- As stated in the report by the Fundación Secretariado Gitano and the report by the Victims of Discrimination Assistance and Counselling Service, it is necessary to promote training in anti-discrimination law and the Victims' Statute for all key actors in this field: the judiciary, the prosecution, the legal profession, and the law enforcement agencies. It is also necessary to provide sufficient resources to all institutions involved in the fight against racial or ethnic discrimination, with a special focus on support for Roma women and other women who suffer discrimination on ethnic grounds.
- Given the dispersion of the norms on (shifting) the burden of proof, the differences in their definitions and the jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court, it would be appropriate to merge the definitions into a single legal text.
- In the last few years, notable progress has been made with significant legal innovations in the fields of disability (RLD 1/2013 to incorporate the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities) and sexual orientation (the incorporation of homosexual, lesbian and bisexual people within the general laws of non-discrimination and the law of homosexual marriage have made these persons enjoy better rights of equality; in addition, some regions have approved specific standards of support for the population LGBTI). However, this legal progress has not been accompanied by actual changes in general behaviour in society or in discriminatory practices. A recent book that summarises several investigations on discrimination in Spain shows the persistence of discrimination in such ways but, according to the authors, 'Spanish society is less reluctant to live with "different" and shows a more open attitude towards diversity' than other European countries. (Cea y Valles, 2018).
- The situation of teachers of religion in state schools. This issue is difficult to resolve because the international agreement between the Holy See and Spain signed in 1976, just before approval of the present Spanish Constitution, is still in force. In other words, teachers of religion are chosen for their suitability by the Catholic Church to teach in state (or public) schools and the Catholic Church can therefore be asked to make demands in accordance with its faith or doctrine (however, a dismissal of a religion teacher for not fulfilling these requirements in his or her private life could be declared null and void).

In the field of artificial intelligence, it is worth highlighting the initiative taken by the Spanish Government in approving the Digital Rights Charter in 2021. This is a charter that seeks to expand citizens' rights in the face of the new digital reality. Particularly important in the Charter are the rights relating to artificial intelligence, to algorithmic non-discrimination and to the right of the individual to request human supervision or intervention. The Charter of Digital Rights has no binding effect, i.e. it does not have the force of law, which can be an obstacle to its effective application, but it is also true that it can promote respect for the rights of citizens and workers since, in the wake of the Charter, several laws have been passed. In any case, the application of this Charter will have to be assessed as it is not binding.

12 LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN 2021

12.1 Legislative amendments

During 2021, no legislation has been adopted that has specifically affected the principle of non-discrimination as regulated by Directives 2000/78 and 2000/43.

Only some legislation has been adopted relating to the grounds of discrimination covered by these Directives. For example, as referred to in this report, the following legislation has been adopted: Law 21/2021, of 28 December, on guaranteeing the purchasing power of pensions and other measures to reinforce the financial and social sustainability of the public pension system. In accordance with this new regulation, with the aim of favouring the extension of working life, collective agreements may establish clauses that make it possible to terminate the employment contract when the worker reaches the age of 68 years and beyond.

As has also been mentioned in this report, the Advisory Commission on Religious Freedom (regulated by Royal Decree 932/2013, of 29 November 2013) has been modified by Royal Decree 371/2021, of 25 May, in order to attach this body to the Ministry of the Presidency, Relations with Parliament and Democratic Memory.

Furthermore, Royal Decree 203/2021 of 30 March, approving the Regulations and Functioning of the Public Sector through Electronic Means was passed. This Royal Decree establishes that the public sector must respect the principle of user accessibility, understood as the set of principles and techniques to be respected when designing, building, maintaining and updating electronic services to ensure equality and non-discrimination in access for users, in particular persons with disabilities and the elderly

Finally, the Spanish Government approved Order SND/1215/2021, of 5 November, amending Annex III of Royal Decree 1030/2006, of 15 September, which establishes the National Health System's common services portfolio and the procedure for updating it, and Annexes I and II of Royal Decree 1277/2003, of 10 October, which establishes the general bases for authorising health centres, services and establishments.²⁰⁹ According to this legislation, lesbian women, bisexual and transgender people with gestational capacity and women without a partner who want to have children alone will once again (after seven years in which they could not do so) be able to have access to assisted human reproduction techniques in the National Public Health System.

12.2 Case law

Relevant discrimination ground(s): Discrimination on grounds of disability

Name of the court: Constitutional Court

Date of decision: 7 October 2021

Reference number: Judgment 172/2021

Link: <https://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/26822>

Brief summary: The court ruling under analysis is the Constitutional Court's Judgment No. 172/2021 of 7 October 2021.

²⁰⁹ Order SND/1215/2021, of November 5, which modifies Annex III of Royal Decree 1030/2006, of September 15, which establishes the portfolio of common services of the National Health System and the procedure for updating, and annexes I and II of Royal Decree 1277/2003, of October 10, which establishes the general bases on the authorisation of health centres, services and establishments (*Orden SND/1215/2021, de 5 de noviembre, por la que se modifica el anexo III del Real Decreto 1030/2006, de 15 de septiembre, por el que se establece la cartera de servicios comunes del Sistema Nacional de Salud y el procedimiento para su actualización, y los anexos I y II del Real Decreto 1277/2003, de 10 de octubre, por el que se establecen las bases generales sobre autorización de centros, servicios y establecimientos sanitarios*), BOE, 9 November 2021, available at: <https://www.boe.es/eli/es/o/2021/11/05/snd1215>.

The main facts to consider in order to understand the scope of this ruling are as follows: the person appealing to the Constitutional Court was a woman born in 1954 with a significant visual impairment. From 1987 to 2013, she worked as a lottery coupon seller for the Spanish National Organisation for the Blind. In 2013, she was granted 'early retirement' based on her disability. Subsequently, in July 2016 (at the age of 62), she applied to the National Social Security Institute for a permanent severe disability pension as she had a certified disability of over 64 % resulting from severe vision loss. This meant that she required the assistance of a third person for basic life activities such as dressing, moving around, preparing food, etc. It should be made clear that permanent pensions for severe disability are accompanied by a financial supplement intended to compensate the person assisting the beneficiary of a severe disability pension.

The National Social Security Institute rejected the claimant's application, for one main reason: on the date of application the woman had already taken 'early retirement due to disability', and the 2015 General Social Security Law stipulates that 'early retirement status' cannot be changed to one of severe permanent disability. In fact, the General Social Security Law establishes the following: a permanent disability pension (in any of its degrees, including severe disability) can be obtained before retirement, but if a person has already retired, the general principle is that a permanent disability status can no longer be recognised. However, in certain cases, despite having taken early retirement, a person may obtain a permanent disability pension if he or she has not yet reached the 'official retirement age' stipulated in Article 205.1 of the 2015 General Social Security Law (65 or 67 years of age, depending on proof of contribution periods during the applicant's working life). As a result, once the official retirement age has been reached, the person no longer qualifies for a permanent disability pension.

In this case, the woman applying for a permanent severe disability pension had not yet reached the age of 65 or 67, although she had taken early retirement due to disability. Thus, *a priori* her request might have been accepted. However, this outcome was not permitted by the Courts of Justice (initially, the claim was accepted by the Social Court of San Sebastián, which examined the dispute; this judgment was appealed and the High Court of Justice of the Basque Country and the Supreme Court did not admit the worker's claim) on the basis of a specific legal interpretation of the social security legislation discussed below. First, the Courts referred to the fact that, in cases of early retirement due to disability, age reduction coefficients are established by law for persons with disabilities who wish to retire. However, despite taking early retirement, and unlike in other cases of early retirement, persons with disabilities receive no reduction in the amount paid out in their retirement pension (i.e. their retirement age is adjusted downwards, but not the amount they would receive if they retired at the age of 65 or 67). As a result, people taking early retirement due to disability have the same financial entitlements as persons without disabilities retiring at the age of 65 or 67.

Thus, traditional judicial doctrine has established that for people taking early retirement due to disability, the age limit for claiming a permanent disability pension is based on a legally established reduction in age, not on the general age cap set out in Article 205.1 of the General Social Security Law (65 or 67 years of age). In other words, according to court decisions adopted in this matter, in cases of early retirement due to disability, the normal retirement age is not 65 or 67 (at which point a permanent disability pension can no longer be claimed), but the age resulting from legally established age reduction coefficients in cases of disability. This means that if a woman with disability retires at the age of 59, she cannot claim a permanent disability pension at the age of 62, even if she has not yet reached the official retirement age of 65 or 67.

The Constitutional Court identified that this legal conflict was based on the legal interpretation of Social Security Law regarding eligibility for a permanent disability pension for a person whose early retirement status was due to disability. The Court also found it necessary to assess whether the interpretation made by the Courts of Justice generated,

per se, a difference in employment (or difference in treatment in this field) not provided for under the Law, and if so, whether it was objectively and reasonably justified. In short, the Constitutional Court went on to analyse whether the interpretation made by the Courts violated the principle of non-discrimination recognised at its highest level in Article 14 of the Spanish Constitution ('Spaniards are equal before the law and may not in any way be discriminated against on the grounds of birth, race, sex, religion, opinion or any other personal or social condition or circumstance').

In its ruling, the Constitutional Court summarised the doctrine on non-discrimination on grounds of disability, as well as the evolution that it has undergone in the framework of European Union Law. This included mainly Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, Council Decision 2010/48/EC, of 26 November 2009, which has incorporated the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities into EU Law, as well as judgments of the European Court of Justice itself, which has been using the 2006 UN Convention as a source for interpreting Directive 2000/78/EC, in particular as regards the right to non-discrimination on the grounds of disability in the workplace.²¹⁰

Moving on to examine the merits of the case, the Court upheld the appeal of the claimant, and allowed her to apply for a permanent severe disability pension. The Court confirmed that the interpretation made by the Courts of Justice with respect to Social Security regulations led to people who take early retirement due to disability being excluded from access to a permanent disability pension, as opposed to other cases of early retirement in which they would still be eligible. The Court also added that the argument that early retirement due to disability is more beneficial in economic terms than other cases of early retirement does not respond to the principles that should govern the interpretation of the legislation currently in force. It should respond to the values of national and international disability legislation, such as the integration of persons with disabilities, protecting them in particular with the rights to which all citizens are entitled.

Specifically, the Court referred to the fact that early retirement due to disability constituted a 'positive action measure' (taking the form of a reduction in the retirement age based on the greater effort made by the person with disabilities in carrying out his or her activity, without reducing the amount of the pension). This measure applies when determining the conditions for early retirement. However, the Constitutional Court also added that, 'once retirement is granted, no discrimination should exist between different situations of early retirement, i.e. unequal treatment without legal objective justification or just cause. Otherwise, the paradox arises that the positive action measure established for access to a certain situation (early retirement due to disability) becomes, at the same time, a form of negative discrimination against people in this situation. It would be a kind of reverse effect of the positive action measure. The measure would no longer be adequate for its intended purpose since it would not allow real and effective equality to be achieved between those who were originally in a different situation, generating a new situation of inequality between those who have already been made equal under the law.'

To sum up, the main points of interest of this resolution are as follows:

- Early retirement due to disability cannot be viewed differently from other situations of early retirement in terms of access to a permanent disability pension. The fact that it is more financially beneficial than other forms of early retirement cannot prevent access to a permanent disability pension if the applicant meets the age cap requirement, as this would result in discrimination against persons with disabilities.

²¹⁰ The Court cited CJEU judgments of 11 April 2013, joined cases C-335/11 and C-337/11, *HK Danmark and others*, § 37 to 41, 47 and 93; 18 March 2014, Grand Chamber, C-363/12, *Z v. A Government department and the Board of management of a community school*, § 76 and 77; 18 December 2014, C-354/13, *Fag og Arbejde (FOA) v. Kommunernes Landsforening (KL)*, § 53, 54, 64 and 65; 1 December 2016, C-395/15, *Mohamed Daoudi v. Bootes Plus, S.L., and others*, § 42 to 45, and 9 March 2017, C-406/15, and *Petya Milkova v. Izpalnitelen direktor na Agentsiata za privatizatsia i sledprivatizatsionen kontrol*, § 36.

- The interpretation given by the Courts of Justice does not provide any objective or reasonable justification for the difference in treatment between the early retirement disability scheme and other schemes with regard to claiming a permanent disability pension. Moreover, given that the age requirement had been met, the request made by the claimant with disabilities was justified on the grounds of her physical circumstances.
- The judgment received two dissenting votes, based on the argument that each early retirement scheme has its own regulations, which cannot be compared against each other, and that any changes must be made by the legislator, not by the Court. It was also pointed out that, in general, the Courts of Justice have recognised access to permanent disability pensions for early retirement schemes that have a worse or less advantageous treatment than the scheme for persons with disabilities.

Relevant discrimination ground(s): Discrimination on grounds of disability

Name of the court: Constitutional Court

Date of decision: 15 March 2021

Reference number: Judgment 51/2021

Link: <https://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/26642>

Brief summary: To understand the significance of the Court's ruling, the main facts are as follows: In April 2013, a lawyer working in the Administration of Justice took office as Court Secretary. In the next few years, inspections carried out by the Administration detected serious problems in the running of the Court due to the Secretary's failure to do his work adequately. As a result, disciplinary actions were begun against the Court Secretary.

During the disciplinary sanction procedure, the claimant revealed that he suffered from Asperger's syndrome, information that he had reserved the right not to disclose until then as a matter corresponding to his privacy. To prove it, he provided a psychiatric assessment with a diagnosis of Asperger's syndrome issued by the doctor who had been treating him since 2002. The Secretary asked for another psychiatric assessment to be carried out by the Administration to confirm his doctor's diagnosis. He also asked for his right to 'reasonable adjustments' in his workplace to be recognised because the problems relating to his work were due to his disability and could be resolved if adjustments were made.

The Administration of Justice failed to respond to the Secretary's requests, which led him to claim that he was being discriminated against because of his disability. Despite this, in 2016 the Administration of Justice sanctioned the Secretary by suspending him from work without pay for one year and a day due to serious misconduct for failing to fulfil his work duties.

After having his appeal turned down in a normal court, the claimant sought protection from the Constitutional Court. He argued that the Administration of Justice had violated his right not to suffer disability discrimination (Article 14 of the Spanish Constitution) since no reasonable adjustments had been made in his workplace. In addition, he argued that the Administration's decision to sanction him was based solely on objective factors (shortcomings in the running of the Court), without any consideration for the relevant subjective factors (his disability).

The Constitutional Court's ruling was based on the fact that Asperger's syndrome is a disorder that can lead to mental disability. Thus, the Court analysed whether the allegations of disability put forward by the claimant should have resulted in the Administration of Justice making reasonable adjustments in the workplace to avoid disability discrimination against him. The Court also analysed whether imposing sanctions, despite the fact that reasonable adjustments had not been made, prevented the Secretary from fulfilling his obligations adequately and violated the principle of penal legality enshrined in Article 25 of the Spanish Constitution. That is, the Court also determined whether, by failing to respect the right to reasonable adjustments, the Secretary was

prevented from fulfilling his work obligations diligently, thereby absolving him from being sanctioned.

In relation to the Secretary's claim to have been discriminated against based on Article 14 of the Constitution, the Constitutional Court recognised that the failure to provide reasonable adjustments to the claimant's workplace did indeed constitute discrimination. The Court considered that when a person requests reasonable adjustments to their work due to disability, the request should be attended to from the moment it is made and the extent of the disability proven. The employer's response should be expressly and duly motivated, particularly when the requested adjustments are denied, considering them disproportionate or inappropriate.

With regard to the disciplinary sanctions, the Constitutional Court also upheld the Secretary's claim that disability discrimination had existed, since none of the claimant's allegations of discrimination had been taken into consideration by the Administration in the disciplinary procedure. In the framework of public employment disciplinary actions, the Court recalled that when allegations that fundamental rights are being violated (for example, being discriminated against on grounds of disability) are made by employees, and rational evidence (or *prima facie* reasonable evidence of discrimination) is provided, the Administration/employer has the obligation to refute the claimant's arguments. This did not occur in this case brought before the Constitutional Court in which the Administration did not bear its burden of proof to undermine the arguments and evidence provided by the claimant to prove he was experiencing discrimination.

In fact, the decision of the Administration of Justice to impose suspension from work without pay on the Secretary for not fulfilling his work obligations also violated the principle of penal legality (Article 25 of the Spanish Constitution), since the claimant was sanctioned solely on the basis of objective factors – negligence in performing his work duties. The Court considered that the Administration should have assessed the Secretary's claim that he suffered from a mental disorder and reasonable adjustments should have been made so he could do his job adequately. By failing to do so, the Administration was unable to assess whether the claimant's conduct was diligent or not in order to impose sanctions. That is, sanctions were imposed on the Secretary based solely on the result (shortcomings in carrying out work duties) and not on the degree of culpability (i.e. regardless of whether the Secretary was diligent or not).

As a result, the Constitutional Court declared the sanction imposed on the Secretary null and void. The employer was also ordered to reinstate the claimant in the position he had held prior to the sanction and adopt the measures requested by the Secretary to prevent discrimination against him.

To sum up, the main points of interest of this resolution are as follows:

- In cases of Public Administration employees with mental health disabilities who request reasonable adjustments in their work, the Administration is obliged to take the request into consideration. The employer's response must be expressly and duly motivated, especially when the requested adjustments are denied for being considered disproportionate or inappropriate.
- In cases of sanction procedures carried out by the Administration against public employees who claim to be suffering from discrimination, and provide evidence thereof, the Administration has the burden of proving that the disciplinary actions are totally unrelated to any discriminatory activity.
- In cases in which reasonable adjustments are not carried out by the Administration in the workplace of an employee with mental health disabilities, and the employee is

sanctioned, the principle of penal legality may be affected. The employee's conduct must be properly assessed in order to impose sanctions.

Relevant discrimination ground(s): Discrimination on grounds of race or ethnic origin

Name of the court: Constitutional Court

Date of decision: 25 January 2021

Reference number: Judgment 1/2021

Link: <https://hj.tribunalconstitucional.es/HJ/es/Resolucion/Show/26579>

Brief summary: The conflict began when a Roma woman was denied a widow's pension from Social Security on the death of her husband. Their marriage took place in 1994 in accordance with Roma customs (which is not recognised under Spanish Law as a valid marriage for civil purposes) and they lived together for 15 years before his death. Five children were born of this union, although they were registered at birth as children of unmarried parents. The National Institute of Social Security resolved not to grant the woman a survivor's pension because she had not formally established herself as the 'common-law partner' of the person with whom she had been living, based on Article 174.3 of Royal Legislative Decree 1/1994, of 20 June, approving the revised text of the General Law on Social Security. (This Article establishes that, to be granted a survivor's pension, the beneficiary must provide proof of marriage or civil partnership with the deceased for a period of at least five years. A civil partnership must be registered or formalised in a public document at least two years prior to the date of death of the deceased).

An appeal was lodged by the Roma woman before the Constitutional Court alleging that being denied a survivor's pension violated her right to non-discrimination on grounds of race and ethnic origin in accordance with Article 14 of the Spanish Constitution. The arguments made to support the claim were: 1). the applicability to this case of the European Court of Human Rights judgement of 8 December 2009 (*Muñoz Díaz v. Spain*), in which it was ruled that the plaintiff had acted *bona fide* in the belief that her marriage was valid for all intents and purposes; 2). If this was not recognised, the claimant alleged that the requirement for civil partnerships to be officially registered may cause indirect discrimination against the Roma community due to their deeply rooted traditions, closely linked to family and lifelong cohabiting partnerships, and to the belief held by the Roma that these partnerships are equal to any other union of a marital nature.

The National Institute of Social Security and the Public Prosecutor's Office objected to these arguments, pleading non-applicability of the European Court of Human Rights judgement (8 December 2009) given that in the case at hand, the applicant had not acted in good faith regarding the validity of her marriage through a Roma ceremony as at no time was any reference made to the union between both partners in documents issued by the Spanish authorities (for example, the children were registered as 'born to unmarried parents' in their birth certificates). Concerning race neutrality, both institutions also claimed the legitimacy of the Law in requiring that common-law couples must be legally constituted or registered in a public document.

Finally, another objection to the appeal was made by the Public Prosecutor's Office. In the Public Prosecutor's opinion, the virginity test carried out on the bride in Roma marriage rites implied an assumption of sex-based discrimination. Thus, according to the Public Prosecutor, if the Constitutional Court ruled that the civil partnership registration requirement be modified due to the specific characteristics of the Roma people, it should also avoid making a distinction between a common-law couple married through a Roma ceremony and another Roma couple who share the same cultural values but are not willing to accept the virginity test, do not observe this particular custom and live together as a married couple.

The applicant's request was turned down by the Constitutional Court and accordingly it was resolved that discrimination on grounds of race or ethnic origin had not existed in

denying the Roma woman a survivor's pension. The grounds leading to this resolution were the following:

1. The doctrine of the European Court of Human Rights judgment (8 December 2009) (*Muñoz v. Spain*) is not applicable in this case since the former was based on a different assumption from the case currently contemplated by the Constitutional Court. According to the Constitutional Court, the ECtHR ruling assumed that the claimant acted in good faith since she had been given the impression in several public documents by the authorities that the marriage had been solemnised in accordance with Spanish law. This has not occurred in the present case. Moreover, the formal constitution of common-law couples and effects thereof in terms of Social Security protection were not discussed in the first case. Yet, they are grounds for denying a survivor's pension in the current case.
2. Unequal treatment or discrimination is not derived from obliging the beneficiary to have formed a valid marriage in accordance with legally recognised forms of union in order to obtain a survivor's pension. Therefore, being refused a survivor's pension based on a union solemnised in accordance with Roma customs, which is not recognised as a valid form of civil union, does not imply direct discrimination on grounds of ethnicity.
3. Direct discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity does not exist for failing to equate unions solemnised in accordance with Roma customs and legally recognised civil unions in order to obtain a survivor's pension (thus, there is no right for the Roma to receive specific treatment based on their culture with regard to obtaining a survivor's pension). The Constitutional Court recalls that what is known as 'discrimination resulting from failure to provide differential treatment' is not covered by Article 14 of the Constitution, since said provision is not enshrined in a 'right to unequal treatment', since no subjective right to unequal regulatory treatment exists.
4. The Constitutional Court does not find indirect discrimination on grounds of race or ethnicity due to the fact that the Law requires a civil partnership to be formally established in order to obtain a survivor's pension. According to the Court no prejudice has been observed to indicate that this legal obligation has adverse effects on the Roma community. In this regard, data based on statistical evidence allowing this prejudice to be accredited were not provided, nor was a greater or unfavourable prejudice for belonging to the Roma minority accredited, given that the Law is also implemented for all other groups that choose not to formalise a cohabiting relationship or for formalised unions that lack civil validity.

To sum up, the main points of interest of this resolution are as follows:

- The legal requirement that the marriage must be valid in order to obtain a survivor's pension does not imply direct discrimination on grounds of race against the Roma people, who, in keeping with their culture, have been married solely through a Roma ceremony. This form of union is not recognised as a marriage for civil purposes.
- The legal requirement to provide proof of a duly registered civil union in order to obtain a survivor's pension does not imply direct discrimination against Roma people who have been in a cohabiting relationship for years, but have failed to formally register their union.
- The legal requirement to register a common-law partnership in the corresponding registers in order to obtain a survivor's pension does not imply indirect discrimination on grounds of race against the Roma people unless said requirement may cause a prejudice. For instance, that this prejudice is based on statistical evidence or data, or that a greater or unfavourable prejudice is accredited for belonging to the Roma minority when comparing to other people who have chosen not to formalise a cohabiting relationship

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alventosa, J. (2008), *Discriminación por orientación sexual e identidad de género en el derecho español*, Madrid, Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales (MTAS).
- Arastey, L., 'Jurisprudencia laboral en materia de libertad religiosa', en AAVV, Dir. Ferran Camas Roda (2016), *El ejercicio del derecho de libertad religiosa en el marco laboral*, Editorial Bomarzo).
- Árias, A. and Hierro, F. J. (2005), 'Discapacidad, igualdad de trato y no discriminación', en AAVV., *La igualdad ante la Ley y la no discriminación en las relaciones laborales*, Madrid, MTAS, 383-400.
- Ballester, M.A. (2010), 'Evolución del principio antidiscriminatorio comunitario: un análisis preliminar', in *La transposición del principio antidiscriminatorio comunitario al ordenamiento jurídico español*, ed. M.A. Ballester, Tirant lo Blanch, Valencia, 17-77.
- Blázquez, E. M. (2005), 'La discriminación por razón de edad en el ámbito de la Seguridad Social', en AAVV., *La igualdad ante la Ley y la no discriminación en las relaciones laborales*, Madrid, MTAS, 183-199.
- Cabeza, J. (2013): 'La discriminación por discapacidad: el caso Chacón Navas', *Revista del Ministerio de Empleo y Seguridad Social*, No. 102, 299-318.
- Camas Roda, F. (2009): *La edad en relación al empleo, la Seguridad Social y la inmigración*, Barcelona, Editorial Bosch.
- Camós Victoria, I., 'La gestión de la diversidad religiosa en el ámbito del empleo y las empresas de tendencia', en AA.VV, Dir. Ferran Camas Roda, (2016), *El ejercicio de la libertad religiosa en el marco laboral*, Editorial Bomarzo.
- Cachón, L. (2003), 'Discriminación en el trabajo de las personas inmigradas y lucha contra la discriminación', en *La discriminación racial. Propuestas para una legislación antidiscriminatoria en España*, Barcelona, Icaria, 2003, 39-101.
- Cachón, L. (2004), 'España y la Directiva 2000/43: de la "ocasión perdida" a una legislación general sobre igualdad de trato', *Tiempo de Paz*, No. 73, verano 2004, pp. 13-22 (No. monográfico sobre *La promoción de la no discriminación por origen racial o étnico*).
- Cachón, L. (2009), 'Los retos actuales de las políticas antidiscriminatorias en España', *Documentación Social*, No. 154, 105-118.
- Cachón, L. (2012), 'Racismo y lucha contra el racismo: notas sobre la 'Estrategia integral' española contra el racismo', *Razón y Fe*, mayo-junio, 391-403.
- Carrasco A. and González, M^a C. (2001): '¿Acciones de clase en el proceso civil?', *Aranzadi Civil-Mercantil*, No. 3/2001, Editorial Aranzadi, Pamplona.
- Cayo, L. and Lidón, L. (eds.) (2015), *Derechos humanos y discapacidad. Informe España 2014*, Madrid, CERMI and Ediciones Cinca.
- Cea, M.A. and Valles, M. (2018), *Evolución de la discriminación en España*, Instituto de la Mujer, Madrid.
- Cebolla, H. (2015), 'Las trayectorias educativas de los hijos de los inmigrantes en España', AAVV, *España 2015. Situación social*, Madrid, CIS, 225-233.
- Cortes, L. (1995), *La cuestión residencial*, Madrid, Fundamentos.
- EUMC (2005), *Racist Violence in 15 EU Member States. A Comparative Overview of Findings from the RAXEN NFP Report 2001-2004*, Vienna, European Union Monitoring Centre.
- Fernández, M. F. (1985), 'Libertad religiosa y prestación de servicios', *Relaciones Laborales*.
- FSG (2013): *El impacto de la crisis en la Comunidad gitana*, Madrid, Fundación Secretariado Gitano.
- Freixes, T. (2009), 'Thematic Legal Study on the Impact of the Racial Equality Directive. Spain', FRA.
- Garreta, J. (2003), *La integración socioeconómica de las minorías: gitanos e inmigrantes*, Barcelona, Anthropos.
- Gimeno, R. (2005), *La presión laboral tendenciosa (el mobbing desde la óptica de un juez)*, Madrid, Lex Nova.

- Gutierrez, D. (2018), 'La obligación de realizar ajustes razonables en el puesto de trabajo para personas con discapacidad: origen, evolución y configuración actual. Una perspectiva desde el Derecho comparado y el Derecho español', <https://www.tesisenred.net/handle/10803/565828#>.
- López, L. (2013), 'La discriminación por razón de edad en la jubilación forzosa: el caso Palacios de la Villa', *Revista del Ministerio de Empleo y Seguridad Social*, No. 102, 319-351.
- Ministerio del Interior (2015), *Informe sobre incidentes relacionados con los delitos de odio en España 2014*, Madrid, Ministerio del Interior.
- Puente, V. (2003 and 2004), *Reports on the Transposition of Directive 2000/78/EC, establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation for discrimination based on religion and belief* (mimeo).
- Río, M. (2014), 'Políticas de realojo, comunidad gitana y conflictos urbanos en España', *Quid* 16, 4, 34- 61.
- Rivas Vallejo, P. (2021), 'Discriminación algorítmica: detección, prevención y tutela/ Discriminació algorítmica: detecció, prevenció i tutela' (Algorithmic Discrimination: Detection, prevention and protection), paper presented at the 31st Catalan Social Law Conference (XXXI Jornades Catalanes de Dret Social), 'Treball, discriminació i COVID' (Work, Discrimination and COVID), Barcelona, April 2021, pp. 1-79, <http://www.iuslabor.org/jornades-i-seminaris/ponencies/any-2021/>.
- Rodríguez, L. (2004), *Reports on the situation of discrimination for reason of disability* (mimeo).
- Rojo, E. (2005), 'Aspectos laborales y de Seguridad Social de la regulación jurídica de las parejas de hecho', *Nous reptes del Dret de família*, Girona, Universidad de Girona, 405-436.
- Rossell, J. (2008): *La no discriminación por motivos religiosos en España*, Madrid, MTAS.
- Rossell, J (2021): Organismos Administrativos para la Gestión de la Libertad Religiosa, 276, *Derecho y Religión*, <https://riucv.ucv.es/bitstream/handle/20.500.12466/1441/Tema%2011.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.
- Rubio-Marín, R. (2004), 'Spain', in European Group of Experts on Combating Sexual Orientation Discrimination, *Combating sexual orientation discrimination in employment: legislation in fifteen EU member states* (mimeo).
- Salas, M. (2014), 'Ponderación y modulación del ejercicio del derecho a la libertad religiosa en el contexto obligacional laboral: una mirada a la jurisprudencia española', *Revista Crítica de Historia de las Relaciones Laborales y de la Política Social*, No. 9, 43-60.
- Salcedo, C., 'La Carta Social Europea y el Protocolo de reclamaciones colectivas: Los Derechos Sociales en clave de efectividad', *Net21*. No. 5, July 2021.
- Serrano, R. (2005), *El acoso moral en el trabajo*, Madrid, Consejo Económico y Social.
- Solà, X. (2016), 'La imposición de límites máximos de edad en el acceso al empleo', *IUSLabor*, 3/2016.
- Vicente, F. (1998), *El Derecho del Trabajador al Respeto de su Intimidad*, Madrid, Consejo Económico y Social.

ANNEX 1: MAIN TRANSPOSITION AND ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION

Country: Spain
Date: 31 December 2020

Title of the law: *Constitución Española* (Spanish Constitution)

Abbreviation: SC

Date of adoption: 27.12.1978

Entry into force: 30.12.1978

Latest relevant amendments: No amendments

Web link: [https://www.boe.es/eli/es/c/1978/12/27/\(1\)/con](https://www.boe.es/eli/es/c/1978/12/27/(1)/con)

Grounds covered: Race, sex, religion, opinion and 'other personal or social condition or circumstance'

Constitution

Material scope: All

Principal content: Principle of equality and non-discrimination, and positive action

Title of the law: *Ley 62/2003, de 30 de diciembre, de medidas fiscales, administrativas y de orden social* (Law 62/2003, of 30 December 2003, on Fiscal, Administrative and Social Measures)

Abbreviation: LFASM

Date of adoption: 30.12.2003

Entry into force: 01.01.2004

Latest relevant amendments: No amendments

Web link: <https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2003/12/31/pdfs/A46874-46992.pdf>

Grounds covered: Racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, sexual orientation

Administrative law

Material scope: All

Principal content: Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78 are transposed in Title II, Chapter III, Articles 27-43. Creates a specialised body dealing with racial or ethnic discrimination

Title of the law: *Real Decreto Legislativo 2/2015, de 23 de octubre, Estatuto de los Trabajadores* (RLD 2/2015, of 23 October, of Workers' Statute)

Abbreviation: LWE

Date of adoption: 23.10.2015

Entry into force: 25.10.2015

Latest relevant amendments: No amendments

Web link: <https://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2015/BOE-A-2015-11430-consolidado.pdf>

Grounds covered: Gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, sexual orientation

Administrative law

Material scope: Employment and occupation

Principal content: All rights and duties relating to labour, employment and occupation

Title of the law: *Ley 36/2011, de 10 de octubre, reguladora de la jurisdicción social* (Law 36/2011, of 10 October, on Social Jurisdiction)

Abbreviation: LSJ

Date of adoption: 10.10.2011

Entry into force: 21.12.2011

Latest relevant amendments: No amendments

Web link: <http://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2011/BOE-A-2011-15936-consolidado.pdf>

Grounds covered: Gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, sexual orientation

Administrative law

Material scope: Employment and occupation

Principal content: Infractions and sanctions on the social order labour, employment and occupation

Title of the law: *Ley Orgánica 7/1980, 5 julio, de Libertad Religiosa* (Organic Law 7/1980, 5 July, on Religious Freedom)

Abbreviation: OLRF Date of adoption: 05.07.1980 Entry into force: 13.08.1980 Latest relevant amendments: No amendments Web link: http://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/1980/BOE-A-1980-15955-consolidado.pdf Grounds covered: Religion Administrative law Material scope: Religious freedom Principal content: Religious freedom
Title of the law: <i>RLD 1/2013, 29 Noviembre, Ley General de derechos de las personas con discapacidad y de su inclusión social</i> (RLD 1/2013, 29 November, General Law on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Inclusion) Abbreviation: GLRPDSI Date of adoption: 29.11.2013 Entry into force: 04.12.2013 Latest relevant amendments: No amendments Web link: http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/12/03/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-12632.pdf Grounds covered: Disability Administrative law Material scope: Equal opportunities, non-discrimination, and universal access for persons with disability in all fields Principal content: Equal opportunities for persons with disabilities; Improvement of working and living conditions; Infractions and sanctions in the field of equal opportunities for persons with disabilities
Title of the law: <i>Ley Orgánica 4/2000, 11 enero, sobre derechos y libertades de los extranjeros en España y su integración social</i> (Organic Law 4/2000, 11 January, on the Rights and Liberties of Aliens in Spain and their Social Integration) Abbreviation: OLRLA Date of adoption: 11.01.2000 Entry into force: 01.02.2000 Latest relevant amendments: No amendments Web link: http://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/2000/BOE-A-2000-544-consolidado.pdf Grounds covered: Nationality Administrative law Material scope: Administrative situation of aliens Principal content: Direct and indirect discrimination; the entire administrative situation of aliens
Title of the law: <i>Ley Orgánica 10/1995, 23 noviembre, del Código Penal</i> (Organic Law 10/1995, 23 November, Criminal Code) Abbreviation: OLCC Date of adoption: 23.11.1995 Entry into force: 24.05.1996 Latest relevant amendments: 30.10.2015 Web link: http://www.boe.es/buscar/pdf/1995/BOE-A-1995-25444-consolidado.pdf Grounds covered: Gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, sexual orientation Criminal law Material scope: All criminal matters Principal content: Crimes against the rights of workers; all aspects of discrimination

ANNEX 2: INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS**Country: Spain****Date: 31 December 2020**

Instrument	Date of signature	Date of ratification	Derogations / reservations relevant to equality and non-discrimination	Right of individual petition accepted?	Can this instrument be directly relied upon in domestic courts by individuals?
European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)	24.11.1977	04.10.1979	Reservation with regards to Arts. 5 and 6 relating to disciplinary regime of the armed forces	Yes	Yes
Protocol 12, ECHR	04.10.2005	13.02.2008	None	--	--
Revised European Social Charter	23.10.2000	08.06.2021	None	Yes	Yes
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	28.09.1976	27.04.1977	None	Yes	Yes
Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities	01.02.1995	01.09.1995	None	Yes	Yes
International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	28.09.1976	27.04.1977	None	No	Yes
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	13.09.1968	13.09.1968	None	Yes	Yes
ILO Convention No. 111 on Discrimination	06.11.1967	06.11.1967	None	No	Yes
Convention on the Rights of the Child	26.01.1990	06.12.1990	None	Yes	Yes

Instrument	Date of signature	Date of ratification	Derogations / reservations relevant to equality and non-discrimination	Right of individual petition accepted?	Can this instrument be directly relied upon in domestic courts by individuals?
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	30.03.2007	03.12.2007	None	Yes	Yes

GETTING IN TOUCH WITH THE EU

In person

All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct information centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en.

On the phone or by email

Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service: – by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls), – at the following standard number: +32 22999696, or – by email via: https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en.

FINDING INFORMATION ABOUT THE EU

Online

Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en.

EU publications

You can download or order free and priced EU publications from: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publications>. Multiple copies of free publications may be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local information centre (see https://europa.eu/european-union/contact_en).

EU law and related documents

For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1951 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu>.

Open data from the EU

The EU Open Data Portal (<http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en>) provides access to datasets from the EU. Data can be downloaded and reused for free, for both commercial and non-commercial purposes.

