

TORTURING ENVIRONMENT SCALE

ESCALA DE ENTORNOS DE TORTURA

PAU PEREZ-SALES

TORTURING ENVIRONMENT SCALE (TES)

Autor: Prof. Pau Pérez-Sales.

Contacto: pauperez@arrakis.es

TORTURING ENVIRONMENT SCALE (TES)	1
1. Rationale.....	2
2. Description.....	2
3. Instructions.....	4
4. Measuring impact.....	5
5. The Torturing Environment Scale	7
6. Scoring and interpretation of results.....	17
7. Example of application	20
8. Examples of profiles of torturing environments.....	26
9. Further steps: from torturing environments to psychological torture	38
10. Torturing environments and the documentation of torture	38
ESCALA DE ENTORNOS DE TORTURA – [VERSIÓN EN CASTELLANO]	39

The idea of torturing environments and the possibility of measuring them is a major shift in the contemporary conceptualization of torture. It provides a multifaceted and comprehensive way to face the problem of determining the existence of torture in general (and psychological torture in particular) and the conditions that promote it, based on a conceptual model that supports the construction and development of the TES.

Currently no tool exists to help visualize the combined effects of torturing methods. The TES meets this need. The model is based on defining which human function is under attack, and grouping torture methods accordingly using a teleological approach (that is, organizing methods according to a finite number of purposes—the intended impact they have on the person).

The scale can measure both *environments* and *experiences* related to torture. The TES is not a scale to assess psychological torture, as torture and psychological torture are two sides of the same coin and should not be considered as separate phenomena. It is a scale to assess torture from a comprehensive point of view that includes physical and psychological torture. The two are inextricable and part of the same process. The TES measures environments and experiences of torture.

The TES is not intended to quantify torture- or to measure the severity of suffering; neither of these things can be measured, because, as we have shown, each victim's

experience is unique. Its aim is to serve as a guide for independent observers (e.g., decision-makers, judges, forensic experts, mental health professionals, researchers), by providing a comprehensive checklist of the main indicators of torture experiences or torturing environments. Based on this list, it is possible to determine the likelihood that a person has suffered torture. Additionally it is possible to define profiles of torturing scenarios. The TES does not distinguish between CIDT and torture. This is a legal distinction that depends upon the law code applied. But provides strong arguments to the juridical operators that must qualify the events.

1. RATIONALE

The TES provides an overview of risk factors for torture. The analysis focuses on conditions in the ethical, legal, medical, psychological, and sociological contexts which offer a comprehensive view of a situation that is liable to constitute torture. Some indicators require the evaluator to acquire an emphatic and thorough understanding of the victim's experience. Other indicators can be evaluated based only on the narrative and testimony. The TES cannot be filled out as a simple questionnaire in the same way that a self-reported questionnaire would be, and no questions are posed directly to the survivor. The TES is best filled out after establishing trust and getting to know each other, or after a visit to monitor detention conditions. Though ideally the TES would complement an evaluation based on the Istanbul Protocol, its structure allows a preliminary analysis pending further information.

The TES can also be applied as a collective measurement tool. In this sense its purpose would not be to assess the situation of a given person, but to provide an analysis of the conditions of a certain environment where people are held in custody. The TES can be a useful adjunctive tool for monitoring detention centers and reinforcing the work of National Prevention Mechanisms and NGOs.

2. DESCRIPTION

The TES does not need to be completed in a single interview. It is an open tool: information can be added in successive meetings as the evaluator gains knowledge of the person, the environment, and the events.

It has 54 indicators of torture, 6 legal indicators and 12 medical and psychological corroborating elements.

ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENT: ACTIONS TARGETING THE SURVIVOR'S BODY AND PSYCHE

The TES looks at eight different blocks or groups of indicators: **Contextual Manipulations** are attacks on basic physiological functions and environmental changes that would disrupt the person's homeostasis: inhuman conditions of detention, sensory deprivation, restricting basic physiological functions, the use of time for

generating confusion and anguish, and manipulation of environmental conditions. These types of manipulations relate to Biderman's (1961) "monopolization of attention" concept and the CIA KUBARK Manual's concept of "forced absorption." **Fear-producing actions** target the need for security and preservation of life (threats of torture, threats to relatives, witnessing the torture of others, phobias, and terror); **Pain producing actions** are attacks on the physical integrity of the person. These are distinguished from **Extreme pain – Mutilation – Death** as suggested by most of the factorial analysis on methods of torture available (Başoğlu, 2009; Phillips, 2011). **Actions against sexual integrity** is considered a specific, separate category, as shown in both the experience of survivors and factorial analysis of torture methods (Cunningham & Cunningham, (1997), Hooberman et al., (2007), Başoğlu (2009), Phillips (2011)). **Actions targeting the need to belong** include indicators related to isolation and breaking of ties (e.g., prolonged solitary confinement, incommunicado detention, cultural confinement (Koenig, 2013)). **Actions targeting identity** are elements that target the need for respect and dignity, question the inner sense of self, and provoke humiliation or shame. **Coercive interrogation techniques** involve actions targeting understanding and control; this category specifically evaluates the presence of harsh interrogation techniques. For each Block there are groups of torture methods organized teleologically (based on their function) within the overall torturing environment.

All of the blocks are open ended; the TES does not seek to define a limited or comprehensive set of torture methods, but rather classifies these methods according to their aims, or *targets*. We have seen that torture techniques are as infinite as the imagination of torturers. However, the number of targets *is* limited and can be properly defined.

There are six indicators related to **Legal aspects**. Three indicators are criteria in the UNCAT definition of torture; the other two (the existence of a torturing system, and the demand for application of the exclusionary rule) are additional elements that signal the possible presence of torture from a legal point of view. Sometimes, even if a case does not fully fit the UNCAT definition, a court will rule that the case amounted to torture based on legal precedents. This is collected in the sixth indicator.

MEDICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL INDICATORS

The TES also has a list of additional corroborating items organized under **Medical and psychological indicators**. These would likely fall outside the area of expertise of an assessor who is not a mental health professional. We refer to them as corroborating items because their presence supports the idea of torture, but their absence does not exclude torture—indeed, such absence may simply mean one is working with a resilient survivor. Some involve clinical diagnoses (PTSD/Complex PTSD) that require the evaluation of a trained clinician.

We suggest that the TES be complemented with the Standardized Evaluation Form for an Assessment of Credibility based on the Istanbul Protocol (SEF-IP). This is a tool that should be used by a trained interviewer. It provides guidelines and criteria for the credibility analysis that a psychiatric forensic expert conducts based on the Istanbul Protocol.¹

3. INSTRUCTIONS

The person who is doing the assessment selects the most appropriate of three options: *No*, *Circumstantial or Limited (C-L)*, or *Yes*:

Column 1. NO. Mark *No* when it is possible to reasonably ascertain that the indicator has not happened to the person (individual measure) or has never been documented in that location (collective measure). Leave it blank if there is *No Information Available (NIA)* and needs further clarification.

Column 2. C-L. *Present, but Circumstantial or Limited.* Mark *CC-LM* if the indicator has eventually appeared but it was not part of a systematic attack or one of the core techniques applied to the survivor. This is not a measure of the intensity of suffering, but a modulated assessment of the intensity and systematicity of the aggression.² For instance, a person may recall that he or she was treated in a humiliating way by a specific guard, but he or she felt that in general he or she was treated with respect during most of his detention; or a person may recall that while being detained during a demonstration, he or she was violently handcuffed and was repeatedly slapped by the police while being forced into a car. He or she recalls this, but does not attribute much importance to it and it has no physical or psychological consequences.

Column 3. YES. Mark *Yes* to signal the clear and consistent presence of the indicator according to the survivor's account. This is the core column of the TES. The allegations must be credible, and it is best to adopt a conservative approach to inconsistent statements (see Chapter 18 for more on credibility analysis in allegations of torture).

Sometimes there is a strong suspicion that the indicator happened. A survivor often needs time to open up and talk.³ Decisive elements of the experience of torture may appear a long time after disclosure or after therapy was initiated.⁴ It is not uncommon

¹ Istanbul Protocol, Paragraphs 141–143.

² In fieldwork with preliminary versions of the TES, the main source of doubt was the intensity of the indicator necessary to consider that it was present. This led to the inclusion of this column.

³ Often the best forensic expert is the survivor's own therapist, because it can take months, and sometimes years, to remember, organize, and be able to express everything that happened.

⁴ There are many explanations for this. Survivors may say, for example: "I never found the right time to bring it up," or "you asked, but I felt it was unimportant," or, "it was too painful at the time," or even

that the survivor has difficulty putting words to suffering. Feelings of shame or guilt, cultural factors, fragmented memories, or dissociative states may prevent the person from describing the events clearly and thoroughly.

In exceptional cases, the person doing the assessment can mark *Yes* to signal the presence of the indicator if he or she:

- (a) has *very* strong grounds to believe that the indicator of torture is present; and
- (b) has marked at least 2 of the 12 corroborating medical or psychological indicators (in Part 2 of the TES) which he or she thinks relate to the torture indicator suspected to be present.

For example, one might strongly suspect the presence of Actions Targeting Sexual Integrity in a case involving a woman with mutism, severe depressive symptoms (corroborating elements 1, 2, and 9), and marks on her body, who was held in a detention camp where most women in her barracks were raped.

Note that the criteria to choose one indicator or another is the role of a certain action within the overall process of torture. For instance, *denying medical attention* when needed can be considered part of *inhuman conditions of detention* if denied regular attention (indicator 1), as a *pain-producing action*, if denied analgesia or treatment of a severe addiction in a drug addict (indicator 20), or even as *mutilation* if denial of medical attention results in the loss of a body part (indicator 27). *Forced feeding* of a prisoner can be a humiliating and debasing treatment (indicator 37), a pain-producing action (indicator 20), or an expression of absolute deprivation of will (indicator 45). The evaluator will mark only one by choosing the option that best reflects the overall torturing environment.

Many indicators include an additional bullet point for techniques or methods not included in the scale, and all subscales also have an additional point for actions not included in the available list of options. The TES is, in this sense, a living scale that can be adjusted to any context involving torture.

4. MEASURING IMPACT

Column 4. Impact. Additionally, the TES includes a column to measure *Impact*. It should be marked when the indicator has great importance in the narrative of the survivor and is remembered as especially devastating. *Impact* is a key element for understanding the experience of the survivor. This column can be used to include a subjective evaluation of the contribution of a given indicator to the understanding of the sequelae in the survivor. *Impact* is related to the subjective perception of the

have confusing memories (“I was not sure that my memories were true because everything was so confusing, but now I’ve recalled images and became a bit more sure of what happened to me).”

survivor's experience, not to objective measurements of the severity of the situation (e.g., the number of days of continuous interrogation). For instance, a person might explain in his or her account that being naked in public was the most heinous and painful element of the experience, even more than being mistreated or beaten. For others, the indicator with maximum impact may have been the threat of rape against relatives or loved ones. Highlighting *Impact* allows the evaluator to quickly detect the key elements of a torturing environment in a given population and helps to understand the deeper experience of survivors. In many cases we may not have access to such intimate information; in such cases the column is left blank.

Excerpts from a survivor's narrative are included at the end of this chapter. We invite the reader to practice filling out the TES based on this narrative. You will likely discover that the survivor underwent many situations that are part of a Torturing Environment, but the experience she recognizes as having affected her the most is probably not the one that the evaluator would have selected without taking *Impact* into consideration.⁵ Thus, the "Impact" column in the TES highlights the importance of a particular indicator within the overall effect of the torturing environment from the point of view of the observer after working with the survivor⁶.

Sometimes it will be possible to connect the indicators that were more damaging in the victim's *subjective experience* with certain aspects of torture that were pre-planned and tailored to attack central aspects of the victim's identity. This would strongly support the motivational criteria that distinguishes CIDT from torture.

⁵ It was not the extremely harsh conditions, the beatings, the stress positions and exhausting exercises, the nakedness, humiliation, sexual harassment, threats of rape, or even the guilt associated with giving false information that incriminated others in order to escape torture. The experience she identifies as having affected her the most was a seemingly endless moment when she was subjected—as she had been previously—to dry asphyxia with "la bolsa" (the bag); but one day she was wrapped in a blanket and put on a table with her head hanging in a position from which she could not defend herself. She had been able to rationalize aspects related to shame and guilt, but this experience of *absolute lack of control* and being completely at the mercy of the interrogators was her breaking point. It will remain in her memory forever. Neither a checklist, nor an assessment of the "severity" of a technique (for example, as part of an objective assessment of the threat to life or supposed pain) would have detected this.

⁶ The idea of Impact is connected to one of the indicators proposed by Crampton and Rodley (2013): the significance of the technique of psychological maltreatment for the victim. They studied the Estrella v. Uruguay case, in which the Inter-American Court ruled that psychological torture had occurred when Mr. Estrella, a famous Argentine pianist, was threatened with having his hands irreversibly injured. They also included the example of rape in the context of ethnic cleansing and the unique, severe psychological significance it has for the victim. When Crampton and Rodley proposed "significance" as a criterion for identifying torture, they focused on how torture targets elements that are key to the identity of the person. This is what the fifth column of the TES reveals.

5. THE TORTURING ENVIRONMENT SCALE

Torturing Environment Scale - TES

<p>Choose the best option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No presence of indicator: Mark <i>0</i> under <i>NO</i> • Present, but Circumstantial or Limited: Mark <i>1</i> under <i>Cc-Lm</i> • Presence of indicator or Strongly Suspected: Mark <i>2</i> under <i>Yes</i> • Additionally: Mark <i>X</i> under <i>I (Impact)</i> if indicator caused significant impact 					
PART 1. Assessment of Environment					
Torturing Environment Scale (TES)					
		NO	Cc-Lm	YES	I
Contextual manipulations		Select			
1	a. Inhuman conditions of detention according to international standards (e.g., Cell size and conditions, Overcrowding, Lack of hygiene)				
2	b. Manipulation of environmental conditions (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> Temperature (heat/cold) <input type="checkbox"/> Humidity <input type="checkbox"/> Noise, white noise, music <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent bright light <input type="checkbox"/> Others:				
3	c. Altering basic physiological functions (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> Starvation <input type="checkbox"/> Thirst <input type="checkbox"/> Restricting urination/defecation <input type="checkbox"/> Others:				
4	d. Sleep dysregulation (e.g., deprivation, shifting hours)				
5	e. Manipulating sense of time				
6	f. Partial deprivation of senses/disorientation (e.g., blindfolds, earmuffs, hooding)				
7	g. Medical induction of altered states/mind-altering methods <input type="checkbox"/> Use of drugs/pharmacological torture <input type="checkbox"/> White noise, visual or kinetic manipulations <input type="checkbox"/> White or monochrome environments <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Complete</i> sensory isolation Others:				
8	Other contextual manipulations. Specify:				
Fear		NO	Cc-Lm	YES	I
9	a. Manipulation of hopes and expectations to produce extreme fear or terror (e.g., inducing helplessness; denying information; grotesque, absurd, illogical or terrorizing environments; constructing				

	scenarios; creating expectations of pain or death; prolonged waiting or silence)				
10	b. Threats against the person (e.g., endless isolation, endless interrogation, rape, pain, torture, death)				
11	c. Threats against family or relatives (next-of-kin) (e.g., rape, detention, punishment, retaliation), or threats against other detainees				
12	d. Anguish associated with lack of information (e.g., relatives of people detained/disappeared)				
13	e. Experiences of near death (e.g., mock executions, dry/wet asphyxia...)				
14	f. Forced witnessing of others' torture or death				
15	g. Use of situations evoking insurmountable fear (e.g., phobias, total darkness)				
16	h. Other situations provoking fear or terror. Specify:				
Physical Pain		NO	Cc-Lm	YES	I
17	a. Blunt trauma (specify) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Punches, kicks, slaps; Blows with sticks, falaqa <input type="checkbox"/> "Clean" whipping / flagellation, beating with wires or truncheons <input type="checkbox"/> Beatings over the ears with closed hands, eyeball press <input type="checkbox"/> Being thrown/dragged/shaken <input type="checkbox"/> Other: 				
18	b. Forced battles against oneself. Forced self-induced pain (specify) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Positional torture: suspension, hanging <input type="checkbox"/> Stretching body/limbs <input type="checkbox"/> Prolonged constraint of movement, sweatboxes, coffins, blackholes, straitjackets, ties <input type="checkbox"/> Forced to stand, sit or kneel for hours; chair tortures <input type="checkbox"/> Forced to stand under heavy sun, ice, strong electric light <input type="checkbox"/> Other: 				
19	c. Exhaustion exercises <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Forced running, military training, drilling <input type="checkbox"/> Step-ups, knee bends, push-ups, squats, crunches <input type="checkbox"/> Other: 				
20	d. Other pain-producing actions not included in the methods that produce mutilation or extreme pain. Specify:				
Extreme Pain - Mutilation - Death		NO	Cc-Lm	YES	I
21	a. Devices that produce excruciating pain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Burns with cigarettes, heated instruments, scalding liquid, or caustic substances 				

	<input type="checkbox"/> Cuts with knives, blades, or other sharp objects <input type="checkbox"/> Electric shocks (e.g., electric prod or “picana,” dinamos, electrical wires, electroshock weapons (batons, rifles and guns (tasers), stun belts) <input type="checkbox"/> Dry and Wet Asphyxia, suffocation, strangulation <input type="checkbox"/> Chemical exposure to salt, chili pepper, gasoline, etc. (in wounds or body cavities) <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanical devices that produce extreme pain (e.g., wooden horse (“caballete”), parrot’s perch, standing on sharp objects) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:				
22	b. Mutilation <input type="checkbox"/> Crush injury, smashing parts of the body <input type="checkbox"/> Disfigurement <input type="checkbox"/> Traumatic removal of skin, digits, nails, teeth, hair, ears <input type="checkbox"/> Amputation, surgical removal of organs, dismemberment <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent organ damage, ischemia <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent penetrating injuries, such as sticks with nails or spikes, stab or gunshot wounds, hard whipping <input type="checkbox"/> Mutilation by insects (e.g., worms, ants, bees) or animals (e.g., dogs, rats) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:				
23	c. Brain Damage <input type="checkbox"/> Open head wounds <input type="checkbox"/> Severe brain contusions, loss of consciousness due to repeated traumatic head injuries <input type="checkbox"/> Non-medical electroconvulsive therapy, insulin therapy, or other physical or chemical direct attacks on the brain (excluding pharmacological torture) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:				
24	d. Other actions producing extreme pain, mutilation, or death. Specify:				
	Sexual Integrity	NO	Cc-Lm	YES	I
25	a. Humiliation related to sexual identity (e.g., forced nakedness, debasing treatment targeting sexual characteristics or sexual orientation),				
26	b. Sexual assault (including violent acts targeting genitals)				
27	c. Rape				
28	d. Other actions targeting sexual integrity. Specify:				
	Need to belong	NO	Cc-Lm	YES	I
29	a. Prolonged solitary confinement [more than 15 days]				
30	b. Incommunicado detention				

31	c. Breaking social bonds/isolation from family, social, cultural, political networks				
32	d. Other actions targeting the need to belong. Specify:				
Identity (breaking/installing new identity)		NO	Cc-Lm	YES	I
33	a. Attacks on sense of self (e.g., forcing detainee to break with his or her past/identity, questioning basic values, breaking worldviews)				
34	b. Induced submission and compliance (e.g., changing rules, trivial orders, random punishment or rewards, "testing" loyalty)				
35	c. Manipulation of affect (e.g., actions encouraging traumatic bonding with the torturer, ambivalence feelings of love/care and hate/rejection, occasional discretionary favors, rewards for compliance)				
36	d. Instilling guilt, (e.g., detainee forced to harm others; forced choices such as deciding who's next to die; forcing betrayal)				
37	e. Induced shame/humiliation (e.g., debasement based on physical appearance, forced to perform humiliating acts, being exhibited in public, feral treatment, preventing personal hygiene, debasement based on ethnic or cultural background)				
38	f. Violation of taboos (i.e., coerced actions that go against the person's moral principles)				
39	g. Installing goals and identity (e.g., forced to adopt new values and a new sense of meaning, pushed into a grafted identity)				
40	h. Other actions targeting identity. Specify:				
Coercive Interrogation Techniques		NO	Cc-Lm	YES	I
41	a. Extreme conditions during interrogation (e.g., oppressive or intimidating setting, night interrogation, disruption of sleep, prolonged and exhausting interrogations or continuous interrogation for several days, interrogation combined with elements that produce confusion (e.g., beatings to the head, strenuous physical exercise, asphyxia)				
42	b. Emotional conditions of interrogation that foster false confessions: provoking extreme emotions or emotional exhaustion, for example, omnipotence, omniscience (showing absolute power over the body and fate of the detainee during interrogation), maximization (exaggerating evidence, data, responsibility, or guilt), minimization (alleviating responsibility, providing justifications or excuses), threats for not confessing, use of personal information to break the self				
43	c. Cognitive conditions of interrogation that foster false confessions: lies or deliberate deception (e.g., direct accusations with false, fabricated, or unsubstantiated evidence; false or deceptive information regarding family, detention site, or interrogators; use of false witnesses; offering leniency or rewards for cooperation);				

	cognitive manipulation or cognitive exhaustion (e.g., forced choices between two incriminating options, contradictory and confusing messages, prisoner's dilemma, role-playing such as good cop/bad cop, manipulation of detainees' words)				
44	d. Other extreme coercive actions to intimidate, obtain information, or force self-incrimination. Specify:				

Part 2. Manner of interaction – Indicators of a torturing environment

	Relational indicators	NO	Cc-Lm	YES	I
45	a. Person completely deprived of will (the individual freedom that requires reflection and conscious choice)				
46	b. Violation of autonomy , expressed in the absolute power and imposing control of the perpetrator and the lack of control and helplessness of the victim				
47	c. The situation fosters unpredictability (e.g., no restraints on time or location, no one knows where the detainee is held, uncertain or vague accusations, abrupt changes in rules or scenarios)				
48	d. Systematic violation of dignity ; Lack of recognition and respect for the victim as a human being				
49	e. Torture designed and planned as a personalized process (torture tailored to the subject's characteristics and identity)				
50	f. Signs of evil or extreme cruelty in the torture process				
51	g. Increased vulnerability associated with age (e.g., victim is a child, elder), gender and sexuality (e.g., victim is a woman, LGBTI), ethnic group, or other factors				
52	h. Forcing the victim to play an active role in his or her own suffering and fighting against his or her own body and self (e.g., prolonged stress positions, prolonged impediments to physiological functions)				
53	i. Physical and or mental harm is prolonged or repeated over a period of time				
54	j. Other relational factors. Specify:				

Part 3. Legal Criteria

Legal criteria	NO	YES
1. The interviewee was in the custody of or under the physical control of institutional agents.		
2. There are legal cases, testimonies, documentation, or other contextual information that provides grounds to suspect that this treatment is part of a state policy (<i>torturing system</i> criteria).		
3. There is a clear purpose or motivation related to obtaining information or a confession.		
4. There are grounds to think that the main purpose of ill-treatment was punishment, humiliation, or revenge against the detainee or the group he or she represents.		
5. The subject rejects the statements made during his or her detention and claims that he or she gave those statements because of ill-treatment (Detainee demands <i>Exclusionary Rule</i>).		
6. There are legal precedents of similar cases considered to amount to torture.		

PART 4. Medico-Psychological Criteria⁷

The presence of one or more of the following indicators *supports the idea of a torturing environment or a torturing situation*. The absence of these indicators does not preclude the existence of a torturing environment, and may indicate physical or psychological resilience. Please check the appropriate box.

	NO	YES
Medical and Psychological indicators. <i>Due to one or more of the above techniques or situations, and within the cultural and social context of the examinee, the person shows:</i>		
1. steady signs of confusion or disorientation during or after detention		
2. steady signs of anguish, fear, or terror during or after detention		
3. steady signs of emotional exhaustion or cognitive impairment during or after detention		
4. signs of emotional manipulation during or after detention (e.g., guilt/shame, emotional dependence, ambivalent emotions toward alleged perpetrator)		
5. signs of damage to identity and self-questioning worldviews		
6. indicators of brain damage (e.g., neurological examination, neuropsychological assessment, EEG and/or related tests or other measures of brain damage, CT-SCAN, MNR, or other brain imaging evidence)		
7. Other acute medical disorders attributable to the alleged acts. Specify:		
8. Chronic medical sequelae attributable to the alleged acts. Specify:		
9. Acute or Chronic PTSD related to the alleged acts		
10. Complex PTSD/Enduring Personality Change after Catastrophic Experience (EPCACE) or other similar diagnosis related to the alleged acts		
11. Severe or prolonged dissociative states related to the alleged acts		
12. Other medical or psychiatric disorders attributable to the alleged acts. Specify:		

⁷ If the TES is used for forensic or legal purposes, complement this Section with the SEF-IP (Standardized Evaluation Form for an Assessment of Credibility based on the Istanbul Protocol). See Chapter 18.

TES – Summary Sheet

Name:

PART 1. Assessment of Environment

Date:

S: Score (0 = No, 1= CC-LM, 2= Yes); I: Intensity

Contextual manipulations			
1	a. Inhuman conditions of detention		
2	b. Environmental manipulation		
3	c. Basic physiological functions		
4	d. Sleep dysregulation		
5	e. Handling of time		
6	f. Sensory deprivation		
7	g. Mind-altering methods		
8	h. Other (contextual manipulations)		
Raw Score			
Fear-Producing Actions		S	I
9	a. Hopes and expectations		
10	b. Threats to the person		
11	c. Threats against family/detainees		
12	d. Lack of information		
13	e. Experiences of near death		
14	f. Witnessing others' torture		
15	g. Phobias		
16	h. Other situations		
Raw Score			
Pain-producing Actions		S	I
17	a. Beatings		
18	b. Battles against oneself		
19	c. Exhaustion exercises, forced work		
20	d. Other pain-producing actions		
Raw Score			
Extreme Pain – Mutilation — Death		S	I
21	a. Extreme pain		
22	b. Mutilation		
23	c. Brain damage		
24	d. Other (specify)		
Raw Score			
Actions targeting Sexual Integrity		S	I
25	a. Humiliation		
26	b. Sexual assault		
27	c. Rape		
28	d. Other (targeting sexual integrity)		
Raw Score			

Actions targeting the need to belong		S	I
29	a. Prolonged solitary confinement		
	b. Cultural isolation		
30	c. Incommunicado detention		
31	d. Breaking social bonds		
32	e. Other (targeting need to belong)		
Raw Score			
Actions targeting identity (breaking/ installing new identity)		S	I
33	a. Attacks on sense of self		
34	b. Induced submission/compliance		
35	c. Manipulation of affect		
36	d. Instilling guilt		
37	e. Induced shame/humiliation		
38	f. Violation of taboos		
39	g. Installing goals and identity		
40	h. Other (targeting identity)		
Raw Score			
Coercive Interrogation Techniques		S	I
41	a. Conditions during interrogation		
42	b. Style of interrogation		
43	c. Deception/cognitive manipulation		
44	d. Other (extreme coercive actions)		
Raw Score			

Part 2. Manner of interaction

Relational indicators		S	I
45	a. Will		
46	b. Violation of autonomy		
47	c. Fostering unpredictability		
48	d. Systematic violation of dignity		
49	e. Personalized process		
50	f. Extreme signs of evil or cruelty		
51	g. Vulnerability Factors		
52	h. Active role in own suffering		
53	i. Prolonged harm (physical/mental)		
54	j. Other (relational factors)		
Raw Score			

Part 3. Legal Criteria

Legal criteria	YES
1. Institutional agents	
2. <i>Torturing system</i> criteria	
3. Clear motivation for obtaining confession	
4. Clear purpose of punishment, humiliation, or revenge	
5. <i>Exclusionary rule</i>	
6. Legal precedents	

PART 4. Medico – Psychological Criteria

Medical and Psychological indicators. <i>Due to one or more of the above techniques, and within the cultural and social context of the examinee:</i>	YES
1. Confusion or disorientation	
2. Anguish, fear, or terror	
3. Emotional or cognitive exhaustion	
4. Signs of emotional manipulation	
5. Signs of damage to identity	
6. Brain damage	
7. Other acute medical disorders	
8. Chronic medical sequelae	
9. Acute or Chronic PTSD	
10. Complex PTSD/EPCACE	
11. Dissociative states	
12. Other relevant condition	

Part 1 TORTURING ENVIRONMENT	C-L	Yes	CF	Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		I	
	(x1)	(x2)																					
Block 1. Contextual manipulations																							
Block 2. Fear-producing actions																							
Block 3. Pain-producing actions			x2																				
Block 4. Extreme pain – mutilation – death			x2																				
Block 5. Sexual integrity			x2																				
Block 6. Attachment and need to belong			x2																				
Block 7. Actions targeting identity																							
Block 8. Coercive interrogation techniques			x2																				
Overall Score (Sum of Totals for each Block)					Mark YES if there is either [a] at least one FULL criteria in any of the 8 Blocks, or [b] An overall score of 5 or more.															YES	NO		
Part 2. RELATIONAL INDICATORS	CC-LM	Yes		Overall Score	Mark YES if there are at least 2 FULL relational criteria or an overall score of 5 or more.															YES	NO		
Part 3 LEGAL INDICATORS	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mark YES if Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 (or both) are fulfilled. Exceptionally consider Criteria 6.															YES	NO
Part 4. MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL INDICATORS	NUMBER				Mark YES if there is at least 1 Medico-Psychological criterion															YES	NO		
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AMOUNT TO TORTURE	Conditions amount to Torture if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 1, 2 and 4 are fulfilled Allegations additionally supported if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 3 are fulfilled There is an overall consistency of allegations according to the SEF-IP 												NO	PARTIALLY	YES								

6. SCORING AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS.

The Overall Score provides a combined view of techniques and relational, legal, and medico-psychological criteria for **determining whether or not torture has occurred**. Thus, the TES is an aid for obtaining an objective definition of torturing environments or experiences for forensic, legal, or research purposes. It is **not** intended to quantify the *experiences of torture*. Personal experiences of survivors are unique and cannot be quantified or compared. Any individual element considered in the Torturing Environment Scale can destroy a human being and amount to torture in itself.

Steps to Score the TES.

1. Sum Up Scores for each Block (CC-LM = 1, Yes = 2) and Multiply by Correcting Factor (CF) to obtain the Score for each block of torture methods. Value range from 0 to 16.
2. Obtain the Overall Score by Summing Up the Scores of the 8 Blocks. Value range from 0 to 128.
3. Mark YES if there is at least one full criteria (“YES”) in any of the 8 Blocks or an overall score of 5 or more.

Part 1	CC-LM (1)	Yes (2)	CF	Score [0-16]		
Block 1. Contextual manipulations						
Block 2. Fear-producing actions						
Block 3. Pain-producing actions			x2			
Block 4. Extreme pain – mutilation – death			x2			
Block 5. Sexual integrity			x2			
Block 6. Attachment and need to belong			x2			
Block 7. Actions targeting identity						
Block 8. Coercive interrogation techniques			x2			
Overall Score [0-128] (Sum of Totals for each Block)						
Torturing Environment — Assessment of Environment/Experience Mark YES if there is either [a] at least one FULL criteria in any of the 8 Blocks, or [b] An overall score of 5 or more.					YES	NO

4. Color in the cells at the right to obtain a visual portrait of the torturing environment, and Mark the column (I) according to the Methods which were deemed to have maximum destructive Impact according to the survivor’s experience.

5. Calculate the Score for Relational indicators. Values range from 0 to 20. Mark YES if there are at least 2 FULL relational criteria or an overall score of 5 or more.

Part 2. Relational Indicators (Mark the number of indicators that are met)	Cc-Lm	YES (Full criteria)	Score TOTAL
Overall Score [0-20]			
Torturing Environment — Relational Indicators Mark YES if there are at least 2 FULL relational criteria or an overall score of 5 or more.			YES NO

6. Indicate the legal criteria. Mark YES if Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 (or both) are fulfilled Exceptionally consider, additionally, Criteria 6.

Part 4	1	2	3	4	5	6
Legal Indicators (Mark which indicators are met)						
Torturing Environment - Legal Criteria [Mark YES if Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 (or both) are fulfilled Exceptionally consider Criteria 6.						YES NO

7. Calculate the Score for Medico-Psychological Indicators. Values range from 0 to 12. Mark YES if there is at least 1 full Medico-Psychological criterion.

	YES
Part 3. Medico-Psychological Indicators (Mark the number of indicators that are met)	
Torturing Environment — Medico-Psychological Indicators Mark YES if there is at least 1 Medico-Psychological criterion	YES NO

8. The combination of all the above will indicate whether conditions amount to torture.

Torture has occurred if:			
A. There is at least one FULL criteria in any of the 8 Blocks or a score of 5 or more summing up all indicators in Part 1 AND			
B. There are at least 2 FULL Relational criteria in Part 2 AND			
C. Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 are fulfilled in Part 3. Exceptionally consider Criteria 6.			
Additionally, results support the presence of torture if:			
D. At least 1 Medico-Psychological indicator in Part 3 is present			
E. There is an overall consistency of allegations according to the SEF-IP			
CONDITIONS AMOUNT TO TORTURE:	NO	PARTIALLY	YES

1. The structure in eight Blocks and the graphic offer a portrait of torture methods at a glance. Additionally, it is possible to calculate comparative scores between Environmental, Physical and Psychological Methods. Sum as indicated in the table and weight. Final scores range from 0 to 10.

Psychological versus Physical Torture Methods

TORTURE	Blocks + Items	Weight	Methods Score
MANIPULATION OF ENVIRONMENT	[Block 1] + [items 29, 41]	Divide by 2	
mostly based on PHYSICAL PAIN	[Block 3]+[Block 4]+ [items 3, 13, 27, 50]	Divide by 4	
mostly based on PSYCHOLOGICAL PAIN	[Block 2]+[Block 6]+[Block 7]+[Block 8] + [items 25, 26, 47]	Divide by 7	

The values do not measure the intensity of each category of torture methods, but simply allows for comparison among methods. A final score of, for example, 1.3, 3.1, and 5.2 would mean that the torturing environment was heavily focused on producing psychological pain as compared to environmental manipulation and physical pain. It would not say anything about the *intensity* of that pain, and could not be used for that purpose.

7. EXAMPLE OF APPLICATION

Excerpts from an interview with Nagore X based on the Istanbul Protocol

Excerpts from Nagore X's Istanbul Protocol. The survivor was held for five days in incommunicado detention. We invite the reader to review her testimony and complete the TES based on her experience.

"They put me in a cell and started not allowing me to sleep. It was nighttime. I was exhausted from so much stress and from the ride there. I tried to sleep on a concrete bed, with no mattress or foam, and they began to beat me and turned on the light. I was told to stay standing in front of the peephole in order to be seen when they knocked on the door, and that's how it went every two or five minutes (...) I was scared, really scared, because I knew what was going to happen."

Detention: Day 2

"It's humiliating, they are constantly humiliating you: they tell you that you're fat... I remember one detail, they said, 'Yuck! She even has hairs on her nipples!' and other things like that; they stripped me and touched my breasts constantly. I was a little afraid that such things could go further and reach the point of rape. On one hand, they kept saying: 'Yuck! I'm not fucking this one, because she has her period!' I thought, 'Well... in the end, this is going to save me.' But on the other hand, you don't know... You think: 'Look: I'm an adult, I'm 32 years old.' The nakedness you try to take in stride, but it brings about loads of impotence. You can't do anything, you're in their hands and you can't say, 'You pig, take your hands off me!' Because you know it will be worse for you, so you just take it (...). And then from then on, they began the interrogation sessions. Well, in fact they had already started in the car, but there they asked questions again, about little things: 'Where do you work? Where do you live?' And once you start to say something, they jump into questioning and bam! 'Who recruited you?' If you keep quiet, they beat you, and then they start over again. (...) They used different techniques. They started with roles of the good and the bad cops. There was one, who was called 'the coffee guy,' who kept saying 'Let's see, calm down... Let's have a coffee and talk.' He was one of the good cops, and this was a constant throughout the five days... [Laughing] In the end I don't remember if I ever got to drink that coffee... And then there were more interrogation sessions, and when he didn't like my answers, it got harder. (...) They take pieces of information from this guy, and from that guy, and they compile it. Then there are things you say when you have no answers, not even within yourself, and you say, 'What can I do?' They told me they needed names, because they don't believe that you really don't know; 'Come on, give us some answers'... And then they pull the bag over your head until you suffocate, until you give them a name. And again, and again... And you end up end up telling them about friends, giving names of people you don't know... Keeping silent is a victory over them, and the more you talk, the more you lose; besides, you say things that you don't even know are true."

"I was shocked, and I kept quiet, and they started hitting me on the head with something rolled up, like a magazine or something like that. (...) They beat me, and went on asking me. (...) I have no bruises, no marks, so I can't prove anything, either with the forensic doctor or with anyone else."

"At that time I did not think, I just tried to sleep. I was obsessed with relaxing from the stress. I curled up in a fetal position, thinking about all that I had said and not said."

Days 3—5

"They took me down the hall, head bowed, as usual, and eyes closed; and when I was to get in the interrogation room, they made me raise my head, and they stood behind me, so I couldn't see them. (...) I

didn't know where I was or what I was doing there; they took me into a room and started asking me questions again. I don't know if they wanted to involve me in some other story... They rolled me into a blanket with only underwear on and tied me to a table leaving my head hanging off the table (...). They pulled the bag on my head. (...) The blanket is what broke me down completely, because I did not expect it. And besides, I peed on myself when I lost consciousness, another reason for humiliation. (...) [From that moment onwards] I was broken, that is the truth."

"When they put 'la bolsa' [the bag] on me, what I did was to try to push down my chin to stop them from tightening the bag so much, so that later when it loosened a bit, some air could flow in from below. But with my head [hanging off the back of the table], I couldn't do that. The body, in that situation, tends to escape because you are strong, [but] there were four people holding my body down."

"I am half naked and they are putting things between my legs, sticks at crotch height, and then they tell you to 'Get down!' so that the stick rubs against your genitals. These guys are obsessed with sex (...). It's a constant pattern."

"I had to do 'squats' to the point of exhaustion with my head covered by a woolen garment which hindered my breathing while my trousers and underwear had been pulled down. And more questions... And if they do not like what you answered, they force you to do squats, and up and down, and if you get tired you have to stretch your arms out, until you can't take any more, and then... a blow. And then the bag again, and again with the bag until you suffocated ... And they got you undressed... and they tied you to a chairAnd squats and more squats ... And then back to the cell, again."

"They filled out [the police statement] as if they knew about you, and made you repeat the answers they wanted. Some of the things were things I had said in the interrogation and others weren't. They made you memorize the police statement: 'When they ask you this, you say...' just like that, until I was ready. And they take you to a man who introduces himself to you as a lawyer, at a computer, and he asks you the same questions, and makes you sign; but I didn't sign it because even though I'd made those declarations, I disagreed. 'You're not going to sign?! Come on... You are going to sign blank papers!' So once again they undressed me, [made me do] squats, until I signed."

TES – Summary Sheet

Name: Nagore XXX

PART 1. Assessment of Environment

Date: XX / XX / 20XX

S: Score (0 = No, 1: CC-LMN, 2 : Yes) ; I: Intensity

		S	I
Contextual manipulations			
1	a. Inhuman conditions of detention	0	
2	b. Environment conditions	1	
3	c. Basic physiological functions	0	
4	d. Sleep dysregulation	0	
5	e. Handling of time	1	
6	f. Sensory Deprivation	1	
7	g. Mind-altering methods	0	
8	h. Other contextual manipulations		
Raw Score		3	
Fear-Producing Actions		S	I
9	a. Hopes and expectations	2	
10	b. Threats to the person	2	
11	c. Threats against family / detainees	0	
12	d. Lack of information	0	
13	e. Experiences of near death	2	✓
14	f. Witnessing others' torture	0	
15	g. Phobias	0	
16	h. Other situations		
Raw Score		6	
Pain-producing Actions		S	I
17	a. Beatings	1	
18	b. Battles against oneself	0	
19	c. Exhaustion exercises, forced work	2	
20	d. Other pain producing actions		
Raw Score		3	
Extreme Pain – Mutilation - Death		S	I
21	a. Extreme pain	0	
22	b. Mutilation	0	
23	c. Brain Damage	0	
24	d. Other (specify)		
Raw Score		0	
Actions targeting Sexual Integrity		S	I
25	a. Humiliation	2	
26	b. Sexual assault	2	✓
27	c. Rape	0	
28	d. Other (targeting sexual integrity)		
Raw Score		5	

	Actions targeting the need to belong	S	I
29	a. Prolonged solitary confinement b. Cultural isolation	0	
30	c. Incommunicado detention	2	
31	d. Breaking social bonds	1	
32	e. Other (targeting need to belong)		
Raw Score		3	
	Actions targeting identity [breaking / instilling new one]	S	I
33	a. Attacks on sense of self	0	
34	b. Induced submission / compliance	1	
35	c. Manipulation of affect	0	
36	d. Instilling guilt	2	
37	e. Induced shame/humiliation	2	✓
38	f. Violation of taboos	0	
39	g. Installing goals and identity	0	
40	h. Other (targeting identity)		
Raw Score		5	
	Coercive Interrogation Techniques	S	I
41	a. Conditions during interrogation	2	
42	b. Style of interrogation	2	
43	c. Deception /Cognitive manipulation	1	✓
44	d. Other (extreme coercive actions)		
Raw Score		5	

Part 2. Manner of interaction

	Relational indicators	S	I
45	a. Will	2	
46	b. Violation of autonomy,	2	✓
47	c. Fostering unpredictability	1	
48	d. Systematic violation of dignity	1	✓
49	e. Personalized process.	1	
50	f. Extreme signs of evil or cruelty	1	
51	g. Vulnerability Factors	2	
52	h. Active role in own suffering	0	
53	i. Prolonged harm (physical/mental)	0	
54	j. Other (relational factors)		
Raw Score		10	

Part 3. Legal Criteria

Legal criteria	YES
1. Institutional agents	✓
2. <i>Torturing system</i> criteria	✓
3. Clear purpose or motivation - confession	✓
4. Clear purpose of punishment, humiliation, or revenge	
5. <i>Exclusionary rule</i>	✓
6. Legal precedents	✓

PART 4. Medico – Psychological Criteria

Medical and Psychological indicators. <i>Due to one or more of the above techniques, and within the cultural and social context of the examinee:</i>	YES
1. Confusion or disorientation	
2. Anguish, fear, or terror	✓
3. Emotional or cognitive exhaustion	✓
4. Signs of emotional manipulation	
5. Signs of damage to identity	
6. Brain damage	
7. Other acute medical disorders	✓
8. Chronic medical sequelae	
9. Acute or Chronic PTSD	✓
10. Complex – PTSD / EPCACE	
11. Dissociative states	
12. Other relevant condition	✓

Part 1 TORTURING ENVIRONMENT	C-L	Yes	CF	Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		I	
	(x1)	(x2)																					
Block 1. Contextual manipulations	3	0		3																			
Block 2. Fear-producing actions	0	3		6																		✓	
Block 3. Pain-producing actions	1	1	x2	6																			
Block 4. Extreme pain- mutilation - death	0	0	x2	0																			
Block 5. Sexual integrity	0	2	x2	8																		✓	
Block 6. Attachment and need to belong	1	1	x2	6																			
Block 7. Actions targeting identity	1	2		5																		✓	
Block 8. Coercive interrogation	1	2	x2	10																		✓	
Overall Score (Sum of Totals for each Block)				44	Mark YES if there is either [a] at least one FULL criteria in any of the 8 Blocks, or [b] An overall score of 5 or more.															YES ✓	NO		
Part 2. RELATIONAL INDICATORS	CC-LM 4	Yes 3		Overall Score 10	Mark YES if there are at least 2 FULL relational criteria or an overall score of 5 or more.															YES ✓	NO		
Part 3 LEGAL INDICATORS	1 ✓	2 ✓	3 ✓	4	5 ✓	6	Mark YES if Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 (or both) are fulfilled. Exceptionally consider Criteria 6.															YES ✓	NO
Part 4. MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL INDICATORS	NUMBER 5				Mark YES if there is at least 1 Medico-Psychological criterion															YES ✓	NO		
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AMOUNT TO TORTURE	Conditions amount to Torture if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 1, 2 and 4 and fulfilled Allegations additionally supported if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 3 are fulfilled There is an overall consistency of allegations according to the SEF-IP 															NO	PARTIALLY	YES					

Psychological versus Physical Torture Methods

TORTURE	Blocks + Items	Weight	Methods Score
MANIPULATION OF ENVIRONMENT	[Block 1] + [items 29, 41]	Divide by 2	5/2 : 2.5
mostly based on PHYSICAL PAIN	[Block 3]+[Block 4]+ [items 3, 13, 27, 50]	Divide by 4	9/4 : 2.2
mostly based on PSYCHOLOGICAL PAIN	[Block 2]+[Block 6]+[Block 7]+[Block 8] + [items 25, 26, 47]	Divide by 7	32/7: 4.5

Sum as indicated and weight.

The TES shows that:

- It can be ascertained beyond reasonable doubt that Nagore was subjected to torture, according to: [a] Methods which were used on her (Part 1), [b] Relational indicators (Part 2) and [c] Legal aspects. The medical and psychological indicators also support the conclusion that she was tortured.
- Her torture was a short-term (five days) incommunicado detention (Block 6), in which interrogators used Fear (Block 2), Moderate but Constant Pain (Block 3), Attacks on identity (Block 7), and especially Actions Targeting Sexual Integrity (Block 5) in the context of an extremely coercive interrogation (Block 8).
- Globally she was submitted to environmental manipulations (2.5/10), physical pain (2.2/10) and psychological pain (4.5/10). Her torture was, thus, mainly psychological, although environmental manipulation and physical methods for torture were also used.
- She showed long-lasting psychological impact from her days of detention.
- The three elements that help better understand the long term impact of her experience were:
 - [13] Experiences of near death (dry asphyxia)
 - [37] Induced shame/humiliation (debasement based on physical appearance, forced to perform humiliating acts; being exposed in public; personal hygiene prevented; debasement based on cultural and socio-political background)
 - [43] Conditions of interrogation that foster false confessions: Lies; Cognitive Manipulation – Cognitive exhaustion.

The following are examples of the application of the TES. They show different profiles of torturing environments based on testimonies of survivors of torture.

1. Vann Nath: Survivor of the Khmer Rouge

In his memoir, Vann Nath describes hunger as an extremely painful torture method, and the slow death of the body as a method for breaking the psyche. His text also describes the environment of terror and the permanent state of fear and panic while waiting for the final moment of torture and killing, watching trucks arriving with new detainees, and hearing how the newcomers were also tortured and disappeared. Time periods without limits, the total absence of hope, and constant signs of evil and cruelty all caused irreversible damage to his worldviews.

The TES final summary indicates that:

- Mr. Van Nath was subjected to torture, according to: [a] Methods which were used on him (Part 1), [b] Relational indicators (Part 2), and [c] Legal aspects (Part 3). There are strong grounds to suspect, based on his memoir, strong medical and psychological consequences (Part 4).
- The torture methods used ranked the highest possible scores in almost all possible categories of physical and psychological attacks. In the TES, torture can be identified if scores are higher than five and fulfill one Full Criteria in Part 1. Mr. Van Nath scores 92 and fulfills criteria in all categories (Contextual manipulations, Fear-Producing Actions, Pain-Producing Actions, Extreme Pain and Mutilation, Actions targeting attachment and need to belong, Actions targeting identity, and Coercive Interrogation techniques).
- His torture was prolonged (more than two years). During that time he was starved nearly to death and continuously interrogated in a context of extreme fear and pain, with the purpose of changing his identity to match the Khmer Rouge's vision of the new society. Hunger is remembered not as a manipulation of environment (Block 1) but as extremely painful and unbearable situation, a method to slowly kill the victim (Block 4).
- Treatment constitutes torture when there are at least two relational indicators. Mr. Van Nath fulfills seven out of ten (Deprived of will, Violation of Autonomy, Fostering Unpredictability, Systematic violation of dignity, Extreme signs of evil or cruelty, Active Role in Own Suffering, and Harm prolonged over time)
- He showed long-standing psychological impacts from his days of detention. The three elements that help better understand the deep impact of his experience are:
 - [14] Cruelty/seeing others die
 - [24] Hunger
 - [41] [43] Conditions and style of interrogation

Part 1 TORTURING ENVIRONMENT	C-L	Yes	CF	Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		I	
	(x1)	(x2)																					
Block 1. Contextual manipulations	0	6		12																			
Block 2. Fear-producing actions	0	7		14																			
Block 3. Pain-producing actions	0	4	x2	16																			
Block 4. Extreme pain-mutilation – death	0	3	x2	12																		√	
Block 5. Sexual integrity	0	0	x2	0																			
Block 6. Attachment and need to belong	0	2	x2	8																			
Block 7. Actions targeting identity	0	7		14																			
Block 8. Coercive interrogation	0	4	x2	16																		√	
Overall Score (Sum of Totals for each Block)				92	Mark YES if there is either [a] at least one FULL criteria in any of the 8 Blocks, or [b] An overall score of 5 or more.															YES √	NO		
Part 2. RELATIONAL INDICATORS	CC-LM	Yes		Overall Score	Mark YES if there are at least 2 FULL relational criteria or an overall score of 5 or more.															YES √	NO		
	0	7		14																			
Part 3 LEGAL INDICATORS	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mark YES if Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 (or both) are fulfilled. Exceptionally consider Criteria 6.															YES √	NO
	√	√	√	√																			
Part 4. MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL INDICATORS	NUMBER				Mark YES if there is at least 1 Medico-Psychological criterion															YES √	NO		
	7																						
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AMOUNT TO TORTURE	Conditions amount to Torture if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 1, 2 and 3 are fulfilled Allegations additionally supported if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 4 are fulfilled There is an overall consistency of allegations according to the SEF-IP 															NO	PARTIALLY	YES					

2. Carlos Liscano – *The Truck of Fools*

In his testimony he gives a detailed account of nine months of daily torture suffered in a clandestine detention center in Uruguay during a military regime, with a unique description of the psychological mechanisms of destruction of identity that he was exposed to, and the complexities of the relationships between the victim and the torturer and the victim and his own damaged and humiliated body. He rightly affirms that torture is unique for each person. The process of being alone with the pain, of trying to stay oriented despite manipulation and deceit, and the unbearable anguish of suffocation in the *tacho* (waterboarding), are all unique. So too is the ambivalence and the feeling of dependency and hatred towards the torturer.

According to his memoir, the TES final summary indicates that :

- Mr. Liscano was subjected to torture, according to: [a] Methods which were used on him (Part 1), [b] Relational indicators (Part 2), and [c] Legal aspects (Part 3). The medical and psychological indicators (Part 4) also support the overall conclusion.
- Torture methods fell into the highest possible range of scores, specially in Actions producing Fear and Pain, Actions targeting identity, and Actions targeting attachment and need to belong. He was also subject to constant coercive interrogations.
- It can be said that torture has occurred when there are at least two relational indicators. Mr Liscano fulfills eight out of ten (Deprived of will, Violation of Autonomy, Fostering Unpredictability, Systematic violation of Dignity, Torture as a Personalized process, Extreme signs of evil or cruelty, Active Role in Own Suffering and Harm prolonged over time). The combined effect of these elements, more than any specific torture method, offers a portrait of a torturing system, including a full torturing environment and a torturing relationship.
- His torture was prolonged (more than nine months). Although he showed long-standing psychological impact from his days of detention, The two elements that help better understand the deep impact of his experience are:
 - [18] Forced self-produced pain / Battle against oneself
 - [41] Conditions of coercive interrogation
- He can be comparatively considered, with the passing of years, as a resilient survivor who managed to give meaning to his experience and slowly gain control over the consequences.

Part 1 TORTURING ENVIRONMENT	C-L	Yes	CF	Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		I	
	(x1)	(x2)																					
Block 1. Contextual manipulations	0	6		12																			
Block 2. Fear-producing actions	0	8		16																			
Block 3. Pain-producing actions	0	3	x2	12																		√	
Block 4. Extreme pain-mutilation – death	0	1	x2	4																			
Block 5. Sexual integrity	0	2	x2	8																			
Block 6. Attachment and need to belong	0	3	x2	12																			
Block 7. Actions targeting identity	0	6		12																		√	
Block 8. Coercive interrogation	0	3	x2	12																			
Overall Score (Sum of Totals for each Block)				88	Mark YES if there is either [a] at least one FULL criteria in any of the 8 Blocks, or [b] An overall score of 5 or more.															YES √	NO		
Part 2. RELATIONAL INDICATORS	CC-LM	Yes		Overall Score	Mark YES if there are at least 2 FULL relational criteria or an overall score of 5 or more.															YES √	NO		
	0	8		16																			
Part 3 LEGAL INDICATORS	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mark YES if Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 (or both) are fulfilled. Exceptionally consider Criteria 6.															YES √	NO
	√	√	√		√	√																	
Part 4. MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL INDICATORS	NUMBER				Mark YES if there is at least 1 Medico-Psychological criterion															YES √	NO		
	4																						
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AMOUNT TO TORTURE	Conditions amount to Torture if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 1, 2 and 3 are fulfilled Allegations additionally supported if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 4 are fulfilled There is an overall consistency of allegations according to the SEF-IP 															NO	PARTIALLY	YES					

3. Ana: Aggression and arbitrary detention during a mass protest

Country: Italy

Events: Ana is detained during an antiglobalization protest. She is part of a group that is staying in a school that also serves as a media center. The police break into the school in an extremely violent way and indiscriminately beat everyone present. There is widespread panic and many people are seriously injured. Ana is beaten on the head and arms, and (together with others) taken to the police station in a police van. At the station she is frisked, inappropriately touched, and insulted; they take her photo, and she is fingerprinted. Then she is transferred to an old military barracks that has been refurbished as a detention center. At the entrance, she is frisked again, and a police officer draws a red cross on the foreheads of several detainees and laughs. There she is forced to remain standing for hours, facing the wall, without eating, drinking, or going to the bathroom. Once in a while a police officer comes in and insults them. Some of the detainees are kicked and slapped, but she isn't. After eighteen hours she is frisked again and, finally, released. When she gets home she goes to the nearest hospital, and is examined because of the pain she is in; they certify that she has a fractured rib and hematomas all over her body from the beatings.

According to the Istanbul Protocol interview the TES final summary indicates that :

- Ana was subjected to torture, according to: [a] Methods which were used on her (Part 1), [b] Relational indicators (Part 2), and [c] Legal aspects (Part 3). The medical and psychological indicators (Part 4) also support the overall conclusion.
- She was subjected to pain-producing actions, and during certain moments during her detention, she was subjected to conditions of environmental manipulation and Fear-producing actions.
- She was subjected to a relationship with the detention officers that can be considered as torture-prone through Violation of Autonomy. She was also held in a context of Violation of Dignity, and was forced to play an active role in her own suffering (through prolonged stress positions).
- She had acute medical disorders attributable to the alleged events : a broken rib and hematomas documented in a subsequent hospital report. There were no psychological consequences at the time of the interview.

Part 1 TORTURING ENVIRONMENT	C-L (x1)	Yes (x2)	CF	Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		I	
	Block 1. Contextual manipulations	3	0		3																		
Block 2. Fear-producing actions	2	0		2																			
Block 3. Pain-producing actions	1	1	x2	6																			
Block 4. Extreme pain-mutilation - death	0	0	x2	0																			
Block 5. Sexual integrity	0	0	x2	0																			
Block 6. Attachment and need to belong	0	0	x2	0																			
Block 7. Actions targeting identity	0	0		0																			
Block 8. Coercive interrogation	0	0	x2	0																			
Overall Score (Sum of Totals for each Block)				11	Mark YES if there is either [a] at least one FULL criteria in any of the 8 Blocks, or [b] An overall score of 5 or more.															YES √	NO		
Part 2. RELATIONAL INDICATORS	CC-LM 3	Yes 1		Overall Score 5	Mark YES if there are at least 2 FULL relational criteria or an overall score of 5 or more.															YES √	NO		
Part 3 LEGAL INDICATORS	1 √	2	3	4 √	5	6 √	Mark YES if Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 (or both) are fulfilled. Exceptionally consider Criteria 6.															YES √	NO
Part 4. MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL INDICATORS	NUMBER 1				Mark YES if there is at least 1 Medico-Psychological criterion															YES √	NO		
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AMOUNT TO TORTURE	Conditions amount to Torture if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 1, 2 and 3 are fulfilled Allegations additionally supported if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 4 are fulfilled There is an overall consistency of allegations according to the SEF-IP 															NO	PARTIALLY	YES					

4. Khadim: racial profiling

Country: Spain

Events: Khadim is detained at a local police checkpoint at 7:00 PM for vending goods in a street market without a license. After asking for his papers, he's taken into a doorway and verbally attacked. Bystanders stop and protest the police's actions and someone begins to record what happens on a cell phone, causing the police to release Khadim. Two hours later, after nightfall, when Khadim is walking down a quiet street to a homeless shelter, two police cars appear and block his path—one in front of him and one behind. Several plainclothes officers get out and walk towards him, mentioning what happened a few hours earlier and saying that he's not going to make a fool of the police. They beat him violently for approximately three minutes. They punch and kick him. They throw him to the ground, causing him to hit the back of his head, and they continue kicking him. Then they handcuff him and take him to the hospital where he is attended to and detained. The police charge him with disobeying authority and accuse him of calling them racist, spitting on them, and attacking them.

According to the Istanbul Protocol interview the TES final summary for Khadim indicates that:

- He was subjected to torture methods (Fear and Pain production ctions, and Actions targeting identity) although in a limited or circumstantial way. Although there are indicators of being submitted to elements of a torturing environment, the overall score does not suggest it could amount to torture.
- He was subjected to a relationship with the acting officers that can be considered torture-prone (Factors associated with increased vulnerability and, partially, torture as a personalized process), although overall it does not appear sufficient to qualify it as a relationship involving torture.
- He was in custody and there are clear elements of racial punishment in the beatings.
- At the time (and since then), he has shown steady signs of anguish, fear, and terror.

Overall: The case fulfills the legal requirements for torture. Khadim was PARTIALLY SUBJECTED to torturing conditions and the case requires a careful evaluation of the context and personal circumstances. The fact that he suffers long-standing psychological consequences from the events, as certified by a forensic expert, supports the idea that his treatment could amount to torture.

Part 1 TORTURING ENVIRONMENT	C-L	Yes	CF	Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		I
	(x1)	(x2)																				
Block 1. Contextual manipulations	0	0		0																		
Block 2. Fear-producing actions	1	0		1																		
Block 3. Pain-producing actions	1	0	x2	1																		
Block 4. Extreme pain-mutilation – death	0	0	x2	0																		
Block 5. Sexual integrity	0	0	x2	0																		
Block 6. Attachment and need to belong	0	0	x2	0																		
Block 7. Actions targeting identity	0	1		2																		
Block 8. Coercive interrogation	0	0	x2	0																		
Overall Score (Sum of Totals for each Block)				4	Mark YES if there is either [a] at least one FULL criteria in any of the 8 Blocks, or [b] An overall score of 5 or more.														YES √	NO		
Part 2. RELATIONAL INDICATORS	CC-LM	Yes		Overall Score	Mark YES if there are at least 2 FULL relational criteria or an overall score of 5 or more.														YES	NO √		
	1	1		3																		
Part 3 LEGAL INDICATORS	1 √	2	3	4 √	5	6	Mark YES if Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 (or both) are fulfilled. Exceptionally consider Criteria 6.														YES √	NO
Part 4. MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL INDICATORS	NUMBER 1					Mark YES if there is at least 1 Medico-Psychological criterion														YES √	NO	
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AMOUNT TO TORTURE	Conditions amount to Torture if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 1, 2 and 3 and fulfilled Allegations additionally supported if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 4 are fulfilled There is an overall consistency of allegations according to the SEF-IP 														NO	PARTIALLY	YES					

5. Pedro: torture at the hands of drug dealers

Country: Honduras

Events: Pedro is 16 years old and belongs to a church group that does work in his neighborhood. His cousin pressured him to join a gang that works for local drug dealers. After receiving death threats against himself and his mother, he agrees to do some “deliveries” in the neighborhood. During one of these deliveries he is captured by a rival gang who demands that he tell them which safe house his cousin is staying in. They hang him from a tree, and they proceed to beat him and threaten him with a gun (including several mock executions) for over 10 hours. They use a knife to cut him all over his body, including his genitals. They intended to decapitate him, but the police rescued him after an anonymous call.

According to the Istanbul Protocol interview the TES final summary of Pedro indicates that:

- He was subjected, beyond a doubt, to physical and psychological torture methods, some of them extreme.
- He was subjected to a relationship with the persons who detained him that can be considered to be a torture process. It fulfills five out of seven criteria of a as a relationship involving torture.
- He was not held under the control of a public institution (or anyone acting in an official capacity or with the knowledge or acquiescence of a public authority). There are no similar cases in Honduras’ domestic jurisprudence in which it has been determined that torture has occurred.
- At the time, and since then, he showed steady signs of anguish, fear, and terror.

Overall: Pedro was subjected to torture according to environmental and relational criteria; this is further supported by medico-psychological criteria. But the case does not fulfill the legal requirements for torture. This does not mean that a judge, taking the context and circumstances into consideration, wouldn’t consider this treatment to be torture by arguing that the state is ultimately responsible for the events or by making an specific interpretation of national laws.

Part 1 TORTURING ENVIRONMENT	C-L	Yes	CF	Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		I	
	(x1)	(x2)																					
Block 1. Contextual manipulations	0	0		0																			
Block 2. Fear-producing actions	1	4		8																			
Block 3. Pain-producing actions	0	2	x2	8																			
Block 4. Extreme pain-mutilation – death	0	2	x2	0																		√	
Block 5. Sexual integrity	1	0	x2	2																			
Block 6. Attachment and need to belong	0	0	x2	0																			
Block 7. Actions targeting identity	0	0		0																			
Block 8. Coercive interrogation	0	2	x2	8																			
Overall Score (Sum of Totals for each Block)				26	Mark YES if there is either [a] at least one FULL criteria in any of the 8 Blocks, or [b] An overall score of 5 or more.															YES √	NO		
Part 2. RELATIONAL INDICATORS	CC-LM	Yes		Overall Score	Mark YES if there are at least 2 FULL relational criteria or an overall score of 5 or more.															YES √	NO		
	1	5		11																			
Part 3 LEGAL INDICATORS	1	2	3	4	5	6	Mark YES if Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 (or both) are fulfilled. Exceptionally consider Criteria 6.															YES	NO √
Part 4. MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL INDICATORS	NUMBER				Mark YES if there is at least 1 Medico-Psychological criterion															YES √	NO		
	1																						
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AMOUNT TO TORTURE	Conditions amount to Torture if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 1, 2 and 3 and fulfilled Allegations additionally supported if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 4 are fulfilled There is an overall consistency of allegations according to the SEF-IP 															NO	PARTIALLY	YES					

6. Inma: victim of sex trafficking

Country: Brazil

Events:

Inma is 26 years old and lives in Asunción, Paraguay. She has two daughters, and both she and her husband are unemployed. An agency offers her work as a caretaker for elderly people in Brazil. When she arrives at the appointed location she is given lodging, and an older woman meets her and keeps her passport. She soon realizes that she can't leave the building, and that she's trapped in a prostitution ring. The next day, several men enter her room and explain that she has to work in a club to pay her debt for the travel expenses to Brazil, which is several thousands of dollars. When she tries to leave she is repeatedly raped and beaten by three men. The beatings and rapes continue for over a week, even though she no longer puts up any resistance. They tell her they have people in Paraguay, and that if she tries to escape they will go look for her family and burn them alive. For four years, she remains kidnapped in the club, forced to work nonstop shifts. She suffers regular humiliation and abuse and does not earn any money for her work. She is freed by the police during a raid; they discovered the operation after one of the other women succeeded in escaping the house.

According to the Istanbul Protocol interview the TES final summary for Inma indicates that:

- She was subjected, beyond a doubt, to physical and psychological torture methods: in addition to attacks on sexual integrity (including forced prostitution), she was also subjected to Contextual manipulations (time, space, environment, etc.), extreme Fear-Producing Actions, and Actions attacking identity and Attachment.
- According to the TES, she had a relationship with her captors involving torture (Deprived of Will, Violation of Autonomy, Situation foster Unpredictability, Systematic violation of dignity, Signs of evilness or cruelty, Vulnerability factors, Forced to play an active role in her own suffering and Prolonged Physical and mental harm).
- She showed permanent psychological consequences (Chronic and Complex PTSD and Dissociative States related to the events).

Although the case does not fulfill the legal criteria for torture, there are many precedents of similar cases that were found to constitute Torture which take into consideration the responsibility of the state to dismantle trafficking networks and protect immigrants from human trafficking.

Although the TES indicates that the case would not strictly be considered torture, the evaluator concludes that in the context in which he works there are sufficient legal precedents of trafficking which have been found to constitute torture by a court.

Part 1 TORTURING ENVIRONMENT	C-L (x1)	Yes (x2)	CF	Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		I	
	Block 1. Contextual manipulations	0	3		6																		
Block 2. Fear-producing actions	0	6		12																			
Block 3. Pain-producing actions	1	1	x2	6																			
Block 4. Extreme pain-mutilation – death	0	2	x2	0																			
Block 5. Sexual integrity	0	4	x2	16																		√	
Block 6. Attachment and need to belong	0	2	x2	8																			
Block 7. Actions targeting identity	0	4		8																			
Block 8. Coercive interrogation	0	0	x2	0																			
Overall Score (Sum of Totals for each Block)				53	Mark YES if there is either [a] at least one FULL criteria in any of the 8 Blocks, or [b] An overall score of 5 or more.															YES √	NO		
Part 2. RELATIONAL INDICATORS	CC-LM 1	Yes 8		Overall Score 17	Mark YES if there are at least 2 FULL relational criteria or an overall score of 5 or more.															YES √	NO		
Part 3 LEGAL INDICATORS	1	2	3	4	5	6 √	Mark YES if Legal criteria 1 and Legal criteria 3 or 4 (or both) are fulfilled. Exceptionally consider Criteria 6.															YES	NO √
Part 4. MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL INDICATORS	NUMBER 6				Mark YES if there is at least 1 Medico-Psychological criterion															YES √	NO		
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS AMOUNT TO TORTURE	Conditions amount to Torture if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 1, 2 and 3 and fulfilled Allegations additionally supported if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria of Part 4 are fulfilled There is an overall consistency of allegations according to the SEF-IP 															NO	PARTIALLY	YES					

9. FURTHER STEPS: FROM TORTURING ENVIRONMENTS TO PSYCHOLOGICAL TORTURE

The definition and study of *torturing environments* brings us closer to a definition of psychological torture. The TES shows that some actions or attacks are considered torture in and of themselves; their mere existence points to torture. Rape is the best example. There is ample legal support for the idea that rape must be considered a form of torture in itself (Littleton, 2007; McGlynn, 2009; McHenry, 2002; Schwartz, 1994; Zawati, 2007). Other examples include prolonged sensory deprivation and mutilations. If the other requirements for identifying torture are met (motivation, acting in an official capacity), there is little doubt that the acts amount to torture.

Further research is needed to determine if it is possible to establish rough criteria that can help in other situations, and if there are certain combinations or patterns of *torturing environments* that can be also considered torture in themselves.

10. TORTURING ENVIRONMENTS AND THE DOCUMENTATION OF TORTURE

The TES provides an overview of the experience of torture, but it should not substitute other methodologies that are closer to the direct experience of torture survivors. In the future, the TES will help compare patterns of torture across different countries, contexts, and historical moments, map torture's evolution, and work accordingly. However, the best way to create a map of a torturing environment is to work directly with the testimonies of survivors. A transtheoretical tool like the TES helps to pool knowledge, but it risks neglecting idiosyncratic elements and specific experiences.

Collecting testimonies, transcribing them, analyzing them through software-aided qualitative methodology, elaborating a thesaurus of methods from the experience of survivors, and trying to derive frequencies of each of method so as to create a portrait of the elements of a torturing environment are all important parts of the work that lies ahead in deepening our understanding of torture. Ideally, this would be done through a Participatory Action Research (PAR) process with survivors to gain a perspective from the survivor's own point of view. A qualitative and PAR approach to mapping torturing environments takes time and effort, but produces unique insights that no scale can offer. Both the TES and qualitative research are important tools and that bring us closer to a better definition and understanding of torturing environments.

ESCALA DE ENTORNOS DE TORTURA – VERSIÓN EN CASTELLANO

La Escala de Entornos de Tortura (TES) mide, a nivel individual, las probabilidades de que una persona haya sufrido tortura, y a nivel colectivo, si un entorno determinado puede ser considerado torturante⁸. El análisis se centra en las condiciones legales, éticas, médicas, psicológicas y sociológicas en que es retenida una persona y ofrece una visión integral de la situación a efectos de evaluar si plausiblemente pudiera ésta ser considerada tortura.

La TES debe ser completada, de ser posible, después de establecer una sólida relación de confianza con el entrevistado o después de haber realizado una visita en profundidad a un centro de detención. La TES no requiere ser completada en una única entrevista sino que puede añadirse información a medida que ésta se amplía en sucesivas visitas o entrevistas.

Marque la columna 1 (No) cuando es posible afirmar razonablemente que el indicador señalado por el ítem no le ha ocurrido a la persona (medida individual) o nunca ha sido documentada en el centro (medida colectiva). Déjelo en blanco si *No hay información disponible* (NID) y se requiere de información adicional.

Marque la columna 2 (L-C) *Presente, aunque de modo Limitado o Circunstancial* si el indicador ha aparecido eventualmente pero no es parte de un ataque o una estrategia sistemáticos o una de las técnicas nucleares usadas en el caso. No se trata de evaluar la intensidad del sufrimiento, sino de hacer una evaluación de la intensidad y la sistematicidad de la agresión.

Marque la columna 3 (Si) para indicar que existe una presencia clara y consistente del indicador de acuerdo al testimonio del superviviente. Las alegaciones deben ser consistentes. En casos excepcionales indique *Si* cuando: (a) tiene fuertes razones para creer que el indicador de tortura está presente (b) ha marcado al menos 2 de los 12 indicadores médicos o psicológicos (en la Parte 2 de la TES), teniendo en cuenta que estos deben estar presentes en relación con las alegaciones de tortura.

Para seleccionar los criterios use como criterio el rol que desempeña una cierta técnica o práctica dentro del proceso global de estructuración de un entorno de tortura.

Columna 4 (Impacto) está en relación con la percepción subjetiva de la experiencia de tortura por parte del superviviente. Debe marcarse cuando el indicador tiene gran importancia dentro de la narrativa del superviviente y es recordado como especialmente devastador. En muchos casos es posible que no se tenga acceso a este tipo de información; en este caso es preferible dejarla en blanco.

Elija la mejor opción:

- Ausencia del indicador: Marque 0 en la columna NO
- Presencia, aunque circunstancial o limitada: Marque 1 bajo la columna L-C

⁸ Sugerimos utilizar la TES en conjunción con el Cuestionario de Evaluación Estandarizada para el Análisis de la Credibilidad basada en el Protocolo de Estambul (SEF-IP). Esta es una herramienta que debe ser usada por un entrevistador experimentado. Da criterios y guías para el análisis de credibilidad que realiza un psiquiatra o psicólogo clínico experto en Protocolo de Estambul.

- Presencia del indicador o Evidencias Sólidas: Marque 2 bajo la columna SI
- Adicionalmente: Marque X bajo la columna I (Impacto) si se trata de un indicador que causó impacto profundo en la persona

PARTE 1. Evaluación del Entorno

ESCALA DE ENTORNOS DE TORTURA (TES, por sus siglas en inglés)

		NO	L-C	SI	I
	Manipulación del contexto	Seleccionar			
1	a. Condiciones inhumanas de detención en relación a estándares internacionales (p.e., Tamaño y condiciones de la celda, hacinamiento, falta de higiene)				
2	b. Manipulación de las condiciones ambientales (especificar) <input type="checkbox"/> Temperatura (frio/calor) <input type="checkbox"/> Humedad <input type="checkbox"/> Ruido, ruido blanco, musica. <input type="checkbox"/> Luz brillante permanente <input type="checkbox"/> Otras:				
3	c. Alteración de las funciones fisiológicas básicas (especificar) <input type="checkbox"/> Hambre <input type="checkbox"/> Sed, <input type="checkbox"/> Restricción de posibilidades de micción o defecación, <input type="checkbox"/> Otros:				
4	d. Desregulación del sueño (p.e. privación, horas cambiantes)				
5	e. Manipulación del sentido del tiempo				
6	f. Deprivación / Desorientación sensorial (p.e. aislamiento absoluto, uso de vendas en los ojos, bolsas o capuchas, tapones u orejeras en oídos)				
7	g. Inducción de estados alterados de conciencia/métodos de alteración de la conciencia <input type="checkbox"/> Uso de drogas / tortura farmacológica, <input type="checkbox"/> Ruido blanco, manipulación visual o quinética, <input type="checkbox"/> Ambientes completamente blancos o de colores monótonos. <input type="checkbox"/> Aislamiento sensorial completo. <input type="checkbox"/> Otros:				
8	h. Otras manipulaciones contextuales. Especificar:				
	Miedo	NO	L-C	SI	I
9	a. Manipulación de expectativas y esperanzas para inducir miedo o terror extremos (p.e. induciendo sentimientos de completa indefensión; negación de información; entornos grotescos,				

	absurdos, ilógicos o aterrizantes, teatralización y construcción de escenarios; creación de expectativas de muerte o dolor extremo; tiempos prolongados de silencio y/o espera...)				
10	b. Amenazas contra la persona (p.e. amenazas de aislamiento o de interrogatorios indefinidos, de violación, tortura o muerte).				
11	c. Amenazas contra parejas, familiares, parientes o amigos (p.e. violación, detención, castigo, represalias) o Amenazas contra otros detenidos.				
12	d. Angustia asociada con la falta de información (p.e., familiares de detenidos-desaparecidos).				
13	e. Situaciones de percepción de muerte inminente (p.e., simulacros de ejecución, asfixia seca / húmeda (bolsa, <i>waterboarding</i> ...)				
14	f. Testigo forzado de la muerte o tortura de otros				
15	g. Uso de situaciones que evocan un miedo incoercible (p.e., fobias, oscuridad completa ...)				
16	h. Otras situaciones que provocan miedo o terror. Especificar:				
Dolor Físico		NO	L-C	SI	I
17	a. Golpes (especificar) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Puñetazos, patadas, bofetones. Golpes con bastones, faja <input type="checkbox"/> Flagelación o azotes sin marcas, golpes con porras o cables <input type="checkbox"/> Golpes en las orejas con las manos abiertas, presión sobre los globos oculares <input type="checkbox"/> Ser zarandeado, arrastrado o lanzado, <input type="checkbox"/> Otros: 				
18	b. Batallas contra uno mismo. Dolor físico forzado externamente <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Tortura posicional: suspensión, colgamiento <input type="checkbox"/> Estiramiento de miembros / cuerpo <input type="checkbox"/> Restricción prolongada de movimientos, armarios, cofres, pozos, camisas de fuerza, bridas o lazos... <input type="checkbox"/> Ser forzado a estar de pie, sentado en posición forzada o de rodillas durante horas; sillas y otros implementos con sujeciones. <input type="checkbox"/> Ser forzado a estar de manera permanente bajo sol, hielo, luz eléctrica cegadora etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Otros: 				
19	c. Ejercicios extenuantes, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Forzado a correr, entrenamiento militar <input type="checkbox"/> Flexiones, sentadillas, abdominales <input type="checkbox"/> Otros: 				
20	d. Otras acciones productoras de dolor no incluidas dentro de los métodos que producen Dolor atroz extremo o Mutilación. Especificar:				

	Dolor atroz extremo - Mutilación - Muerte	NO	L-C	SI	I
21	<p>a. Métodos o aparatos que provocan dolor atroz o extremo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Quemaduras con cigarrillos, superficies ardientes, líquidos hirviendo o sustancias cáusticas. <input type="checkbox"/> Cortes con cuchillos u objetos con filo o puntiagudos. <input type="checkbox"/> Choques eléctricos (p.e. "picana", parrilla, dinamos, electroshock, armas o bastones eléctricos (Taser, bastones, cinturones eléctricos...), <input type="checkbox"/> Asfixia, sofocación, estrangulamiento <input type="checkbox"/> Exposición química a sal, pimienta, gasolina (en heridas o cavidades corporales) <input type="checkbox"/> Instrumentos mecánicos (p.e. Caballete, Pau de Arara, bipedestación sobre objetos o superficies agudos o cortantes) <input type="checkbox"/> Otros: 				
22	<p>b. Mutilación</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Aplastamiento, fracturas <input type="checkbox"/> Desfiguración <input type="checkbox"/> Arrancamiento traumático de piel, uñas, dientes, pelo, orejas... <input type="checkbox"/> Amputación, extracción quirúrgica de órganos, desmembramiento <input type="checkbox"/> Daño por isquemia a tejidos u órganos <input type="checkbox"/> Heridas penetrantes – agujas o bastones bajo las uñas, disparos, flagelación con desgarro de tejidos <input type="checkbox"/> Mutilaciones por insectos (eje gusanos, homigas, abejas) o animales (p.e. perros, ratas) <input type="checkbox"/> Otros: 				
23	<p>c. Daño cerebral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Heridas abiertas en cabeza <input type="checkbox"/> Contusiones cerebrales severas, pérdida de conciencia por heridas traumáticas repetidas en la cabeza <input type="checkbox"/> Terapia electroconvulsiva no médica, shock insulínico u otros ataques físicos o químicos directos sobre el cerebro (excluyendo la tortura farmacológica) <input type="checkbox"/> Otros: 				
24	d. Otras acciones productoras de dolor atroz o extremo, mutilación o muerte. Especificar:				
	Integridad sexual	NO	L-C	SI	I
25	a. Humillaciones relacionadas con la identidad sexual (p.e., desnudez forzada, trato vejatorio o denigrante en base a características u orientación sexual).				
26	b. Hostigamiento o acoso sexual ; violencia sobre órganos genitales				
27	c. Violación sexual				
28	d. Otras acciones que atentan contra la integridad sexual. Especificar:				

	Necesidad de pertenencia	NO	L-C	SI	I
29	a. Confinamiento solitario prolongado b. Aislamiento cultural				
30	c. Detención incomunicada				
31	d. Aislamiento del entorno afectivo y quiebre de vínculos sociales, culturales o políticos de pertenencia.				
32	e. Otras acciones dirigidas contra la necesidad de pertenencia. Especificar:				
	Identidad (quiebre identitario/inserción de nueva identidad)	NO	L-C	SI	I
33	a. Ataques contra el yo o el sentido de uno mismo (p.e. obligando a romper con el pasado y la identidad previa, cuestionando valores básicos, quebrando la visión del mundo ...)				
34	b. Técnicas de inducción de sumisión y obediencia (p.e, reglas cambiantes, órdenes triviales, uso de castigos o recompensas al azar, imposición de "pruebas" de lealtad...)				
35	c. Manipulación del afecto (p.e, acciones que promueven la vinculación traumática con el torturador, ambivalencia y confusión de sentimientos de amor / odio, acciones simultáneas de cuidado y repudio, favores ocasionales arbitrarios, sistemas de recompensas...)				
36	d. Inducción de culpa (p.e., obligar al detenido a hacer daño a otras personas; elecciones forzadas, como decidir quién será el siguiente que debe morir, delación o traición inducidas).				
37	e. Humillación / Vergüenza (p.e., denigración basada en el aspecto físico, forzar la realización de actos humillantes, exhibición en público, tratamiento como animal, impedir la higiene personal, denigración basada en elementos étnicos o culturales).				
38	f. Violación de tabús (i.e., forzar acciones que van contra los principios morales de la persona).				
39	g. Imponer o inducir nuevas perspectivas vitales o cambios en la identidad (p.e. forzar la adopción de nuevos valores y de un nuevo sentido a la vida, implantar una identidad injertada).				
40	h. Otras acciones que atacan o cambian la identidad. Especificar:				
	Técnicas de interrogatorio coercitivo	NO	L-C	SI	I
41	a. Condiciones en que se realiza el interrogatorio (p.e., entorno opresivo o intimidatorio, interrogatorios nocturnos o interrumpiendo el sueño, interrogatorios prolongados o extenuantes o interrogatorios durante días repetidos, interrogatorios combinados con elementos que producen confusión (p.e. golpes en la cabeza, ejercicio físico extenuante, asfixia...).				
42	b. Características emocionales del interrogatorio que favorecen falsas confesiones: provocar emociones extremas o agotamiento				

	emocional (p.e., omnipotencia, omniscencia (mostrar un poder absoluto sobre el cuerpo y el destino del detenido durante el interrogatorio), maximización (exagerar las evidencias, datos, responsabilidad o culpabilidad del detenido), minimización (aliviar falsamente la responsabilidad, proponer justificaciones o excusas), amenazas por no confesar, uso de información íntima para quebrar a la persona etc).				
43	c. Características cognitivas del interrogatorio que favorecen falsas confesiones: mentiras o engaños deliberados (p.e., acusaciones directas en base a evidencias infundadas, fabricadas o falsas; información falsa, engañosa o manipulada respecto a la familia, el lugar de detención o los interrogadores; uso de testigos falsos; ofrecer falsos indultos o recompensas a cambio de colaboración); manipulación cognitiva o agotamiento intelectual (p.e., elecciones forzadas entre dos opciones incriminantes, mensajes contradictorios o confusos, dilema del prisionero, juegos de roles (p.e. bueno/malo), manipulación de palabras del detenido).				
44	d. Otras acciones de coerción destinadas a intimidar, obtener información o forzar la auto-incriminación. Especificar:				

Parte 2. Modo de interacción o vínculo – Indicadores de entorno de tortura.

	Modo de interacción	NO	L-C	SI	I
45	a. Persona privada completamente de su libre voluntad (<i>libertad individual que requiere de reflexión y elecciones conscientes</i>).				
46	b. Violación de la autonomía personal , expresada en la imposición de control y poder absoluto por parte del perpetrador y una falta de control e indefensión por parte de la víctima.				
47	c. La situación fomenta la incertidumbre y la impredecibilidad (p.e., no limitaciones geográficas o de tiempo, lugar irregular de detención, acusaciones vagas o inciertas, cambios bruscos de escenarios o normas...)				
48	d. Violación sistemática de la dignidad ; Falta de reconocimiento y respeto básico por la víctima en tanto ser humano.				
49	e. La tortura ha sido diseñada o planificada como un proceso personalizado (tortura pensada y adaptada a elementos particulares de la persona o a sus características subjetivas o identitarias).				
50	f. Signos de maldad o crueledad extrema durante la tortura.				
51	g. Elementos de especial vulnerabilidad en relación con la edad (p.e., la víctima es un niño, un anciano), género o identidad sexual (p.e. víctima mujer, LGBT), grupo étnico u otros factores.				
52	h. Forzar a la víctima a desempeñar un rol activo en su propio sufrimiento , siendo forzado a luchar bien contra su propio cuerpo, bien contra sí mismo (p.e., posturas forzadas prolongadas, impedimento constante para las funciones fisiológicas básicas)				
53	i. Daño físico o mental prolongado , repetido o que se extiende a lo largo del tiempo.				

54	j. Otros factores relacionales. Especificar:				
----	--	--	--	--	--

Part 3. Criterios legales.

Criterios legales.	NO	SI
1. El entrevistado estaba en custodia o físicamente bajo el control de agentes del Estado.		
2. Hay documentación, jurisprudencia, testimonios u otra información de contexto que permiten sospechar que los hechos puedan ser parte de una política de Estado (existencia de un Sistema Torturante).		
3. Hay una clara motivación o propósito relacionado con la obtención de información o de una confesión.		
4. Existen bases para pensar que el propósito principal del maltrato era el castigo, la humillación o la venganza contra el detenido o el grupo que él o ella representa.		
5. La persona rechaza las declaraciones realizadas durante su detención y afirma que éstos fueron hechos como consecuencia de los malos tratos (el detenido apela a la aplicación de la <i>Norma de Exclusión</i> a lo declarado).		
6. Existen precedentes legales de casos similares al presente en que se ha considerado que los hechos constituían un delito de tortura.		

PARTE 4. Criterios Médico-Psicológicos

La presencia de uno o más de los siguientes indicadores *apoya la existencia de un entorno de tortura*. La ausencia de estos indicadores no excluye la existencia de un entorno de tortura y puede indicar resistencia física o psicológica. Por favor, marque la casilla adecuada.

	NO	SI
Indicadores Médicos o Psicológicos. <i>Debido a una o más de las técnicas, métodos o situaciones descritos las secciones anteriores, y dentro del entorno cultural y social, la persona muestra :</i>		
1. Signos persistentes de confusión o desorientación durante o después de la detención.		
2. Signos persistentes de angustia, miedo o terror durante o después del período de detención.		
3. Signos persistentes de agotamiento emocional o disfunción cognitiva durante o después del período de detención.		
4. Signos de manipulación emocional durante o después de la detención (p.e., culpa/vergüenza, dependencia emocional, emociones ambivalentes hacia el perpetrador...).		
5. Signos de daño a la identidad y cuestionamiento de la visión del mundo.		
6. Indicadores de daño cerebral (p.e., signos en la exploración neurológica, tests neuropsicológicos, EEG y otros tests relacionados, otras medidas de daño cerebral, Scáner, Resonancia Nuclear y otras evidencias basadas en imágenes...).		
7. Otros trastornos médicos atribuibles a los hechos alegados. Especificar:		
8. Secuelas médicas crónicas atribuibles a los hechos alegados. Especificar:		
9. Trastorno de Estrés Postraumático (TEPT) agudo o crónico en relación con los hechos alegados.		
10. TEPT Complejo / Transformación Persistente de Personalidad Tras Experiencia Catastrófica (EPCACE) o diagnóstico similar en relación con los hechos que se alegan.		
11. Estados disociativos severos o prolongados en relación con los hechos que se alegan.		
12. Otras condiciones médicas o psiquiátricas atribuibles a los hechos que se alegan. Especificar:		

TES – Hoja Resumen

PARTE 1. Evaluación del Entorno

S: Marque (0 = No, 1: L-C, 2 : SI) ; I: Intensidad

Manipulación del contexto			
1	a. Condiciones inhumanas de detención		
2	b. Manipulación condiciones ambientales		
3	c. Funciones fisiológicas básicas		
4	d. Disregulación del sueño		
5	e. Manipulación del tiempo		
6	f. Deprivación sensorial		
7	g. Alteraciones mente.		
8	h. Otras manipulaciones contextuales.		
Puntuación bruta			
Miedo		S	I
9	a. Expectativas y esperanzas		
10	b. Amenazas a la persona		
11	c. Amenas a la familia / detenidos		
12	d. Falta de información		
13	e. Percepción de muerte inmediata		
14	f. Testigo tortura o muerte		
15	g. Fobias		
16	h. Otras situaciones		
Puntuación bruta			
Dolor físico		S	I
17	a. Golpes		
18	b. Batallas forzadas contra uno mismo		
19	c. Ejercicios extenuantes		
20	d. Otras acciones productoras de dolor		
Puntuación bruta			
Dolor atroz- Mutilación - Muerte		S	I
21	a. Dolor extremo		
22	b. Mutilación		
23	c. Daño cerebral		
24	d. Otros (Especificar)		
Puntuación bruta			
Integridad sexual		S	I
25	a. Humillaciones		
26	b. Hostigamiento		
27	c. Violación		
28	d. Otras integridad sexual		
Puntuación bruta			

Nombre:

Fecha:

Necesidad de pertenencia		S	I
29	a. Confinamiento solitario prolongado		
	b. Aislamiento cultural		
30	c. Detención incomunicada		
31	d. Quiebre de vínculos sociales		
32	e. Otras acciones necesidad de pertenencia		
Puntuación bruta			
Identidad [quiebre/injerto]		S	I
33	a. Ataques al yo		
34	b. Inducción de sumisión y obediencia		
35	c. Manipulación del afecto		
36	d. Culpa forzada		
37	e. Humillación / Vergüenza		
38	f. Violación de tabús		
39	g. Imponer perspectivas		
40	h. Otras acciones que atacan identidad		
Puntuación bruta			
Técnicas de interrogatorio coercitivo		S	I
41	a. Condiciones durante interrogatorio		
42	b. Estilo de interrogatorio		
43	c. Engaño / Manipulación cognitiva		
44	i. Otras acciones de interrogatorio coercitivo		
Puntuación bruta			

Parte 2. Modo de interacción

Modo de interacción		S	I
45	a. Voluntad		
46	b. Autonomía personal		
47	c. Impredictibilidad		
48	d. Violación sistemática de la dignidad		
49	e. Proceso personalizado		
50	f. Crueldad extrema		
51	g. Especial vulnerabilidad		
52	h. Rol activo en el sufrimiento propio		
53	i. Daño prolongado (físico/mental)		
54	j. Otros elementos relacionales (justificar)		
Puntuación bruta			

PARTE 3. Criterios Médico-Psicológicos.

Indicadores Médicos y Psicológicos.	
<i>Debido a una o más de las técnicas, métodos o situaciones descritos las secciones anteriores, y dentro del entorno cultural y social:</i>	SI
13. Confusión o desorientación	
14. Angustia, Miedo o Terror	
15. Agotamiento emocional o disfunción cognitiva	
16. Signos de manipulación emocional	
17. Signos de daño a la identidad	
18. Indicadores de daño cerebral	
19. Otros trastornos médicos	
20. Secuelas médicas crónicas	
21. TEPT agudo o crónico	
22. TEPT Complejo / EPCACE	
23. Estados disociativos	
24. Otras condiciones relevantes	

Parte 4. Criterios legales

Criterios legales	SI
7. Agentes del Estado	
8. <i>Sistema torturante</i>	
9. Claro propósito o motivación - confesión	
10. Claro propósito de castigo, humillación o venganza.	
11. <i>Norma de exclusión</i>	
12. Precedentes legales	

Parte 5. Puntuación global

- Cualquiera de los elementos considerados dentro de la Escala de Entornos de Tortura puede constituir tortura por sí mismo.
- La Puntuación Global da una visión de conjunto de técnicas y objetivos, así como elementos relacionales, legales y médico-psicológicos para determinar si ha existido o no tortura.

Parte 1	L-C	SI (COMPLETO)	Punt Bruta TOTAL
Bloque 1. Manipulación del contexto			
Bloque 2. Miedo			
Bloque 3. Dolor físico			
Bloque 4. Dolor atroz – Mutilación - Muerte			
Bloque 5. Integridad sexual			
Bloque 6. Necesidad de pertenencia			
Bloque 7. Identidad (Quiebre/Instalación)			
Bloque 8. Interrogatorio coercitivo			
Puntuación Global [0-88] (Suma de Totales de cada Bloque)			
Entorno de Tortura – Evaluación de la experiencia / entorno. [Marque SI en caso de que (a) haya al menos un criterio COMPLETO en al menos 1 de los 8 bloques o (b) la puntuación global sea de 5 o más].			SI NO

Parte 2. Indicadores relacionales (Marque el número de indicadores)	L-C	SI (COMPLETO)	Punt Bruta TOTAL
Puntuación Global [0-20] (Suma de Totales)			
Entorno de Tortura – Indicadores relacionales [Marque SI en caso de que (a) haya al menos 2 criterios relacionales COMPLETOS o (b) la puntuación global sea de 5 o más].			SI NO

	SI
Parte 3. Indicadores Médico - Psicológicos (Marque el número de indicadores que se cumplen)	
Entorno de Tortura – Indicadores Médico-Psicológicos [Marque SI en caso de que haya al menos 1 criterio Médico-Psicológico].	SI NO

Part 4	1	2	3	4	5
Indicadores legales (Marque que indicadores se cumplen)					
Entorno de Tortura – Criterios legales [Marque SI en caso de que se cumplan el Criterio Legal 1 y el Criterio Legal 3, el 4 o ambos. Excepcionalmente considere el Criterio 6	SI	NO			

Ha ocurrido tortura si:

- A. Hay al menos un criterio completo en uno de los 8 bloques o la puntuación global es de 5 o más, sumando todos los indicadores de la parte 1.
- B. Hay al menos 2 criterios relacionales o la puntuación global es de 5 o más en la parte 2.
- C. Se cumple el Criterio Legal 1 y el Criterio Legal 3, el 4 o ambos. Excepcionalmente considere el Criterio 6

Adicionalmente, apoya la presencia de tortura

- D. Que haya al menos 1 criterio Médico-Psicológico.
- E. Consistencia general de las alegaciones de acuerdo con la SEF-IP

ENTORNO CALIFICADO COMO DE TORTURA :	NO	PARCIAL	SI
---	-----------	----------------	-----------

Perfil de Entorno de Tortura / Experiencia de Tortura.

El gráfico refleja el perfil de la experiencia de tortura. Valores obtenidos multiplicando la puntuación bruta por el factor de corrección.

Nombre:		Puntuaciones Ponderadas													
Bloque		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Superior	I
Puntuación bruta															
1. Manipulación contexto	x1														
2. Miedo	x1														
3. Dolor físico	x2														
4. Mutilación - Muerte	x2														
5. Integridad sexual	x2														
6. Necesidad de pertenencia	x2														
7. Ataque Identidad	x1														
8. Interrogatorio coercitivo	x2														
Total [0 - 88]															