



Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-third session
6-17 May 2019

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Portugal*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 7 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations² and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies³

2. The Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings of the Council of Europe (CoE-GRETA) encouraged Portugal to ratify the Council of Europe Convention against Trafficking in Human Organs.⁴

3. The International Campaign to abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) recommended that Portugal sign and ratify the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons as a matter of urgency.⁵

4. The Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe (CoE-ACFC) noted that the Portuguese authorities adopted the National Roma Communities Integration Strategy 2013-2020, in the framework of the European Union national strategies for Roma integration.⁶

B. National human rights framework⁷

5. CoE-GRETA welcomed the legislative amendments to the criminal law provisions on trafficking in human beings. Nevertheless, it considered that explicitly including "servitude" and "practices similar to slavery" in the list of forms of exploitation under Article 160 of the

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.



Criminal Code, could contribute to the effective implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings.⁸

6. The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (CoE-ECRI) noted that the process of amending the anti-discrimination Law No. 18/2004, gave no indication that the new law would introduce changes to simplify and speed up the procedures for the submission of a discrimination complaint, as recommended.⁹

7. Joint Submission 3 (JS3) noted the reinforcement of the National Commission for the Promotion of Children's Rights and Protection, in order to respond effectively to its mission and ultimately minimize the number of children placed in the institutional environment.¹⁰

8. CoE-GRETA welcomed the setting up of the legal and institutional framework for combating trafficking in human beings, including the adoption of national action plans and the setting up of the Observatory on Trafficking in Human Beings under the Ministry of the Interior. However, it considered that increased attention should be paid to trafficking for the purpose of labour exploitation, which had been on the rise in Portugal.¹¹

9. Joint Submission 1 (JS1) noted that Portugal transposed European Union Directive 2011/93/UE on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography into its domestic legislation through the adoption of law n°103/2015.¹²

10. JS1 stated that child trafficking for sexual purposes and sexual exploitation of children in the context of travel and tourism was still not explicitly criminalised in the Penal Code and called to turning it into a separate legal offence.¹³

11. Despite the prohibition of child pornography in the Penal Code, JS1 mentioned that there was lack a formal definition in line with of the Optional Protocol on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography (OP-CRC-SC). It recommended adopting a definition of child pornography in line with the OP-CRC-SC.¹⁴ JS1 also called upon to adopt a specific national action plan on the sexual exploitation of children, or at least integrate all aspects of the sexual exploitation of children in the National Strategy for the Rights of the Child.¹⁵

12. CoE-ACFC welcomed the fact that the linguistic rights of persons speaking Mirandese were protected in national legislation by Law No. 7/99 on Official Recognition of Linguistic Rights of the Mirandese Community. It invited to start a dialogue with the Mirandese community with a view to finding appropriate solutions for strengthening the existing protection and promotion of the Mirandese language, culture and heritage, including through the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.¹⁶

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

*Equality and non-discrimination*¹⁷

13. The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (EU-FRA) mentioned that the Penal Code was amended to punish with imprisonment ranging between six months and five years, anybody who established an organisation or developed propaganda activities inciting discrimination, hatred or violence against a person or group of persons because of their race, colour, ethnic or national origin, ancestry, religion, sex, gender, sexual orientation, and physical or intellectual disability.¹⁸

14. CoE-ACFC drew the attention of Portugal to the need of reviewing the mechanisms for responding to complaints of racial discrimination, and in particular develop further positive measures to promote full and effective equality and significantly increase their impact.¹⁹

15. CoE-ACFC also urged Portugal to strengthen its efforts to combat all forms of racism and intolerance, to avoid marginalisation, stigmatisation and rejection and to promote

integration of all groups in society. Inter alia, all expressions of racism or intolerance must be firmly condemned, effectively prosecuted and sanctioned.²⁰

16. CoE-ACFC drew the attention of Portugal to the need for resolute measures to put an end to discrimination against Roma regarding access to adequate education, housing, employment and health care facilities.²¹

17. The European Committee of Social Rights (CoE-ECSR) noted that no anti-discrimination legislation existed for the protection of elderly persons against discrimination on grounds of age outside the employment sphere.²²

2. Civil and political rights

*Right to life, liberty and security of person*²³

18. The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CoE-CPT) mentioned that many prisoners met by the CPT stated that they were treated correctly by prison officers. In spite of that, living conditions within parts of the establishments visited, notably at Caxias, Lisbon Central and Setubal Prisons, were totally unsuitable to hold prisoners and may amount to inhuman and degrading treatment.²⁴

19. CoE-CPT recommended promoting a message of zero tolerance of ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty. It should be reiterated to law enforcement officials, including from the highest political level and through appropriate training, that any form of ill-treatment of detained persons constituted a criminal offence and will be prosecuted accordingly.²⁵

20. CoE-CPT recommended ensuring that an investigation was carried out into every death in prison by an independent authority to ascertain, inter alia, the cause of death, the facts leading up to death, including any contributing factors and whether death might have been prevented. Further, an analysis should be undertaken of each death in prison to consider what general lessons may be learned.²⁶

*Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law*²⁷

21. According to CoE-GRECO there was insufficient attention to the issues of integrity, accountability and transparency relating to the regimes that applied to Parliamentarians, judges and prosecutors. No rules on professional conduct had yet been established.²⁸ CoE-GRECO called upon Portugal to instil a corruption prevention perspective into the regulations pertaining to the three above-mentioned professional groups, to consolidate the existing legal framework, to reinforce the powers and impartiality of the oversight institutions, and otherwise promote a cohesive and systematic approach to corruption prevention so as to attain tangible results and sustained enforcement.²⁹

22. CoE-GRECO recommended ensuring that periodic evaluations of first instance court judges and inspections/assessments of second instance court judges ascertained their integrity and compliance with the standards of judicial conduct.³⁰

23. CoE-GRECO recommended that first instance court judgments were made easily accessible and searchable by the public.³¹

24. CoE-ECRI recommended simplifying procedures following the lodging of complaints with the High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue. In a follow-up report, ECRI considered that its recommendation had not been implemented.³²

25. CoE-ACFC urged Portugal to increase the effectiveness and accessibility of domestic remedies to respond to complaints of racial discrimination, as well as to ensure the independence of the complaints body itself. It specifically asked that measures be taken to process the backlog of discrimination complaints which were pending before the office of the High Commissioner for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue.³³

26. CoE-CPT recommended considering the possibility of transforming the Inspectorate General of Home Affairs into an independent body charged with undertaking investigations into all complaints of ill-treatment by law enforcement officials. It also considered that with

increased competences, the Inspectorate would be in a position to provide support to the Public Prosecutor's Office to ensure effective investigations.³⁴

27. CoE-CPT recommended ensuring that the right of access to a lawyer, including the right to talk to the lawyer in private, was guaranteed from the very outset of the deprivation of liberty.³⁵

28. EU-FRA noted that the Civil Code was amended to allow for the Public Prosecutor to consider imposing protection orders due to domestic violence, when initiating and deciding on parental responsibilities.³⁶

*Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life*³⁷

29. EU-FRA mentioned that voting rights or candidacy rights for national elections were provided for selected categories of non-EU citizens, that these rights were extended to citizens of Portuguese-speaking countries living in Portugal and allow third-country nationals to stand as candidates.³⁸

*Prohibition of all forms of slavery*³⁹

30. CoE-GRETA welcomed the possibility in Portuguese law to grant a residence permit to victims of trafficking both on the basis of their personal situation and for their co-operation with the competent authorities. In this connection, it invited the Portuguese authorities to ensure that victims of trafficking can fully benefit from the right to obtain a renewable residence permit.⁴⁰

31. CoE-GRETA welcomed the efforts taken to provide training concerning trafficking in human beings to a wide range of stakeholders. Training should aim, inter alia, to increase the number of prosecutions and convictions of traffickers and guarantee effective access to compensation for victims of trafficking.⁴¹

32. CoE-GRETA was concerned by the low number of convictions for human trafficking and called on the authorities to identify gaps in the investigation procedure and the presentation of cases in court. It also noted the absence of compensation awarded to victims of trafficking, and urged the authorities to address this gap through improved access to legal aid and increased information to victims about their right to compensation and the procedures to follow.⁴² CoE-GRETA urged Portugal to provide appropriate and safe accommodation for victims of trafficking, including for men, and to ensure that the services were adapted to the specific needs of trafficking victims.⁴³

33. CoE-GRETA welcomed the development of data collection on victims of human trafficking and invited Portugal to ensure that statistical data be collected from all main actors, subject to the necessary measures to protect personal data.⁴⁴

34. JS1 stated that although forced marriage was criminalized in November 2016, Portuguese legislation did not fully prohibit early marriage, as the Civil Code established 16 years as the legal age of marriage. Children over 16 must obtain an authorisation from their parents, legal guardian or, where applicable, an administrator from the Civil Registry Office. JS1 recommended to establish 18 years as the legal age of marriage without any possible exception.⁴⁵

35. CoE-GRETA considered that the authorities should make further efforts to sensitise medical professionals involved in organ transplantations and other health-care professionals to trafficking in human beings for the purpose of organ removal.⁴⁶

36. La Manif pour tous expressed concern at the adoption, on July 2016, of law n° 25/2016 authorizing, under conditions, the practice of pregnancy for others.⁴⁷

*Right to privacy and family life*⁴⁸

37. EU-FRA noted that married or cohabitating heterosexual or lesbian couples, as well as all women irrespective of their civil status or sexual orientation were entitled to assisted reproduction.⁴⁹ EU-FRA noted that since 2016, it became possible for same-sex couples to adopt children.⁵⁰

38. EU-FRA noted that some aspects of national laws allowing specific surveillance measures were considered unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court, such as the obtaining of access to metadata, which include traffic and location data.⁵¹

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

*Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work*⁵²

39. EU-FRA mentioned that Portugal adopted legislation that resulted in gender identity being included among the protected grounds of discrimination in the field of employment and occupation.⁵³ CoE-ECSR referred to the right to equal opportunities and treatment in employment and occupation without sex discrimination and noted that in equal pay cases, legislation only permitted comparisons of pay between employees working for the same company.⁵⁴

40. CoE-GRETA mentioned that the authorities have indicated that trafficking for the purpose of labour exploitation occurred primarily in the agricultural and construction sectors, professional football, domestic service and amusement parks.⁵⁵ The Third National Anti-trafficking Action Plan envisaged strengthening labour inspections with a preventive character, with a particular focus on high-risk sectors such as agriculture, hotels and entertainment, and also foresaw the promotion of best practices in the area of corporate social responsibility.⁵⁶

41. CoE-GRETA welcomed the measures already taken and considered that the authorities should take further steps in particular by continuing to organise activities aimed at raising awareness on the risks of human trafficking for the purpose of labour exploitation; strengthening the monitoring of recruitment and temporary work agencies and reviewing the legislative and regulatory framework regarding domestic workers; expanding the mandate of labour inspectors and working closely with the private sector, in line with the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.⁵⁷

42. CoE-ECSR mentioned that the labour inspection system did not have sufficient human resources to adequately monitor compliance with occupational health and safety legislation.⁵⁸

*Right to social security*⁵⁹

43. CoE-ECSR noted that the minimum level of sickness benefit was inadequate,⁶⁰ and that equal treatment regarding social security rights was not guaranteed to foreign citizens as well as access to family allowances.⁶¹

*Right to an adequate standard of living*⁶²

44. JSI referred that according to the statistics provided by the National Statistical Institute, 23.3 per cent of the population were at risk of poverty or social exclusion in 2017, despite a slight decrease in poverty in comparison to previous years.⁶³

45. EU-FRA noted that in Portugal the probability of a severe deprivation of housing was much higher for families with children.⁶⁴

46. CoE-ECSR noted the measures taken by public authorities to improve the substandard housing conditions of most Roma were inadequate.⁶⁵ CoE-ACFC noted that in most places the Roma community continued to live in substandard conditions, isolated from the rest of population, without access to basic facilities.⁶⁶ CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights encouraged Portugal to pursue programmes aimed at addressing the housing needs of the most vulnerable in society, ensuring that Roma fully benefit from these programmes, and pointed to the continuing need to eradicate substandard and segregated Roma settlements.⁶⁷

47. CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights expressed concern that financial cuts, combined with an increase in prices of transportation, electricity and access to health care, resulted in more poverty and social exclusion for many older persons. He underlined the risks associated with the withdrawing by many families of older persons from residential care in order to benefit from additional income in the form of their pensions. While deinstitutionalisation was a welcome process, it should be carried out as part of

comprehensive policies and with additional support for older persons and families in order to prevent higher levels of abuse, including violence and neglect.⁶⁸

48. CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights regretted that non-governmental organisations involved in human rights work and in the provision of services to vulnerable groups faced growing difficulties, even though an ever-increasing number of persons turned to them for support as a result of the financial crisis.⁶⁹

*Right to health*⁷⁰

49. At the Psychiatric Hospital of Santa Cruz do Bispo Prison, the CPT's delegation was concerned at the conditions in which patients were held and the prison-like atmosphere that prevailed. The delegation noted that the establishment cannot provide a therapeutic environment for the care and treatment of psychiatric patients and recommended that it be closed down and the patients relocated to an appropriate hospital facility.⁷¹

50. CoE-CPT recommended ensuring that every patient capable of discernment be given the opportunity to refuse treatment or any other medical intervention. It mentioned that, as part of the safeguards surrounding forced treatments, an external psychiatric opinion should be sought and the possibility to appeal to an independent authority be introduced.⁷²

51. Joint Submission 2 (JS2) noted that the Plan for a Global Family Policy reinforced the need for a better access to sexual and reproductive health care for young people.⁷³ JS2 recommended the use of participatory strategies and methodologies to contribute to a greater involvement and empowerment of children and youngsters in matters regarding their sexual and reproductive health and rights.⁷⁴

*Right to education*⁷⁵

52. CoE-GRETA mentioned the *Progama Escolhas* aiming to promote the social inclusion of children and young people from the most vulnerable socio-economic contexts. Several measures were envisaged: school inclusion and non-formal education; vocational training and employability; civic and community participation in particular for immigrants' descendants, children and young people from the Roma community who face problems such as early school dropout, unemployment or being subjected to guardianship or protection measures.⁷⁶

53. CoE-ACFC recommended that Portugal take vigorous measures to put an end to the practice of placing Roma pupils in separate classes; identify measures to prevent absenteeism and early dropout from school among Roma children, in particular girls.⁷⁷ EU-FRA⁷⁸ and CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights made similar recommendations.⁷⁹

54. CoE-ECSR noted that the daily and weekly working time for children subject to compulsory education was excessive.⁸⁰

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*⁸¹

55. CoE-ACFC noted with satisfaction efforts to promote gender equality within the Roma community by promoting women's professional skills which were considered as essential conditions for women's empowerment, both within Roma communities and in society as a whole.⁸²

*Children*⁸³

56. EU-FRA mentioned that Portugal updated its legislation to include various provisions on sexual crimes against children that contained specific references to new technologies, for example, setting up a system for national cybercrime research⁸⁴

57. CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights highlighted the impact of cuts in social support and benefits on children's rights, the risk of increased domestic violence against children, as well as of a possible resurgence of child labour. He highlighted in particular the inadequacy

of segregated and substandard housing, as well as instances of separate classes for Roma children.⁸⁵

58. JS1 expressed concerns that Portugal was a destination, transit and, to a lesser extent, source country for children subjected to sex trafficking and that Portugal was progressively becoming a preferred destination for travelling child sex offenders, and that child trafficking for sexual purposes and sexual exploitation of children in the context of travel and tourism had increased in tourist areas.⁸⁶

59. JS1 recommended increasing the legal age of sexual consent and amending the legislation to ensure the protection of all children under 18 years, and adopting specific legal provisions to criminalise child trafficking for sexual purposes and sexual exploitation in the context of travel and tourism.⁸⁷

60. The Lanzarote Committee⁸⁸ urged Portugal to take the necessary legislative or other measures to set up or designate mechanisms for data collection or focal points at national or local level and in collaboration with civil society, for the purpose of observing and evaluating the phenomenon of the sexual exploitation and sexual abuse of children in general, and child sexual abuse committed in the circle of trust in particular.⁸⁹

61. CoE-GRETA recommended that Portugal continue efforts in the area of prevention of child trafficking, by using the results of research on new trends, sensitising and training professionals working with children across the country, raising awareness through school education, and paying special attention to migrant children.⁹⁰ CoE-GRETA urged to make efforts to improve adequate support and services which were adapted to the needs of child victims of trafficking, including appropriate accommodation.⁹¹

*Persons with disabilities*⁹²

62. EU-FRA welcomed the project called *Significativo Azul* (The Meaningful Blue), which aimed at raising awareness about the specific protection and communication needs of people with intellectual disabilities or multiple disabilities.⁹³

63. EU-FRA noted that Portugal established the Independent Living Support Model (*Modelo de Apoio à Vida Independente*) programme to provide personal assistance for persons with disabilities, through a series of pilot projects between 2017 and 2020.⁹⁴

64. EU-FRA mentioned the establishment of ‘inclusion desks’ (*balcões da inclusão*) within social security centres, which will provide persons with disabilities and their families with specialised assistance and information on residential homes, centres for occupational activity, rehabilitation centres, employment issues, social benefits and technical aid.⁹⁵

65. EU-FRA noted that the Portuguese National Federation of Social Solidarity Cooperatives and the Public Security Police, in partnership with the National Institute for Rehabilitation and the National Confederation of Social Solidarity Institutions, have developed a programme focused on preventing and responding to violence against people with intellectual disabilities.⁹⁶

*Minorities and indigenous peoples*⁹⁷

66. CoE-ACFC mentioned that Portugal continued to take a pragmatic approach towards the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and that the opportunities for minority representatives and other non-governmental organisations to participate in the monitoring process were limited.⁹⁸

67. CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights urged ensuring the allocation of adequate resources for the effective implementation of the National Strategy for Roma Integration.⁹⁹

68. In 2013, CoE-ECRI urged the authorities to eliminate all walls and other barriers segregating Roma communities. Since no information was provided about walls or physical barriers segregating Roma communities, ECRI considered, in a follow-up report, its recommendation only partially implemented.¹⁰⁰

69. CoE-ACFC mentioned that media continued to promote a negative image of, as well as stereotypes about, Roma and migrants. It urged to make more resolute efforts to combat the dissemination of racism and stereotypes in the media.¹⁰¹

70. CoE-ACFC noted that the involvement of Roma in public affairs remained very limited. Roma representatives were only consulted to a limited extent in the preparation of the National Roma Communities Integration Strategy and few were included in the Advisory Group for the Integration of Roma Communities. Persons belonging to disadvantaged groups, including Roma, continued to face significant obstacles in effectively participating in social and economic life.¹⁰²

71. EU-FRA reported that, according to surveys, more Roma women than men felt discriminated against because of their ethnic origin, 63 per cent and 58 per cent, respectively.¹⁰³

72. CoE-ACFC called upon Portugal to adopt a more structured approach in promoting Roma culture as part of Portuguese society, in close consultation and cooperation with the persons concerned.¹⁰⁴

*Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons*¹⁰⁵

73. CoE-ACFC noted that projects to promote intercultural dialogue and to combat racial discrimination and racism had been maintained, and measures to facilitate the inclusion of migrants and integration of society had been implemented.¹⁰⁶

74. CoE-GRETA urged Portugal to establish repatriation programmes ensuring that the return of victims of trafficking was preferably voluntary, and was conducted with due regard to their rights, safety and dignity, including the right to non-refoulement and, in the case of children, by fully respecting the principle of the best interests of the child.¹⁰⁷

75. CoE-GRETA mentioned that the Strategic Plan for Migration (2015-2020) foresaw measures that included promoting working conditions, citizenship and gender equality through the integration of immigrants, combating illegal use of labour, particularly undeclared work, racial discrimination and trafficking in human beings.¹⁰⁸

76. CoE-ECRI welcomed steps taken to enable the collection of data by the Observatory of Roma Communities and the Migration Observatory as well as studies which have been carried out by these institutions on the situation of Romas and immigrants.¹⁰⁹

77. CoE-GRETA noted that Portugal was seen as a transit country for other European destinations and many asylum seekers disappeared shortly after being accommodated in asylum centres, which hampered their identification as victims of trafficking.¹¹⁰

78. The Lanzarote Committee urged Portugal to take the necessary legislative or other measures to ensure that child victims of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse affected by the refugee crisis, may benefit from therapeutic assistance, notably emergency psychological care.¹¹¹

Notes

¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society

Individual submissions:

ICAN International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (Geneva, Switzerland);
LMPT La Manif pour tous (Paris, France).

Joint submissions:

JS1 **Joint submission 1 submitted by:** Centro Integrado de Apoio Familiar Portugal (CIAF) (Porto, Portugal) and ECPAT International (ECPAT) (Thailand).

JS2 **Joint submission 2 submitted by:** Portuguese Family Planning Association (Associação Para o Planeamento da Família) (APF) (Lisbon, Portugal) and members of the Sexual Rights Initiative coalition: Action Canada for Population and Development (ACPD), Akahatá (Argentina), Coalition of African Lesbians (CAL), Creating Resources for Empowerment in Action (CREA; India), Federation for Women and Family Planning (Poland), Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights (EIPR);

JS3 **Joint submission 3 submitted by:** Fundación Marista por la Solidaridad Internacional (FMSI) (Roma, Italia) and Fundação Champagnat (Lisboa, Portugal).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

CoE Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France):
(CoE-ACFC) Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Third Opinion on Portugal, Adopted on 4 December 2014, Strasbourg, 18 September 2014;
(CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights) Report by Nils Muižnieks, Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe;
(CoE-CPT) Report to the Portuguese Government on the visit to Portugal carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 27 September to 7 October 2016, Strasbourg, 27 January 2018, CPT/Inf (2018) 7;
(CoE-ECRI) European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) Report On Portugal, (interim follow-up), Adopted on 17 March 2016, Published on 7 June 2016, CRI(2016)25;
(CoE-ECSR(2018)) Portugal and the European Social Charter;
(CoE-GRETA) Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, Report concerning the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Portugal, Second evaluation round, Strasbourg, 15 May 2014, GRETA(2017)4;
(CoE-GRECO) Group of States against Corruption, Fourth evaluation round, Adopted on 4 December 2015, Published on 10 February 2016, Greco Eval IV Rep (2015) 5E.
EU-FRA European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, Vienna (Austria).

² The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
ICESCR International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
OP-ICESCR Optional Protocol to ICESCR;
ICCPR International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
ICCPR-OP 1 Optional Protocol to ICCPR;
ICCPR-OP 2 Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty;

CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW;
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child;
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict;
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography;
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure;
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families;
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD;
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

- ³ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 125.1, 125.5, 126.1-2, 128.1-4, A/HRC/27/7/Add.1 paras. 127.1, 127.3-5.
- ⁴ CoE-GRETA, Report concerning the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Portugal, second evaluation report, para. 92.
- ⁵ ICAN, para. 6.
- ⁶ CoE, ACFC, ACFC/OP/III (2014)/002, para.37.
- ⁷ For relevant recommendations see paras. A/HRC/27/7, paras. 125.2, 126.5, 126.9, A/HRC/27/7/Add.1 paras. 127.2, 7, 8, 15, 17, 29, 41, 42, 52, 60, 71, 72, 78.
- ⁸ CoE-GRETA, *Ibidem*, para. 164.
- ⁹ CoE-ECRI, Conclusions on the implementation of the recommendations in respect of Portugal subject to interim follow-up, p. 5.
- ¹⁰ JS3, para. 3.
- ¹¹ CoE-GRETA, *Ibidem*, para. 2.
- ¹² JS1, para. 13.
- ¹³ JS1, para. 13.
- ¹⁴ JS1, paras. 17 and 22.
- ¹⁵ JS1, para. 23.
- ¹⁶ CoE-ACFC, paras. 23 and 25.
- ¹⁷ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 126.4, 6, 11, 13, 15-16, 18-20, 22, 24-28, 45. A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, para 127.9, 14, 42, 67, 72, 79.
- ¹⁸ EU-FRA, p.4.
- ¹⁹ CoE-ACFC, page 2.
- ²⁰ CoE-ACFC, para.51.
- ²¹ CoE-ACFC, page 2.
- ²² CoE-ECSR, Portugal and the European Social Charter, p. 5. See also. CoE-Commissioner, pp. 9 and 17.
- ²³ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 125.3-4, 126.30, 34, 40, 41, 43, A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras. 127.18-28, 127.30-33, 127.38-39, 127.45-46.
- ²⁴ CoE-CPT, Report on the visit to Portugal carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, CPT/Inf (2018) 6, p.6.
- ²⁵ CoE-CPT, *ibidem*, p.15.
- ²⁶ CoE-CPT, *ibidem*, p.42.
- ²⁷ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras. 127.40, 43-44.
- ²⁸ CoE-GRECO, Corruption prevention in respect to members of Parliament, judges and prosecutors, GRECO EVAL IV Rep (2015) 5E, para.4.
- ²⁹ CoE-GRECO, *ibidem*, para. 7.
- ³⁰ CoE-GRECO, *ibidem*, para. 107.
- ³¹ CoE-GRECO, *ibidem*, para. 117.
- ³² CoE-ECRI, *ibidem*, p. 6.
- ³³ CoE-ACFC, para. 56.
- ³⁴ CoE-CPT, *ibidem*, p. 19.
- ³⁵ CoE-CPT, *ibidem*, p. 21.
- ³⁶ EU-FRA, p.5.
- ³⁷ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 125.6, 126.23.
- ³⁸ EU-FRA, pp. 13-14.
- ³⁹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 126.29, A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras. 127.34-37.

- 40 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, paras. 137 and 141.
- 41 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, para. 45.
- 42 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, para. 2.
- 43 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, para. 114.
- 44 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, para. 46.
- 45 JS1, paras. 20-22.
- 46 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, para. 94.
- 47 LMPT, para 7.
- 48 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras. 127.47-51.
- 49 EU-FRA, p.6.
- 50 EU-FRA, p.6.
- 51 EU-FRA, p.9.
- 52 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 126.10-12, A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras. 127.54 and 77.
- 53 EU-FRA, p.12.
- 54 CoE-ECSR, Ibidem, p. 5.
- 55 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, para. 14.
- 56 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, para. 67.
- 57 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, para. 77.
- 58 CoE-ECSR, Ibidem, p. 5.
- 59 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras. 127.56 and 61.
- 60 CoE-ECSR, Ibidem, p. 5.
- 61 CoE-ECSR, Ibidem, p. 5.
- 62 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras. 127.53, 55, 57-59, 62, 63, 76.
- 63 JS1, para. 5.
- 64 EU-FRA, p.5.
- 65 CoE-ECSR, Ibidem, p. 7.
- 66 CoE-ACFC, para. 14.
- 67 CoE-Commissioner, p. 3.
- 68 CoE-Commissioner, p.3.
- 69 CoE-Commissioner, p.3.
- 70 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 126.54.
- 71 CoE-CPT, ibidem, p.7.
- 72 CoE-CPT, ibidem, p.8.
- 73 JS2, para. 5.
- 74 JS2, para. 41.
- 75 For relevant recommendations see see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 126.3, 56-58. A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras.127.6, 16, 66, 68-70.
- 76 CoE-GRETA, para. 89.
- 77 CoE-ACFC, para. 78.
- 78 EU-FRA, p.7.
- 79 CoE-Commissioner, p. 3.
- 80 CoE-ECSR, Ibidem, p. 6.
- 81 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 126.7-8, 10, 31-33, 35-38.
- 82 CoE-ACFC, para. 40.
- 83 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7, paras. A/HRC/27/7, paras. 126.60, A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras.127.6, 55-56, 63-65, 75.
- 84 EU-FRA, p.9.
- 85 CoE-Commissioner, p. 3.
- 86 JS1, para. 10.
- 87 JS1, para. 22.
- 88 The Lanzarote Committee is the body monitoring the application of the Council of Europe Convention on Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse, also known as “the Lanzarote Convention”.
- 89 CoE page 7.
- 90 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, para. 85.
- 91 CoE-GRETA, Ibidem, p. 128.
- 92 For relevant recommendations see see A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras.127.62 and 71.
- 93 EU-FRA, p.15.
- 94 EU-FRA, p.5.
- 95 EU-FRA, p.6.
- 96 EU-FRA, p.7.
- 97 For relevant recommendations see see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 126.14, 22, 46-49, 50-58. A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, paras.127.73-74.

- ⁹⁸ CoE-ACFC, p.1.
⁹⁹ CoE-Commissioner, p. 3.
¹⁰⁰ CoE-ECRI, *ibidem*, p.6.
¹⁰¹ CoE-ACFC, paras. 64-65.
¹⁰² CoE-ACFC, P.19.
¹⁰³ EU-FRA, p.16. See also CoE-Commissioner, p.3.
¹⁰⁴ CoE-ACFC, P.44.
¹⁰⁵ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/27/7, paras. 126.5, 17, 21-22, 28, 45-46, 55-56, 58.
A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, A/HRC/27/7/Add.1, para 127.10, 14, 75.
¹⁰⁶ CoE-ACFC, p.1.
¹⁰⁷ CoE-GRETA, *Ibidem*, para. 156.
¹⁰⁸ CoE-GRETA, *Ibidem*, paras. 88 and 97.
¹⁰⁹ CoE-ECRI, *ibidem*, p.5.
¹¹⁰ CoE-GRETA, *Ibidem*, para. 112.
¹¹¹ CoE, p. 8.
-