



Strasbourg, 18 May 2005

GT-DH-SOC(2005)006

**STEERING COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS  
(CDDH)**

---

**WORKING GROUP ON SOCIAL RIGHTS  
(GT-DH-SOC)**

---

**ACTIVITY REPORT  
FOR THE CDDH**

---

## Introduction

1. In October 2002<sup>1</sup>, the CDDH decided to examine questions concerning social rights in relation to the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), bearing in mind developments taking place particularly in the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the European Union. In June 2003<sup>2</sup>, it agreed on the membership of a Working Group on Social Rights (GT-DH-SOC) and adopted terms of reference for the Group (see Appendix I). These terms of reference are to be reconsidered by the CDDH in June 2005<sup>3</sup>, in the light of an analysis of the Group's work.

2. The Group has held three meetings (17-18 October 2003<sup>4</sup>, 4-5 November 2004 and 30 March-1 April 2005) with Ms Deniz AKÇAY (Turkey) in the Chair. The list of participants at the meetings is reproduced in Appendix II.

3. In the course of these meetings, the Group:

- a) examined its terms of reference;
- b) examined recent developments regarding in particular the European Social Charter (ESC) / revised European Social Charter (ESCrev) and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights (the Court), as well as the possible impact on the protection of social rights of the entry into force of Protocol No. 12 to the ECHR (prohibition of all forms of discrimination);
- c) held an exchange of views on the justiciability of social rights at the national and the international levels and in particular on the possibility and appropriateness of including some of these rights in the system of the ECHR;
- d) examined, as a working hypothesis, a list of social rights and suggestions of possible wordings, to see whether any rights among these could be liable for inclusion in the system of the ECHR.
- e) held an exchange of views on the usefulness of a possible continuation of reflection in this area.

---

<sup>1</sup> 54<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CDDH (1-4 October 2002, see paragraph 28.(iii), CDDH(2002)016).

<sup>2</sup> 55<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CDDH (17-20 June, see paragraphs 35-38, CDDH(2003)018).

<sup>3</sup> 60<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CDDH (13-17 June 2005).

<sup>4</sup> On the occasion of its 1<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Group attended, in conjunction with the "Extreme poverty and social cohesion" grouping and ATD Fourth World, the ceremony to mark the International Day for the Eradication of Poverty (17 October 2003).

4. The Group based its work in particular on the information collected by the Secretariat<sup>5</sup> relating to recent developments in this field in the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the European Union. The Group bore in mind Recommendation (2000)3 on the right to the satisfaction of basic material needs of persons in situations of extreme hardship. It also took into account a contribution submitted by ATD Fourth World<sup>6</sup>.

**a) Terms of reference**

5. The Group noted that, in accordance with the terms of reference given by the CDDH, its work was to be exploratory in nature and that it was not envisaged at this stage that it should draw up a draft instrument. This is the basis on which the Group approached its task. Its aim was to provide sufficient information to enable the CDDH to decide on what further work should be done in this area.

6. The Group acknowledged that the issue put in its terms of reference was not new<sup>7</sup>. It tied in with the follow-up given to the European Ministerial Conference on Human Rights held in Rome on 3 and 4 November 2000 on the occasion of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the ECHR. This Conference had solemnly reiterated the interdependence and indivisibility of human rights, stressing the need for the reflection on improving the protection of social rights in Europe to continue<sup>8</sup>.

7. The Group felt it necessary from the outset to clarify the scope of the concept of “social rights” for the purposes of fulfilling its terms of reference. It considered it preferable

---

<sup>5</sup> See documents: “Information gathered by the Secretariat on the issue of justiciability of social rights in the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the European Union” (GT-DH-SOC(2003)002 and Addendum, and its update (GT-DH-SOC(2005)002); “Overview of the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights in social matters” (GT-DH-SOC(2004)001 and its update GT-DH-SOC(2005)001), and the document on “Execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights concerning social rights” (GT-DH-SOC(2005)004) and the document drawn up by the Secretariat of the European Social Charter (GT-DH-SOC(2005)003).

<sup>6</sup> Document GT-DH-SOC(2004)002.

<sup>7</sup> In 1977, members of the Parliamentary Assembly had already made the point that “*the time has come to widen the scope of application of the Convention, in such a way as to include certain fundamental rights in the areas of education, employment, housing, health and social security, which, up to now, have not been considered as having, necessarily, to be in that instrument, although they are guaranteed by member States*” (see the Motion for a Recommendation concerning the widening of the scope of application of the European Convention of Human Rights, tabled by Mr. CZERNETZ and others, Doc. 4006 of 07/07/1977, §8). See also, document GT-DH-SOC(2003)002, paragraphs 11-18 for a summary of the background to this question.

<sup>8</sup> See letter D, paragraphs 23-28, Resolution I “Institutional and functional arrangements for the protection of human rights at national and European levels” adopted at the Conference.

to focus on examining social rights within the meaning of the ESCrev, while at the same time acknowledging that the concept of “social rights” could be understood more broadly, encompassing economic and cultural rights as well.

**b) Consideration of recent developments**

**- *The role of the European Social Charter / revised European Social Charter***

8. The Group exchanged views on the protection system of social rights provided by the ESC/ESCrev.

9. According to several members, this system was adequate and sufficient. The measures taken by member States in the light of the findings of the supervisory mechanisms of the ESC/ESCrev showed that the latter’s effectiveness should not be underestimated. According to these experts, before proceeding with a Protocol to the ECHR to include social rights in the ECHR, it must clearly be demonstrated that some additional benefit would result from the exercise.

10. Without any intention of questioning the value of the ESC/ESCrev, other experts underlined that the inclusion of social rights under the ECHR would strengthen their protection because it would make possible an additional protection of such rights through individual complaints (article 34 ECHR).

11. Other experts emphasised that the current system of the ESC/ESCrev and the possible inclusion of some social rights in the system of the ECHR are not incompatible as such: the decisions of the European Committee of Social Rights on collective complaints, or the conclusions with regard to the procedure of reports on national situations in the context of the ESC/ESCrev, may enable the general problems noted in a given state to be remedied, and that this, in principle, is compatible with and complementary to the fact that an individual might, someday, bring a complaint before the Court and obtain appropriate redress<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> In response to the question why the Council of Europe had decided on a collective complaints procedure and not a system of individual complaints under the ESC/ESCrev, it was suggested that it was not the subject matter that had determined that decision, but the political choices made by states at the time. There was a clear preference to opt, initially, for a system that drew on the mechanisms of the International Labour Organisation and in which the social partners had an important role to play.

- ***The possible impact of Protocol No. 12 to the ECHR***

12. The potential of Protocol No. 12 for the protection of social rights under the ECHR was also discussed.

13. Several experts were doubtful about the added value of a possible inclusion of some social rights in the system of the ECHR, considering that some social rights will hence be protected in particular by the Court thanks to Protocol No 12.

14. Other experts, however, pointed out that Protocol No. 12 does not give the Court a competence to verify whether a State has recognised and protected a social right that is not explicitly set forth in the ECHR. It will only rule on the right not to suffer discrimination in the enjoyment of this or that right, including a social right.

c) **Possible inclusion of some social rights in the system of the ECHR**

15. The members of the Group expressed different opinions as to the possibility and appropriateness of including some social rights in the ECHR. They however noticed that, whatever their approach, the adoption of the political decision concerning the advisability of continuing or putting an end to work in this area was not within the remit of their terms of reference.

16. Before presenting the arguments for or against the possible inclusion of some social rights in the system of the ECHR, it was considered useful to note various important issues on which the Group was unanimous:

- i. The fact that if a right was to appear in the ECHR it had to be *fundamental, universal* and sufficiently *precise*:
  - The *fundamental* character should be examined in the light of its impact on human dignity. The members of the Group considered that the concept of human dignity should underlie any discussion on social rights, this concept being the foundation of human rights in general.
  - The requirement of the *universal* character did not mean that the right should be guaranteed in a uniform manner in all Council of Europe's member States. Similarly, having regard to some rights or aspects of such rights, it is likely that they be granted only to persons being in the same individual situation (for example; legally residing in the State).
  - Any new right should be defined in a *precise* manner to give rise to legal obligations for States.

- ii. The need to better define the concept of national and international justiciability of social rights. If the work were to be continued, several members proposed that a hearing be organised to look further into this key concept and that a study of the extent to which social rights are justiciable at national level be carried out.
- iii. The fact that the Court may already rule on certain economic and social rights which are in the ECHR, such as: the prohibition of forced or compulsory labour (article 4§2), the right to form or join trade unions (article 11), the right to education (article 2, Protocol 1), as well as the right to protection of property (article 1, Protocol 1). It may also, through the use of various interpretative techniques, rule on cases which relate to the social field. Several experts, however, drew attention to the fact that as long as other social rights are not explicitly set forth in the Convention, many applications will be rejected *ratione materiae*.
- iv. The need, if further social rights were to be included in the system of the ECHR in the future, to bear in mind the restraints that this would produce for the Court in terms of volume and complexity of applications. This being said, according to several experts such factors, which relate to the Court's working methods, should not, in principle, be an obstacle to discussions on the appropriateness of including new rights in the system of the ECHR.

- ***Arguments in favour of justiciability and the inclusion of further social rights in the system of the ECHR***

17. The members of the Group wishing that further social rights be considered as justiciable and be included under the ECHR put forward in particular the following arguments:

- i. Such an inclusion would allow applicants to benefit from the system of control set up under the ECHR, which is as such an added value compared to the current situation. It should also be added that while supervising the execution of judgments, the Committee of Ministers more and more often requires the defendant State to take general measures which are likely to benefit many individuals and not just the applicant.
- ii. By including further social rights in the system of the ECHR, the indivisibility of human rights would not only be recognised in principle but also confirmed in practice.
- iii. The interdependence of human rights would also be emphasised by placing the focus on respect for human dignity which lies at the very foundation of the protection of all human rights (civil, political, social and others).

- iv. Justiciability of some social rights and/or of some aspects of social rights has already gained support at the international level of the special reporters of the United Nations on adequate housing, on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, on the right to food and on the right to education<sup>10</sup> as well as in the framework of the European Union<sup>11</sup>.
- v. The political momentum to carry on discussions concerning the strengthening of protection of social rights within other international bodies (United Nations, European Union) is currently patently obvious. The Council of Europe also ought to continue its reflection and to examine possibilities of enhancing protection of these rights. Moreover, civil society has expectations: the fact, for instance, that a significant number of applications lodged before the Court concern social issues indicates this trend.

- ***Arguments against justiciability and the inclusion of further social rights in the system of the ECHR***

18. The members of the Group not wishing that further social rights be considered as justiciable and be included under the ECHR put forward in particular the following arguments:

- i. Before attempting to include further social rights in the system of the ECHR, it would be necessary to ensure whether actual national justiciability of such rights exists.
- ii. Many social rights require by their nature the allocation of financial resources for their protection together with legislation to provide means for their enforcement. The decisions of the Court could have serious consequences on internal politics concerning social issues. These are decisions to be taken by democratically elected governments, rather than by a judiciary, particularly considering the wide margin of appreciation of the State in this area.
- iii. The very nature of social rights, the protection and enjoyment of which in practice depend primarily on political and economic factors and whose realization is often progressive, would not lend itself to supervision by the Court. Social rights would

---

<sup>10</sup> See the reports of the special reporters Kothari on adequate housing, Hunt on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Ziegler on the right to food and Tomaševski on the right to education (document E/CN.4/2005/52, 10 February 2005, published on the website at: <http://www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/chr/sessions/61/lisdocs.htm>)

<sup>11</sup> See in particular the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union as incorporated in the Constitutional Treaty and the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Communities.

need to be formulated with sufficient precision to permit their justiciability. Moreover, for many social rights it would need to be clarified whether they were to be granted to “everyone” or to “everyone, legally working / legally residing”... In any event, many States would have difficulty accepting too regulatory provisions in international agreements.

- iv. The possible inclusion of further social rights under the ECHR would not necessarily be of benefit to those in the greatest need, as the latter would very likely not turn to the courts to seek redress for a violation of their rights. This could lead to inefficient use of the state’s resources and the protection of social rights could be weakened as a result.
- v. An action in the Court would not necessarily provide an “effective remedy” for the individual, who may need to enforce rights against other individuals or bodies (such as employers), since the Court’s judgments do not generally have horizontal effect.

19. At the end of this discussion, the Group considered it useful to record these various arguments in this activity report, without making any particular recommendation to the CDDH in one or the other direction. Similarly, it decided to record in this report the arguments in favour and against pursuing reflection work in the field (see paragraph 21 below).

**d) Analysis of a list of wordings of possible social rights**

20. The Group undertook, as a working hypothesis, the examination of a list of wordings of possible social rights prepared by the Secretariat (GT-DH-SOC(2005)005). The report of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting (30 March-1 April 2005, document **GT-DH-SOC(2005)007, paragraphs 13-38**) gives a detailed overview of this exchange of views.

**e) Continuation of the reflection: arguments for and against**

21. All participants expressed their view on the advisability of continuing or not this reflection. At the close of this exchange of views, it was noted that there was a clear-cut difference of opinions (half in favour, half against). The Group, therefore, decided that the decision should be taken by the CDDH and that, for this purpose, it would be useful to briefly list the main arguments in favour and against continuing the work of reflection. These arguments may be summed-up as follows:



<u>CONTINUING WORK</u>	<u>ENDING WORK</u>
<p>While reflection on the enhancement of the protection of social rights continues within the United Nations and the European Union, putting a halt to this reflection within the Council of Europe would send a negative signal with regard to the interest devoted by the 46 member States to the enhancement of the protection of social rights.</p>	<p>Putting a halt to the reflection would not mean that the Council of Europe does not strive for the protection of social rights. It does so through the ESC/ESCrev mechanisms (collective complaints and State reporting) and will also do so through the up-coming case-law on Protocol 12 to the ECHR.</p>
<p>The Group has not had enough time to complete its reflection: it would be very useful to further deepen the examination of the possible justiciability of specific social rights or certain aspects of such rights. Even if political consensus would currently be difficult to reach on this matter, it is deemed useful to continue the reflection to have ideas and possible concrete results to build upon when the subject matter will have gained the momentum to really move forward. Moreover, nothing is at obstacle in thinking that some common ground may be found more quickly for certain rights, particularly that contained in Recommendation (2000)3.</p>	<p>The Group has sufficiently discussed about the possible justiciability of social rights within the system of the ECHR. Time is not ripe to go any further. It is preferable to exploit the potentials of existing mechanisms (ESC/ESCrev and Protocol 12 to the ECHR) and reconsider things in the future.</p>
<p>Making it possible for individuals to lodge a complaint with the European Court of Human Rights to protect social rights should be the ultimate objective to be set to guarantee in practice the indivisibility of human rights.</p>	<p>The indivisibility of human rights does not entail that recourse has to be made to the same supervision mechanisms of their implementation as each category of rights presents a specificity which has to be taken into account. It has not been demonstrated that the ECHR is the best instrument to enhance protection of social rights. The ESC/ESCrev mechanisms (collective complaints and State reporting) should duly be taken into consideration.</p>

22. Finally, if it were decided to continue the reflection, it has to be decided as well whether another new group will have to be established for this purpose or whether the terms of reference of the current Group will have to be extended. Some experts suggested that if the reflection were to continue, this could take place in the CDDH itself, in the DH-DEV or in a new Working Group of the CDDH. Other experts were of the opinion that a possible future discussion should be continued by social rights experts and therefore should not take place within the framework of CDDH (the Governmental Committee of the European Social Charter was mentioned as a possibility).

23. By adopting this activity report, the Group considered that it had completed the terms of reference given to it by the CDDH.

24. At the close of its work, the Group warmly thanked its Chair, Mrs Deniz AKÇAY (Turkey) for the exemplary manner in which she had led its work.

\* \* \*

Appendix I

**Terms of reference for the GT-DH-SOC**  
(CDDH(2003)018, Appendix VII)

**1. Name of committee:** Working Group on Social Rights (GT-DH-SOC)

**2. Type of committee:** Working Group

**3. Source of terms of reference:** Steering Committee for Human Rights (CDDH)

**4. Terms of reference:**

i) To examine:

- the implementation of Recommendation No. R(2000)3 of the Committee of Ministers to member States on the right to the satisfaction of basic material needs of persons in situations of extreme hardship;
- the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights on any positive obligations in the field of social rights;
- the developments in relation to the European Social Charter;
- the developments in relation to the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union;
- the on-going work within the United Nations with regard to the elaboration of an Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recognising a right to individual and/or collective complaints;
- the developments in relation to Protocol 12 of the ECHR;
- any other relevant international instruments and developments in this field.

ii) On the basis of such elements, to consider whether any possible new rights or aspects of such rights might be appropriate for justiciability under the control system established under the ECHR.

**5. Composition:**

- i) The working group is composed of a Chair and seven members, specialists in the field of social rights: Belgium, Bulgaria, Finland, France, Ireland, Netherlands, Russian Federation and Turkey (Chair).
- ii) Other member States, the observers to the CDDH, as well as the Parliamentary Assembly and the European Committee for Social Cohesion (CDCS) may also participate in the work, at their own expenses.

**6. Working methods:**

- i) The GT-DH-SOC will consult/exchange views with the European Committee of Social Rights and the European Court of Human Rights.
- ii) The GT-DH-SOC will decide about the appropriateness of engaging consultants.

**7. Duration of the terms of reference:**

The present terms of reference will be reviewed on 30 June 2005.

Appendix II

**List of participants / Liste des participants**

**At the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting / à la 1<sup>ère</sup> réunion (16-17 octobre 2003)**

**BELGIUM / BELGIQUE**

M. Jan LATHOUWERS, Conseiller Chef de Service, Service public fédéral Justice, Direction générale de la Législation et des Libertés et Droits fondamentaux, Service des Droits de l'Homme

Mlle Chantal GALLANT, Conseiller-adjoint, Service public fédéral Justice, Direction générale de la Législation et des Libertés et Droits fondamentaux, Service des Droits de l'Homme

**BULGARIA / BULGARIE**

M. Vassil MRATCHKOV, Président du Conseil Consultatif de Législation près l'Assemblée Nationale

**FINLAND / FINLANDE**

Mr Arto KOSONEN, Director, Agent of the Government, Legal Department, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, PO Box 176, FIN 00161 HELSINKI

**FRANCE**

Mme Brigitte JARREAU, Conseiller de tribunal administratif, Tribunal administratif de Versailles

**GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE**

Ms Barbara JANSEN, Juge de tribunal, Bundesministerium der Justiz

Mr Holger MAUER, Verwaltungsangestellter, Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Arbeit, Scharnhorststr.

**IRELAND / IRLANDE**

Ms Denise McQUADE, Assistant Legal Adviser, Legal Division, Department of Foreign Affairs

**NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS**

Ms Claudia J. STAAL, Senior Policy Advisor, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, Directorate for International Affairs

**POLAND / POLOGNE**

Ms Sylwia JACZEWSKA, II Secretary, Permanent Representation of the Republic of Poland

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE**

M. Vladislav ERMAKOV, Premier Secrétaire du Département de la coopération humanitaire et des droits de l'homme, Ministère des affaires étrangères de la Fédération de Russie

**SWEDEN / SUEDE**

Ms Anita LINDER, Legal Adviser, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, SE – 103 39 STOCKHOLM

**SUISSE / SWITZERLAND**

Mme Dominique STEIGER, Collaboratrice scientifique à la section des droits de l'homme et du Conseil de l'Europe, Division des affaires internationales

**TURKEY / TURQUIE (Chairperson/Présidente)**

Mme Deniz AKÇAY, Conseillère juridique, Adjointe au Représentant permanent de la Turquie auprès du Conseil de l'Europe

**UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI**

Ms Catherine DAVIDSON, Lawyer, Department for Work and Pensions

*Observers / Observateurs*

**HOLY SEE / SAINT-SIEGE**

Mme Béatrice LIBORI MAURER, Consultant juridique auprès de la mission du Saint-Siège

**EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR SOCIAL COHESION / COMITE EUROPEEN POUR LA COHESION SOCIALE**

M. François VANDAMME, Conseiller Général, Division des Affaires Internationales, service public fédéral « Emploi, Travail et Concertation sociale »

Mme Michèle AKIP, Deputy Head of the Social Policy Department/Chef adjointe du Service des Politiques Sociales, DG III, Conseil de l'Europe

**At the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting / à la 2<sup>ème</sup> réunion (4-5 novembre 2004)**

**BELGIUM / BELGIQUE**

Mlle Chantal GALLANT

**BULGARIA / BULGARIE**

M. Vassil MRATCHKOV

**FINLAND / FINLANDE**

Mr Arto KOSONEN

**FRANCE**

Mme Brigitte JARREAU,

**GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE**

Mr Holger MAUER

**IRELAND / IRLANDE**

Ms Denise McQUADE

**NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS**

Ms Claudia J. STAAL

**POLAND / POLOGNE**

Mme Joanna MACIEJEWSKA, Conseillère du Ministre, Département des analyses économiques et prévisions, Ministère de la politique sociale

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE**

M. Sergueï KONDRATIEV, Attaché du Département de la coopération humanitaire et des droits de l'homme, Ministère des affaires étrangères de la Fédération de Russie

**SWEDEN / SUEDE**

Ms Anita LINDER

**SUISSE / SWITZERLAND**

Mme Nathalie STADELMANN, Collaboratrice scientifique, Office fédéral de la Justice, Section des droits de l'homme et du Conseil de l'Europe

**TURKEY / TURQUIE (Chairperson/Présidente)**

Mme Deniz AKÇAY

**UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI**

Ms Catherine DAVIDSON

*Observers / Observateurs*

**EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR SOCIAL COHESION / COMITE EUROPEEN POUR LA COHESION SOCIALE**

M. François VANDAMME,

**Other guest / Autre invité**

**EUROPEAN TRADE UNION CONFEDERATION (ETUC)**

Mr Klaus LÖRCHER, Legal Adviser, Head of Department for European and International Legal Affairs

**At the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting / à la 3<sup>ème</sup> réunion**

**BELGIUM / BELGIQUE**

Mme Chantal GALLANT

**BULGARIA / BULGARIE**

M. Vassil MRATCHKOV

**FINLAND / FINLANDE**

Mr Arto KOSONEN

**FRANCE**

Mme Brigitte JARREAU

**GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE**

Mr Heiko BRÜCKNER, Executive Assistant to the Agent for human Rights, Federal Ministry of Justice

**IRELAND / IRLANDE**

Ms Denise McQUADE

**NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS**

Ms Claudia J. STAAL

**POLAND / POLOGNE**

Mme Joanna MACIEJEWSKA

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE**

M. Vladislav ERMAKOV

**SWEDEN / SUEDE**

Ms Anita LINDER

**SUISSE / SWITZERLAND**

Mme Nathalie STADELMANN

**TURKEY / TURQUIE (Chairperson/Présidente)**

Mme Deniz AKÇAY

**UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI**

Ms Melanie NIXON, Lawyer, Office of the Solicitor to the Dept for Work and Pensions

\* \* \*

*Observers / Observateurs*

**HOLY SEE / SAINT-SIEGE**

Mme Odile GANGHOFER, Docteur en Droit, Mission Permanente du Saint-Siège auprès du Conseil de l'Europe

**EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR SOCIAL COHESION / COMITE EUROPEEN POUR LA COHESION SOCIALE**

M. François VANDAMME

**Other guests / Autre invités**

**EUROPEAN TRADE UNION CONFEDERATION (ETUC)**

Mr Klaus LÖRCHER

**THE DANISH INSTITUTE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS**

Ms Ida Elisabeth KOCH, Senior Researcher

\* \* \*

**Secretariat / Secrétariat**

**Directorate General of Human Rights - DG II / Direction Générale des Droits de l'Homme - DG II, Council of Europe/Conseil de l'Europe**

M. Pierre-Henri IMBERT, Director General of Human Rights / Directeur Général des Droits de l'Homme (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> meetings / 1<sup>ère</sup> et 2<sup>ème</sup> réunions)

**Human Rights Intergovernmental Cooperation Division / Division de la coopération intergouvernementale en matière de droits de l'homme**

M. Alfonso DE SALAS, Head of the Division / Chef de la Division

Mrs Gioia SCAPPUCCI, Administrator / administratrice, Secretary of the GT-DH-SOC / Secrétaire du GT-DH-SOC (1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> meetings / 1<sup>ère</sup> et 3<sup>ème</sup> réunions)

Mme Severina SPASSOVA, Lawyer / Juriste, (2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> meetings / 2<sup>ème</sup> et 3<sup>ème</sup> réunions)

Mrs Katherine ANDERSON-SCHOLL, Administrative assistant / assistante administrative (2<sup>nd</sup> meeting / 2<sup>ème</sup> reunion)

Ms Dearbhal MURPHY, Trainee/stagiaire (1<sup>st</sup> meeting / 1<sup>ère</sup> reunion)

M. Benjamin SCHNEIDER Trainee/stagiaire (3<sup>rd</sup> meeting/3<sup>ème</sup> reunion)

Mme Michèle COGNARD, Assistant / assistante

**Secretariat of the European Social Charter / Secrétariat de la Charte sociale européenne**

M. Régis BRILLAT, Executive Secretary / Secrétaire exécutif