Declassified[1]
AS/Soc/NCP (2024) PV04add
12 September 2024
Asocncppv04add_2024

Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development

Network of Contact Parliamentarians for a Healthy Environment

Minutes

of the exchange of views on "Ensuring safe, healthy and sustainable food for all"

held in Paris on Tuesday 4 June 2024

The Network held an exchange of views with **Ms Pauline Scherer**, Sociologist, Research & Experimentation Centre, Montpellier (France), **Ms Magali Ramel**, Doctor of Public Law and Moderator of the National Food Council's consultation group "Preventing and combating food insecurity", Paris (France) and **Mr Timothée Parrique**, research economist at the Faculty of Economics and Management of the University of Lund (Sweden) , on the themes at the centre of the introductory note on "Ensuring Safe, Healthy, and Sustainable Food for All" and in presence of the Young Ambassadors for Food Resilience led by the association MakeSense.

The Chairperson of the Network, **Ms Edite Estrela**, recalled that this issue was being revived thanks to the initiative of the Chairperson of the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development, Mr Moutquin, who was appointed rapporteur to present a report on "Ensuring safe, healthy and sustainable food for all". The Assembly was a pioneer in this field in the 1960s. Today, the question had arisen again as to what role the Council of Europe could and should play in anchoring the transition to sustainable food systems in human rights. The report would be discussed within the Committee in Lisbon in September and submitted to the Assembly for adoption at its 4th session (October 20-24). The exchange of views aimed to provide three different perspectives: legal, sociological and economic.

- The first on the challenges of a human rights approach and the concrete policy avenues that could be drawn from it to better protect the right to healthy food, which were the themes at the heart of the speaker's doctoral thesis.
- The second would draw on the speaker's experience of various aspects of food democracy (mechanisms to combat food insecurity, questioning the current production model and systemic issues of redistribution).
- The last would be a macroeconomic reflection on the possibilities of changing the dogma of growth in the field of food.

Ms Ramel presented "The right to food, a human rights approach to food issues".

Recognition in international law. The right to food was widely recognised in international law. Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) recognised that "everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, particularly with regard to food. ". Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) stated that states will take appropriate steps to ensure access to adequate food. This right was also included in several United Nations conventions, such as those on the elimination of discrimination against women, the rights of the child, the rights of persons with disabilities and the status of refugees. International humanitarian law, through the Geneva Conventions, also protected access to food in times of war. References to the right to food also appeared in

[1] The minutes were approved and declassified by the Network of Contact Parliamentarians for a healthy environment at its meeting on 12 September 2024.

international criminal law, where deprivation of food could constitute a crime against humanity or a war crime under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. Some International Labour Organisation conventions also protected this right, albeit indirectly, through social security and minimum wage systems. The right to food was then recognised in the various non-binding declarations adopted at the World Food Summits of the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), such as the 1996 Rome Declaration on World Food Security. However, it was absent from the Sustainable Development Goals adopted in 2015 and the Paris Agreement.

History of the right to food. In the 18th century, the idea of a right to subsistence emerged under the influence of the Enlightenment, which saw assistance to the destitute as the responsibility of the state rather than the church. In the 19th century, the impoverishment caused by industrialisation and Malthusian theories pushed for increased agricultural productivity to meet the growing demand for food. These theories influenced international food policy after the Second World War. In 1981, Amartya Sen redefined the causes of famine, emphasising that the availability of food was not enough to prevent hunger. He stressed the importance of the right to access food. This approach influenced the work of FAO in the 1980s, emphasising that the problem of hunger was as much social and economic as it was technical.

The emergence of a rights-based approach. Sen's method, which focused on the ability to access food, paved the way for a human rights-based approach. The 1996 Rome Declaration affirmed "the right of everyone to have access to safe and nutritious food". The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights adopted General Comment No. 12 in 1999, which elaborated on this right. In 2004, FAO developed Voluntary Guidelines for the progressive realisation of this right. The entry into force of the Optional Protocol to the ICESCR in 2013 would strengthen the justiciability of the right to food at the international level.

A comprehensive definition covering all the challenges of food systems. The ICESCR distinguished between the fundamental right to be free from hunger and the right to food. General Comment No. 12 specified that this right included physical and economic access to sufficient and appropriate food. This approach encompassed various rights and freedoms related to access to food, including the right to an adequate standard of living, a healthy environment, water, health, and the rights of farmers and food systems workers. It differed from the concept of food security by emphasising human dignity and the establishment of legal frameworks to guarantee adequate food for all.

State obligations. States had obligations to respect, protect and fulfil the right to food. Respect meant not taking actions that undermine the sustainability of food systems. Protect meant ensuring that companies or individuals did not impede the transition to sustainable food systems. Fulfill meant adopting legal and policy measures to facilitate this right, mobilising all possible resources.

A human rights-based definition as a compass for public policies. The normative framework of the right to food guided governance mechanisms, policy strategies and monitoring and evaluation systems. The "PANTHER" principles (participation, accountability, non-discrimination, transparency, human dignity, empowerment, rule of law) must guide public policies. The FAO Strategic Framework 2022-2031 and the work of the HLPE (High-Level Panel of Experts attached to the Committee on World Food Security) stressed the importance of transition towards more efficient, inclusive, resilient and sustainable food systems to ensure access to adequate food for all, while integrating health, nutrition and sustainable development concerns.

At the level of the European Union, in line with the Farm to Fork Strategy Action Plan, the European Commission had started work on a proposal for a Framework for Sustainable Food System Legislation (FSFS), planned for the end of 2023. The challenge of this framework legislation was to promote coherence between EU and national policies, to integrate sustainability into all food-related policies and to strengthen the resilience of food systems. So far, however, no concrete measures seemed to have been adopted to take this project forward, which could be considered abandoned.

In conclusion, the speaker quoted David R. Boyd (United Nations Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment): "The human rights-based approach, with its focus on the right to food and the right to a healthy environment, is a critical catalyst for accelerating the transformation of today's unsustainable food systems to a future where everyone enjoys healthy, sustainable diets, workers are treated fairly, and degraded ecosystems are restored. It is an obligation for states, not an option".

The Chairperson thanked the speaker and underlined the conclusion to be drawn: the right to food goes beyond freedom from hunger.

Ms Kluit wondered how Europe's commitment to "feeding Africa" could be reconciled with the human rights approach.

Mr Amraoui noted that a very interesting initiative was that of the World Food Programme (WFP), the food aid agency of the United Nations and the FAO.

Mr Schennach confirmed that food waste was a major problem, with enough food thrown away every year to feed a large city. He pointed out that there were several levers that could be used to reduce food waste. Tons of food were also thrown away every year simply because it had reached its sell-by date, even though it was often perfectly edible. Managing the chemical components of agriculture also played a role in food waste. Pesticides, herbicides, and chemical fertilisers used to maximise yields could affect the quality and shelf life of produce.

Ms Gökcen recalled that the right to food was a fundamental human social right that was intrinsically linked to human dignity and social well-being. It was important to strengthen the European Social Charter on this point. This would ensure a stronger and more uniform protection of the right to food across Europe, requiring Member States to take concrete measures to combat hunger, malnutrition and food insecurity. The role of the Council of Europe was clear.

Mr Fridez emphasised that the issue of food was closely linked to profitability and market liberalism. In a system dominated by the profit motive, decisions on food production and distribution were often driven by profit margins rather than people's nutritional needs. This raised the question of market regulation: should we go so far as to regulate the food market in order to rebalance priorities and create a more equitable and resilient food system, where profitability does not come at the expense of the right to adequate food for all? This would involve policy interventions to ensure fair prices, support small local producers and ensure a more equitable and sustainable distribution of food resources.

Ms Ramel recalled that the right to food was a fundamental human right and that States had an obligation to respect, protect and fulfil it. It was not optional. They were obliged to act. A proactive approach and robust mechanisms were needed to ensure the right to food. The case law of the Indian Constitutional Court was interesting in that it recognised the right to one meal a day as a fundamental right. At the same time, food waste remained a shocking paradox. Instead of simply distributing surplus food to the poorest, it was essential to deconstruct this food aid system. To solve this problem, we needed to address the root causes of food waste. It was not just a question of redistribution, but of systemic change to ensure that every individual, without exception, had access to sufficient and nutritious food every day. The speaker then referred to Professor Fakrhi of the University of Pau, who criticised the World Trade Organisation (WTO) for its liberal approach, which favoured profit at the expense of equity. He called for an exception for agriculture and food, stressing that food should not be treated as an ordinary commodity. According to him, trade policies had to recognise the specificity and vital importance of agriculture and food in order to guarantee equitable and sustainable access to these essential resources. Finally, she stressed that the WFP focused on the emergency and protection against immediate hunger. This approach did not address the structural problems that perpetuated hunger and could create dependency on solidarity.

Ms Scherer presented "various aspects of food democracy (mechanisms to combat food insecurity, questioning the current production model and systemic issues of redistribution)".

A necessary global approach to food insecurity. Food insecurity was limited, inadequate or uncertain access to healthy and nutritious products, of which hunger was the ultimate but not systematic consequence. Lack of access to food in sufficient quantity and quality in a country that did not suffer from food shortages was due to a lack of economic means and referred to a problem of poverty. Food insecurity had a more global meaning, reflecting a situation in which a person did not have guaranteed access to sufficient, quality and sustainable food that met their food preferences and nutritional needs, which may lead to or result from social exclusion and marginalisation or an impoverished environment. The term food insecurity therefore referred to difficulties that went beyond food insecurity, as it raised the issue of social connectedness at the heart of exclusion processes and inequalities in access to food.

Barriers to accessing quality and more sustainable food. We lived in a low-cost food system. Financially, ultra-processed foods, which were often cheap, were the most accessible, while disadvantaged households had to make budgetary choices, often at the expense of food quality. Convenient availability was also a barrier, with some neighbourhoods lacking healthy alternatives to agro-industrial products. Educational levels influenced understanding of nutritional issues, and entrenched socio-cultural behaviours made it difficult to change habits. Psychosocial factors, including emotional state and the perception of pleasure or frustration associated with eating, played a crucial role. Finally, perceptions of the relationship between food and health, influenced by marketing strategies, affected the autonomy of food choices.

A single and limited response: food aid. Food aid had gone through several historical phases, beginning with religious institutions as the main source of support for the poor. In the 20th century, after the world wars and during the reconstruction period, governments took a more active role in ensuring the food security of their citizens. More recently, large retail chains had started to redistribute their surplus food to food banks and NGOs, with initiatives known as Restos du Cœur in France. However, despite its modernisation, food aid was still subject to criticism regarding its effectiveness and sustainability. One of the main concerns was the quality of the food distributed, which often consisted of agro-industrial products with low nutritional value and little diversity. This could create dependency among beneficiaries and limit their ability to escape poverty. In addition, the use of food aid could lead to stigmatisation and marginalisation, raising questions about the dignity and recognition of beneficiaries within the community. Food aid also contributed to the perpetuation of an unsustainable food system. By distributing food surpluses from the agri-food industry, it supported intensive and polluting agricultural practices, and did not sufficiently promote decentralised and local agriculture, which were essential for a transition to a more sustainable and equitable food system.

How did precarity challenge food systems? Industrialised and globalised food systems exacerbated geographical and socio-economic inequalities, making access to healthy, affordable food more difficult. They made the whole food chain more precarious, especially small farmers and workers in precarious conditions. Globalisation had homogenised diets, threatening cultural and gastronomic diversity, and concentrated power in the hands of a few companies, limiting competition and consumer choice. To respond to these challenges, it was necessary to reform food systems to make them more sustainable, equitable and resilient, integrating health, accessibility, cultural diversity, the environment, working conditions, the economy and governance, as argued by the reference association Terra Nova in its report "Towards sustainable food security: issues, initiatives and guiding principles", published in November 2021. A structural transformation of public policies on access to food, beyond the logic of aid, was essential. Such a perspective also invited us to consider the creation of social food security, capable of reinventing the foundations of food citizenship in a broader sense.

Food democracy as a condition for a just transition. These sustainability issues were now the subject of numerous social movements and the development of alternative initiatives on the part of producers and eaters (AMAP and short circuits, urban agriculture, cooperative shops, purchasing groups, community gardens, etc.), which embodied the "food democracy movement" defined by Tim Lang in 1996. This concept highlighted the fundamentally democratic issue that food represented by emphasising the need for citizens to reclaim the subject. So far, however, these initiatives, which were carried out at territorial level, were limited, remained local and did not structurally rethink public action in terms of real food democracy and from a perspective of sustainability that involved and affected the most vulnerable people.

This question was a driving force in the reflection on the development of food democracy spaces as a vector of social, public and economic transformations, and in particular social food security (SSA) or "food funds". The idea was to enable everyone to have access to healthy food, making it a right in the same way as health or education. The principle was quite simple: it involved integrating food into the general social security system. The SSA was based on three pillars: universality, financing through contributions and the democratic agreement of professionals. There were about thirty experiments in France. The oldest was the Common Food Fund in Montpellier, launched in 2023 and coordinated by Mrs Scherrer. It had around 350 participants; the principle was that everyone contributed according to their means; everyone received the same sum of €100 per month on a special card, like a health card, at approved food distribution points chosen by the committee (grocery stores, producers, purchasing groups, etc.). The feedback from participants was positive: "Some tell us that they have rediscovered a taste for good meat or fruit and vegetables. They have the pleasure of going to places where they have never set foot".

According to a **member of MakeSense**, the Social Security of Food (SSA) project could help to reduce food insecurity in the suburbs, particularly in the Seine-Saint-Denis area, thanks to a "food vitality card" that would allow people to collect points for access to healthy food. Across France, initiatives were emerging to bring the SSA to life. La Marmite Rouge, an association based in the 12th arrondissement, was one of them.

Ms Tanguy believed that the key to everything was to know how to cook simply and freshly. Cooking and nutrition lessons should start in primary school. We must not forget that the individual is at the centre of his abilities and must be the main protagonist. The public system could not solve everything.

Mr Fridez gave the example of Switzerland, which had 8 to 9 million inhabitants and woke up every morning with stores ready to feed 40 million people. The problem of food waste was really shocking. He wondered how this surplus food could be recycled. We needed a framework, a place where we could cook together and meet.

Ms Scherer explained that public schools and educational buses were part of the project she was coordinating. However, she believed that we needed to go beyond this prism and recognise the societal dimensions. The

influence of the structure was very important when we knew that 80% of shopping was done in supermarkets and that ultra-processed products dominated the offer. So far, the response had not been strong enough in terms of solidarity. It was also expected that the response would not separate the social from the environmental, which food security had well integrated. Food was a very good issue for democracy, that was the strength of this issue, because it could bring everyone together. The experience of the citizens' committee showed that everyone had knowledge and that the intersection with the knowledge of experts was fruitful. This intersection, which took place in the care of each person's words and the link that was created, allowed each person to increase their capacity, first for themselves and then for the collective.

Mr Parrique offered an overview of the concept of degrowth and the debates surrounding it: how exactly was it defined? How could it be articulated - or not - with our current production and food systems?

The speaker had dedicated a thesis to degrowth, entitled "The political economy of degrowth" (2019), which examined degrowth as a strategy for ecological transition. In it, he defined the concept of degrowth as "the reduction of production and consumption to reduce the ecological footprint, democratically planned in a spirit of social justice and with a concern for well-being", leading to a post-growth society as "a stationary economy in harmony with nature, where decisions are taken together, and wealth is equitably shared so that we can prosper without growth". The speaker questioned the prioritisation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) defined by the 2030 Agenda. He underlined that certain goals could conflict with each other. For example, a focus on economic growth (SDG 8) could sometimes undermine environmental goals (such as SDG 13 on climate action) and social goals (such as SDG 10 on reducing inequality).

The economists' narrative was rooted in a vision of economic growth as the primary goal and means of solving social and environmental problems. This narrative was based on several key postulates: the primacy of gross domestic product (GDP) growth as a measure of prosperity and economic well-being; faith in the ability of technological innovation and technical progress to solve environmental challenges, such as energy transition or the management of limited natural resources; and belief in the "natural" efficiency of the market, even in environmental matters. However, we were facing planetary resource limits and this biophysical constraint would be with us forever. "Infinite growth in a finite world is impossible". The concept of the "wheel of overshoot" (or ecological overshoot) well described the way in which human activities were exceeding planetary limits. There was a correlation between economic activity and ecological footprint. The more dynamic and growing an economy was, the more it increased its consumption of resources and its production of waste, which increased the ecological footprint. This meant that these 'entities' had already used up their annual quota of natural resources earlier in the year and were therefore dependent on non-renewable ecological resources for the rest of the year.

The speaker proposed to decouple economic well-being from material growth, suggesting a review of the relationship between economic growth and ecological footprint. His argument was that economic and social policies should be reoriented to optimise access to food and other basic needs while limiting environmental impacts. Green growth was implausible because it was insufficient to address the challenges we were facing. Simply greening the economy without challenging the foundations of material economic growth would not be enough. A deeper transformation of economic and social systems was needed, involving a substantial reduction in material consumption and a reorientation towards models of sustainable and equitable development.

He proposed a planned reduction in production and consumption to reduce ecological footprints. This approach aimed to keep the environmental impact of human activities at a sustainable level, taking into account the limits of natural resources and the planet's capacity to absorb waste. To ensure that this reduction was done in a fair and equitable way, it insisted on the need for a democratic process. This meant that decisions on reductions had to be taken in a transparent and participatory manner, involving different stakeholders in society. The aim was to ensure that the benefits and sacrifices of this transition were shared fairly among all members of society, maintaining a foundation of social justice and preventing the most vulnerable populations from being disproportionately affected.

A study by ADEME (the French Environment and Energy Management Agency) identified meat consumption as one of the main causes of negative environmental impacts. It used the concept of externalities to explain how the environmental and social costs of meat production were not reflected in its market price, which encouraged excessive consumption. Using the analogy of a boat, we could say that in order to stabilise the boat (our economic and ecological system) we needed to start by removing the heaviest loads (the most significant environmental impacts). Meat consumption, with its high externalities, was therefore one of the first weights to be reduced. This study was based on the findings of Chapter 5 of the IPCC report, which dealt with the possible intervention categories of abatement (reducing or eliminating the activities that contributed most to greenhouse gas emissions), abstinence from production (for the meat industry, this would mean abandoning

intensive practices and switching to more sustainable methods, or even stopping certain production altogether) and diet (changing eating habits).

However, if we looked at post-capitalist theories, we could only see that industry, motivated by profit and economic growth, had no interest in significantly reducing its production and consumption. There were, however, alternative paths to sustainable development, such as the concept of sobriety, which consisted of adopting simpler, less resource-intensive lifestyles. Sobriety did not mean deprivation, but rather a reassessment of needs and a reduction of excesses. By adopting a more sober approach, society could reduce its ecological footprint while improving the quality of life.

Ms Kluit asked the speaker about the impact of the degrowth on employment.

A Make Sense participant pointed out that the food sector represented 8% of GDP, emphasising its economic importance. However, this value did not apply equally to all actors in the chain. Farmers, who were often the first links in the chain, were rebelling against low purchase prices that did not cover their production costs, while consumers were facing increasing insecurity and difficulties in accessing quality food. So, the question was: where was the value created in this sector going? Much of it seemed to be concentrated in the hands of intermediaries and large brands, leaving little profit for producers and increasing pressure on consumers. To rebalance this distribution, it was necessary to rethink agricultural and food policies to ensure fair remuneration for farmers and equitable access to healthy food for all.

Mr Amraoui recalled how he was struck by the climate fresco measuring the carbon footprint of cattle. Reducing the production and consumption of beef seemed an obvious necessity to reduce the ecological footprint. But why was so little concrete action being taken in this area? The answer lied largely in the power of the meat industry lobbies, which had considerable influence over policy decisions. Their economic clout and ability to steer public debate hindered initiatives to reduce beef production.

Mr Parrique confirmed that unemployment was at the heart of the debate, because the decline would affect jobs in sectors that were parasitic on the transition, such as publicists, which could be redirected to more useful sectors. From the point of view of degrowth economists, this unemployment was not to be feared, but rather a blessing. It was essential to redesign the system with a safety net, social housing and social food security to ensure well-being. It was all a question of design: degrowth was a precaution, much less catastrophic than the status quo. The Citizens' Food Convention was based on real needs: what did we need? The answer should not lie with the producers. There was an imbalance between nature, which was free, and the inconvenience of undervalued farmers. It was a question of the distribution of wealth, as always in capitalist systems, where the value of banks and insurance companies increased while that of farmers and teachers decreased. It was imperative to reverse this hierarchy of values in order to restore the rightful place of the essential sectors of our society.

The meat lobby was a reality that made it difficult to promote “consumption slowdown”. Communication in favour of “consumption slowdown” was counterintuitive because it consisted of promoting the idea of not buying. A comparison of communication budgets revealed the problems. Today, the government's communication budget was comparable to that of a company like KFC, which invested heavily in marketing to promote meat consumption. This budgetary asymmetry made it difficult to disseminate messages in favour of reducing meat consumption, especially as the economic interests at stake were considerable.

List of presence / Liste de présence

(The names of members who took part in the meetings are in bold / *Les noms des membres ayant pris part aux réunions sont en caractères gras)*

Member States / *États Membres*

Albania / *Albanie*			
Andorra / *Andorre*			
Armenia / *Arménie*	Mr/*M.*	Armen Gevorgyan	EC/DA
Austria / *Autriche*	Mr/*M.*	**Stefan Schennach**	SOC
	Ms/*Mme*	Agnes Sirkka Prammer	SOC
Belgium / *Belgique*	Mr/*M.*	**Rik Daems**	ALDE
Bosnia and Herzegovina / *Bosnie-Herzégovine*	Mr/*M.*	Saša Magazinović	SOC
Bulgaria / *Bulgarie*			
Croatia / *Croatie*	Ms/*Mme*	Zdravka Bušić	EPP/CD
Cyprus / *Chypre*			
Czechia /T*chèquie*			
Denmark / *Danemark*			
Estonia / *Estonie*			
Finland / *Finlande*	Ms/*Mme*	**Minna Reijonen**	EC/DA
France	Ms/*Mme*	**Liliana Tanguy**	ALDE
Georgia / *Géorgie*	Ms/Mme	**Eka Sepashvili**	EC/DA
Germany / *Allemagne*	Ms/*Mme*	Franziska Kersten	SOC
Greece / *Grèce*	Mr/*M.*	George Papandreou	SOC
Hungary / *Hongrie*			
Iceland / *Islande*	Mr/*M.*	Bjarni Jónsson	UEL
Ireland / *Irlande*	Mr/*M.*	Thomas Pringle	UEL
	Ms/*Mme*	Róisín Garvey	SOC
Italy / *Italie*	Mr/*M.*	Stefano Maullu	EC/DA
	Ms/*Mme*	**Aurora Floridia**	SOC
Latvia / *Lettonie*	Mr/*M.*		SOC
Liechtenstein	Mr/*M.*	Peter Frick	ALDE
Lithuania / *Lituanie*	Mr/*M.*	Arminas Lydeka	ALDE
Luxembourg	Mr/*M.*	Paul Galles	EPP/CD
Malta / *Malte*			
Republic of Moldova / *République de Moldova*			
Monaco			
Montenegro / *Monténégro*	Mr/*M.*	**Miloš Konatar**	SOC
Netherlands / *Pays-Bas*	Ms/*Mme*	**Saskia Kluit**	SOC
	Ms/*Mme*	Carla Moonen	ALDE
North Macedonia / *Macédoine du Nord*			
Norway / *Norvège*	Ms/*Mme*	Linda Hofstad Helleland	EPP/CD
Poland / *Pologne*	Ms/*Mme*	Danuta Jazłowiecka	EPP/CD
Portugal	Mr/*M.*	Pedro Cegonho	SOC
Romania / *Roumanie*	Ms/*Mme*	Maria Gabriela Horga	EPP/CD
	Ms/*Mme*	Alina Stefania Gorghiu	EPP/CD

San Marino / *Saint-Marin*			
Serbia / *Serbie*			
Slovak Republic / *République slovaque*			
Slovenia / *Slovénie*	Mr/*M.*	Dean Premik	ALDE
Spain / *Espagne*			
Sweden / *Suède*			
Switzerland / *Suisse*			
Türkiye	Mr/*M.*	**Sevan Sivacioğlu**	NR
Ukraine	Ms/*Mme*	Yuliia Ovchynnykova	ALDE
United Kingdom / *Royaume-Uni*	Baroness	Doreen E. Massey	SOC

PACE Committees Concerned / *Commissions de l'APCE concernées*

Political Affairs / *Questions politiques*	Mr/*M.*	Simon Moutquin	SOC
Legal Affairs / *Questions juridiques*			
Migration / *Migrations*	Mr/*M.*	**Pierre-Alain Fridez**	SOC
Equality / Égalité	Ms/*Mme*	**Edite Estrela**	SOC
Culture			

Bureau of the Committee on Social Affairs (Ex-Officio Members)/
Bureau de la Commission des Questions Sociales (Membres d'office)

Chairperson / *Président*	Mr/*M.*	Simon Moutquin	SOC
First Vice-Chairperson / *Première Vice-Présidente*	Ms/*Mme*	Danuta Jazłowiecka	EPP/CD
Second Vice-Chairperson / *Deuxième Vice-Président*	Mr/*M.*	Armen Gevorgyan	EC/DA
Third Vice-Chairperson / *Troisième Vice-Président*	Mr/*M.*	Pedro Cegonho	SOC

Other parliamentarians present / Autres parlementaires présents

Ms / *Mme* Gökce Gökcen, Turkiye / Turkey
Mr/M. Cemalettin Kani Torun, Turkiye / Turkey

Partners for Democracy / Partenaires pour la Démocratie

Mr/M. Allal Amraoui, Morocco / Maroc

Secretariat of Delegation or of Political Group / *Secrétariat de délégation ou de Groupe politique*

Mr / *M.* Sabih Gazi Öztürk, Turkiye / Turkey
Ms / *Mme* Vera Damjanović, Montenegro

Other people present / *Autres personnes présentes*

Ms / *Mme* Pauline Scherer, Sociologist, Research & Experimentation Centre, Montpellier (France)
Ms / *Mme* Magali Ramel, Doctor of Public Law and Moderator of the National Food Council's consultation group "Preventing and combating food insecurity", Paris (France)
Mr / *M.* Timothée Parrique, research economist at the Faculty of Economics and Management of the University of Lund (Sweden)

Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development /
Commission des questions sociales, de la santé et du développement durable

Ms / *Mme* Catherine Du Bernard ..... Head of the Secretariat / *Cheffe du Secrétariat*
Ms / *Mme* Aiste Ramanauskaite ..... Secretary to the Committee / *Secrétaire de la commission*
Ms / *Mme* Jannick Devaux ..... Secretary to the Committee / *Secrétaire de la commission*
Ms / *Mme* Claire Dubois-Hamdi ..... Secretary to the Committee / *Secrétaire de la commission*
Ms / *Mme* Xenia Birioukova ..... Assistant / *Assistante*
Ms / *Mme* Özgü Tan ..... Assistant / *Assistante*