

State of the Rule of Law in Europe in 2022

Reports from National Human Rights Institutions

Poland



Poland

Commissioner for Human Rights

Independence and effectiveness of the NHRI

International accreditation status and SCA recommendations

The Polish NHRI was last reaccredited with A-status in November 2017. The SCA commended the efforts of the Polish NHRI in discharging its mandate effectively despite the challenging political context in which it operates.

In addition, while noting that the Polish NHRI carries out activities that can be considered promotional in nature, the SCA encouraged the NHRI to continue interpreting its mandate in a broad manner and to advocate for amendments to its enabling legislation to give it a more comprehensive mandate to promote human rights.

The SCA also encouraged the Polish NHRI to advocate for amendments to its enabling legislation to require a pluralistic composition in its membership and staff. It acknowledged that the Polish NHRI informed that it is prohibited by law from inquiring about citizens' ethnic, religious or other background, and that in practice its staff is inclusive of members of these groups.

Moreover, the SCA encouraged the Polish NHRI to advocate for amendments to its enabling legislation to protect the Deputy Commissioners and staff members of the NHRI from legal liability for actions undertaken by them in good faith in their official capacity.

Finally, the SCA noted the Polish NHRI's views that it does not have adequate resources to effectively fulfil its mandate, including as the NPM. The SCA encouraged the Polish NHRI to advocate for the funding necessary to ensure that it can effectively carry out its mandate.

References

- (1) https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Countries/NHRI/GANHRI/SCA_Report_November_2017_-_ENG.pdf

Enabling and safe space

The issues raised in last year's report remain unaddressed. These include the tendency of the authorities and relevant bodies, including the Constitutional Tribunal, not to take into account the opinions expressed by the CHR on key issues relevant for civil rights and

freedoms and the rule of law. The CHR cooperation with state authorities remains difficult, including due to the authorities' refusal to react on general statements and to take CHR's comments and recommendations into account, as well as the CHR's inability to obtain information on planned bills. The cuts made to the CHR budget over the last years limits the CHR's capacity and ability to act effectively for the protection of fundamental rights. The financial situation of the CHR has partially improved in the second half of 2021 due to a budgetary subsidy accorded by the parliament. However, the means of the Office of the CHR remain not sufficient to fully exercise its missions.

Developments relevant for the independent and effective fulfilment of the NHRIs' mandate

As reported in last year's report, on 15 April 2021, the Constitutional Tribunal of Poland delivered a judgement declaring Article 3, paragraph 6 of the Act on the Commissioner for Human Rights of Poland, which provides that the Commissioner shall remain in office until the new office-holder is appointed, unconstitutional. The Constitutional Tribunal also decided that the existing transitional provision shall cease to apply three months after 15 April 2021, the date when this decision was published in the Journal of Laws of the Republic of Poland. (1)

Following concerns raised by international and regional bodies, as also expressed in the joint statement of 12 May 2021 promoted by ENNHRI, in collaboration with the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), the UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner – Regional Office for Europe (OHCHR), the European Network of Equality Bodies (Equinet), the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI) and the International Ombudsman Institute (IOI) (2), that pending a new appointment, on which there were several delays, the Office of the NHRI would have to function for several months without a Commissioner for Human Rights, seriously limiting its effectiveness as an institution, the term of office of the previous Commissioner, Adam Bodnar, which had formally ended on 9 September 2020, was eventually extended until the week before the appointment of a new Commissioner. The new Commissioner, Marcin Wiącek, was eventually elected by the Polish Sejm on 8 July 2021, and that election was subsequently confirmed by the Polish Senate on 21 July 2021. Although in practice the danger of a potential lack of the ombudsman in office ceased with the election of the present ombudsman, the fact that the principle of continuity of service of the CHR as the national human rights institution has been successfully challenged before the Constitutional Tribunal can still have some negative effects on human rights protection in analogous situations in the future.

References

- (1) <https://trybunal.gov.pl/postepowanie-i-orzeczenia/wyroki/art/11490-pelnienie-obowiazkow-przez-rzecznika-praw-obywatelskich-po-uplywie-piecioletniej-kadencji-do-czasu-objecia-stanowiska-przez-nowego-rzecznika>
- (2) https://ennhri.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Joint-Statement-in-Support-of-the-Polish-NHRI_ENG.pdf

Human rights defenders and civil society space

The effectiveness of human rights as well as of NGO acting as human rights defenders has been, in general, largely undermined with the introduction of the emergency state at the Polish eastern border with Belarus due to migration crisis in this area. The presidential regulation which provided for special security measures applicable in this area has substantially limited or even, for certain categories of people and entities, excluded the right to free movement and access to information. Due to the doubts persisting as to if the measures applied equally to CHR's staff members, the Commissioner has addressed the Minister of Home Affairs and Administration to claim that the CHR's representatives should be allowed to fully exercise their mandate in the area of the state emergency, involving on-site investigations.

Despite some minor incidents (1), the authorities have allowed for CHR's continuous mission in the area, however some of the state organs (National Chief of Police) have been questioning the prior status of CHR mandates with relation to the newly passed bill reforming the law on the protection of the national border and excluding, by this, the exemption of CHR's staff members from restrictive measures provided for in it. The application of the emergency legislation to CHR can have very negative on its mission, in particular on the protection of the rights of migrants and CHR's mandate as a monitoring institution the framework of the UN Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment (OPCAT).

References

- (1) See the case of the Deputy Commissioner and the Council of Europe CHR stopped on their way to the border region:
<https://bip.brpo.gov.pl/pl/node/23494/revisions/24635/view>

Threats and attacks, including strategic litigation against public participation (SLAPPs)

Concerns raised in last year's report as regards threats and attacks on civil society activists remain outstanding. These included restrictions on freedom of assembly, which, while enacted in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, raised concerns as to their legality and proportionality, also exacerbated by a reportedly widespread use of direct coercive measures against demonstrators (gas, 'kettling', stopping), as well as journalists covering demonstrations.

In 2021, concerns were also raised, including by the European Parliament (1), about numerous legal cases brought against rights defenders and activists for the rights of LGBTIQ+ people and for sexual and reproductive rights. Over the past year, the repression of prosecutors who are opposed to changes in the judiciary has also increased. Overnight prosecutors were delegated to cities away from their place of residence (2). Prosecutor Katarzyna Kwiatkowska for criticizing the actions of the General Prosecutor's Office and the National Public Prosecutor, including a delegation of prosecutors, was sued for payment of PLN 250,000 as compensation.

References

- (1) <https://lgbti-ep.eu/2021/01/12/press-release-the-slapps-against-lgbti-activists-in-poland-are-attempts-at-stifling-democratic-participation/>
- (2) <https://bip.brpo.gov.pl/pl/content/rpo-prokuratorzy-lex-super-omnia-delegacje-zbigniew-ziobro>

Checks and balances

Separation of powers between the executive and the judiciary and recent case-law of the Constitutional Tribunal

One of the main challenges to the rule of law framework in Poland is the recent development of case law of the Polish Constitutional Tribunal, especially the decisions which, in fact, aim to invalidate previous judgments of both European Court of Human Rights and the Court of Justice of the EU in cases concerning the independence of Polish judiciary. The Commissioner for Human Rights regularly takes part in the proceedings before the Tribunal to point out to dangers for the fundamental rights protection which may originate from such practice.

Firstly, after the issuance of interim measures in the case C-791/19 R by the CJEU, the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court requested the Constitutional Tribunal to examine whether the provisions of the TEU, in so far as they result in the obligation of a EU

Member State to execute provisional measures relating to the shape of the system and functioning of the constitutional organs of the judiciary of that State, comply with the provisions of the Constitution of Poland. The Constitutional Tribunal ruled that selected TEU provisions, in so far as the Court of Justice of the European Union imposes *ultra vires* obligations on the Republic of Poland as a Member State of the European Union, by issuing interim measures relating to the system and jurisdiction of Polish courts and the procedure before Polish courts are inconsistent with the Polish Constitution (1).

On 7th October 2021 the Constitutional Tribunal, in a case initiated by the Prime Minister, ruled that the provisions of the TEU on the basis of which the judgments of the CJEU C-719/19 and C-204/21 R were issued, were found to be inconsistent with the Polish Constitution (2). The Constitutional Tribunal stated, *inter alia*, that the provisions of the TEU, which authorize to review of the legality of the procedure of appointing a judge, including the review of the legality of the act of appointment of a judge by the President of the Republic of Poland, the review of the legality of the resolution of the National Council of the Judiciary containing an application to the President for the appointment of a judge, as well as a domestic court finding that the judge's appointment process is defective and, as a result, of the judge's refusal recognition of a judge as a judge, are inconsistent with the provisions of the Polish Constitution. Further cases concerning the provisions of the TEU on the basis of which the CJU applied interim measures against Poland were registered in the Constitutional Tribunal under ref. no. K 5/21, ref. no. K 8/21 (CJEU fines issued to give effect to interim measures) and ref. no. K 1/22 (EU conditionality mechanism).

In addition to the issues mentioned above, there are moreover serious doubts also about the very standing of the Polish Constitutional Tribunal to adjudicate in cases enumerated above. With regard to this, the Commissioner's for Human Rights efforts focused on the necessity to comply with the ECHR judgment in case *Xero Flor v. Poland* which declared that judgments by the Constitutional Tribunal delivered in a panel composed of judges whose nomination was made in violation of Polish constitution are to be considered as a breach of the right to fair trial (Article 6 of ECHR). In order to override the cited decision in *Xero Flor* case, on 24th November 2021 the Constitutional Tribunal declared that Article 6 of the Convention (right to fair trial) does not apply with the Constitution – *de facto* invalidating constitutionally the cited decision *Xero Flor* (3). The Commissioner for Human Rights took part in the proceedings before the Constitutional Tribunal in this case and indicated that such a decision would be detrimental to fundamental human and constitutional rights. Now similar efforts are taken to render some of the ECtHR's judgments ineffective, as proven i.a. by the case lodged by the Prosecutor General on 9

November 2021 before the Constitutional Tribunal following the ECtHR judgments in cases of *Reczkowicz v. Poland*, *Broda and Bojara v. Poland* and *Dolińska-Ficek and Ozimek v. Poland* (case in the Constitutional Tribunal ref. no. K 7/21). The motion of the Prosecutor General aims to declare as unconstitutional the interpretation of Article 6 of the Convention as allowing the judges in individual cases to examine the question of independence of justice and disapply binding decisions of the Constitutional Tribunal which may contravene the right to fair trial.

In context of numerous disciplinary proceedings and other administrative procedures against independent judges and the lack of independence of the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court (which was suspended by the decision of the CJEU), the activity of the Constitutional Tribunal cast a very serious doubts about as to the procedural safeguards of judicial independence in Poland. The national authorities, through the judgments of the Constitutional Tribunal, seek in such a way to curtail the legal effect of the judgments of the ECtHR and the CJEU in the national legal system.

Process for preparing and enacting laws

The legislative process in Poland has been deficient for years, which has been raised regularly by the Commissioner for Human Rights (see e.g. annual information delivered to the parliament). Important draft bills are not subject to public consultations, which are circumvented by drafts proposed by the Parliament deputies instead of the regular multi-stage governmental legislative drafting procedure. The work is carried out very quickly and without sufficient reflection, which is often detrimental for the fundamental rights protection. The CHR's has the chance to present opinions on the compliance of the drafts with human rights standards only at the parliamentary stage, usually already at the second stage of the legislative procedure, i.e. voting in the Senate, which, in practice, rarely proves to be effective, especially due to the possibility of the Sejm to reject the amendments adopted by the Senate by a simple majority voting.

In 2021, the ruling party prepared a major reform of tax laws (called Polish Deal, „Polski Ład”). The act was widely criticized. Specialists kept repeating that so many changes affecting individuals cannot be introduced in such a short time. The Commissioner for Human Rights made his comments and indicated that taxpayers should have enough time to prepare for the "Polski Ład", which introduces significant changes to the tax system (4). The government however did not depart from its idea. Two months elapsed from the date of receipt of the bill to the Sejm to its final adoption (5). The act entered into force on January 1, 2022.

At present, more and more groups report their problems related to the reform to the Commissioner for Human Rights (6).

Following the expiry of the state of emergency, the Sejm amended the Law on the State Border. Under the new provisions, where there is a need to ensure security or public order in the border area in connection with a threat to human life or health or to property resulting from crossing the state border illegally or attempting to cross the state border, a temporary ban on staying in a specified area in the border area adjacent to the state border constituting the external border of the EU may be imposed. During the legislative work, the Commissioner submitted to the Senate a critical opinion on the draft law. The Commissioner was critical of the possibility given to the Minister of the Interior and Administration to define in detail the principles of the ban on staying in border areas. The Commissioner also drew attention to the negative impact of the new laws on freedom of expression, freedom of assembly and the daily lives of people living in border areas. order zones. The detailed grounds for such a ban should be regulated in statute. The Commissioner also drew attention to the negative impact of the new laws on freedom of expression, freedom of assembly and the daily lives of people living in border areas (7).

References

- (1) CT judgment of 14.07.2021, case P 7/20
- (2) CT judgment of 7.10.2021, case K 3/21:
<https://trybunal.gov.pl/en/hearings/judgments/art/11662-ocena-zgodnosci-z-konstytucja-rp-wybranych-przepisow-traktatu-o-unii-europejskiej>
- (3) CT judgment of 24.11.2021, case K 6/21:
<https://trybunal.gov.pl/en/hearings/judgments/art/11709-art-6-ust-1-zd-1-konwencji-o-ochronie-praw-czlowieka-i-podstawowych-wolnosci-w-zakresie-w-jakim-pojeciem-sad-obejmuje-trybunal-konstytucyjny>
- (4) <https://bip.brpo.gov.pl/pl/content/rpo-senat-polski-lad-opinia>
- (5) <https://www.sejm.gov.pl/sejm9.nsf/PrzebiegProc.xsp?nr=1532>
- (6) <https://bip.brpo.gov.pl/pl/content/rpo-mf-osoby-niepelnosprawnosci-nizsze-dochody-ulga-rehabilitacyjna-problemy>; <https://bip.brpo.gov.pl/pl/content/rpo-polski-lad-nizsze-emerytura-interwencja-mf>; <https://bip.brpo.gov.pl/pl/content/rpo-mf-polski-lad-podatki-samotni-rodzice>
- (7) <https://bip.brpo.gov.pl/pl/content/rpo-senat-ustawa-granica-panstwowa-uwagi>

Access to public interest information

Obstacles reported in last year's report continued to affect the exercise of the right to access public interest information.

In addition, the motion submitted to the Constitutional Tribunal on 16 February 2021 by the First President of the Supreme Court to review the constitutionality of the Law on access to public information represents an important risk for further backsliding in this area. In the motion, the most fundamental provisions of the law are being challenged, i.e. the definition of public information and the scope of the obligation to make it available to the public especially with regard to the range of the organs subject to such obligation, as allegedly, too extensive. The First President also argues that the current provisions of the law are disproportionate with regard to the right to privacy of persons exercising public functions. This goes against previously established case-law of the Constitutional Tribunal which already confirmed the conformity of current provisions with the Constitution. The motion also raises important doubts as to the competence of the Tribunal to rule on the matter. In fact, the motion challenges the case-law of the administrative courts on public information, and not the law itself whereas, under the Polish Constitution, the Tribunal is not competent to review the constitutionality of judicial decisions. In addition to that, there are some doubts as to lack of impartiality of some of the members of the bench in the case. Should the Constitutional Tribunal follow the reasoning of the First President, the standard of the right to access to public information will be substantially undermined. The procedure is still pending.

Functioning of the justice system

Since 2015, the situation related to the independence of the judiciary and the independence of judges has been deteriorating as a result of changes introduced by the ruling party. Despite the judgments issued by the EU Court of Justice and the European Court of Human Rights, as well as infringement proceedings initiated by the European Commission and numerous concerns raised by other regional and international institutions and civil society, the situation has not yet improved since the last report. The lack of progress in the area of judicial independence also led the European Commission to delay the approval of the Polish Recovery and Resilience Plan.

Despite the judgments of the ECtHR and the CJEU, the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court has continued to consider cases of judges concerning, i.a., lifting of their judicial immunity enabling criminal responsibility of judges. When ruling on the permission to bring a judge to criminal justice, the Chamber also decides on the suspension of the judge from exercising professional activities and the reduction in remuneration.

Only very recently, on 3 February 2022, the Polish President announced the intention to file a draft of a bill changing the functioning of Poland's Supreme Court. The proposed amendments (1) include the liquidation of the Supreme Court's disciplinary chamber, which the Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU), following an infringement procedure launched by the European Commission in October 2019, declared restrictive to judicial independence and thus incompatible with EU law, demanding the Polish government to immediately suspend it. At the same time, however, the bill also announces the creation of a Chamber of Professional Responsibility, a new body still within the Supreme Court. Furthermore, it proposes that the so-called 'judges' from Disciplinary Chamber would be offered to join other chambers of the Supreme Court. On 27 October 2021, the CJEU had imposed a EUR 1 million daily fine on Poland until it complied with such request, on the basis of which the European Commission sent, in January 2022, its first call for payment of the fine to cover the period from November 3, 2021 to January 10, 2022, amounting to around EUR 70 million.

References

(1) <http://orka.sejm.gov.pl/Druki9ka.nsf/dok?OpenAgent&9-020-794-2022>

Role of the NHRI in contributing to the effective functioning of the justice system

The CHR in 2021 has continuously taken part in the legislative process and proceedings before the Constitutional Tribunal which were relevant for lawful the organisation of the judiciary in Poland. The CHR stands on the firm position that human rights standards related to the right to fair trial as established in the recent case-law of the ECHR and CJEU, especially as far as the independence of the judiciary is concerned, should be implemented in the Polish law and respected by the State authorities. The Commissioner has been also monitoring the disciplinary proceedings against judges as a major threat to judges independence in their office as well as to their freedom of expression.

Media freedom, pluralism and safety of journalists

Concerns raised in last year's report as regards pressure on and safety of journalists remain outstanding.

These include reports of attacks, arrests and police brutality against journalists covering public demonstrations as well as, more recently, journalists reporting on the situation at the Polish-Belarus border (1).

As of 2 September 2021, a state of emergency was introduced in the areas bordering Belarus. This decision was justified by the authorities by a particular threat to the security

of citizens and public order in connection with numerous attempts to illegally cross the border. This crisis was triggered by the actions of the Belarusian authorities. By means of a regulation, the Council of Ministers introduced restrictions on freedom of assembly, a ban on organising mass events, a ban on people who do not live there residing in the area covered by the state of emergency, as well as restrictions on the right of access to public information. Among others, reporters and aid workers were banned from the 3km (2 miles)-wide border zone, where dozens of asylum seekers who manage to cross from Belarus go in hiding. On 18 January 2022, Poland's Supreme Court stated that the governmental regulation preventing journalists from accessing the border with Belarus is incompatible with current Polish law, including the Polish Constitution, and also violates European and International law. (2) The Commissioner for Human Rights also pointed out that the complete restriction of journalists' access to the area covered by the state of emergency and the complete exclusion of the right of access to public information raise doubts. The Commissioner pointed out that it would be reasonable to introduce a mechanism for granting passes to journalists entering border areas. The authorities have not taken account of the Commissioner 's recommendations in this regard (3).

Legal proceedings which may be qualified as SLAPPs are also been reportedly brought against investigative journalists. A study published in June 2021 by the Polish Society of Journalists noted at least 66 instances of SLAPPs brought to silence journalists between 2015 and 2021, with public institutions, state-owned bodies, and politicians and their relatives among those who most frequently launched these legal actions. Prominent cases have also been denounced by international press freedom groups, such as proceedings brought against Gazeta Wyborcza reporter Katarzyna Włodkowska (4) and the criminal defamation claims brought against Polityka journalist Ewa Siedlecka, who was convicted of criminal defamation (5).

On a positive note, following concerns raised by national media and civil society, as well as EU and other regional and international bodies, the ruling party partly backed on its efforts to “re-Polonize” the domestic media. In 2021, the government’s suspended its plans to introduce a new tax on the media levied on income from advertisements and the Polish President vetoed the controversial media bill known as “Lex TVN”, that would have tightened the rules on foreign ownership of media in the country. The CHR has on numerous occasions presented his opinion (both to the Senate in the legislative procedure on the bill as well as in response to National Radio and Television Council letter) that such changes would substantially undermine the freedom and plurality of media in Poland and, as such, would be in blatant contradiction with the freedoms and rights enshrined in the

Polish constitution and violate Poland's obligations under EU law. The bill has been afterward vetoed by the President of the Republic.

At the same time, however, the situation in the public media sector has not improved.

References

- (1) <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/11/18/journalists-allegedly-blocked-from-reporting-poland-border-crisis>
- (2) [Supreme Court's Judgment of 18 January 2020, I KK 171/21: https://www.sn.pl/sites/orzeczniactwo/Orzeczenia3/1%20KK%20171-21.pdf](https://www.sn.pl/sites/orzeczniactwo/Orzeczenia3/1%20KK%20171-21.pdf)
- (3) <https://bip.brpo.gov.pl/pl/content/rpo-senat-ustawa-granica-panstwowa-uwagi>
- (4) <https://rsf.org/en/news/will-poland-be-only-eu-country-jail-journalist-doing-their-job>
- (5) <https://www.article19.org/resources/poland-journalists-criminal-defamation-conviction-may-further-impair-freedom-of-expression/>

Impact of measures taken in response to COVID-19 on the national rule of law environment

Emergency regimes and related measures

The measures adopted in response to COVID-19 pandemics have continued to have a detrimental impact on human rights standards in Poland. This was especially the case of public and political freedoms, in particular of the freedom of assembly, as well as on the conduct of businesses within the exercise of economic freedoms. Both the substantial assessment of adopted measures as well as the way in which they have been adopted have posed important threat to rule of law environment with regard to both to constitutional rights and freedoms as well as constitutional provisions on legislative procedures and adoption of special measures in cases of state of emergency.

In December 2021 the CHR has published a special report 'Report on pandemics. Experiences and conclusions' (1). The main identified issues were linked with a persistent lack of regularity of legislation in this area. The legislative process was in most of cases too hasty and not followed by a robust and comprehensive assessment on human rights impact. Many of the measures have been adopted in a violation of the Polish Constitution by adoption of measures by means of regulations adopted by the executive power. Among other actions taken to strike down the adopted measures, the CHR has filed many appeals against individual, both penal and administrative measures (in particular in cases

of penalties applied for failure to comply with the obligation to wear mask in public or gather in public spaces). This has now resulted in an established case law of domestic courts censuring the governmental measures on the grounds of their unconstitutionality.

The CHR urged the state authorities to adopt appropriate measures without circumventing the constitutional regime of state of emergency and to suspend the application of restrictive measures and execution of individual penalties based on unconstitutional provisions.

References

- (1) https://bip.brpo.gov.pl/sites/default/files/2021-12/Raport_RPO_pandemia_2021.pdf

Other relevant developments or issues having an impact on the national rule of law environment

In its quality as National Mechanism for the Prevention of Torture (NPM), the CHR visited places of detention to verify recommendations of international and regional monitoring bodies. The NPM's findings were illustrated in a thematic report published in January 2022. The NPM found that most of the monitoring bodies' recommendations have not been implemented. Among the greatest concerns are the failure to take action with regard to fundamental safeguards against torture for persons in police custody and persons deprived of their liberty and with regard to the long-standing recommendations to ensure decent detention conditions, including the minimum living space per prisoner in a cell and appropriate recording of injuries observed in prisoners.

References

- CHR, Human rights in places of detention. How Poland is implementing into practice the recommendations of the international bodies for the prevention of torture (CPT and SPT), <https://bip.brpo.gov.pl/sites/default/files/2022-01/Human%20rights%20in%20places%20of%20detention%20-%20NMPT%20report.pdf>

NHRI's recommendations to national and regional authorities

The CHR, in its quality as NPM, recommends to national authorities:

- To review the recommendations of monitoring bodies in order to assess the possibility of changing the legislation applicable to the issues raised by these bodies, in close cooperation with professional association bodies and civil society.

- To give due account to the standards and recommendations of monitoring bodies when drafting relevant legislative acts, strategies, policies, guidelines and regulations.
- To ensure financial support to the relevant institutions so as to enable them to practically implement the monitoring bodies' recommendations, and put in place awareness raising and training initiatives addressed to officers and employees of places of detention.
- To recognise torture as a separate crime under the Criminal Code provisions so as to meet the standards provided for in the UN Convention Against Torture.
- To ensure wide dissemination of the Istanbul Protocol among professional groups that may come into contact with persons deprived of their liberty or victims of violence.
- To adhere to the procedure of automatic publication of reports of the Committee on the Prevention of Torture and subsequent government responses to the reports.