

## LEGAL AND MORAL PERMISSIBILITY OF IMMUNITY PASSPORTS

[summary for the general public]

The question of the permissibility of introducing immunity passport has become a particularly pressing issue in the context of COVID-19 pandemic. At first glance, immunity passport programs appear as an excellent measure to reduce the spread of an infection disease. On the one hand, the introduction of immunity passports seems to be much more effective in minimising risk of harm than *laissez faire* strategy, on the other hand, it is not as burdensome measure as more stringent arrangements, such as common lockdowns or mandatory vaccinations. Is this intuition defensible? Under what conditions are policymakers entitled to introduce immunity passports? What are the main objections against this policy? The research project is dedicated to examine and answer these questions.

According to Brown et al, *immunity passports are a way of recording that an individual is believed to have immunity to COVID-19 and is presumed unlikely to contract or spread the disease. They could take the form of a certificate, wristband, mobile-based app or other document* [Brown, Savulescu, Williams, Wilkinson, Passport to Freedom? Immunity Passports for COVID-19, 'Journal of Medical Ethics' 46(10)/2020]. Possessing such passport is a condition allowing one to access certain places (e.g. restaurants, museums, shops, schools), or engage in certain activities (travelling, sport training, socializing). The crucial idea is that people who possess immunity passports are granted freedoms and opportunities that others lack.

There are several challenges one may raised against immunity passport programs. The first one concerns the worry that immunity passports introduce illegitimate inequalities between persons (*equality objection*); the second one points to threats of constraining freedoms of some citizens (*freedom objection*); the third one relates to risks regarding state's interference into private life (*privacy objection*); the forth one states that such measures taken against pandemic would be ineffective (*efficiency objection*); the fifth one refers to problems of undermining social trust and cohesion (*solidarity objection*).

The project assumes that the legitimacy of immunity passports' policies depends on rejecting these challenges. This is why all aforementioned objections should be taken seriously into account. The aim of the project is to carefully consider these challenges, firstly, on moral grounds, and secondly, on legal grounds, in order to answer the question whether immunity passports are a legitimate policy measure.

The main hypothesis of the research states that immunity passports policies are a permissible measure, however only when certain conditions are met.