



---

**Human Rights Council**  
**Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review**  
**Thirty-eighth session**  
3–14 May 2021

## **Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Latvia\***

### **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 8 stakeholders' submissions<sup>1</sup> to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. A separate section is provided for the contribution by the national human rights institution that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

#### **II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles**

2. In May 2015, the Ombudsman urged the Parliament to include in the Constitution a new chapter on the "Ombudsman", to strengthen its compliance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles). The Ombudsman reported that there had been no progress on this, and also noted that the allocation it received from the state budget remained insufficient.<sup>2</sup>

3. Although the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OP-CAT) had yet to be ratified, in 2017, the Government entrusted the Ombudsman with the function of a preventive mechanism. In 2018, a Prevention Division was established, to visit institutions where persons have or may have restricted liberty. In early 2020, the Ombudsman was invited to provide comments to the draft law on the OP-CAT.<sup>3</sup>

4. In 2019, the Ombudsman visited all short-term detention facilities in Latvia finding inadequate living conditions in many of them.<sup>4</sup> The Ombudsman noted that the Latvian prison infrastructure was outdated and the application of human rights standards would require large financial resources.<sup>5</sup> He stated that the issue of self-governance or hierarchy of prisoners remained unresolved in Latvian prisons.<sup>6</sup>

---

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



5. The Ombudsman reported that, despite significant improvements in aligning national laws with the Council of Europe's Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention), Latvia had yet to ratify it.<sup>7</sup>
6. In 2018, the Ombudsman had called on authorities to provide a legal framework for the recognition of various forms of family in accordance with the latest findings of the European Court on Human Rights.<sup>8</sup>
7. The Ombudsman observed that a considerable part of hate speech was now found online and recommended a more active application of criminal law.<sup>9</sup>
8. The Ombudsman pointed out shortcomings regarding co-ordination between actors involved in the prevention of trafficking in human beings. Many institutions saw their role as informing the police, and neglected assistance to victims.<sup>10</sup> The Ombudsman called upon the Government to develop a comprehensive "umbrella" law to improve the regulatory framework and to provide a clear referral mechanism for victims, as well as an effective mechanism for public authorities and social service providers to exchange information.<sup>11</sup>
9. In 2019, the Ombudsman analysed the compliance of minimum income levels - guaranteed minimum income, poverty level income threshold, state social security benefit and minimum pensions - with the Constitution. As a result, in July 2020, 5 cases were initiated in the Constitutional Court.<sup>12</sup>
10. Concerning children's rights, the Ombudsman stated that, in order to provide meaningful assistance to children exposed to domestic violence, it was necessary to consider the psychosocial rehabilitation needs of each child.<sup>13</sup>
11. He also reported that many children with special needs did not have access to special education programs near their place of residence or even in the municipality. As a result, they were often taken to boarding schools. According to the regulatory framework, funding followed the student, but often the educational institution did not objectively evaluate its financial and human resources to ensure an appropriate learning process. The Ombudsman said the problem needed to be solved urgently.<sup>14</sup>
12. In 2017, the Ombudsman published the results of an investigation concerning the provision of technical aids to children. At the time of reporting, the Ministry of Welfare had not addressed the shortcomings identified by the Ombudsman.<sup>15</sup>
13. The Ombudsman acknowledged that the Central Election Commission had carried out activities to promote the participation of persons with special needs in elections. Persons who were treated in hospitals or in social care centers were provided with the opportunity to vote.<sup>16</sup>
14. The Ombudsman recalled that, in line with the Asylum law, asylum seekers had the right to appeal negative decisions, including those made through an accelerated procedure. A person could not be deported until the final decision in their asylum case had come into force.<sup>17</sup> The Ombudsman observed that, since 2016, asylum seekers and beneficiaries of international protection had the right to receive the support of a social worker and a mentor to facilitate their integration. However, this right had yet to be enshrined in law.<sup>18</sup> The Ombudsman drew attention to the lack of affordable housing for beneficiaries of international protection and noted that this affected the ability to receive social benefits provided by the municipality.<sup>19</sup>
15. The Ombudsman welcomed the adoption, in 2019, of a law which stipulated that from 2020 no children would be born in Latvia with "non-citizen" status. Nevertheless, he noted that there was still a large number of non-citizens and naturalization could be accelerated. Latvian language courses for naturalization applicants remained insufficient.<sup>20</sup>
16. The Ombudsman also stated that there was no comprehensive policy on human rights education in Latvia.<sup>21</sup>

### III. Information provided by other stakeholders

#### A. Scope of international obligations<sup>22</sup> and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies

17. The Council of Europe's Commissioner for Human Rights (COE-Commissioner) sent a letter to the Parliament of Latvia, addressing misconceptions about the Istanbul Convention and expressing the hope that Latvia would swiftly ratify it.<sup>23</sup> The EU Fundamental Rights Agency (EU FRA) also observed that the ratification process for this Convention had stalled in Latvia.<sup>24</sup>

18. The Latvian Center for Human Rights (LCHR)<sup>25</sup> and the Committee for the Prevention of Torture of the Council of Europe (CoE-CPT)<sup>26</sup> recommended that Latvia ratify the OP-CAT.

19. JS1 recommended that Latvia accede to the European Convention on Nationality and the Council of Europe Convention on the Avoidance of Statelessness in relation to State Succession, and remove all reservations to the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons.<sup>27</sup> Latvia acceded to the latter in 1999, but kept reservations to Articles 24.1(b) (social security for stateless persons lawfully in the country) and 27 (issuing identity papers to stateless persons).<sup>28</sup>

20. The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance of the Council of Europe (CoE-ECRI) recommended that Latvia ratify the Protocol No. 12 to the European Convention on Human Rights, which provides for a general prohibition of discrimination.<sup>29</sup>

#### B. National human rights framework<sup>30</sup>

21. The CoE-ECRI recommended that the Ombudsman's mandate include the provision of independent assistance to victims of racism and racial discrimination.<sup>31</sup>

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

##### 1. Cross-cutting issues

###### *Equality and non-discrimination*<sup>32</sup>

22. The Council of Europe's Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (CoE-FCNM) recommended that Latvia combat stereotypes and prejudices in political discourse and promote tolerance and inter-cultural dialogue throughout society as a whole; and take specific targeted measures to counteract manifestations of xenophobia in society.<sup>33</sup>

23. The CoE-ECRI recommended that Latvia amend existing legislation in order to include the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity in Articles 48 and 150 of the Criminal Law; and ensure that, in the absence of comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation, both sexual orientation and gender identity are explicitly listed among the grounds on which discrimination is prohibited in various legislation.<sup>34</sup>

24. The EU FRA noted that the Parliament had rejected a draft law aimed at legal recognition of same-sex couples.<sup>35</sup> To advance the rights of lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender and intersex persons, the CoE-Commissioner encouraged authorities to design an action plan in co-operation with the Council of Europe.<sup>36</sup> The CoE-Commissioner specifically highlighted the need to provide legal recognition to cohabiting same-sex couples.<sup>37</sup>

25. LCHR said that, although the government had acknowledged the problem, there was insufficient support to tackle hate speech in a systemic and comprehensive manner, and civil society engaged in online monitoring of hate speech remained heavily dependent on

foreign donors.<sup>38</sup> It recommended that Latvia dedicate resources for training on diversity, ways of addressing hate speech and promoting tolerance, for various target groups.<sup>39</sup>

26. Both the LCHR<sup>40</sup> and the CoE-ECRI<sup>41</sup> noted underreporting of racist and hate crimes. The CoE-ECRI recommended that Latvia establish, as a matter of priority, a unit within the State Police to reach out to vulnerable groups and address the problem of under-reporting of racist and homo/transphobic hate crimes.<sup>42</sup> LCHR recommended the appointment of contact persons in the police, to reach out to vulnerable groups.<sup>43</sup>

27. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE-ODIHR) recommended that Latvia condemn any form of discrimination and hate crime and abstain from any statement or action that exacerbated vulnerabilities.<sup>44</sup>

28. OSCE-ODIHR also recommended that Latvia ensure that any measures and restrictions imposed due to the COVID-19 emergency situation were created and applied in a non-discriminatory manner. Working together with civil society organizations and minority communities in this process was crucial.<sup>45</sup>

*Development, the environment, and business and human rights*<sup>46</sup>

29. The EU FRA reported that Latvia was in the process of adopting a national action plan on business and human rights.<sup>47</sup>

30. The Group of States against Corruption of the Council of Europe issued a report on Latvia with recommendations addressed to central governments (top executive functions) and law enforcement agencies.<sup>48</sup> Although in the past twenty years, significant resources have been injected to curb corruption, strengthen accountability and augment public trust in these two sectors, shortcomings persisted.<sup>49</sup>

## 2. Civil and political rights

*Right to life, liberty and security of person*<sup>50</sup>

31. The CoE-CPT visited Latvia in 2016 and made several recommendations regarding police prison, as well as psychiatric and social care establishments, covering issues such as ill-treatment, conditions of detention, living conditions and measures of restraints.<sup>51</sup>

32. The CoE-CPT recommended that police officers throughout Latvia be reminded, at regular intervals, that all forms of ill-treatment of persons deprived of their liberty were not acceptable and would be punished accordingly.<sup>52</sup> It also invited Latvia to introduce audio (in addition to visual) recording of police questioning.<sup>53</sup>

33. The EU FRA noted that Latvia had specified that committing a violent act against a partner or ex-partner was an aggravating circumstance, in line with Article 46 (a) of the Istanbul Convention.<sup>54</sup>

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

34. The CoE-CPT called upon Latvia to ensure that the right of access to a lawyer was enjoyed by all persons obliged to remain with the police, as from the very outset of their deprivation of liberty.<sup>55</sup>

35. The CoE noted the establishment, in 2015, of an Internal Control Bureau, tasked with conducting all investigations against prison and police officials. The Bureau is institutionally and practically independent from prison authorities and the police, is supervised by the Minister of the Interior, and has a separate budget, its own premises and regional units.<sup>56</sup>

36. The EU FRA reported that Latvia had incorporated the Procedural Safeguards Directive, for children who were suspects or accused persons in criminal proceedings, into its national legislation. The legal reform ensured that all alternative measures are evaluated before detention is used, as a measure of last resort and for security purposes only. The EU FRA also observed that Latvia provided legal aid for children without any income requirements.<sup>57</sup>

37. With regards to judgments and decisions of the European Court of Human Rights, the CoE reported that, as of 31 December 2019, there were 8 cases against Latvia pending before the Committee of Ministers for supervision of their execution. Six were “leading cases” evidencing more or less important general problems.<sup>58</sup>

*Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life*<sup>59</sup>

38. OSCE-ODHIR recommended that Latvia comply with international standards and repeal criminal provisions for defamation in favour of civil remedies and non-pecuniary measures designed to restore the reputation harmed.<sup>60</sup>

39. In 2017, the CoE-Commissioner expressed concern about a decision by the Riga Higher Court to impose a 50,000 Euros fine on the portal Tvnet.lv, noting the disproportionately high amount in the Latvian context, which could have a deleterious impact on media freedom and public speech in the country.<sup>61</sup>

40. The CoE-FCNM recommended that Latvia reconsider the approach to the quota requirements in the broadcasting media; and develop, in close consultation with minority representatives and media professionals, more appropriate means to ensure that Latvian language speakers and speakers of national minority languages benefit from a diverse and shared media space.<sup>62</sup>

41. The CoE-Commissioner welcomed improved policies to protect freedom of assembly and expression of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, as reflected in measures to protect pride events.<sup>63</sup>

42. The EU FRA noted, based on a survey, the public perception that non-governmental organizations and charities were never or only rarely able to operate free from government influence in Latvia.<sup>64</sup>

43. OSCE-ODHIR reported that the 2018 elections were conducted professionally, and that the election administration enjoyed a high level of public confidence. The legal framework was comprehensive and served as an adequate basis for the conduct of elections, although it could be further refined to enhance the inclusiveness of the electoral process.<sup>65</sup>

*Prohibition of all forms of slavery*<sup>66</sup>

44. The European Center for Law and Justice (ECLJ) observed that, in response to recommendations received during its second universal periodic review, the Latvian Government adopted Regulation No. 344 under which victims of trafficking were able to receive rehabilitation services from the government for up to 180 days as long as they met several criteria.<sup>67</sup> However, more needed to be done to ensure that the police had the resources to arrest human traffickers, and to identify the victims and provide them with assistance.<sup>68</sup> The Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings of the Council of Europe also urged Latvia to improve the identification of victims of trafficking and to guarantee access to compensation.<sup>69</sup>

*Right to privacy and family life*

45. The EU FRA reported on the amended Audiovisual Media Services Directive as one of the latest steps to ensure the protection of children online and noted that Latvia had drafted legislative amendments.<sup>70</sup> The EU FRA also observed that Data Protection Supervisory Authorities were looking to increase their cooperation with civil society organizations with expertise in data protection-related issues.<sup>71</sup>

### **3. Economic, social and cultural rights**

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

46. The CoE-FCNM recommended that Latvia improve the living conditions of the Roma by increasing employment opportunities and promoting integration within society.<sup>72</sup>

47. The CoE noted that the minimum of at least one quarter of the employees of an undertaking were required to form a trade union, and 50 founding members were required

to form a trade union outside an undertaking, which constituted an excessive restriction on the right to organise.<sup>73</sup>

*Right to social security*

48. Monitoring the implementation of the European Social Charter in Latvia, the CoE said that the minimum level of unemployment benefits, the minimum level of old age pension and the minimum level of disability pension were inadequate. It also concluded that the level of social assistance paid to a single person without resources was not adequate; and there was no adequate overall and coordinated approach to combating poverty and social exclusion.<sup>74</sup>

*Right to an adequate standard of living*

49. The CoE concluded that the measures taken to improve the substandard housing conditions of Roma were insufficient.<sup>75</sup>

*Right to health*

50. The CoE said that insufficient measures had been taken to effectively guarantee the right of access to health care.<sup>76</sup>

51. The EU FRA observed that, according to a survey, corruption in relation to health services was considered to be a particular problem in Latvia.<sup>77</sup>

52. The EU FRA also noted a ruling of the Latvian Supreme Court which stipulated that the state and its bodies must ensure access to medical care for persons with disabilities.<sup>78</sup>

53. The CoE-ECRI recommended that Latvia closely monitor the impact of the new health insurance rules on the Roma community and make adjustments if necessary.<sup>79</sup>

*Right to education*<sup>80</sup>

54. The Venice Commission of the Council of Europe recommended that Latvia amend Cabinet Regulation No. 716 in order to return to the previous “bilingual approach” in play-based lessons applied to the whole period of pre-school education<sup>81</sup>; ensure that each school will have a possibility to implement a sufficient proportion of education at upper secondary level in the minority language<sup>82</sup>; exempt private schools from the mandatory proportions of the use of the Latvian language applied to state schools implementing minority education programmes<sup>83</sup>; and consider enlarging the possibilities for persons belonging to national minorities to have access to higher education in their minority language.<sup>84</sup>

55. The CoE-Commissioner expressed concern that the 2018 education reform in Latvia risked transforming the bilingual education system into one where minority languages teaching was limited to language and culture classes. She also regretted that the reform distinguished between European Union languages and other languages.<sup>85</sup>

56. The CoE-FCNM recommended that Latvia ensure the continued availability of teaching and learning in languages of national minorities throughout the country with a view to meeting existing demand. It also recommended that representatives of national minorities be consulted to ensure that their interests and concerns are taken into account.<sup>86</sup>

57. The CoE-FCNM also recommended that Latvia step up efforts to identify and remedy the shortcomings faced by Roma children in the field of education and take measures to prevent Roma children from being wrongfully placed in special schools.<sup>87</sup> The CoE-ECRI made a similar recommendation. It also recommended that Latvia ensure that a sufficient number of Roma teaching assistants were employed.<sup>88</sup>

58. The CoE-Commissioner said that a more inclusive system of education should be put in place where children with disabilities have access to mainstream schools close to their residence.<sup>89</sup>

#### 4. Rights of specific persons or groups

##### *Women*<sup>90</sup>

59. While noting the on-going work to develop long-term gender equality policies, the CoE-Commissioner encouraged Latvia to reinforce its efforts to render gender equality effective in reality, to overcome stereotypes and prejudices about gender roles, and to increase women's participation in public and political life.<sup>91</sup>

60. Expressing concern about survey data showing high levels of violence against women and domestic violence, the CoE-Commissioner called on Latvia to raise public awareness about the objectives of the Istanbul Convention and to ensure that law enforcement, prosecutorial and judicial authorities had the necessary capacity to investigate, prosecute and punish all instances of violence against women and to address protection needs by establishing a sufficient number of adequately-resourced specialised shelters.<sup>92</sup>

##### *Children*

61. The CoE-Commissioner was concerned about the placement of orphans and children without parental care in institutions, and called on the authorities to prioritise other types of care in a family-like environment as well as to allocate sufficient funds, and implement information campaigns and training, to increase the number of guardians and foster families.<sup>93</sup>

62. The Committee of the Parties to the Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse of the Council of Europe recommended, *inter alia*, that Latvia ensure that recommendations on child-friendly handling of proceedings involving children victims of sexual abuse be implemented also in the context of proceedings involving children affected by the refugee crisis.<sup>94</sup>

##### *Persons with disabilities*<sup>95</sup>

63. The EU FRA reported on the approval of a Plan for the development of environmental accessibility for 2019–2021, reflecting the recommendations made by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Its goal was to ensure that all people with disabilities had access to public and local authorities and their services by 2030. The plan named organizations representing persons with disabilities as key partners in the assessment and quality control of its efforts to develop and implement universal design principles.<sup>96</sup>

64. The EU FRA cited a ruling of the Supreme Court, in favour of an NGO representing a disabled applicant, according to which access solutions for persons with disabilities should allow independent access as far as possible. The Supreme Court also stressed the need to consult with the representatives of persons with disabilities and examine their claims during the planning process.<sup>97</sup>

##### *Minorities and indigenous peoples*<sup>98</sup>

65. The CoE-FCNM recommended that Latvia encourage effective participation of persons belonging to national minorities in public life and administration; and review whether language proficiency standards regulating access to public employment are necessary and proportional for all of the occupations in state and public service positions that are not accessible to “non-citizens” and to persons not fluent in Latvian.<sup>99</sup>

66. The World Jewish Restitution Organization (WJRO) was concerned by the lack of progress since 2016 regarding Holocaust-era property restitution.<sup>100</sup> The WJRO called upon Latvia to adopt legislation, such as the draft law introduced in June 2019, to address outstanding Jewish property claims from the Holocaust era and its aftermath, including remaining Jewish communal properties. This legislation should be consistent with international standards set forth in the Terezin Declaration on Holocaust Era Assets and the accompanying Guidelines and Best Practices for immovable property, both endorsed by

Latvia.<sup>101</sup> The CoE-ECRI also recommended that Latvia dispel any anti-Semitic sentiment that may stem from such action.<sup>102</sup>

67. The Latvian government informed the EU FRA that no anti-Semitic crimes were recorded in 2018 and 2017. In 2016, one case related to the desecration of Jewish graves was successfully prosecuted.<sup>103</sup>

*Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons*<sup>104</sup>

68. According to LCHR, access to the territory of Latvia by asylum seekers remained a problem, as state border guards returned asylum seekers without examining their claims. It referred to a case pending against Latvia in the European Court of Human Rights. It recommended Latvia to duly examine all asylum claims to reduce the risk of refoulement of asylum seekers.<sup>105</sup>

*Stateless persons*<sup>106</sup>

69. According to JS1, despite steps taken by the Government to prevent and reduce statelessness, more than 200,000 people remained stateless with “non-citizen” status.<sup>107</sup> However, no comprehensive mapping study of statelessness was available, and numbers varied depending on the definitions employed by different actors.<sup>108</sup> It recommended that Latvia improve data collection on stateless persons and those at risk of statelessness and harmonise data collection categories.<sup>109</sup>

70. JS1 noted that, under domestic law, “non-citizens” were excluded from the definition of stateless person as they were considered a separate legal category of persons who enjoyed a significant set of rights.<sup>110</sup> However, “non-citizens” in Latvia clearly lacked a nationality and therefore met the definition of a stateless person under international law regardless of whether they should be excluded from protection under the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons.<sup>111</sup>

71. JS1 recalled that the Citizenship Law defined a stateless person as “someone who is not considered a citizen by any state in accordance with the laws thereof, except a person who is a subject of the Law on the Status of those Former USSR Citizens who do not have the Citizenship of Latvia or that of any Other State”. Aside from excluding “non-citizens” from the definition of a stateless person, the formulation “in accordance with the laws thereof” was narrower than the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, which defined a stateless person as someone “not considered a national of any state under the operation of its law”.<sup>112</sup>

72. JS1 noted that, although “non-citizens” were granted rights (and a route to naturalisation if they met certain conditions) that went beyond the minimum rights prescribed by Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, they were not entitled to “equivalent rights” to Latvian nationals. There were important differences distinguishing “non-citizens” from citizens, including lack of political rights and restrictions on employment and property ownership.<sup>113</sup>

73. The CoE-Commissioner welcomed the adoption of a law to grant automatic citizenship to children of “non-citizens” as of 1st January 2020, unless the parents opted for another nationality, but regretted that the parliament did not extend automatic citizenship to all stateless children in Latvia who are currently under 15.<sup>114</sup> She recommended that Latvia amend the relevant legislation to grant citizenship automatically to stateless children born to “non-citizen” parents. CoE-ECRI, JS1<sup>115</sup> and LCHR expressed similar concerns.<sup>116</sup>

74. JS1 also noted that Latvia had established a statelessness determination procedure in national law, in line with good practice in many respects. However, there remained gaps including limited guarantees to ensure access to the procedure, missing procedural protections such as a guaranteed interview or referral from asylum procedures, a lack of protection and rights during the procedure, and a lack of a facilitated route to naturalisation for people recognised as stateless under the procedure.<sup>117</sup> JS1 recommended that individuals awaiting a determination of statelessness under this procedure were treated in accordance with UNHCR guidance, including by introducing a temporary residence permit for

applicants for stateless status, thus ensuring access to minimum social rights and subsistence.<sup>118</sup>

75. JS1 noted that stateless people faced a heightened risk of arbitrary detention particularly where procedural safeguards to identify statelessness and related barriers to removal were lacking.<sup>119</sup> It recommended that Latvia take steps to improve the identification of statelessness prior to issuing a removal or detention order and consider statelessness as a juridically relevant fact in return and detention decisions, in order to prevent arbitrary (immigration) detention of stateless people.<sup>120</sup>

76. JS1 noted that a person recognised as stateless under the stateless determination procedure might apply for naturalisation after five years' permanent residence.<sup>121</sup> There were no exemptions for stateless people from the general naturalisation requirements. To apply for a nationality they must be able to demonstrate: fluency in Latvian language, a legal source of income, knowledge of the Constitution, national anthem and history and culture of Latvia.<sup>122</sup>

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: [www.ohchr.org](http://www.ohchr.org).

### *Civil society*

#### *Individual submissions:*

ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
LCHR	Latvian Centre for Human Rights, Riga (Latvia);
WJRO	World Jewish Restitution Organisation, Jerusalem (Israel).

#### *Joint submissions:*

JS1	<b>Joint submission 1 submitted by:</b> European Network on Statelessness, London (United Kingdom) and Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion, Tilburg (The Netherlands).
-----	---

### *National human rights institution:*

Ombudsman	Ombudsman of the Republic of Latvia, Riga (Latvia).
-----------	---

### *Regional intergovernmental organization(s):*

CoE	The Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France); Attachments: CoE-CPT (2016) – European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT). Report to the Latvian Government on the visit to Latvia carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 12 to 22 April 2016, Strasbourg, 29 June 2017, CPT/Inf (2017) 16; Coe-ECRI (2019) – European Commission against Racism and Tolerance (ECRI). Report on Latvia (fifth monitoring cycle), 5 March 2019, CRI(2019)1; CoE-FCNM (2018) – Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. Third Opinion on Latvia adopted on 23 February 2018, ACFC/OP/III(2018)001REV; CoE-GRECO (2018) – Group of States against Corruption. Evaluation report: Preventing corruption and promoting integrity in central governments (top executive functions) and law enforcement agencies, 21 August 2018, GrecoEval5Rep(2017)6; CoE-GRETA (2017) – 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 Latvia, 23 March 2017, GRETA(2017)2; CoE-Venice Commission (2020) - European Commission for Democracy through Law. Opinion on the recent amendments to the legislation on education in minority languages adopted
-----	---

EU FRA

OSCE-ODIHR

by the Venice Commission on 18 June 2020.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, Vienna (Austria);

Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe-Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, Warsaw,(Poland).

- 2 Ombudsman, p. 9.
- 3 Ombudsman, p. 2.
- 4 Ombudsman, p. 2.
- 5 Ombudsman, p. 1.
- 6 Ombudsman, p. 2.
- 7 Ombudsman, p. 4.
- 8 Ombudsman, p. 6.
- 9 Ombudsman, pp. 5-6.
- 10 Ombudsman, p. 3.
- 11 Ombudsman, p. 4.
- 12 Ombudsman, pp. 8-9.
- 13 Ombudsman, p. 4.
- 14 Ombudsman, p. 8.
- 15 Ombudsman, p. 4.
- 16 Ombudsman, p. 8.
- 17 Ombudsman, p. 5.
- 18 Ombudsman, p. 5.
- 19 Ombudsman, p. 5.
- 20 Ombudsman, p. 6.
- 21 Ombudsman, p. 7.
- 22 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, paras. 118.1–118.3, 118.26, 119.1, 119.6, 119.7, 120.8–120.16, 120.18, 120.19 and 120.66.
- 23 CoE, pp. 2-3.
- 24 EU FRA, p. 4.
- 25 LCHR, p. 2.
- 26 CoE, p. 2. See also CoE-CPT (2016), p. 12.
- 27 JS1, p. 12.
- 28 JS1, p. 3.
- 29 CoE, p. 4. See also CoE-ECRI (2019), p. 11.
- 30 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, paras. 118.9, 118.11, 119.9 and 119.10.
- 31 CoE, p. 4. See also CoE-ECRI, p. 14.
- 32 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, paras. 118.7, 118.14–118.18, 118.23, 118.24, 119.8, 120.13, 120.40–120.42, 120.48, 120.49, 120.55–120.58, 120.60, 120.62–120.64 and 120.70.
- 33 CoE, p. 5. See also CoE-FCNM (2018), p. 25.
- 34 CoE, p. 4. See also CoE-ECRI (2019), p. 30.
- 35 EU FRA, p. 3.
- 36 CoE, p. 3.
- 37 CoE, p. 4.
- 38 LCHR, p. 4.
- 39 LCHR, p. 6.
- 40 LCHR, p. 5.
- 41 CoE, p. 4. See also CoE-ECRI (2019), p. 18.
- 42 CoE, p. 4. See also CoE-ECRI (2019), p. 18.
- 43 LCHR, p. 6.
- 44 OSCE-ODIHR, p. 4.
- 45 OSCE-ODIHR, p. 4.
- 46 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, para. 120.47.
- 47 EU FRA, p. 6.
- 48 CoE, p. 9. See also CoE-GRECO (2017), pp. 50-51.
- 49 CoE, p. 9. See also CoE-GRECO (2017), p. 4.
- 50 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, para. 118.26.
- 51 CoE, p. 4. See also CoE-CPT (2016).
- 52 CoE, p. 2. See also CoE-CPT (2016), p. 15.
- 53 CoE, p. 2. See also CoE-CPT (2016), p. 17.
- 54 EU FRA, pp. 5-6.
- 55 CoE, p. 2. See also CoE-CPT, p. 19.

- <sup>56</sup> CoE, p. 10.
- <sup>57</sup> EU FRA, p. 5.
- <sup>58</sup> CoE, p. 9.
- <sup>59</sup> For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, para. 118.41.
- <sup>60</sup> OSCE-ODIHR, p. 3.
- <sup>61</sup> CoE, p. 3.
- <sup>62</sup> CoE, p. 5. See also CoE-FCNM, p. 55.
- <sup>63</sup> CoE, p. 3.
- <sup>64</sup> EU FRA, p. 7.
- <sup>65</sup> OSCE-ODIHR, p. 2.
- <sup>66</sup> For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, paras. 118.6, and 118.32–118.38.
- <sup>67</sup> ECLJ, p. 3.
- <sup>68</sup> ECLJ, p. 5.
- <sup>69</sup> CoE, pp. 5-6. See also CoE-GRETA (2017), p. 25.
- <sup>70</sup> EU FRA, p. 4.
- <sup>71</sup> EU FRA, p. 4.
- <sup>72</sup> CoE, p. 5. See also CoE-FCNM (2018), p. 19.
- <sup>73</sup> CoE, p. 11.
- <sup>74</sup> CoE, p. 11.
- <sup>75</sup> CoE, p. 11.
- <sup>76</sup> CoE, p. 11.
- <sup>77</sup> EU FRA, p. 7.
- <sup>78</sup> EU FRA, p. 6.
- <sup>79</sup> CoE, p. 4. See also CoE-ECRI (2019), p. 26.
- <sup>80</sup> For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, paras. 118.48, 118.50–118.52, 120.74 and 120.76.
- <sup>81</sup> CoE, p. 11. See also CoE-Venice Commission (2020), p. 20.
- <sup>82</sup> CoE, p. 11. See also CoE-Venice Commission (2020), p.21.
- <sup>83</sup> CoE, p. 11. See also CoE-Venice Commission (2020), p. 22.
- <sup>84</sup> CoE, p. 11. See also CoE-Venice Commission (2020), p. 23.
- <sup>85</sup> CoE, p. 2.
- <sup>86</sup> CoE, p. 5. See also CoE-FCNM (2018), p. 2.
- <sup>87</sup> CoE, p. 5. See also CoE-FCNM (2018), p. 3.
- <sup>88</sup> CoE, p. 4. See also CoE-ECRI (2019), p. 25.
- <sup>89</sup> CoE, p. 3.
- <sup>90</sup> For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, paras.118.4, 118.10, 118.30, 118.31, 119.3, 120.34 and 120.72.
- <sup>91</sup> CoE, p. 3.
- <sup>92</sup> CoE, p. 3.
- <sup>93</sup> CoE, p. 3.
- <sup>94</sup> CoE, pp. 7-9.
- <sup>95</sup> For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, paras. 118.47, 118.48 and 120.73.
- <sup>96</sup> EU FRA, p. 4.
- <sup>97</sup> EU FRA, p. 4.
- <sup>98</sup> For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, paras. 118.49, 118.53, 118.54, 120.74, 120.75, 120.85 and 121.1–121.3.
- <sup>99</sup> CoE, p. 5. See also CoE-FCNM (2018), p. 55.
- <sup>100</sup> WJRO, p. 2.
- <sup>101</sup> WJRO, p. 7.
- <sup>102</sup> CoE, p. 4. See also COE-ECRI (2019), p. 28.
- <sup>103</sup> EU FRA, p. 6.
- <sup>104</sup> For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, paras. 120.87, 120.88, 120.92 and 120.93.
- <sup>105</sup> LCHR, pp. 3-4.
- <sup>106</sup> For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/32/15, paras. 118.55, 118.56, 120.45, 120.77, 120.80, 120.83 and 120.96.
- <sup>107</sup> JS1, p. 6.
- <sup>108</sup> JS1, p. 5.
- <sup>109</sup> JS1, p. 13.
- <sup>110</sup> JS1, p. 4.
- <sup>111</sup> JS1, pp. 4-5.
- <sup>112</sup> JS1, p. 10.
- <sup>113</sup> JS1, p. 4.
- <sup>114</sup> CoE, p. 2.

- <sup>115</sup> JS1, p. 13.
- <sup>116</sup> LCHR, p. 2.
- <sup>117</sup> JS1, p. 5.
- <sup>118</sup> JS1, p. 12.
- <sup>119</sup> JS1, p. 11.
- <sup>120</sup> JS1, p. 12.
- <sup>121</sup> JS1, p. 10.
- <sup>122</sup> JS1, pp. 10-11.

---