



# Monitoring Boards Report

2020

August 2021



TCPS  
kitaplığı

## Project Sponsors

This publication was prepared with the support of the Swedish Embassy. Only the Civil Society in the Penal System Association is responsible for the content of the publication, and the report in no way reflects the views of the Swedish Embassy, Sida.



Monitoring Boards Report- 2020  
Berivan Emine Korkut

Translation: Ali Rıza angırılıođlu / I.d.e.a. Proje  
Design: Tayfun Ko

Civil Society In The Penal System  
Adres: Katip Mustafa elebi Mahallesi, Billurcu Sokak,  
No:5 Daire:2 Beyođlu / İstanbul  
Telephone: 0212 293 69 82  
e-mail: info@cisst.org.tr



# **MONITORING BOARDS REPORT**

**2020**

**BERİVAN E. KORKUT**

## INTRODUCTION

In the scope of the monitoring and advocacy activities, the Civil Society in the Penal System Association (CISST) makes applications to the human rights follow-up and supervision mechanisms on the course of the requests and complaints received from the prisoners.

As an association, applications are made to various institutions, including the Ministry of Justice, General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses (CTE), Presidential Communication Centre (CİMER), Human Rights Investigation Commission of Grand Assembly (MİHİK), Human Rights and Equality Institution of Turkey (TİHEK), penal institutions, detention houses monitoring boards (hereinafter referred in the report as prison monitoring boards), and provincial and district human rights boards. In addition, considering the characteristics of the complaints received and the scope of authorities of the institutions, applications are made also to a comprehensive group covering the Ministry of Health, Turkish Medical Association (TTB), bars and consulates.

This report was prepared using our database, with a view to evaluate the applications that our association made to and the responses received from the Ministry of Justice, General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses, Presidential Communication Centre, Human Rights Investigation Commission of Grand Assembly, Human Rights and Equality Institution of Turkey, Provincial/District Human Rights Boards (İİHK) and Provincial/District Prison Monitoring Boards (CİK) between January 01, 2020 and December 31, 2020.

The losses that might arise during the transfer of the information to the database and the losses that might arise during the receipt of the responses by our association (like loss of responses in the mail) are at a minimum level that does not affect the entirety of the report and the accuracy of the data.

Since the prison monitoring boards and the provincial and district monitoring boards have the authority to enter the prisons and monitor directly, and to monitor on the basis of individual applications, the report focuses primarily on these institutions. Although MİHİK and TİHEK carry out monitoring activities on the basis of prisons and general violations, the rate of monitoring of these institutions on the basis of the individual applications made to them is low. The response evaluations of the Ministry of Justice, General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses and Presidential Communication Centre were covered less in the report, because these are non-monitoring institutions as administrative institutions, and the responses received were scarce and had similar content.

In the evaluation of the responses of the institutions other than administrative institutions, the Paris Principles,<sup>1</sup> which are considered as an important reference text for the monitoring of enclosed spaces, were taken as the basis.

---

1 <https://www.ombudsman.gov.tr/contents/files/717Paris-Prensipleri.pdf> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

## OVERVIEW

Our association made total 18,689 applications to various institutions between January 01, 2016 and December 31, 2020.

The breakdown of the applications in the last five years is below:

2036 applications in 2016

2522 applications in 2017

4986 applications in 2018

6041 applications in 2019

3104 applications in 2020

As the data above demonstrates, the number of applications increased between 2016-2019, while it decreased in 2020. In addition, the increase in the number of applications does not provide any statistical data regarding the rights violations suffered and the problems experienced by the prisoners. The number of applications is determined by the level of visibility of the association, and other factors such as the censorship mechanisms of the prisons and the retaliation concerns of the prisoners, which may affect applications by individuals. It has to be stressed that there are many different factors effecting the number of applications, and information relevant to these is not covered in this study.<sup>2</sup>

## THE APPLICATION MECHANISMS EMPLOYED BETWEEN JANUARY 01, 2020 AND DECEMBER 31, 2020

Although the number of applications by our association increased over the years, there was a significant decrease in the number of applications in 2020. The COVID-19 pandemic that began affecting the world as of March 2020, and subsequently, the precautions taken at the prisons, negatively affected the communication of the prisoners with the outside world. As it was the case for our association that communicated with the prisoners intensely by means of letters and helpline, the other non-governmental organizations also experienced significant delays in their communication with the prisoners during this period. As evident in the table below (*Table 1*), there was a significant decrease in the number of applications to our association especially in the first three months following March, when the first COVID-19 case was seen in Turkey.

---

<sup>2</sup> We recommend you to inspect the prison reports prepared by our association in order to get detailed information about the problems experienced by the prisoners: <https://cisst.org.tr/tcps-yayinlari/raporlar/> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

Application Date Range	Number of Applications
January 01, 2020 - March 31, 2020	932
April 01, 2020 - June 31, 2020	296
July 01, 2020 - September 30, 2020	1068
October 01, 2020 - December 31, 2020	808

**Table 1: CISST's number of rights violations applications in 2020**

Our association maintained communication with the relatives of the prisoners by means of the helpline, and with the prisons through the prisoners held at open penal execution institutions. The decrease in the number of letters received by our association during the initial months of the COVID-19 pandemic reflected also on the number of our applications. As emphasized before, the increase or decrease in the number of applications do not provide any statistical data regarding the rights violations suffered and the problems experienced by the prisoners.

Institution Applied	Number of Applications Made
CİK	412
İHK	397
MİHK	435
TİHEK	370
CİMER	404
AB	456
CTE	437
Other	193

**Table 2: Breakdown of CISST's rights violations applications in 2020 according to institutions**

Finally, it has to be emphasized that many institutions possessing the monitoring authority stopped direct monitoring at the prisons on the grounds of the pandemic that started in 2020. When the responses to the applications are examined in detail, it is evident that, instead of monitoring, it was contented with requesting information from the institutions that are the subject of the applications. The statements of the prisoners also affirm the observations of our association.

Although it was emphasized in the statement of principles<sup>3</sup> issued by European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) on March 20, 2020 in relation to the treatment of persons deprived of their liberty in the context

3 <https://rm.coe.int/16809e09ec> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic that “States should continue to guarantee access for monitoring bodies to all places of detention, including places where persons are kept in quarantine”, the on-site monitoring activities at the prisons in Turkey were stopped in practice (de facto) apart from a few exceptions.

## PRISON MONITORING BOARDS

Obligated by the international conventions acceded to, Turkey put into effect the “Law No: 4681 on City-based Prison Monitoring Boards”<sup>4</sup> in 2001.<sup>5</sup> In this context, the prison monitoring boards were formed by the judicial justice monitoring commissions at the provinces where the prisons are located.

In the first article of the relevant law, the aim of the prison monitoring boards was defined as “*to see on-site, inspect and get information on the administration, operation and practices of the penal institutions and detention houses, and submit its findings to the competent and relevant authorities as a report*”<sup>6</sup>. These boards are required to submit their reports periodically every four months at the latest to various institutions including the Ministry of Justice, Public Prosecutor’s Office, to the related offices of judge of execution if covered in their purview, and to the Presidency of Human Rights Investigation Commission of Grand National Assembly. Furthermore, the reports of the boards are not shared with the public, and the public and the relevant non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are not able to access the reports directly.

The monitoring boards consist of 5 permanent members and 3 reserve members, and the members are replaced every four years.<sup>7</sup> The elected members are required to have the qualifications listed in Law No. 657 on Civil Servants, as well as objective qualifications such as age, education and minimum 10 years’ professional experience, and some additional qualifications.<sup>8</sup>

In the relevant law, the election of the members was regulated as “*The members of the monitoring boards are elected ex officio from among the persons eligible as per the conditions stipulated in articles 3 and 4, or by conferring with the professional organizations that are the relevant public authorities at that place, or unanimously by the judicial justice commission from among those designated with the help of the highest administrative authority at that place and those applied directly*”.

The issues such as the time of the election for the boards, where to apply and the means of objection for the applicants not elected are obscure, and the mechanisms providing effective

---

4 <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.4681.pdf> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

5 Although the Law on Prison Monitoring Boards was amended in 2021, the amendments were not included since this report covers the year 2020.

6 <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.4681.pdf> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

7 <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2007/12/20071204-1.htm> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

8 <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.4681.pdf> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

application by individuals were not established. The obligation for the applicants to possess the qualifications for civil servants in the frame of Law No. 657 is an important factor that restricts the applications. This issue may be criticized with respect to Paris Principles. Another issue of criticism, where the memberships of all the members of the monitoring boards were annulled and it was decided to make new elections with the Statutory Decree No. 673 dated September 01, 2016, imperils the “guarantee of independence” envisaged in Paris Principles.

The matters such as the training provided for the persons working at the monitoring boards and the documents taken as basis for monitoring, the basic rules complied with for the preparation of the reports, the means for determining the rights violations observed during monitoring, and the cases defined as rights violations, are quite vague. When the details of the responses to applications were examined, it was observed that a general approach between the boards was not present and different boards gave rather different responses to the same problem, as was the case in previous years. Yet again, it was observed that the general international conventions and principles were not sufficiently considered in the responses. In case of objections to the decisions of boards, on the grounds that the boards did not carry out sufficient and effective inspections for their responses to the applications, there is an ambiguity regarding the institution/organization that the objections should be submitted.

When all the results were examined;

Years	Number of Applications
2016	378
2017	375
2018	732
2019	875
2020	412

**Table 3: CISST’s number of rights violations applications to CİK between 2016-2020**

Years	Number of Responses to Applications
2016	4
2017	21
2018	19
2019	22
2020	13

**Table 4: Number of responses to CISST’s rights violations applications to CİK between 2016-2020**

Years	Number of Violations Determined in Responses to Applications
2016	0
2017	2
2018	3
2019	1
2020	0

**Table 5: Number of violations determined in responses to CISST’s rights violations applications to CIK between 2016-2020**

Years	Number of Monitoring
2016	0
2017	19
2018	3
2019	5
2020	2

**Table 6: Number of monitoring carried out as the result of CISST’s rights violations applications between 2016-2020**

In 2020, our association made 412 applications to the prison monitoring boards. Only 13 of these applications were responded. Our association was informed that 6 applications were forwarded between institutions. As the result of the applications we made in 2020, we were informed in the responses of only 2 applications that monitoring was carried at the relevant penal institutions. In addition, when the 13 responses given to the applications made by our association were examined in detail, information was requested from the relevant institutions in only six applications and the responses were given on the course of such information. In four responses, the relevant article of the law or regulation was given as the response without any interpretation. Examining the 412 applications and the responses received, it was observed that the prison monitoring boards did not determine any rights violations regarding any of the applications.

## PROVINCIAL AND DISTRICT HUMAN RIGHTS BOARDS

In Turkey, one of the institutions with the authority to directly monitor the penal institutions is the Provincial and District Human Rights Boards. These boards, which are based on the Law No. 4643,<sup>9</sup> are established in the scope of the Regulation on the Establishment, Duties and Rules of Procedure of Provincial and District Human Rights Boards.<sup>10</sup> There are human rights boards at every province and district in Turkey, and these boards are authorized to inspect the complaints related only with public institutions.

In Article 13 of the related regulation, the function of these boards is defined as: “*The Provincial and District Boards are responsible for inspecting and researching the applications related with human rights violation claims, to evaluate the results of inspection and research, to convey the conclusions reached to the Office of Public Prosecutor or to the relevant administrative authorities according to their subject, and to follow-up the outcomes.*”

The related regulation stipulates that these boards are authorized to inspect and resolve the claims of violation submitted to them. However, the said regulation does not grant the boards the authority to suggest direct sanctions regarding the applications inspected by them. The board may only submit their non-binding suggestions to the Office of Public Prosecutor or to the relevant administrative authorities. They do not possess the authority to implement such suggestions, or to have them implemented.

When considered with respect to Paris Principles, the independence of the structure of these boards is also controversial. The boards are chaired by the governor or deputy governor, and in case that such appointment is not made, by the metropolitan mayor or deputy mayor at metropolitan municipalities and by the mayor or deputy mayor at other provinces.

The right of the professional organizations such as Bars, Medical Associations and Chamber of Industry and Commerce to appoint a representative is the main positive aspect for these boards. The NGOs and civil actors other than these may also apply to be appointed at the boards, but appointment of these individuals is under the initiative of the administrative authorities. The precondition “a representative to be determined by the office of the governor” in the regulation is one of the unacceptable aspects with respect to Paris Principles.

The matters such as the time of the elections for the boards, the criteria and conditions for application, and the criteria to be employed by the administrative authority are not adequately defined in the regulation. Similarly, the means of objection for the board candidates, whose applications were not accepted by the administrative authority, and the criteria for election are also obscure.

---

9 <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/6635.pdf> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

10 <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2003/11/20031123.htm> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

The section in Article 10 of the regulation, concerning the precautions to be taken to facilitate the access of individuals, stipulates the installation of “Human Rights Application Boxes” “at all public institutions and organizations”, yet in practice, “Human Rights Application Boxes” are not installed at penal institutions.

Although it is stated in the regulation that these boards have monitoring authority, the issues such as the basic principles for such monitoring and the points to be considered are rather obscure. Again, as is the case for prison monitoring boards, the reports of the provincial human rights boards are not accessible for the non-governmental organizations when they are forwarded to the relevant administrative units.

Years	Number of Applications
2016	389
2017	391
2018	663
2019	876
2020	397

**Table 7: CISST’s number of rights violations applications to İHK between 2016-2020**

Years	Number of Responses to Applications
2016	91
2017	86
2018	114
2019	139
2020	50

**Table 8: Number of responses to CISST’s rights violations applications to İHK between 2016-2020**

Years	Number of Violations Determined in Responses to Applications
2016	1
2017	5
2018	1
2019	2
2020	3

**Table 9: Number of violations determined in responses to CISST’s rights violations applications to İHK between 2016-2020**

Years	Number of Monitoring
2016	9
2017	15
2018	10
2019	3
2020	4

**Table 10: Number of monitoring carried out as the result of CISST’s rights violations applications between 2016-2020**

In 2020, our association made 397 applications to the Provincial and District Human Rights Boards. As a result, 50 applications were evaluated by the board and written responses were given to our association. We were informed that monitoring was carried out for only 4 applications among these 50 applications. 15 of these responses to applications were prepared on the course of the responses received from other administrative institutions (such as CTE, Ministry of Justice, Offices of Public Prosecutor and Penal Institution Administrations), and in 23 responses, the relevant clause of the law was annexed to the response to application and forwarded to our association. After 397 applications made, the Provincial and District Human Rights Boards determined only 4 violations.

Although paragraphs (h), (i) and (j) of Article 12 of the related regulation, in which the duties and authorities of the boards are defined, cover the supervision of the custodial jails and making recommendations regarding this matter, the other closed institutions - for example prisons - are not included in this definition. In practice, this adds to the confusion of the boards regarding the prisons, and some boards do not accept the applications related with prisons although they are authorized to do so. However, since paragraph (f) of the same article of the regulation states that “*Make visits to the related institutions and organizations in order to see the human rights practices on-site*”, we believe that this distinction was made to emphasize that the custodial jails are also covered, rather than to argue that the prisons are not covered.

Although covered in their scope of authority, 38 of 397 applications made to provincial and district human rights boards by our association were forwarded to different institutions such as CİK or the relevant Public Prosecutor Offices without being investigated, with a note stating “the penal institutions were not covered in their scope of authority”.

## HUMAN RIGHTS INVESTIGATION COMMISSION OF GRAND ASSEMBLY

The Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TBMM) also has the authority to supervise and monitor the penal institutions. The members of TBMM have the authority to visit, without advance notice, the penal institutions, and the prisoners other than those covered in the scope of Anti-Terror Law.<sup>11</sup>

This supervision may also be achieved by means of parliamentary questions and parliamentary inquiries.<sup>12</sup> Another way of supervision is the Human Rights Investigation Commission established within the structure of TBMM with Law No. 3686<sup>13</sup> dated December 05, 1990, and the Commission for Rights of Prisoners on Remand and Convicts,<sup>14</sup> which is a sub-commission affiliated to the above-mentioned commission.

These commissions have the right and the responsibility to investigate the applications received from the prisoners at penal institutions and from the related NGOs. When inspecting the complaints it received, the Commission has the authority to demand information and documents and to request investigations from the Ministry of Justice and General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses. In addition, it also has the authority to visit the penal institution and to monitor on-site, to talk with the prisoners and to inspect the physical conditions of the institution.

When the data pertaining to the period between January 01, 2016 and December 31, 2020 and the reports issued by MİHİK are inspected, it is evident that the commission has the tendency to monitor, albeit limited, the general human rights and the general conditions of the prisons, but it does not have the tendency to monitor or to evaluate the situation in case of individual applications. Although there were various discussions at the commission regarding this matter, there was no positive development in 2020.<sup>15</sup> Again, when the minutes of meeting are inspected, it was stated that 6093 applications were made to MİHİK in 27th Legislative Session as of October 12, 2020, and 4767 of these were related with penal institutions.<sup>16</sup> In the statement of the commission, it was also noted that necessary action was taken in relation with 5825 applications, but detailed information regarding these actions and the steps for solving the problems was not provided.

---

11 <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuat?MevzuatNo=8345&MevzuatTur=7&MevzuatTertip=5> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

12 <http://www.anayasa.gen.tr/tbmmictuzuk.htm> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

13 <https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/komisyonsan/haklari/kanun.htm> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

14 <https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/develop/owa/komisyonsan/haklari.mvgoruntule?pTutanakId=36584> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

15 <https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/develop/owa/komisyonsan/haklari.goruntule?pTutanakId=2540> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

16 <https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/develop/owa/komisyonsan/haklari.goruntule?pTutanakId=2576> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

Years	Number of Applications
2016	370
2017	421
2018	677
2019	875
2020	435

**Table 11: CISST’s number of rights violations applications to MĪHĪK between 2016-2020**

Years	Number of Responses to Applications
2016	42
2017	48
2018	49
2019	33
2020	23

**Table 12: Number of responses to CISST’s rights violations applications to MĪHĪK between 2016-2020**

Our association received information and documents stating that only 23 of the 435 applications, which we made between January 01, 2020 and December 31, 2020, were processed. It was stated that 11 of these applications were forwarded to the related institutions, but our association was not informed about the result of and the responses to these forwarded applications. When these responses are inspected, it is evident that on-site monitoring was not carried out, the views of the prisoners were not asked, and the documents and the image recordings at the institutions were not inspected.

We did not receive any response to application, stating that MĪHĪK or the affiliated sub-commission for rights of prisoners on remand and convicts carried out any direct monitoring upon our applications. Judging by the data above, it is possible to claim that MĪHĪK has the tendency to forward the applications to the Ministry of Justice, CTE and the related Offices of Public Prosecutor rather than visiting the prisons and carrying out monitoring or investigation in relation with the human rights applications made by means of our association. In addition, in relation to the prison visits carried out intermittently (but not on the basis of individual applications), it is evident in the minutes of meeting of the commission that the volume of the applications made to the commission is considered for the selection of the prisons to be visited.

## HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY INSTITUTION OF TURKEY

Human Rights Institution of Turkey was established on June 21, 2012 in the scope of Law No. 6332,<sup>17</sup> but it was abolished and replaced with Human Rights and Equality Institution of Turkey on April 20, 2016 with the Law No. 6701<sup>18</sup>. TİHEK, “*is tasked with effectively struggling against torture and ill-treatment, and functioning as the national prevention mechanism (NPM) in this matter, as well as protecting and enhancing the human rights on the basis of human dignity, ensuring the equal treatment right of individuals, and preventing discrimination in exercising the legally granted rights and freedoms.*”<sup>19</sup>

As per paragraph (i) of Article 9 of the Law, TİHEK is authorized, as the national prevention mechanism, to inspect, investigate, resolve on and follow the results of the applications of the individuals deprived of their liberty or put under protection.

When evaluated on the basis of Paris Principles, it is possible to state that TİHEK, which is a national prevention mechanism, has numerous structural problems. Considering the basic criteria such as the establishment structure, the way of election of the members and the economic independence of the institution, we can state that TİHEK, as a national prevention mechanism, is not in compliance with Paris Principles and has disputable independence. Our association applies to TİHEK to “use its authority to visit and investigate ex officio as the national prevention mechanism as per the Optional Protocol to the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT)”. In 2020, only one application, among 370 applications made by our association, was directly responded by the institution.

Years	Number of Applications
2016	67
2017	215
2018	532
2019	739
2020	370

**Table 13: CISST’s number of rights violations applications to TİHEK between 2016-2020**

17 <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2012/06/20120630-2.htm> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

18 <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.6701.pdf> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

19 <https://www.tihkek.gov.tr/ulusal-onleme-mekanizmasi/> (Accessed on: August 15, 2021)

## PRESIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION CENTRE

BIMER (Prime Ministry Communication Centre) was established in 2006 under the Prime Ministry, and upon abolishment of the office of Prime Minister, it continued its activities as CIMER (Presidential Communication Centre).

We are regularly applying CIMER in relation with all the complaints received by our association. In 2020, our association made 404 applications to CIMER and only 20 of these applications were responded. Investigation and inspection were carried out and our association was informed for only 7 of these applications. For other responses other than these applications, CIMER often contented with the response “your application is being processed”. The information such as the owner of the application being processed, the name of the applicant, the application number, etc. are not indicated. In addition, the file number assigned to the applicant institution during processing is also not indicated. Even though the applicant institution is not given the file number, the responses are given according to the file number. It is not possible for our association to know the file numbers assigned by CIMER since the applications are submitted via fax, therefore it is quite difficult to keep records of the applications to which the forwarded and processed responses belong.

Years	Number of Applications
2016	20
2017	200
2018	661
2019	802
2020	404

**Table 14: CISST’s number of rights violations applications to BIMER and CIMER between 2016-2020**

## MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AND GENERAL DIRECTORATE OF PRISONS AND DETENTION HOUSES

The penal institutions are administratively affiliated to the Ministry of Justice, and to General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses, which is a general directorate affiliated to the Ministry. Since all transactions related with the penal institutions and the prisoners at such institutions are covered under the authority of CTE and the Ministry of Justice, the applications related with the complaints received from the prisoners are made to these institutions. Since CTE is under the structure of Ministry of Justice, the applications made to the Ministry are forwarded directly to CTE, even if separate applications are made to both institutions.

Years	Number of Applications
2016	392
2017	417
2018	764
2019	889
2020	456

**Table 15: CISST's number of rights violations applications to Ministry of Justice between 2016-2020**

Years	Number of Responses to Applications
2016	4
2017	6
2018	0
2019	6
2020	2

**Table 16: Number of responses to CISST's rights violations applications to Ministry of Justice between 2016-2020**

Years	Number of Applications
2016	391
2017	421
2018	692
2019	810
2020	437

**Table 17: CISST's number of rights violations applications to CTE between 2016-2020**

Years	Number of Responses to Applications
2016	145
2017	214
2018	243
2019	33
2020	4

**Table 18: Number of responses to CISST’s rights violations applications to CTE between 2016-2020**

CTE generally informs the prisoners directly in relation with the applications to CTE by our association. In cases where responses are forwarded to our association, such responses do not contain any information, but state that the prisoner for whom the application was made is informed.

This makes it difficult for us to get sufficient information about the results of the application, to follow the process, and to obtain accurate information about how the applications were concluded. The Ministry of Justice also informs the prisoner directly and carries out transactions, instead of informing our association about the applications we made.

## **CONCLUSION**

With respect to non-governmental organizations, the responsibility of the boards mentioned in the report regarding the prisons becomes more important, since rights-based monitoring has not been carried out at Turkish prisons for a long time. The effect of these boards in the field in the context of human rights is very important for CISST, which is one of the organizations that use the application mechanisms most actively. Since the applied institutions do not share the number and the results of the applications, it is not possible to make a more detailed reporting and evaluation regarding this matter. In order to fulfil this need, this report was prepared despite all such restrictions, and for the institutions to share transparent reports with the public when executing their processes. Although the report does not provide general information with respect to the application mechanisms and the responses received, it is important since it constitutes a sample. When the responses to the applications and the contents of these responses are inspected, it is clear that the mechanisms are not independent and lack on-site monitoring feature, that the same board structure has different forms at different judicial areas and provinces, and that the concerned persons are not informed in an objective and detailed manner regarding any rights violation or claim of rights violation. All these are important data that indicates the efficiency of the application mechanisms should be improved.

## **TABLES**

### **Monitoring Boards Report**

- Number of Applications
- Prison Monitoring Boards
- Provincial and District Human Rights Boards
- Human Rights Investigation Commission of Grand Assembly
- Human Rights and Equality Institution of Turkey
- Presidential Communication Centre
- Ministry of Justice
- General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses
- Breakdown of rights violation applications according to the institutions
- Breakdown of responses to rights violation applications according to the institutions

### **Prison Monitoring Boards**

- Application
- Response
- Violations determined
- Monitoring
- CISST's number of rights violations applications to CİK between 2016-2020 - number of responses received
- Examining the 412 applications made by CISST and the responses received; it was observed that the prison monitoring boards did not determine any rights violations regarding any of the applications.

### **Provincial and District Human Rights Boards**

- Application
- Response
- Violations determined
- Monitoring
- CISST's number of rights violations applications to İİHK between 2016-2020 - number of responses received
- In 2020, our association made 397 applications to the Provincial and District Human Rights Boards. As a result, 50 applications were evaluated by the board and written responses were given to our association. We were informed that monitoring was carried out for only 4 applications among these 50 applications.

### **Human Rights Investigation Commission of Grand Assembly**

- Application
- Response
- CISST's number of rights violations applications to MİHİK between 2016-2020 - number of responses received
- Our association received information and documents stating that only 23 of the 435 applications, which we made in 2020, were processed. It was stated that 11 of these applications were forwarded to the related institutions, but our association was not informed about the result of and the responses to these forwarded applications.

### **Human Rights and Equality Institution of Turkey**

- Application
- Response
- CISST'S number of rights violation applications to TİHİK between 2016-2020
- In 2020, only one application, among 370 applications made by our association, was directly responded by the institution.

### **Ministry of Justice**

- Application
- Response
- CISST'S number of rights violation applications to Ministry of Justice between 2016-2020

### **General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses**

- Application
- Response
- CISST'S number of rights violation applications to CTE between 2016-2020

