

**AS/Per (2023) PV 01**  
24 April 2023

## **Standing Committee**

### **Minutes**

of the meeting held in The Hague, Netherlands

**on Thursday 2 March 2023 from 16:30 to 18:30  
and on Friday 3 March 2023 from 09:00 to 12:30**

## **Thursday 2 March 2023 from 16:30 to 18:30**

### **1. OPENING OF THE MEETING BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY**

**Mr Tiny Kox**, President of the Parliamentary Assembly, **opened** the meeting of the Standing Committee at 4.30pm.

### **2. OPENING SPEECHES BY MR JAN ANTHONIE BRUIJN, PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE (EERSTE KAMER), AND MR TOM VAN DER LEE, VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (TWEDE KAMER)**

**The President** welcomed Mr Jan Anthonie Bruijn, President of the Senate (Eerste Kamer), and Mr Tom van der Lee, Vice-President of the House of Representatives (Tweede Kamer).

**Mr Bruijn**, President of the Senate, welcomed the participants at the Hague. Seventy-five years ago, the Hague Congress was held here and discussed the organisation of the Council of Europe. One year later, the Council of Europe was founded to protect the values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law in Europe. He praised the work of the Dutch delegation in the Assembly. The re-elected President of the Assembly, Mr Tiny Kox, was a member of the Senate. He thanked the members of the delegation – Petra Stienen, the chairperson of the delegation, Ms Margreet de Boer, Ms Ria Oomen-Ruijten and Mr Bob van Pareren. Three of them would unfortunately have to leave the delegation as they would not be re-elected to the Senate next May. Democracy could not be taken for granted, as the unprecedented events leading to the expulsion of the Russian Federation from the Council of Europe showed. Democracy was a work in progress, benefiting from continuous discussions with the institutions and considering changes from outside. He welcomed the fact that the future of the Council of Europe was the subject of the current meeting and of the forthcoming Fourth Summit of Heads of State and Government.

**Mr van der Lee**, Vice-president of the House of Representatives, welcomed the Standing Committee. The topic of the meeting was the future in this challenging time of having a war in one of the member States of the Council of Europe. The work of the Assembly was not always visible and valued in the Netherlands. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, he and his colleagues greatly appreciated this work. He thanked the Assembly for its report on the crash of flight MH17. 75 years ago, the founding fathers of the Council of Europe came together to protect values of human rights and democracy in the aftermath of World War II. The quest was ongoing today. He wished fruitful work to members.

### **3. EXAMINATION OF NEW CREDENTIALS**

Doc. 15719

The Standing Committee **ratified** the credentials of new members of the Assembly submitted by the delegations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, the Republic of Moldova and the United Kingdom.

### **4. MODIFICATIONS IN THE COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES**

Commissions (2023) 03  
Commissions (2023) 03 Add.

The Standing Committee **ratified** the modifications in the composition of Assembly committees in respect of the delegations of Bulgaria, Greece, Latvia, the Republic of Moldova, Spain, Ukraine and the United Kingdom. In addition, the Socialists, Democrats and Greens Group (SOC) and the Group of the European People's Party (EPP/CD) have nominated members to the Monitoring Committee.

### **5. REQUEST FOR A CURRENT AFFAIRS DEBATE (UNDER RULE 53 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE)**

**The President** informed the Standing Committee that a request for a current affairs debate on "Supporting Ukraine one year since the beginning of the Russian Federation's large-scale war of aggression: the role of the Council of Europe" had been tabled by the five political groups. At its meeting in the morning, the Bureau of the Assembly agreed to recommend the holding of this current affairs debate and appointed Mr Iulian Bulai as the first speaker.

There being no objections, the Standing Committee **approved** the proposal to hold the debate on "Supporting Ukraine one year since the beginning of the Russian Federation's large-scale war of aggression: the role of the Council of Europe".

## 6. AGENDA

The Standing Committee **adopted** the revised draft agenda (AS/Per (2023) OJ 01 rev2).

## 7. SECOND PART-SESSION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY (24-28 APRIL 2023)

AS/Bur (2023) 08

The Standing Committee **took note** of the draft agenda of the second part-session of the Parliamentary Assembly (24-28 April 2023).

## 8. REFERENCES TO COMMITTEES

AS/Per (2023) 03

The Standing Committee **ratified** the references proposed by the Bureau (Appendix 1).

## 9. CURRENT AFFAIRS DEBATE - SUPPORTING UKRAINE ONE YEAR SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION'S LARGE-SCALE WAR OF AGGRESSION: THE ROLE OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

**Mr Bulai** opened the current affairs debate on "Supporting Ukraine one year since the beginning of the Russian Federation's large-scale war of aggression: the role of the Council of Europe" by recalling that a year ago the Russian Federation had begun a barbaric invasion of a sovereign and independent state. Today, in defending its independence, Ukraine was also defending the basic principles of international law. The ALDE Group reiterated its support for Ukraine.

*[Minute of silence for the victims of war]*

Ukraine was the main focus of the Assembly's agenda and would remain the priority as long as the aggression continued. The Council of Europe, created as an organisation for peace, acted in the face of this aggression, by excluding the aggressor, supporting the victims unanimously, and preparing numerous reports on the subject of the rule of law, human rights, responsibility, culture, the environment and others. The Organisation continued to build an effective accountability system. Priorities should be given to the following three actions: assistance to Ukraine, the country's rapprochement with EU standards and the building of a system of accountability. The Committee of Ministers adopted an Action Plan for a record amount of 50 million euros, which already enabled the implementation of eighteen projects dealing with the execution of the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights, freedom of media, and the collection and documentation of human rights violations in the context of the war. Germany, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, the European Union and the Human Rights Trust Fund secured 6.5 million euros. Other States and stakeholders were invited to contribute too. The "Partnership for Good Governance" 2023-2027 was another joint initiative strengthening governance in the Eastern Partnership region.

Accountability was the key area of actions to which the Assembly had already contributed by initiating the proposal to exclude the aggressor. The resolution on *Legal and human rights aspects of the Russian Federation's aggression against Ukraine*, adopted in the framework of the report by Mr Cottier (ALDE, Switzerland), made proposals regarding the crime of aggression, war crimes and compensation for all the damage caused by the aggression and the violation of international law stemming from the aggression. A statement made by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe on *Accountability for human rights violations and role of the international community* addressed, among others, the relevance of the Council of Europe. The Secretary General's proposal to establish a register to record evidence and claims of damage, loss or injury from the Russian aggression against Ukraine was very much welcomed. Important work on Ukraine was also being done by the Council of Europe Bank on Reconstruction and Development, which would become even more active after Ukraine joined. An ad hoc tribunal was an idea to be taken ahead by the final communication of the Fourth Summit of Heads of State and Government. Finally, there was room for the Assembly, and the Council of Europe in general, to step up even more to help Ukraine.

**Mr Schwabe**, speaking on behalf of the Socialists, Democrats and Greens Group (SOC), regretted the human suffering caused by wars or natural disasters. In his constituency, at a commemoration to mark one year since the military aggression of Ukraine by the Russian Federation, he promised to a boy from Kharkiv that everything would be done to keep the boy's country independent. The SOC group would support all efforts for the independence of Ukraine, and in terms of armaments and humanitarian aid. It was important for the Council of Europe to complete its work on accountability, such as collecting evidence but also to start taking action to rebuild the country and help its rapprochement with the European Union. The declaration of the Fourth Summit, which would take place in Reykjavik, should sign up to the above actions.

**Mr Pociąg**, speaking on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (EPP/CD), thanked the Dutch Senate and the Dutch delegation for the invitation. He had discussed the attitude of the Russian Federation at length with the member of the Dutch delegation and member of his group, Ms Ria Oomen-Ruijten, and she had finally come to terms with his opinion. Another member of the Assembly and member of his group, Mr Omtzigt, was the first to warn the world in his report on flight MH17 about the danger of the Russian Federation. He agreed with Mr Bulai on the need to have an ad hoc tribunal, not only for the purpose of examining the past but also as a tool that could have a bearing on the future, as the Republic of Moldova and the Balkans were currently in danger. He invited members to support the motion on *Excluding the athletes and officials of the Russian Federation and Belarus from participating in the international Olympic movement*. The tradition of holding a truce during the Olympic Games was probably one of the oldest European traditions, which was why Russia had been under pressure to postpone the start of the invasion until after the end of the Beijing Olympic Games on 20 February 2022. No athletes representing Russia or Belarus should be admitted to the Olympics to keep the above tradition alive.

**Mr Howell**, speaking on behalf of the European Conservatives Group & Democratic Alliance (EC/DA), said that, being a member of the UK Parliament for 15 years, he did work in central and eastern Europe and was delighted to take part in this debate. He was very disappointed by the attitude of many Russian citizens who supported the aggression of their country. For 30 years he had been involved with Russia in trying to promote democracy and the market economy, all efforts that were swept aside by Putin. He wanted to pay tribute to the courage of the Ukrainian people and commemorate the victims. The speech that the Secretary General gave at the last session would not have been possible before, and this showed the evolution of thinking in the Council of Europe. It was satisfying to see after years of rhetoric that the Council of Europe was not a defence organisation and that nothing could be done, that actions were possible such as the establishment of the register. The recommendation on *Environmental impact of armed conflicts* adopted at the last session invited for a treaty to be drawn up on this subject and the Council of Europe should take the lead. It was disappointing to see that the idea of an ad hoc tribunal was still being debated. In addition, the problem of Russian propaganda had to be overcome and it was pleasing to see that the Secretary General was prepared to take action on these issues.

**Mr Jónsson**, speaking on behalf of the Group of the Unified European Left (UEL), spoke of his visit to Ukraine the week before, during which he and his Assembly colleagues met President Zelensky and the Minister of Defence. They were able to attend the ceremony held in the hemicycle of the Verkhovna Rada to mark one year after the full-scale invasion by the Russian Federation. President Zelensky started the meeting by saying that the people of Ukraine did not want to lose their country and independence. The Ukrainian delegation to the Assembly could be proud of the fact that the entire Assembly had come together to achieve this goal.

**Ms Kravchuk** learned of the full-scale invasion when she had been at the Hague during the fact-finding mission to prepare a report on *Justice and security for women in peace reconciliation*. Her return plane had been the last to land at Boryspil airport, which she hoped would become operative again. She had just returned from the session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe which continued to have the Russian Federation among its members. To oppose this, the Ukrainian delegation stayed out of the meeting room and had twenty bilateral meetings. She invited colleagues to ask their respective delegations to the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to change the Rules of Procedure to allow for sanctions for flagrant violations. As Chairperson of the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media, she would like to draw attention to the fact that the Russian Federation was deliberately destroying Ukrainian historical, cultural and religious sites with the aim of destroying Ukrainian tangible and intangible identity. She thanked the Assembly for having decided to discuss the case of Ukrainian children abducted by the Russian Federation who were now being re-educated in special camps and forced to lose their Ukrainian identity.

**Mr Zingeris** expressed his sympathy and solidarity to the Chairperson of the delegation of Türkiye, Mr Yıldız, in the context of the earthquake in Türkiye and the 15,000 victims it had caused. He also expressed solidarity for the train accident that had taken place in Greece the day before the Standing Committee had begun its work. The tragedy remained a tragedy regardless of the number of victims. He thanked the Chairperson of the delegation of Ukraine, Ms Mezentsseva, for having organised the visit to Kyiv which allowed Assembly members to better understand the issues and the reality on the ground. It was gratifying to see that the Assembly had a unanimous position, expressed, among others, in resolutions on *Further escalation in the Russian Federation's aggression against Ukraine* and on *Legal and human rights aspects of the Russian Federation's aggression against Ukraine*. Unanimity within the Assembly was not the case at the time of the annexation of Crimea by Russia. At present, all Assembly groups acted with one voice and be ahead of the Committee of Ministers in view of the forthcoming Fourth Summit. The establishment of the register was welcomed. However, it was also important to invite the Summit to decide on the establishment of an ad hoc

tribunal. The Assembly could adopt a recommendation to this effect during the April part-session. The Assembly needed to act as long as there was a unanimous will to move forward.

**Mr Wold**, speaking on behalf of the Norwegian delegation, pointed out that by invading Ukraine, the Russian Federation had violated not only the Statute of the Council of Europe but also the Charter of the United Nations and, more generally, the rule on which the international order was based. Putin was wrong to think that Europe would not support Ukraine. Looking to the future, the Council of Europe, as the united pan-European platform, should work towards the unity of Europe. Norway already contributed extensively to supporting Ukraine. 10.7 million Norwegian crowns have been donated for civil, humanitarian and military support, and the country was already planning sustainable support in the future. The Norwegian Parliament had already adopted a support plan for Ukraine amounting to 75 million Norwegian crowns, which provided for an annual payment of 15 million between 2023 and 2027. Norwegian funding would cover military and humanitarian support, but also the repair of civilian infrastructure and reconstruction, when possible. This support was necessary for the Ukrainian people, but also for the security of Norway and of the whole of Europe.

**Ms Stienen** extended her sympathy to the Chairperson of the Turkish delegation, Mr Yildiz, for the terrible events that affected both the citizens of Türkiye and the Syrians who had found refuge in the country. She extended her sympathy to her Greek colleagues for the train accident. While discussing the situation in Ukraine, it was necessary to go beyond the Europe-centric vision to include the countries that were Partners for Democracy and also those countries that had experience of the conflict. There was a meeting organised by the Lithuanian Parliament against immunity and on accountability, during which it became clear that if the Baltic States had been listened to more concerning Putin's ambitions, it would have been possible, if not to prevent the war, at least to be better prepared. A banner on a building in Vilnius which said "Putin, the Hague is waiting for you", correctly summed up today's interventions.

**The President** thanked the members for their contributions. There were many ways in which the Council of Europe could support Ukraine, such as the Secretary General's proposal to set up a register of claims. This proposal would certainly be included in the declaration of the Reykjavik Summit. In the future this register could be hosted in the Netherlands, as the Dutch Minister of Legal Protection had confirmed.

### **Friday 3 March 2023 from 09:00 to 12:30**

#### **10. #ROADTOREYKJAVIK: TOWARDS THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE OF THE FUTURE**

**Mr Martin Eyjólfsson**, Permanent Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Iceland, said that the Reykjavik Summit was a critical opportunity for the Heads of State and Government to come together to reiterate their support for Ukraine and Europe, as well as to deliver concrete results. Interactivity was at the heart of the organisation of the Summit with a round table, a dinner and a general debate. Two thirds of the participants had already confirmed their participation, and the members of the Assembly were invited to contact their respective governments on this subject. A live broadcast was planned with the aim of having an open event, as well as the participation of civil society with more than 100 contributions already received. The Standing Committee will be held the day before to endorse the two-pillar structure of the Council of Europe and to give democratic legitimacy to the Summit. There was close interaction between the two pillars ahead of the Summit with the participation of the Prime Minister of Iceland scheduled for the April part-session and the participation of the President of the Assembly in the Reykjavik Summit. The Congress of Local and Regional Authorities would also be present in the Summit. The Secretary General already submitted the modalities for the establishment of the register of damages. Work was also done on finalising the final Summit's document taking account of input from the Assembly, NGOs and the open calls.

**Mr Daems** asked whether the Summit should not already set the date for a next summit in order to make the meeting of Heads of State and Government a regular exercise. Also, supported by **Ms Kravchuk**, he suggested that the Joint Committee meeting be held on the day of the Summit.

**Mr Cottier** agreed with the proposal to hold the Joint Committee meeting but was not optimistic about the realisation of this idea. He invited colleagues to contact their respective governments, as he had done, with the request to be part of national delegations and in this way contribute to the discussion. Youth should be involved in the holding of the Summit, and in general in the activities of the Council of Europe. Embedding the adherence to principles of democracy in schools would make young people better leaders of tomorrow. The title of the discussion was "#ROADTOREYKJAVIK: towards the Council of Europe of the future", and the youth was the future.

**Mr Bulai** asked for more information on the participation of European micro-States, of the opposition of Belarus and the representatives of Kosovo. Also, was the participation of Türkiye foreseen given the presidential election on 14 May?

**Mr Zingeris** welcomed the idea of introducing a register of damages at the Summit. Another important action was the establishment of the ad hoc tribunal.

**Ms Stienen** stressed the importance of having the participation of civil society.

**Mr Eyjólfsson** gave a positive appraisal to the idea of having regular summits. As for the Joint Committee meeting, the agenda of the Summit was quite busy, but he would take this proposal back to Reykjavik. It was important to involve the youth: if we did not act now, democracy would be in danger. Participatory inclusiveness was important for Iceland, itself being a small State. The organisers were in contact with the Belarusian opposition and the format of participation had to be confirmed. The establishment of the register of damages and the ad hoc tribunal were the main topics of discussion at the Summit. With regard to the tribunal, there was a need to be consistent on the steps to be taken. The participation of civil society was foreseen, and the format was yet to be confirmed. There would be a live broadcast of the event.

**Mr Leendert Verbeek**, President of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, recalled that the aim of the Fourth Summit was to renew the 'conscience of Europe'. The Summit came at a time of emerging health, environmental and energy challenges. In addition to these threats and challenges, the Russian Federation's aggression against Ukraine marked the return of war to Europe and also the desire of a nuclear power to roll back all the founding values. The objective of the Fourth Summit would be, among others, to improve the efficiency of all the Council of Europe bodies including the Congress. Established as an intergovernmental organisation, the Council of Europe also equipped itself with bodies to enable it to reinforce the work in favour of values. The Congress was one of two political assemblies of the Council of Europe, created by the decision of the Assembly to strengthen territorial democracy. Today nearly 130 000 local and regional authorities represented by the Congress have become major players in the democratic health of societies. A sustainable response to the challenges required actions by local, regional, provincial or municipal governments. The local level was also well situated to test democratic innovations. Therefore, it was important to strengthen the Congress. Ms O'Loughlin (ALDE, Ireland) stressed in the report "The Reykjavik Summit of the Council of Europe: United around values in the face of extraordinary challenges" the role of the two assemblies as political bodies representing European citizens which should play a more important role in taking part in the general activities of the Organisation and in serving as multipliers of its norms and values at national level. The heads of delegations to the Congress were invited to contact their counterparts in the Parliamentary Assembly in order to better co-ordinate their joint actions.

**Mr Bjørn Berge**, Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe, welcomed the contribution to the preparation of the Fourth Summit by the Assembly, embodied in the report by Ms O'Loughlin. This, together with the report of the High-level Reflection Group, the important contribution of the Congress to be adopted in March, the CURE Campaign input, as well as other inputs, constituted a very solid basis for reflections on what could be achieved at the Summit. The Committee of Ministers discussions were now at full speed. The Summit would provide a historic opportunity to redefine the future of the Council of Europe in a fundamentally changed European geopolitical landscape and to unambiguously commit to our values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law, as opposed to the violence, death and destruction pushed by those sitting in the Kremlin right now. No doubt Putin and his supporters would face justice and the Council of Europe should play a key role here. The role of the Council of Europe was three-fold. First, the continuation of support for the Prosecutor General of Ukraine in dealing with alleged crimes and human rights violations, including in the context of the new Council of Europe Action Plan for Ukraine "Resilience, Recovery and Reconstruction" 2023-2026. Second, the Council of Europe could play a leading role in the establishment and the functioning of a register of damages, physical and material, as a first and necessary step for the operation of any future compensation mechanism. Third, the Council of Europe should provide its support to any international effort relating to the establishment of the special tribunal for the crime of aggression against Ukraine. The extent of that support could include, for example, assistance in the selection and appointment of judges, the elaboration of rules of evidence and procedure, the provision of technical or legal support in the area of case management, and the secondment of experts. It was also necessary to reflect on how we came to such a situation of aggression. This was due to the renunciation of democratic values and the rule of law standards which had been noted throughout recent years by the European Court of Human Rights, the monitoring bodies, the Secretary General and the Assembly. The authority of the Court would be reconfirmed, as well as the rights surrounding free and fair elections, which included among others, free speech, free and smooth transfer of power. Youth and civil society had to be extensively integrated into the work of the Council of Europe, including those from the opposition of Belarus and Russia. The Fourth Summit would also address new challenges such as the environmental crisis and artificial intelligence. He agreed with Professor Barbara Oomen who had mentioned

the silent impact of the Council of Europe on building human rights protection in Europe and showed how it was possible to reach out to citizens to tell the Council's stories.

**Ms Jacobine Geel**, President of the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights, recalled the Congress of Europe which took place 75 years ago in The Hague and was the origin of the Council of Europe. The standards elaborated by the Council of Europe remained highly influential for the definition, promotion and protection of human rights. National human rights institutes monitor how these standards are respected by member States, based on the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights and the supervision of their execution, the work of the Assembly and monitoring bodies such as GREVIO, and the visits of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture. The participants were able to see how the current context and new challenges – such as climate change or artificial intelligence – were changing the human rights landscape. In particular, the use of artificial intelligence opened opportunities, but created the risk of abuse that could lead to the violation of human rights. Looking at the future of the Council of Europe, there were both opportunities and a need for continuing and strengthening co-operation between the Council and national human rights institutions that worked in both directions: they shared knowledge with the Council of Europe bodies and brought knowledge of standards to the national level. The Council of Europe was invited to explore the ways in which it could strengthen its co-operation with institutions during the Reykjavik Summit.

For **Ms O'Loughlin**, the Assembly and the Congress were both political bodies and the role of the Congress was highlighted in her last report. The report also mentioned democratic backsliding, climate justice and artificial intelligence. The Congress was created at a summit 30 years ago and was working today for the strengthening of democracy at the local level in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity. The Congress President's aim to strengthen the co-operation of the two assemblies was welcome. More than 130 cases of the European Court of Human Rights concerned local or regional governments. The voice of young people had to be heard. The Fourth Summit should be the summit of unity. The Council of Europe was the only international Organisation that had expelled Russia and this moment should be seized to continue.

As Chairperson of the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media, **Ms Kravchuk** stressed the importance of culture and education for the development of young people. These were the Council of Europe's key activities and were currently suffering from budgetary cuts. It was important for the Council of Europe to protect the cultural identity of displaced Ukrainians.

**Mr Daems** recalled that the European Convention on Human Rights was about fundamental freedoms and should also be the subject of the Fourth Summit to ensure that democracy did not turn into the authority of the majority. The Summit should be committed to the respect of new generations of rights such as environmental rights. The Council of Europe could then give legal form to this political commitment. Protocol 15 to the European Convention on Human Rights dealt with the principle of subsidiarity promoting the action at the level of the Congress' representatives. The commitment to the respect of the new generation of rights could mobilise the participation of young people.

**Ms Mezentseva** thanked the "City4City" programme which involved all member States and addressed the specific needs of Ukrainian cities, such as the payment of oil by Rotterdam to Kharkiv or the delivery of warm clothes to Odesa. The office of the Council of Europe in Ukraine was the largest of all field offices with many projects carried out on the ground. However, this work of the Council was still unfortunately unknown to the population. Youth was no longer our future but already our present, ready to run our human rights institutions.

**Mr Zingeris** welcomed the efforts of the Council of Europe to resist attempts to destroy democracy. Despite the war, Ukrainian parliamentarians continued to exercise their democratic duty. Under the bombing, the Istanbul Convention was ratified. The Deputy Secretary General mentioned the establishment of a register of damages and an ad hoc tribunal, both of which were important projects to bring to fruition. The Summit declaration should also support the UN's commitment to democracy.

For **Ms Kalniņa-Lukaševica**, it was important to reconcile the present and the future agenda. In the present, it was obvious that the value system of the international order was challenged by the aggression of Ukraine by the Russian Federation. It was important for all international organisations and States to act through the resolution to stop Russia and to set up a system of accountability: both the register of damages caused by the violation of international law and an ad hoc tribunal. The second element was equally important and she hoped to see Putin on trial in The Hague one day. Looking ahead, the values and standards of the Council of Europe on freedom of expression and the protection of journalists were in danger. Several state and non-state actors were using these values to destroy them by indulging in propaganda and glorification of war crimes. The Reykjavik Declaration should enable the Council of Europe to find ways to respect human rights in this context and to resist the threat.

**Mr Mularczyk** stressed the urgency of reconciliation in Europe in the face of the aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine. An integral part of reconciliation was compensation or restitution, made in a fair and non-discriminatory manner. After the Second World War, the continent was divided and the countries of central and eastern Europe found themselves behind the Iron Curtain under Soviet domination, without their consent. Consequently, they were deprived of the possibility to seek a recovery and appropriate compensation. Therefore, it was important today to allow all victims to obtain redress regardless of their nationality, ethnic identity and country of origin. Russian aggression on Ukraine should remind that no statutory limitation applied to war crimes and crimes against humanity, irrespective of the date of their commission. It also reminded that victims of gross violations of international human rights law and serious violations of international humanitarian law had the right to remedies including equal and effective access to justice, and adequate, effective and prompt reparation for the harm suffered. Sustainable standards and norms were needed, based on the principle of equal redress for all victims. The experience of the Congress in monitoring the European Charter of Local Self-Government and observing local and regional elections allowed early warning in democratic backsliding. The Congress had developed synergies with the European Court on Human Rights and should also be systematically consulted by the Committee of Ministers.

**Mr Wold** found the points raised during the discussion interesting. Undoubtedly Ukraine would be the central topic of the Fourth Summit. Also, it would be necessary to recommit to main principles and values. For example, it was important to support the authority of the Court because Russia's attack on Ukraine showed clearly what could happen if human rights were not respected. It was important to focus on the implementation of the Court's judgements too. Closer co-operation with civil society was also necessary.

**Ms Khomenko** recalled that in November 2022 Ukraine proposed a peace plan. The Summit would be an opportunity to implement this plan. The ad hoc tribunal for crimes of aggression should be established and she expressed the hope that the Council of Europe would participate in the special working group on the establishment of this tribunal. The peace plan also provided for the return of displaced persons, including Ukrainian children forcibly displaced and held in Russia. Another point of the plan concerned the protection of the right to a healthy environment in times of war, including the criminalisation of environmental crimes. Food shortage was another important point as food security was important to secure democracy. The Black Sea Initiative was important: 10 million tonnes of foodstuffs were transported by sea which could, if the Initiative was extended, increase the transportation to 45 million tonnes this year including to countries which faced the food shortage. Radioactive and nuclear threats should also be mentioned. She hoped that the Ukraine peace plan would be taken into consideration at the Summit.

**Mr Jensen** recalled that the idea of having a Summit was originally developed by Mr Nicoletti in his report *A call for a Council of Europe Summit to defend and promote democratic security in Europe*. This idea had become even more relevant, given the current context. The summit presented an opportunity to strengthen the Council of Europe and to confirm the fundamental value of human rights. We were on the right path regarding the participation in the Fourth Summit. He supported the idea of giving more space to the subject of culture.

**Mr Cottier**, Chairperson of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights, was very supportive of recommitting to fundamental freedoms and of underlining the importance of compliance with the judgements of the European Court of Human Rights. The proposals of the Secretary General, including the establishment of a register of damages, were welcomed. He recalled that the Assembly was to hold a conference on election observations, an important activity challenged by the Covid-19 pandemic, crises and natural disasters. The participation of both the President of the Assembly and the President of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities was an important element of synergy.

For **Ms Geel** it was important that the Summit recommitted to the values and principles and that it was as public and inclusive as possible. The best way to attract the attention of young people was to provide an example of personal commitment to the principles one defended.

**Mr Verbeek** reiterated the importance of co-operation between the two assemblies to defend human rights at local level. The Assembly identified the core issue to be defended and the Congress used it to promote it and defend it locally. For example, during his visit to Türkiye, where he visited imprisoned mayors, he relied heavily on the Assembly's reports. The reports on environmental issues were important too in this regard, which he confirmed was also the topic that could attract the participation of young people. He also emphasised the role of culture in democracy, which was why the role of culture should be recognised. Concerning the "City4City" platform, the Congress was involved in its management and was made aware that the cultural background could impact contacts between cities. This led him to conclude that democracy was dependent on a cultural background and therefore not transposable from one country to another. Each country, also Ukraine, had to find its own democratic construction.



For **Mr Berge**, it was important to reach out to citizens and youth and it could be done through the Council of Europe's initiative of having a contact person in each government. New initiatives were needed. The future position of the Commissioner for Democracy and Rule of Law proposed by the Assembly was a means of preventing the backsliding in democracy that everyone noted. The Commissioner could travel to member States to raise awareness and to promote the work of the Council. More attention should be paid to the assistance projects in addition to the already extensive work on standard-setting and monitoring. Some member States work on principles of democracy that each country could sign up to. The execution of the Court's judgments was an important point; having just the Committee of Ministers meetings was not enough. The Council was working on a convention to combat environmental crimes, as well as on a convention on artificial intelligence. Ukraine was a priority for the Council of Europe, which was running many projects. The Cultural Roads was a unique project bringing States together and showing the importance of culture, the increased focus on which had been highlighted by Ms Kravchuk. She also mentioned education and it should be noted that a "democratic citizen project" was being introduced in school curriculums to respond to the backsliding of democracy. Freedom of journalists was a concern of the Council of Europe, which worked on media literacy.

**The President** closed the debate and thanked participants for their interesting contributions.

## 11. MIGRATION, REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

### European solidarity in the context of asylum and international protection

Doc. 15718

**Mr Gavan**, presenting the report in the absence of the rapporteur, the Earl of Dundee, who had left the Assembly, stressed the importance of the report in the current context of the Russian Federation's invasion of Ukraine. European solidarity in the context of asylum and international protection was an essential part of the European values enshrined in the Statute of the Council of Europe and the Organisation possessed a set of tools enabling its implementation by member States. The situation of the 5 million displaced Ukrainian citizens called for innovative solutions on the ground. Solidarity allowed to reach an objective of better protection of displaced persons, refugees and persons under international protection. The Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, the Conference of INGOs, the European Youth Centres in Strasbourg and Budapest, and the North-South Centre in Lisbon were already contributing to this action. The report also highlighted the role of the Council of Europe Development Bank which mobilised an important sum for displaced Ukrainians and the country itself while the country was in the process of joining the Bank. The report gave practical examples of actions and urged the creation of a more efficient system for allocating tasks and deployment to a variety of capable operators. The Assembly will be able to provide political support to the topic, which should also be on the agenda of the Reykjavik Summit. Tribute should be paid to the rapporteur for his deep commitment to the refugees. At present, his charity, called Siobhan's Trust, provides 4 000 hot meals a day in eastern Ukraine. Following the terrible earthquake in Türkiye, he also planned to organise humanitarian help to internally displaced persons there.

The Chairperson of the committee, **Mr Rousopoulos**, paid tribute to the work of the Earl of Dundee in the committee.

**Mr Yildiz** recalled that during the migration crisis the European Union was reluctant to receive Syrian refugees on its soil. Türkiye welcomed the refugees and an agreement was concluded with the European Union, the terms of which were not entirely respected. The question of solidarity arose again following the recent earthquakes in Türkiye. Many Turkish citizens, but also Syrian refugees, lost their homes. They wanted to come to their families living in the European Union, which was very difficult because of the visa regime. Mr Yildiz called on his colleagues from EU member countries to promote solidarity and make it easier for their governments to facilitate the visa application by victims of the earthquakes.

**Ms Stienen** shared the view that solidarity should not depend on the nationality of the people seeking asylum or international protection. Putin used the migration crisis as a weapon. In 2015, Syrian schools, nurseries and hospitals were bombed by Putin to undermine the stability of the Western societies by creating migration flows of people seeking protection. Europe showed that it could resist by providing protection to Ukrainians. She invited the Standing Committee to identify lessons learned. For example, people impacted by the current situation in Ukraine were able, given the special status, to quickly find housing and work.

**Mr Zingeris** paid tribute to the Earl of Dundee and praised his work. He supported Mr Yildiz regarding the reluctance of the European Union. The EU had allocated but blocked the transfer of €6 billion allocated since 2016 to refugees. The Russian private military group Wagner had used Syria as a laboratory before committing crimes on Ukrainian soil. The group was to be declared a terrorist group by the Assembly.

**Mr Gavan** shared all points raised during the discussion. Solidarity should not depend on the nationality of those seeking protection. The example of Ukraine showed that solidarity was possible, and lessons should be learned for the future. Finally, he joined the voices praising the work of the Earl of Dundee.

The Standing Committee **adopted unanimously** the draft resolution “European solidarity in the context of asylum and international protection” [Resolution 2487 (2023)].

The draft recommendation “European solidarity in the context of asylum and international protection” was also **adopted unanimously** [Recommendation 2248 (2023)].

## 12. CULTURE, SCIENCE, EDUCATION AND MEDIA

### a. The Cultural Routes: a platform for intercultural dialogue

[Doc. 15710](#)

**Mr Gryffroy**, rapporteur, presented the report on “the Cultural Routes: a platform for intercultural dialogue” which was a follow-up to the report on *Cultural heritage in crisis and post-crisis situations* by Ms Ismeta Dervoz, in that it examined the role of cultural routes in promoting the Council of Europe policies on social cohesion and intercultural dialogue between groups and individuals with different cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds, but also on access to culture across regions in Europe. The current war in Ukraine and the war in Yugoslavia in the 1990s showed that cultural identity and heritage could be a target of destruction. The rapporteur wanted to thank experts who stand behind the six Cultural Routes and were interviewed online – Atrium Route, Liberation Route Europe, European Route of Jewish heritage, Saint Martin of Tours Route, Phoenicians’ Route and Routes of El Legado Andalusi. The establishment of a route required solid logistical support which was why the European Institute of Cultural Routes was established in Luxembourg. Once created, it was necessary for a route to sustain its activity and relevance in the long term and the draft resolution highlighted in paragraphs 4 and 5 some recommendations in this regard for the attention of both central as well as local and regional governments. The European Union was also invited to co-operate with the Council of Europe to support the Cultural Routes Programme, in particular within the framework of the European Heritage Label (EHL) initiative, and to develop targeting EU funding programmes for cultural routes. The committee also invited Partners or Democracy or Observers with the Parliamentary Assembly to join the Enlarged Partial Agreement on Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe.

**Mr Cottier** recalled that it was unfortunately necessary, in view of the resources available, to make a choice in terms of priorities and that it would be difficult to increase the funding for all the projects. Even if he supported the idea of closer co-operation with the European Union, the idea of the EHL, which the Peace Palace was among the first to receive, had been extended to all European States, which formed together the European cultural heritage.

**Mr Gryffroy** concurred with Mr Cottier. In addition, the cultural routes went beyond the European borders like the Phoenicians’ Route which went across the Mediterranean or the Routes El Legado Andalusi which went to Northern Africa. However, it was important to co-operate with the European Union in view of the funding of the European cultural heritage, but at the same time to maintain independence.

The Chairperson of the committee, **Ms Kravchuk**, welcomed the report and said the cultural roads were important for establishing co-operation across borders and to deepen the knowledge of heritage. That was the case of Ukraine which joined the Enlarged Partial Agreement on Cultural Routes in 2021.

The Standing Committee **adopted unanimously** the draft resolution “The Cultural Routes: a platform for intercultural dialogue” [Resolution 2488 (2023)].

The draft recommendation “The Cultural Routes: a platform for intercultural dialogue” was also **adopted unanimously** [Recommendation 2249 (2023)].

### b. Promoting online education and research across national borders

[Doc. 15714](#)

The Chairperson of the committee, **Ms Kravchuk**, presented the report in the absence of the rapporteur, the Earl of Dundee, who had left the Assembly. The right to education, guaranteed by the Additional Protocol No. 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights, was fundamental to the creation and development of democratic societies. The Covid-19 pandemic and Russia's military attack on Ukraine showed that the current system of education in Europe was fragile. On the other hand, technological advances allowed for a transition to an on-line interactive and inclusive education, the strengths and weaknesses of which were examined in the report. The report examined the work of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) on tertiary education in light of the increasing use of online courses. In 2019, UNESCO launched

Open Education Resources, to which the Council of Europe could bring a complementary dimension in particular by reducing the geographical and linguistic divide and encouraging a response and regulations by public authorities to the offer by private industries producing digital educational resources. At the level of the European Union, the Digital Education Action Plan (2021-2027) called for greater promotion of on-line learning and for support of digital education systems. Advanced digital skills were considered as priorities by the EU. In its Resolution 2411 (2021) the Assembly also examined lessons learned from the implementation of emergency pandemic measures, including on-line education. It invited policy makers to make it accessible and free from gender, cultural, age and other stereotypes. Another question concerned the support needed by schools, libraries and institutions for a transition from blackboard and books to interactive on-line education. Quality standards and norms should also be encouraged along with the recognition of online study periods and results in accordance with the Lisbon Recognition Convention. The forthcoming Conference of Ministers of Education (28-29 September 2023) would address the topics of the renewal of the civic mission of education, education in times of crises and digitalisation and AI in education. The Committee of Ministers was invited to make the right to education, including to on-line education, a priority and to update the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region. The Council's work on library legislation and policy should be encouraged. Eurimages work had to include co-production of socially responsible videos to help an interactive learning process. The internet and schools were part of the critical infrastructure. Without electricity, as was the case in Ukraine, the right to education was not effective.

For **Ms O'Loughlin**, on-line education could not replace classical education, which remained an important means of socialisation. The disadvantage of on-line education, made obvious during the Covid-19 pandemic, was its ability to make inequalities more pronounced. The issue of school infrastructure was to be one of the subjects of the Reykjavik Summit. The positive development was that after the pandemic schools were able to switch quickly to on-line mode when physical attendance was not temporarily possible because of, for instance, weather conditions.

For **Mr Yildiz**, online education was a good means of providing education in the context of pandemic, war, or natural disasters. Online education was also open to international co-operation. However, one had to consider addiction or hate speech.

**Ms Dalloz** supported the report subject to recognition that on-line education remained reserved for contexts such as pandemics or serious crises without becoming the norm. It was also necessary to consider the desocialisation and the personal follow-up of a pupil by a teacher.

**Ms Kravchuk** stressed that online education was becoming increasingly widespread in the context of digital innovation, which was why one needed to be prepared for it.

The Standing Committee **adopted unanimously** the draft resolution "Promoting online education and research across national borders" [Resolution 2489 (2023)].

The draft recommendation "Promoting online education and research across national borders" was also **adopted unanimously** [Recommendation 2250 (2023)].

### 13. EQUALITY AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

#### Innovative approaches to sexual and reproductive health and rights

[Doc. 15715](#)

**Ms Stienen**, rapporteur, thanked the experts who had contributed to the preparation of her report, which advocated for a change in mentality given that sexual reproductive health and rights was more than only warning about unwanted pregnancies, sexually transmitted diseases, or access to legal and safe abortion. The main goal of the report was to identify innovative approaches to sexual and reproductive health and rights: in science and technology, design, communication and education. As far as communication was concerned, the report examined how to organise information on sexual and reproductive health rights. The Irish referendum campaign "Together For Yes" was mentioned. The report also reflected on how one should act when facing the issue of the ultra-conservative's backlash on women's rights: ignore them or react, and how? Male contraception was an important shift in the share of responsibilities between women and men. Technology provided e-health care that facilitated access to health care for all genders. However, one should avoid e-healthcare being used as a justification to reduce "real life" services. The concern of design was about the integration of all gender aspects already in university education in the fields of engineering and technology. For example, medical tools that were supposedly gender neutral were very often designed for men with harmful consequences for women. The report addressed identity, gender expression and sexual characteristics not only of cis-gender women but also of transgender people. At the same time, the text advocated for an intersectional approach because the various grounds of discrimination such as race, religion, culture, gender,

social origin or age were often intersected. The draft resolution also acknowledged the notion of “reproductive coercion” – pressure to become pregnant or control over the outcomes of a pregnancy – which often came from the partner but also from family members or religious leaders. The report also stressed the need to promote comprehensive sex education which should be part of the school curriculum at all levels.

**Mr Jensen** underlined that the report dealt with the right to self-determination including abortion. It sent an important signal on the eve of the annual UN Commission on the Status of Women. What was the message on abortion the Assembly could present to the UN Commission?

**Ms O’Loughlin** said the Irish referendum was an example of when civil society had been ahead of parliamentarians and provided a good experience of engaging with civil society to have a full consultation.

**Ms Stienen** did not want the report to be focused on abortion. The 2022 Assembly report “Access to abortion in Europe: stopping anti-choice harassment” by Ms Margreet De Boer was the one which addressed in detail the topic as well as anti-choice attacks in clinics. If sexuality and well-informed choices to have children were respected, the number of abortions would decrease, that was the message of the present report. But generally, the legal right to abortion was needed which was already the case in most member States. She also thanked all who had contributed to the drafting of the report.

The Chairperson of the committee, **Ms Mezentseva**, said that 1.8 billion people were currently in fragile settings including 168 million in humanitarian settings. Sexual and reproductive health and rights were closely linked to implementation of Sustainable Development Goals and the education level which guided choices. The report mentioned innovative approaches including telemedicine which allowed to expand services and beneficiaries. The integration of reproductive health and rights in development programmes for maternity and child health was also mentioned. The effect of the full-scale aggression of Ukraine by the Russian Federation impacted 1.7 billion people in 94 countries. Gender-based violence perpetrated in Ukraine deprived victims of their reproductive rights as some of them would never be able to give birth. The report would continue to be discussed during a meeting on the ratification of the Istanbul Convention to be held in London and at the meeting of the annual UN Commission on the Status of Women.

The Standing Committee **adopted unanimously** the draft resolution “Innovative approaches to sexual and reproductive health and rights” [Resolution 2490 (2023)].

#### 14. OTHER BUSINESS

**Mr Yildiz** expressed his thanks for the messages of solidarity. The death toll was rising. Turkish rescue services were not able to immediately reach the Syrian side due to restrictions by the Syrian regime. The war in Ukraine continued. The Black Sea Corridor was extended for three months until mid-March and Türkiye would make every effort to ensure that this initiative continued. However, a joint action within the UN was needed to put pressure on the Russian Federation, especially in the light of experts’ predictions of a forthcoming Russian offensive.

**The President** reminded that the possible action by the Council of Europe following the earthquakes in Türkiye would be discussed during the April part session and the rapporteur, Mr Moutquin, would pay a visit to the country.

**Mr Seyidov** would like to inform the committee on recent development in the region. In particular, the Parliament of Azerbaijan appointed a special envoy to Nagorno-Karabakh to have direct communication with Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh which was made possible following the resignation of Ruben Vardanyan.

**The President** regretted the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh and reminded that peace was a vital precondition of a civilised society.

#### 15. NEXT MEETINGS

**The President** announced that the next meetings of the Standing Committee would be held in Reykjavik (Iceland) on 15 May 2023, and in Riga (Latvia) on 25-26 May 2023.

The meeting **ended** at 13:00.

## APPENDIX 1

### References to committees

**1. The situation in Iran**

[Doc. 15688](#)

**Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Max Lucks and other members of the Assembly**

Reference to the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy *for report* and to the Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination *for opinion*

**2. Promoting the revised Code of Good Practice on Referendums**

[Doc. 15691](#)

**Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr George Papandreou and other members of the Assembly**

Reference to the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy *for report*

**3. Ensuring Azerbaijan's accountability for serious violations of international humanitarian law and its statutory obligations**

[Doc. 15693](#)

**Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Ruben Rubinyan and other members of the Assembly**

Reference to the Committee on the Honouring of Obligations and Commitments by Member States of the Council of Europe (Monitoring Committee) *to be taken into account in the framework of the report on the "Honouring of obligations and commitments by Azerbaijan"* and to the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons *to take into account in the preparation of the report on "Addressing the humanitarian consequences of the blockade of the Latchin corridor"*

**4. Excluding the athletes and officials of the Russian Federation and Belarus from participating in the international Olympic movement**

[Doc. 15721](#)

**Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Indrek Saar and other members of the Assembly**

Reference to the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media *for report*

**5. Transfer and resettlement of asylum seekers**

[Doc. 15571](#)

**Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Liddell-Grainger and other members of the Assembly**

Reference to the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons *to take into account in the preparation of the report on "Ensuring human rights compliant asylum procedures"*.

## APPENDIX 2

### List of participants / Liste des participants

#### President of the Parliamentary Assembly / Président de l'Assemblée parlementaire

Mr Tiny KOX Netherlands / Pays-Bas

#### Chairpersons of Political Groups / Présidents des groupes politiques

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Mr Frank SCHWABE        | Socialists, Democrats and Greens Group (SOC) /<br>Groupe des socialistes, démocrates et verts (SOC)   |
| Mr Aleksander POCIEJ    | Group of the European People's Party (EPP/CD) /<br>Groupe du Parti populaire européen (PPE/DC)  |
| Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER | European Conservatives Group and Democratic Alliance<br>(EC/DA) /<br>Groupe des Conservateurs européens et Alliance démocratique<br>(CE/AD) |
| M. Iulian BULAI         | Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE) / Alliance<br>des démocrates et des libéraux pour l'Europe (ADLE)                      |
| Mr George KATROUGALOS   | Group of the Unified European Left (UEL) /<br>Groupe pour la gauche unitaire européenne (GUE)   |

#### Vice-Presidents of the Assembly / Vice-président·e·s de l'Assemblée

|                     |                              |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Mr John HOWELL      | United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni |
| Mr Reinhold LOPATKA | Austria / Autriche           |
| Mr Armin LASCHET    | Germany / Allemagne          |
| Mr Ahmet YILDIZ     | Türkiye                      |
| M. Bertrand BOUYX   | France                       |
| Ms Olena KHOMENKO   | Ukraine                      |
| Ms Elvira KOVÁCS    | Serbia / Serbie              |

#### Chairpersons of National Delegations / Président·e·s de délégations nationales

|                             |                              |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Mr Samad SEYIDOV            | Azerbaijan / Azerbaïdjan     |
| Mr Reinhold LOPATKA         | Austria / Autriche           |
| Mr Rik DAEMS                | Belgium / Belgique           |
| Mr Nicos TORNARITIS         | Cyprus / Chypre              |
| Mr Georg GEORGIEV           | Bulgaria / Bulgarie          |
| Mr Mogens JENSEN            | Denmark / Danemark           |
| M. Bertrand BOUYX           | France                       |
| Mr Frank SCHWABE            | Germany / Allemagne          |
| Mr Irakli CHIKOVANI         | Georgia / Géorgie            |
| Mr Bjarni JÓNSSON           | Iceland / Islande            |
| Ms Fiona O'LOUGHLIN         | Ireland / Irlande            |
| Mr Gusty GRAAS              | Luxembourg                   |
| Ms Zanda KALNIŅA-LUKAŠEVICA | Latvia / Lettonie            |
| Mr Emanuelis ZINGERIS       | Lithuania / Lituanie         |
| Ms Petra STIENEN            | Netherlands / Pays-Bas       |
| Mr Arkadiusz MULARCZYK      | Poland / Pologne             |
| Ms Biljana PANTIĆ PILJA     | Serbia / Serbie              |
| M. Damien COTTIER           | Switzerland / Suisse         |
| Mr Ahmet YILDIZ             | Türkiye                      |
| Ms Mariia MEZENTSEVA        | Ukraine                      |
| Mr John HOWELL              | United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni |

**Chairperson of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights /  
Président de la Commission des questions juridiques et des droits de l'homme**  
M. Damien COTTIER Switzerland / Suisse

**Chairperson of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons /  
Président de la Commission des migrations, des réfugiés et des personnes déplacées**  
Mr Theodoros ROUSOPOULOS Greece / Grèce

**Chairperson of the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media /  
Présidente de la Commission de la culture, de la science, de l'éducation et des médias**  
Ms Yevheniia KRAVCHUK Ukraine

**Chairperson of the Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination /  
Présidente de la Commission sur l'égalité et la non-discrimination**  
Ms Mariia MEZENTSEVA Ukraine

**Chairperson of the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs /  
Présidente de la Commission du Règlement, des immunités et des affaires institutionnelles**  
Mme Marie-Christine DALLOZ France

**Chairperson of the Committee on the Election of Judges to the European Court of Human Rights /  
Président de la Commission sur l'élection des juges à la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme**  
Mr Titus CORLĂȚEAN Romania / Roumanie

**Rapporteurs of the Committees / Rapporteur-e-s des commissions**

Mr Andries GRYFFROY Belgium / Belgique  
Ms Petra STIENEN Netherlands / Pays-Bas

**Ex-officio members of the Bureau / Membres ex-officio du Bureau**

Mr Bjarni JÓNSSON Iceland / Islande  
Ms Fiona O'LOUGHLIN Ireland / Irlande  
Ms Zanda KALNIŅA-LUKAŠEVICA Latvia / Lettonie

**Other members of the Parliamentary Assembly / Autres membres de l'Assemblée parlementaire**

Ms Arusyak JULHAKYAN Armenia / Arménie  
Ms Margreet DE BOER Netherlands / Pays-Bas  
Mr Paul GAVAN Ireland / Irlande  
Ms Nina KASIMATI Greece / Grèce  
Ms Agnes MULDER Netherlands / Pays-Bas  
Mr Morten WOLD Norway / Norvège  
Mr Barna Pál ZSIGMOND Hungary / Hongrie

**Invited personalities / Personnalités invitées**

Mr Jan Anthonie BRUIJN President of the Senate (Eerste Kamer) / Président du Sénat (Eerste Kamer)  
Mr Tom van der LEE Vice-President of the House of Representatives (Tweede Kamer) / Vice-Président de la Chambre des Représentants (Tweede Kamer)  
Mr Martin EYJÓLFSSON Permanent Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Iceland / Secrétaire d'État permanent, ministère des Affaires étrangères, Islande  
Mr Leendert VERBEEK President of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities / Président du Congrès des pouvoirs locaux et régionaux  
Ms Jacobine GEEL President of the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights / Présidente de l'Institut néerlandais des droits de l'homme

## **Secretaries of Political Groups / Secrétaires des groupes politiques**

|                       |                 |
|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Ms Francesca ARBOGAST | SOC             |
| Ms Denise O'HARA      | EPP/CD / PPE/DC |
| Mr Tom VAN DIJCK      | EC/DA / CE/AD   |
| Ms Maria BIGDAY       | ALDE / ADLE     |
| Ms Anna KOLOTOVA      | UEL / GUE       |

## **Private Office of the Secretary General and the Deputy Secretary General / Cabinet de la Secrétaire Générale et du Secrétaire Général adjoint du Conseil de l'Europe**

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Ms Marija PEJČINOVIĆ BURIĆ | Secretary General of the Council of Europe / Secrétaire Générale du Conseil de l'Europe   |
| Mr Bjørn BERGE             | Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe / Secrétaire Général adjoint du Conseil de l'Europe   |
| Mr Gianluca ESPOSITO       | Deputy Director of the Private of the Secretary General and the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe / Directeur adjoint du Cabinet de la Secrétaire Générale et du Secrétaire Général adjoint |
| Ms Irène KITSOU-MILONAS    | Adviser, Private office of the Secretary General and the Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe / Conseillère, Cabinet de la Secrétaire Générale et du Secrétaire Général adjoint                |

## **Secretariat of the Parliamentary Assembly / Secrétariat de l'Assemblée parlementaire**

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| Ms Despina CHATZIVASSILIOU | Secretary General / Secrétaire Générale  |
| Ms Louise BARTON           | Director of Committees - Human Dignity and Sustainable Development / Directrice des commissions - Dignité humaine et développement durable   |
| Mr Mark NEVILLE            | Director of Committees - Democracy and Rule of law / Directeur des commissions - Démocratie et État de droit   |
| Mme Valérie CLAMER         | Head of the Table Office, Information Technologies and Events Department / Cheffe du service de la Séance, des technologies de l'information et des événements                                 |
| Ms Liri KOPACI-DI-MICHELE  | Head of the Inter-Parliamentary Co-operation and Parliamentary Projects Support Division / Cheffe de la Division de la coopération interparlementaire et de soutien des projets parlementaires |
| Mr Sergey KHRYCHIKOV       | Acting Head of the Private Office of the President of the Assembly / Chef ad interim du Cabinet du Président de l'Assemblée  |
| Mme Isild HEURTIN          | Head of the Secretariat of the Bureau of the Assembly / Cheffe du Secrétariat du Bureau de l'Assemblée   |
| Mr Francesc FERRER         | Head of the Communication Division / Chef de la Division de la communication   |
| Ms Kateryna GAYEVSKA       | Secretary of the Standing Committee / Secrétaire de la Commission permanente   |
| Ms Greta FAGGIANI          | Acting Head of the Office of the Secretary General / Cheffe du Bureau ad interim de la Secrétaire Générale   |
| Mme Rachel MOREL           | Principal administrative assistant of the Table Office / Assistante administrative principale du Service de la Séance  |
| Mme Martine MEYER          | Administrative assistant of the Standing Committee / Assistante administrative de la Commission permanente   |
| Mme Aurélie HAUG           | Assistant of the Standing Committee / Assistante de la Commission permanente   |
| Mme Anne GAREL             | Assistant of the Bureau / Assistante du Bureau   |