

**Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and Other Cruel,
Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment**

ADVANCED UNEDITED VERSION

**Visit to Portugal undertaken 1 to 10 May 2018:
observations and recommendations addressed to the
national preventive mechanism**

Report of the Subcommittee* **

* In accordance with article 16 (1) of the Optional Protocol, the present report was transmitted confidentially to the national preventive mechanism on 8 November 2018. On 22 August 2019, the national preventive mechanism requested the Subcommittee to publish the report, in accordance with article 16 (2) of the Optional Protocol.

** The present document is being issued without formal editing.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	3
II. National preventive mechanism	3
III. Recommendations to the national preventive mechanism.....	4
A. Recommendations relating to institutional and structural issues	4
B. Recommendations on methodological issues	6
IV. Final recommendations	8
Annexes	
I. List of places of deprivation of liberty visited by the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture....	10
II. Places of deprivation of liberty visited jointly by the NPM and the SPT	11
III. List of officials and other persons with whom the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture met .	12

I. Introduction

1. In accordance with its mandate under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT), the Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture (SPT), carried out its first regular visit to Portugal from 1 to 10 May 2018.
2. The Subcommittee members conducting the visit were: Nora Sveaass (Head of Delegation), Satyabhooshun Gupt Domah, Roberto Michel Fehér Pérez, Kosta Mitrovic, and Margarete Osterfeld. The Subcommittee was assisted by three Human Rights Officers from the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), two United Nations security officers and four interpreters.
3. In course of the visit, the Subcommittee conducted visits to police stations, penitentiary, health, psychiatric and migration detention facilities (Annex I). The Subcommittee also observed the work of the national preventive mechanism (NPM) during two visits to places of deprivation of liberty (Annex II). The Subcommittee held meetings with a range of Portuguese government authorities and officials, the Parliamentarians, the Ombudsperson, as designated NPM of Portugal, and members of civil society (Annex III).
4. Meetings held with members of the national preventive mechanism permitted the Subcommittee to discuss the mechanism's mandate and working methods and to explore ways to strengthen and increase its effectiveness. In order to better understand how the mechanism works in practice, the Subcommittee also visited, together with the mechanism, two places of deprivation of liberty. One visit was led by the NPM, with the members of the Subcommittee as observers. The second visit was conducted jointly with the NPM.
5. The present report sets out the observations and recommendations of the Subcommittee addressed to the national preventive mechanism of Portugal. These recommendations are made in accordance with the Subcommittee's mandate to offer training and technical assistance and to advise and assist the mechanism, in accordance with article 11 (b) (ii) and (iii) of the Optional Protocol.
6. The Subcommittee will send a separate confidential report to the authorities in which it will make specific recommendations to the State party.
7. The present report remains confidential unless the mechanism decides to make it public.
8. **The Subcommittee recommends that the mechanism make the present report public, and requests that it be notified of the mechanism's decision in this regard.**
9. The SPT draws the NPM's attention to the Special Fund established under article 26 of the Optional Protocol. Recommendations contained in those SPT visit reports which have been made public can form the basis of applications to benefit from that Fund, in accordance with its published criteria.
10. The SPT wishes to express its gratitude to the national preventive mechanism of Portugal for their assistance and cooperation during the visit.

II. National preventive mechanism

11. Portugal ratified the Optional Protocol on 15 January 2013. On 23 May 2013, the SPT was notified that by Resolution of the Council of Ministers dated 9 May 2013 the Portuguese Ombudsperson (Provedor de Justiça) was designated as national preventive mechanism.¹
12. In addition to its function as a national human right institution (NHRI), the Ombudsperson carries out unannounced visits to places of deprivation of liberty, such as prison facilities, educational centers, police detention facilities and psychiatric institutions. According to the Resolution of Council of Ministers, Ombudsperson also has the power to make recommendations to the relevant authorities and it may submit proposals and

¹ <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/OPCAT/NPM/NVPortugal23May2013.pdf>

observations on existing legislation or draft legislation relating to matters under the Optional Protocol.²

13. In order to fulfil its functions, a Support Structure³ is established to assist the NPM in performing its tasks, namely, identifying places of detention, planning and conducting visits and the acquisition and analysis of data. This Support Structure is composed of Advisory Council, Steering Committee and Visitors Team. The Advisory Council is comprised of 12 members, including the presiding Ombudsman. Six of them are appointed by the Parliamentary Committee on Constitutional Affairs, Rights, Freedoms and Guarantees, the High Council of the Judiciary, the High Council of the Public Prosecutor's Office, the Bar Association, the Medical Association and the Psychologists Association. The Steering Committee is composed of three persons and it develops the annual activity plan and plans the NPM visits. In most of the visits, one member of the Steering Committee is present. The Visitors Team, which carries out visits to the places of detention, is composed of Ombudsperson's staff members appointed for that purpose on account of their experience and knowledge.⁴ According to the information provided to the SPT prior to the visit⁵, the Visiting Team is composed of 9 members of the Ombudsperson's team.

14. Due to the lack of the dedicated budget for the NPM, the Ombudsperson has to allocate its regular resources for performing the tasks of the NPM. There are no explicit provisions in the NPM legislation regarding earmarked funding. This means that there is no specific economic framework or ring-fenced budget provided for the mechanism. In this connection the SPT underlines that the lack of budgetary independence has a negative impact on the independent functioning of the NPM.

15. While there is no single model for an OPCAT-compliant national preventive mechanism structure, it is clear that when national human rights institutions are designated as national preventive mechanisms their particular structures must be examined in order to ensure that the mechanism can fulfil its mandate according to the OPCAT. Experience suggests that a national preventive mechanism can most effectively exercise its mandate when it is established as a separate unit within the national human rights institution. In Portugal this is not the case. Moreover, the NPM of Portugal should have full operational autonomy with regard to its staff, but it does not. The mechanism does not have any staff working exclusively for it. All the members of the NPM team are combining their NPM functions with those of NHRI. That situation makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for the mechanism to take a systematic and planned approach to torture prevention in the country.

16. The SPT welcomes the fact that NPM, regardless of the scarce resources and limitations due to the way in which it is organized, has been operational for almost five years, has conducted unannounced and announced visits to places of deprivation of liberty in Portugal and published its annual reports, some of which have been shared with the Subcommittee.

III. Recommendations to the national preventive mechanism

A. Recommendations relating to institutional and structural issues

Structure and independence

17. As a general observation, the Subcommittee notes that the national preventive mechanism of Portugal does not have an identity distinct from the Ombudsperson, not only with respect to its own resources but also in relation to its institutional framework and guarantees of independence. While the Optional Protocol does not provide for a unique model

² NPM Annual Report 2015, para. 1.3, http://www.provedor-jus.pt/site/public/archive/doc/NPM_2015_ING_0.pdf,

³ http://www.provedor-jus.pt/site/public/archive/doc/Regulamento_EMNP_0.pdf

⁴ NPM Annual Report 2015, para. 1.3, http://www.provedor-jus.pt/site/public/archive/doc/NPM_2015_ING_0.pdf

⁵ NPM assessment matrix for NPMs filled in by the NPM

for an OPCAT-compliant mechanism structure, it is imperative for the mechanism that it is able to carry out its mandate in accordance with the principles of the Optional Protocol, as reflected in the Subcommittee's NPM Guidelines.⁶

18. The Subcommittee emphasizes that the NPM should complement rather than replace existing systems of oversight and its establishment should not preclude the creation or operation of other such complementary systems.⁷ In this connection the Subcommittee recommends that the national preventive mechanism take the necessary steps, legislative or otherwise, to ensure that it is independent within the Office of the Ombudsperson, with its activities and functions clearly differentiated from those of the Ombudsperson and with a mandate to act in its own capacity.

19. The Subcommittee recommends the NPM in close cooperation with the respective authorities to review the legal framework in which the NPM operates and bring it into full conformity with all relevant international norms and guidelines with a view to solve existing or potential issues that may hinder the NPM to carry out its mandate effectively and independently. The practical needs and the operability of the NPM have also to be also taken into account. Furthermore, the simplification of the Support Structure of the NPM has to be taken into consideration in order to make it more operational and effective.

Human and financial resources

20. The Subcommittee is concerned that the designation of the Office of the Ombudsperson as the national preventive mechanism of Portugal has not been accompanied by the allocation of sufficient additional resources, including human resources. The SPT underlines that, pursuant to article 18 (3) of the Optional Protocol, the necessary resources must be made available for the functioning of the national preventive mechanism. Without proper resources, including in terms of staffing, the mechanism cannot fulfil its preventive mandate properly and adequately.

21. The Subcommittee is also concerned that the authorities have not allocated the necessary resources because they do not consider that the national preventive mechanism needs additional support in order to carry out its mandate effectively. The Subcommittee does not agree with such an assessment. For instance, in 2015, the Parliamentary Committee on Constitutional Affairs, Rights, Freedoms and Guarantees, did not approve Ombudsperson's proposal to achieve three staff members to work only for the NPM.⁸ During the visit the Subcommittee was informed that they were plans to hire finally a dedicated staff member specifically dealing with the NPM work.

22. The Subcommittee emphasizes that, in order for national preventive mechanisms to fulfil its mandates effectively, the NPM should have a separate secretariat and their own staff and should be able to make recourse to external experts, including medical experts, interpreters and others, as necessary, when such expertise is not available internally.

23. The Subcommittee is concerned that only 9 staff members, that is those in the visiting team, perform tasks related to the mechanism's mandate that affects the ability of the mechanism to fully execute its mandate under the Optional Protocol. An effective system of regular visits to all the places of deprivation of liberty in Portugal cannot function properly with limited number of Ombudsperson's staff, predominantly lawyers, who do not serve exclusively in this function.

24. According to the Annual Report of 2014, the NPM took steps with the members of the Advisory Council to establish a list of experts who will participate in the NPM visits.⁹ In 2016 the NPM carried out 53 visits to places of deprivation of liberty. The teams of visitors were composed of the members of the Coordinating Council and the Visitors Team, as well

⁶ Guidelines on national preventive mechanisms (CAT/OP/12/5).

⁷ Ibid

⁸ NPM Annual Report 2015, para. 1.3, http://www.provedor-jus.pt/site/public/archive/doc/NPM_2015_ING_0.pdf,

⁹ <http://www.provedor->

[jus.pt/site/public/archive/doc/Relatorio_a_Assembleia_da_Republica_2014_MNP_ING_.pdf](http://www.provedor-jus.pt/site/public/archive/doc/Relatorio_a_Assembleia_da_Republica_2014_MNP_ING_.pdf)

as external experts.¹⁰ During the visit the SPT was informed that the NPM was predominantly composed of lawyers. In order to be able to carry out visits under the Optional Protocol the Subcommittee recommends to make the Visiting Team multidisciplinary and to include medical and other experts in the team.

25. Recalling the requirements of Articles 18 (1) and (2) of the Optional Protocol, the Subcommittee recommends to ensure that NPM staff have the diversity of background, capabilities and professional knowledge necessary to enable it to properly fulfil its NPM mandate.¹¹ This should include, inter alia, relevant legal and health-care expertise with a due consideration of gender parity.

26. Recalling that OPCAT article 18 (3) obliges States parties to provide NPMs with the necessary financial and human resources to undertake their work, the SPT reiterates that the NPM shall be provided with a budget sufficient for accomplishing all mandated tasks, in addition to granting the NPM the institutional autonomy to use its resources. This funding should be provided through a separate line in the national annual budget referring specifically to the NPM¹² and not through the general budget of the Ombudsperson. This funding shall be at such a level as to allow the NPM to carry out its visiting programme, to engage outside experts as and when appropriate, to increase its human resources and to regularly access training, in accordance with its own work plan.

27. In order to ensure the functional and operational independence of the NPM and with a view to clearly identify the nature and extent of these additional needs, the NPM has to enter into constructive dialogue with the relevant State authorities in order to ascertain what is needed by the NPM to permit it to properly fulfil its NPM mandate in accordance with the provisions of the Optional Protocol.

28. The Subcommittee recommends that the national preventive mechanism evaluate its financial needs in order to more effectively fulfil its mandate under the Optional Protocol, and that it submit proposals to the governmental authorities concerning its financial needs. The Subcommittee also recommends that the NPM continue to raise with the State party its need for more dedicated staff.

B. Recommendations on methodological issues

Work plan, reporting and follow-up

29. The Subcommittee notes that the NPM is mainly focusing on detention monitoring activities, and primarily in places under criminal law and less in hospitals and health institutions. Nevertheless this was mentioned as one of the areas that would be given stronger priority, in particular if a broader composition of the visiting team was made possible. Furthermore, although the NPM has the legal competence to submit proposals and observations concerning draft legislation, it has not been involved in commenting on draft legislation.¹³

30. The Subcommittee recommends that the NPM has stronger focus not only on visiting places of deprivation of liberty but also on other preventive activities. The Subcommittee further recommends the NPM to develop an annual plan of work which should include all preventive activities, such as commenting on draft legislation, awareness raising and training activities, in accordance with article 19 of the Optional Protocol.

31. While the Subcommittee notes that reports of visits are prepared and presented to the Parliament, it also notes that there is no clear policy concerning the systematic follow-up and

¹⁰ http://www.provedor-jus.pt/site/public/archive/doc/National_Preventive_Mechanism_Report_to_the_Parliament_2016__EN_0.pdf

¹¹ Guidelines on national preventive mechanisms (CAT/OP/12/5), para. 20.

¹² See Compilation of advice provided to NPMs, (CAT/OP/C/57/4), Part III.

¹³ NPM assessment matrix for NPMs filled in by the NPM

dialogue procedure between the NPM and respective authorities. Further to making the annual report public, the Subcommittee recommends that the report and the work of the NPM should be discussed publicly and widely publicized.

32. Following its detention visits, the Subcommittee is under the impression that some officials in places of detention were not familiar with the recommendations of the NPM after their institutions were visited by the NPM. Therefore, there needs to be greater awareness of the reports of the mechanism and, especially, of the degree to which the recommendations contained in the NPM reports are implemented.

33. The Subcommittee recommends that the NPM enters into a continuous dialogue with the relevant authorities as well as with other addressees of their recommendations, with a view to implementing the NPM's recommendations. Following the transmittal of the NPM report, the mechanism should develop a strategy for following up on the recommendations and using the report as a platform for dialogue with the authorities of the place of detention visited as well as with the respective state or other authorities.

34. The Subcommittee further recommends that the mechanism meet with the relevant public authorities directly to discuss the implementation of its recommendations, in accordance with article 22 of the Optional Protocol. Finally, the mechanism should disseminate its annual reports, including by transmitting them to the Subcommittee, for the purposes set out in the Optional Protocol.

Recommendations on visit methodology

35. *Preparation and conduction of visits:* During the joint visits to Carregueira prison and Navarro de Paiva Educational Centre for Juveniles the SPT was pleased to note how well regarded the staff members of the Office of the Ombudsperson were by both the prison authorities and detainees. They were observed to enjoy full access to all places of deprivation of liberty within the prison and had access to all information concerning numbers of detainees and conditions of detention.

36. The Subcommittee noted that the visits were well prepared, the objectives were identified in advance, and there was a clear plan how to conduct the visit. The initial and final talks with the administration of the place of detention took place in well-structured and conducive environment. Nevertheless, the NPM should dedicate more time on conducting interviews with detainees rather than obtaining information from prison staff.

37. *Interviews:* The Subcommittee observed that during the joint visit the members of the NPM sometimes introduced themselves and were often perceived as representatives of the Ombudsperson, because the latter is more widely recognized and better known institution. This may lead to a confusion about the separate mandates of each institution, by both detaining authorities and detainees. The Subcommittee also noted that the members of the mechanism were not clearly identified as such and some of them did not systematically introduce themselves to detainees as representatives from the national preventive mechanism and at times did not explicitly explain their mandate more concretely (including by making a clear distinction between activities and obligations of the NPM and those of the Ombudsman). In addition, some "exchanges of information" with detainees were conducted in the presence or in hearing distance of detention officers.

38. The Subcommittee recommends that all members of the NPM, including external experts, introduce themselves as representatives from the national preventive mechanism. The Subcommittee is of the view that an appropriate and complete presentation builds trust with the interviewees and facilitates communication and information sharing. In addition, the visiting team should be clearly identified as the national preventive mechanism, for example, by wearing badges or vests, and provide an information leaflet to the authorities as well as to the detainees.

39. *Confidentiality and risk of reprisals:* The Subcommittee reiterates that the location where the individual interviews take place should be carefully chosen to ensure that the content of the interview remains confidential and that the "do no harm" principle is applied, without exception. The interviewers should also indicate that the interviewees can report any reprisal they may face subsequent to the visit and encourage them to do so. If necessary,

follow-up visits should be conducted. The Subcommittee underlines the need always to seek ways to protect those interviewed from possible reprisals, even when there appears to be little risk. The Subcommittee noted, in the visits that were carried out together, that the mechanism did not mention to the authorities of the place of detention at the final debriefings that any form of intimidation or reprisal against persons deprived of their liberty constitutes a violation of the State party's obligation.¹⁴

40. The Subcommittee recommends that the national preventive mechanism always consider that there is a risk of intimidation, sanctions or reprisals, and therefore take steps to address that risk. In addition to the precautions mentioned above, the mechanism should clearly inform the authorities that reprisal of any kind is impermissible, will be reported to respective authorities and will be followed up by the mechanism. This is done with the clear intention of ensuring that those responsible for such reprisals are promptly investigated, and if found guilty, receive appropriate penalties. The mechanism should also, inter alia, undertake preventive follow-up visits.

41. While noting the high professionalism of many of the NPM members when conducting interviews with the detainees, the Subcommittee recommends that all NPM members undergo regular trainings, including on interviewing techniques, visiting procedures and skills to detect signs and risks of torture and ill treatment, to develop working methods and a comprehensive visiting methodology that will highlight institutional and systematic challenges, including those affecting vulnerable populations in places where persons are deprived of liberty. Experienced NPM members should train the new members and the external experts on interviewing techniques and regular internal meetings to discuss working methods and experiences based on visits should be organized.

Visibility and awareness

42. The meetings held by the Subcommittee with some of the relevant authorities revealed, however, that little was known about the national preventive mechanism per se. Clearly, the NPM lacks visibility and there may be a lack of understanding of its role vis-à-vis the Office of the Ombudsperson. The Subcommittee notes that there is limited knowledge of the NPM among relevant stakeholders, including persons deprived of their liberty, public authorities and other State monitoring bodies, civil society actors and the general public.

43. The Subcommittee recommends increasing the visibility of the NPM, including through activities that raise awareness of the OPCAT and of the NPM mandate. The NPM should undertake activities to increase the awareness of the general public, and especially persons deprived of their liberty, about its mission and its mandate. The NPM should engage in legislative processes, advocacy, which NPMs are encouraged to undertake under OPCAT article 19, and which increases their overall visibility. The Subcommittee further recommends the NPM to engage in outreach activities and other events as appropriate.

44. The Subcommittee also recommends elaborating and distributing further materials on the NPM's mandate and activities to personnel and detainees in the places of deprivation of liberty, and to the civil society at large to increase the visibility of the NPM as well as enhance understanding about its mandate.

45. The Subcommittee further recommends that the NPM engage more directly and independently with civil society organizations, including, at a minimum, through their increased participation in NPM visits, internal trainings, and in dialogue with the authorities.

IV. Final recommendations

46. In conclusion, the Subcommittee is aware that the national preventive mechanism of Portugal is facing challenges regarding its institutional and structural

¹⁴ Article 13 of the Convention and article 20 of the Optional Protocol.

framework. It recommends that the mechanism take a proactive attitude and submit to the authorities a proposal to revise its institutional and structural framework within the Office of the Ombudsperson, and to submit proposals on how to secure the necessary human resources, further to a thorough internal evaluation of the level of financial resources needed to adequately fulfil its mandate under the Optional Protocol.

47. In the light of scarcity of human and financial resources available to the national preventive mechanism, the Subcommittee recommends that the mechanism also increase its international cooperation with other national preventive mechanisms to reinforce its capacities, share information and practices and develop its working methods so as to improve its ability to carry out its mandate under the Optional Protocol adequately.

48. The Subcommittee also recommends that the NPM continue to develop its capacity through increasing cooperation with the Subcommittee, as well as through engagement with other NPMs and appropriate NPM networks.

49. The Subcommittee regards its visit and the present report as the beginning of a constructive dialogue with the national preventive mechanism of Portugal. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights stands ready to provide technical assistance and advice to the mechanism to reinforce its capacity to prevent torture and ill-treatment in all places of deprivation of liberty in Portugal and to make the common goal of prevention a reality.

50. The Subcommittee recalls that prevention of torture constitutes an ongoing and wide-ranging obligation of the State party, the likelihood of whose achievement is greatly enhanced by an efficient mechanism. The Subcommittee encourages the mechanism to review and strengthen its working methods and to avail itself of training courses to improve its ability to discharge its responsibilities under the Optional Protocol, including through the assistance of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights with following up on the present recommendations.

51. The Subcommittee recommends that, in accordance with article 12 (d) of the Optional Protocol, the national preventive mechanism of Portugal enter into dialogue with the Subcommittee on the implementation of the Subcommittee's recommendations, within six months of the Subcommittee's receipt of the reply to the present report. The Subcommittee also recommends that the national preventive mechanism initiate discussions with the Subcommittee on the arrangements for such a dialogue at the time of the submission of its reply to the present report.¹⁵

¹⁵ NPMs can request technical assistance from OHCHR after an SPT visit through requesting such assistance in writing and addressed to the Director of the Human Rights Council and Treaty Mechanisms Division, copying the Coordinator of Treaty Body Capacity Building Programme and SPT Secretary.

Annex I

List of places of deprivation of liberty visited by the SPT

Penitentiary facilities

Coimbra prison
Pacos de Ferreira prison
Porto prison
Santa Cruz do Bispo Female Prison
Sintra prison

Police stations

Headquarters of the National Republican Guard in Porto
PSP district police stations in Coimbra
PSP Police Station Vila Nova do Gaia
PSP Police Facility Bela Vista
PSP police division 89 in Sintra

Holding facilities for migrants

Lisbon Airport Border Police holding facility
Habitation Unit of Santo António in Porto

Mental Health Institutions

Medical Center of Conde de Ferreira
Psychiatric Hospital of Coimbra
Psychiatric Clinic of S. José
Psychiatric Center of Lisbon

Annex II

Places of deprivation of liberty visited jointly by the NPM and the SPT

Carregueira prison

Navarro de Paiva Educational Centre for Juveniles

Annex III

List of government officials and other persons with whom the SPT met

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Luís Cabaço, Deputy Director General of Political Affairs

Ms. Vera Ávila, Director of the Department of Political Multilateral Organizations

Ms. Raquel Chantre, Head of the Human Rights Division

Ms. Alexandra Carreira, Adviser of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ministry of Justice

Mr. Celso Manata, Director General for Reinsertion and Prison Services

Ms. Ana Horta, Deputy Director General for the Administration of Justice

Ms. Rodrigo Carvalho, Head of the Infrastructures Unit, Directorate-General for the Administration of Justice

Ms. Maria Cristina Mendonça, Member of the Executive Board, National Institute of Legal Medicine and Forensic Sciences

Ms. Carla Moura, Coordinator of the Equipment Conservation Unit, Institute for Financial Management and Equipment of Justice

Mr. Verissimo Milhazes, Director of the Information and Criminal Investigation Unit, Criminal Police

Ms. Helena Leitão Public Prosecutor, Coordinator of the International Relations Department of the Center for Judicial Studies

Ms. Ida Teixeira, Inspector-Internal Controller Ministry of Justice

Ms. Manuela Almeida Silva, Inspector-Internal Controller Ministry of Justice

Ms. Maria Luísa Pacheco, Deputy Director General for Justice Policy

Ms. Sara Almeida, Head of the Unit for Civil Justice, International Affairs Department, Directorate General for Justice Policy

Mr. António Folgado, Head of the Unit for Criminal Justice, International Affairs Department, Directorate General for Justice Policy

Ms. José Castello-Branco, Senior Legal Adviser, Unit for Civil Justice Directorate General for Justice Policy

Mr. João Freire, Head of Cabinet of the Deputy Secretary of State and Justice

Mr. Manuel Leonardo Belchior, Coordinator of the Prison Santa Cruz do Bispo

Office of the Prosecutor General

Ms. Joana Gomes Ferreira, Public Prosecutor and Director of the Documentation and Comparative Law

Ms. Raquel Tavares, Legal Adviser of the Documentation and Comparative Law Office

Ministry of Home Affairs

Mr. Ricardo Carrilho, Deputy Secretary General for International Affairs and Management of EU Funds

Ms. Sónia Rosa, Senior Officer

Lieutenant-Colonel Paulo Poiares, National Republican Guard

Sub-intendant Hugo Guinote, Public Security Police

Mr. João Ataíde, Inspector Coordinator, Immigration and Border Service

Mr. João Pedrosa, Inspector, Inspection General of Internal Administration

Rogério Soares, Inspector

Ministry of Health

Mr. Miguel Xavier, Director of the National Programme for Mental Health, Directorate-General of Health

Ms. Paula Domingos, Senior Officer of the National Programme for Mental Health

Ms. Eva Falcão, Director of International Relations

Ms. Diana Correia, Directorate of International Relations

Ministry of Labour, Solidarity and Social Affairs

Ms. Odete Severino, Vice-President of the National Commission for the Promotion of the Rights and Protection of Children and Youth

Ms. Célia Chamiça, Coordinator of the International Relations Department of NCPRPCY

Ms. Sandra Alves, Director of the Department of Social Development of the Social Security Institute

Mr. Humberto Santos President of the National Institute for Rehabilitation

Mr. Orlando Costa Senior Officer, International Relations

Ministry of Defense

Lieutenant-Colonel Mota Pereira, Director of the Military Prison

Ms. Letícia Bairrada, General Directorate for National Defense Policy

Parliamentary Committee on Constitutional Affairs, Rights, Freedoms and Guarantees

Mr. Bacelar de Vasconcelos, Member of Parliament, President of the Committee

Ms. Sandra Pereira, Member of Parliament from PSD (Social Democratic Party)

Mr. Filipe Neto Brandão, Member of Parliament from PS (Socialist Party)

Ms. Sandra Cunha, Member of Parliament from BE (Left Block)

National Preventive Mechanism of Portugal

Ms. Maria Lúcia Amaral, Ombudsperson

Mr. João Portugal, Ombudsperson's Office

Mr. Miguel Coelho, Ombudsperson's Office

Members of the National Preventive Mechanism

Civil Society

Ms. Catarina Prata, Advocacy and Research Coordinator of Amnesty International Portugal

Mr. Pedro Matos Aguas, Coordinator of HIV/AIDS programme of Anti-Discrimination Center (CAD),

Ms. Sara Malcato and Mr. Gonçalo Aguiar, Associação ILGA PORTUGAL