



Strasbourg, 25 October 2021

Report GEC-MIG (2021) September

GENDER EQUALITY COMMISSION

**5th meeting of the Drafting Committee on Migrant Women
(GEC-MIG)**

**Room G02, Agora building, Council of Europe, Strasbourg
and via videoconference (KUDO platform)**

30 September-1 October 2021

REPORT

1. Opening of the meeting by the Chair

1. The Chair, Vera Eloi da Fonseca (Portugal), welcomed the participants and observers to the fifth meeting of the Drafting Committee on Migrant Women (GEC-MIG 5) and gave an overview of the agenda of the meeting.
2. The Chair recalled that the meeting will be devoted to the discussion and adoption of the [compromise working document](#) prepared by herself and the Secretariat and sent to all members on 13 August 2021. The Chair kindly thanked all member states and other stakeholders for their proposed amendments and for the hard work during the two years of negotiations within GEC-MIG. She stressed that this would be the last meeting of GEC-MIG, where members would have two days to agree on the draft document that will be transmitted to the Gender Equality Commission (GEC) in view of discussion and adoption during its November 2021 plenary meeting.
3. The [compromise working document](#) to be discussed during GEC-MIG 5 was prepared taking into account the amendments proposed by member states and other participants and stakeholders, as well as previous discussions and agreement reached on various issues in GEC-MIG and in the GEC itself. The Chair explained, notably, that the draft document did not go back on the outcome of lengthy discussions and agreements previously made regarding the use of terminology around “gender”, “gender-based violence” and “violence against women”.
4. The Chair also proposed the following working methods for the meeting:
 - The aim of GEC-MIG 5 would be to adopt a revised version of the draft recommendation by the end of the two-day meeting;
 - Due to some comments that were made and to sensitivities in some member states, the meeting would start with a brief general discussion on the scope and target groups of the draft recommendation, taking into account previous discussions and agreements;
 - GEC-MIG would then go through the full compromise document starting from the preamble;
 - The title would be discussed at the end;
 - Only new paragraphs or paragraphs which were significantly amended since the last version of the document should be discussed, although of course, members would be free to intervene at any point.
- *The Drafting Committee took note of the information provided and agreed with the proposed working methods.*
5. The list of participants is attached as Appendix II to this report.

2. Adoption of the agenda

- *The Drafting Committee adopted its agenda as set out in Appendix I to this report.*

3. Presentation of the compromise document by the Chair and the Secretariat

6. The Secretariat presented the [compromise document](#), which was the result of the last internal and external consultation on the document that took place from 4 June to 16 July 2021. Comments and amendments were received from 13 member states, one observer state, one international organisation, one civil society organisation and four Council of Europe sectors. All comments and amendments were carefully considered to develop the Chair's compromise document presented for discussion. In the interest of efficiency at this final drafting stage, the document did not highlight the various amendments proposed by members; these were presented in a separate compendium (GEC-MIG (2021) INF 1).
7. The main content-related issues in the compromise document related to: questions on the scope and target groups of the different measures; changes related to legal aid, whereby the text was modified so as not to go beyond the requirements of the Istanbul Convention or the anti-trafficking convention; and to changes and strengthening of the section on girls.
8. It was stressed by the Chair that not all amendments proposed during the last consultation round were integrated in the compromise document. The analysis and decisions on content were made in the interest of consistency with existing standards and policies of the Council of Europe, and in accordance with discussions and agreements reached during the previous four GEC-MIG meetings and at the GEC meetings. Specialised sectors of the Council of Europe were also consulted during this process. The objective in preparing the compromise document was to have a balanced approach, allowing for consensus building between diverging perspectives. The final aim is to present a draft recommendation, for adoption by the GEC and eventually by the Committee of Ministers, that will make a positive difference in the lives of migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls through a better understanding and implementation of relevant human rights standards and policies.

4. Discussion on the scope of the draft recommendation

9. The Chair explained that the aim had always been for the text to cover all groups of migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls and that agreement was reached on this in the GEC-MIG and in the GEC. But as the issue was raised again by some member states in the last consultation exercise, it was felt necessary to clarify the position of the Drafting Committee on this fundamental issue.

10. Louise Hooper, the expert supporting the work of the Drafting Committee, reminded members that the purpose of the work of GEC-MIG was to put together in a single instrument existing legal standards and main Council of Europe and international policy documents, in order to contribute to a better life for all migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls in practice. This exercise should allow for a better awareness, implementation and monitoring of these instruments and help to put the protection of the rights of migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls higher on the political agenda, in accordance with the aims of the Council of Europe.
11. Louise Hooper further explained that a lot of work and time had been devoted, including during GEC-MIG meetings, ensuring that the different provisions (with regard notably to service provision, education, employment or access to justice) are fully in line with existing standards and that they adequately target the relevant group(s). She added that the aim was still also to protect the rights of undocumented migrant women and girls, who are indeed present on the territory of most member states and are one of the most vulnerable groups in society.
12. The Danish delegation stated that they would favour to include only regular migrants in the scope of the draft recommendation and the delegation of the Russian Federation stated that there should be a clear distinction between the rights of regular and irregular migrants.
13. The Chair and Secretariat explained that due account had been taken of the sensitivities of a minority of member states, notably with regard to migrants in an irregular situation and asylum-seekers, when working on the compromise text. Softer language was included, as were several references to internal law and to a possible distinction based on migration status, in order to accommodate these comments. Nevertheless, these comments do not reflect the majority view in the Drafting Committee.
14. A number of delegations reiterated their support for the inclusion of all relevant groups in the scope of the draft recommendation as agreed during previous discussions and in accordance with the mandate of the GEC-MIG. The scope of the draft recommendation covering all migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls was therefore confirmed.

5. Discussion on the provisions of the draft recommendation

[The numbering of paragraphs in this meeting report refers to the numbering in the [working document](#) used in the fifth meeting of the Drafting Committee]

15. The remainder of the two-day meeting was devoted to the discussion of the provisions of the draft recommendation. Members, observers and other participants to the Drafting Committee expressed their positions on the proposals made, starting from the Preamble.

Discussions on the draft preamble

16. Regarding the preamble, the delegation of the Russian Federation asked again for the deletion of paragraph 10, which refers to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Guidelines on Gender-Related Persecution. A great majority of delegations, as well as UNHCR, stressed the importance of this instrument in relation to the draft recommendation and requested to keep such reference, which was done. A similar discussion took place regarding paragraph 52, which mentions gender-sensitive guidelines on asylum, resulting in a similar decision.
17. Some discussions also took place regarding the new proposed article 12bis, which was an attempt to address concerns about distinctions between different legal statuses. A majority of delegations did not agree with this addition and the paragraph was therefore deleted.
18. Regarding paragraph 13, the Danish delegation did not agree to the reference to a “positive contribution” made by migrant women without adding language regarding the challenges posed by irregular migration. As this issue had already been discussed at length during previous meetings, including the need to refer to best practices of integration, it was agreed to keep the reference to “positive contribution”. However, in order to accommodate the minority view, the other delegations agreed to include a reference to “the challenges posed by changes in migration patterns” which was added in a new paragraph.
19. Regarding paragraph 18 on participation and integration, the Danish delegation objected to the inclusion of migrant women as a target group. A majority of delegations (including Croatia, France, Portugal the Slovak Republic and Spain) stressed the need not to distinguish between different legal statuses in the preamble. Such a distinction in the preamble would introduce mistrust in a recommendation which is intended rather to protect migrant women. A compromise with softer language was accepted, which splits the paragraph in two.
20. The Danish delegation also proposed to replace the term “rights” by “human rights” in paragraph 20.1, but this was not accepted by a majority of delegations.

Discussions on the draft appendix

21. On the scope, it was agreed to add a reference to the absence of an internationally agreed definition of the term “migrant” and some adjustments were also made to refer more accurately to refugee and asylum-seeking women.
22. Regarding the different references to “partner” in the text, a consistent terminology was agreed upon for the full text, with a reference to internal law, further to a proposal made by the delegation of the Russian Federation.

23. Lengthy discussions took place on paragraph 4, about safeguarding the fundamental rights of undocumented migrant women and girls, to which the Danish and Russian delegations objected. As a majority of delegations stressed the need to keep such a provision, agreement was reached on a softer formulation for the paragraph.
24. Regarding paragraphs 6 to 8 on girls, the delegation of the Russian Federation asked for the deletion of the reference to “gender” in paragraph 6ter, which was not agreed upon; the request of the delegation of the Russian Federation to add “adequately trained” to paragraph 7 on guardianship was accepted. Softer language on paragraph 8 on continued access to essential services was also included to accommodate the Danish delegation.
25. The delegations of the Russian Federation and of the Holy See objected to the inclusion of information about “sexual and reproductive health and rights and comprehensive sexuality education” in paragraph 9.4, but a great majority of delegations (including France, Portugal and Spain) stressed that this was agreed language and a much-needed aspect of the text. These references were therefore kept.
26. Language in paragraph 10 – regarding the provision of resources and tools for the empowerment and support of migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls – and in paragraph 11 – dealing with digital services – was softened further to a request by the Danish delegation.
27. Regarding the section on access to justice, a reference to national standards was added to paragraph 12 in order to accommodate the Danish delegation, but various delegations (including France and Spain) stressed the need to keep the rest of the wording intact, as many compromises had already been made and the text already referred to internal law in many provisions in an effort to accommodate the concerns of a minority of delegations.
28. On paragraph 26 in the Protection and support section, several delegations asked to reintegrate more specific reference to the type of measures needed. A reference to “internal law” was added in paragraph 31 at the request of the delegation from Switzerland and the reference to “other forms of subsidiary protection” was deleted from paragraph 32 further to a proposal of the Danish delegation.
29. A compromise was reached regarding the mention of “women interpreters” in paragraph 53 at the request of the Danish delegation, with the addition of “when this possibility exists”.
30. Regarding paragraph 57 on resettlement and relocation, the Danish delegation asked for the deletion of the reference to “relocation programmes” and compromise wording was agreed upon as a result.

31. The Danish delegation noted their disagreement with not deleting the last sentence of paragraph 62 (health services) and objected to the formulation of paragraph 72 on integration and empowerment, but several delegations (including Croatia, France and Spain) stressed that this paragraph was about empowerment and that numerous compromises had already been accepted to accommodate minority concerns on such issues.
32. Regarding the section on education, the word “compulsory” was added to paragraph 73 and “as relevant” to paragraph 74, in order to accommodate the concerns of the Danish and Swiss delegations. The Danish delegation also expressed concern about the target groups in paragraph 76, but this concern was not carried by the majority.
33. Regarding the section on detention, the representative of the Council of Europe Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment suggested to reinstate former paragraph 90.6 on the presence of female staff, which was removed in the compromise document, and to change the order of some paragraphs in the section, which was agreed upon.
34. In the course of deliberations, one delegation raised a point of order regarding the fact that many of the points raised during the meeting had been settled during earlier discussions and asked that colleagues pursue the meeting in a more constructive spirit.
35. The Russian Federation delegation voiced their objection to various parts of the document and about the way the compromise working document was presented. The delegation provided a dissenting opinion in writing, which is appended to the present meeting report (see Appendix III).
36. After the Drafting Committee had considered all provisions of the draft recommendation, the Chair asked members to formally indicate their approval of the text.
 - *The Drafting Committee on Migrant Women agreed with the text of the draft Recommendation on protecting the rights of migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls as discussed during its 5th meeting*
 - *The Drafting Committee on Migrant Women asked the Secretariat to transmit the agreed text to the Gender Equality Commission for discussion and adoption during its next plenary meeting (23-25 November 2021).*

6. Next steps and closing

37. The Chair and Secretariat informed GEC-MIG about the process regarding the next steps for the adoption of the draft Recommendation:

- **By 1 November 2021:** transmission of the draft recommendation to the Gender Equality Commission (GEC);
- **23-25 November 2021:** discussion and adoption of the draft recommendation by the GEC;
- **After the GEC:** finalisation of the document by the Secretariat, including by the legal services of the Council of Europe;
- **February 2022:** transmission of the draft recommendation to the Group of Rapporteurs on Human Rights (GR-H) of the Committee of Ministers for discussion;
- **March 2022 or April 2022:** transmission to the Committee of Ministers, depending on how discussions proceed at the GR-H meeting;
- **Final step:** adoption by the Committee of Ministers.

➤ *The Drafting Committee took note of the next steps for the adoption of the draft recommendation*

38. The Secretary of the Drafting Committee thanked the Chair and the expert, as well as GEC-MIG participants and colleagues of the Secretariat, for all the work and good co-operation during the two years of the GEC-MIG's existence.

39. The Chair thanked GEC-MIG participants, the Secretariat, interpreters and technicians for the achievements of the Drafting Committee and all the hard work. She concluded by saying that she trusted that efforts would continue to ensure that a strong text would be finally adopted, and she closed the meeting.

APPENDIX I

AGENDA

Thursday 30 September 2021

1.	10:00-10:15 am	Opening of the meeting by the Chair and adoption of the agenda	GEC-MIG (2021) 5
2.	10:15-10:45 am	Presentation of the working document by the Chair and the Secretariat	GEC-MIG (2021)3 rev2
10:45-11:00 am Coffee break			
3.	11:00 am-12:30 pm	Discussion on the draft recommendation	
12:30-2:30 pm Lunch break			
4.	2:30-3:45 pm	Discussion on the draft recommendation (continued)	
3:45-4:00 pm Coffee break			
5.	4:00-4:50 pm	Discussion on the draft recommendation (continued)	
6.	4:50-5:00 pm	Conclusions and closing of day 1	

Friday 1 October 2021

7.	10:00-11:15 am	Discussion on the draft recommendation (continued)	
11:15-11:30 am Coffee break			
8.	11:30 am-12:30 pm	Discussion on the draft recommendation (continued)	
12:30-2:30 pm Lunch break			
9.	2:30-3:45 pm	Discussion on the draft recommendation (continued)	
3:45-4:00 pm Coffee break			
10.	4:00-4:50 pm	Discussion on the draft recommendation (continued)	
11.	4:50-5:00 pm	Next steps and closing of the work of GEC-MIG	

APPENDIX II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Members

Armenia	Diana Tumanyan Head of International Human Rights Cooperation Division Human Rights and Humanitarian Issues Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Samra Filipovic-Hadziabdic Director of the Agency for Gender Equality Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees
Croatia	Narcisa Bećirević Minister Plenipotentiary Deputy to the Permanent Representative Permanent Representation of Croatia to the Council of Europe Martina Bosak Expert associate Government Office for Gender Equality
Cyprus	Kostas Psevdiotis Deputy Permanent Representative Permanent Representation of the Republic of Cyprus
Denmark	Marie Thøgersen Head of Section Division for Asylum and Visa Ministry of Immigration and Migration
Finland	Varpu Taarna Senior Specialist Competence Centre on Immigrant integration Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment
France	Alexis Rinckenbach Head of the European and International Affairs Office Directorate General for Social Cohesion Ministry of Solidarity and Health/Delegate Ministry for Equality between women and men
Georgia	Giorgi Bedoidze Specialist Maka Peradze Head Human Rights Secretariat of the Administration of the Government
Iceland	Rán Ingvarsdóttir Legal Adviser Department of Equality Prime Minister's Office

Italy	Cordialina Coppola Presidency of the Council of Ministers Department for Equal Opportunities Office for International Issues and General Affairs Francesca Scarpini Administrative Officer National Asylum Commission Ministry of the Interior
Lithuania	Aistė Gerikaitė-Šukienė Ministry of Social Security and Labour
Republic of Moldova	Tatiana Ciumaș Deputy Head of Asylum and Integration Department Bureau of Migration and Asylum Elena Coliujco Deputy Head of Legislation Coordination and Data Management Department Bureau of Migration and Asylum
North Macedonia	Elena Grozdanova Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
Poland	Karolina Michalczyk Legal clerk Office of the Government Plenipotentiary for Equal Treatment Iwona Rzymowska Director Office of the Government Plenipotentiary for Equal Treatment
Portugal	Vera Eloi da Fonseca (Chair) Coordinator of the Project Team on Intersecting Inequalities High Commission for Migration
Romania	Aurora Martin National Agency for Equal Opportunities between women and men
Russian Federation	Olga Opanasenko Counsellor Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Serbia	Svetlana Djordjevic Ministry for Human and Minority Rights and Social Dialogue
Slovak Republic	Alžbeta Kvasničková Department of migration and integration Migration office Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family

Spain	Ana Arrillaga Aldama Director Support Unit Lara Ferguson Vázquez De Parga Senior Adviser Support Unit Institute of Women and for Equal Opportunities Ministry of Equality
Switzerland	Valérie Hofer Specialised advisor Schengen/Dublin Federal Department of Justice and Police FDJP State Secretariat for Migration SEM Directorate for International Affairs European Cooperation Division Section Schengen, Dublin and Bilateral Affairs
Turkey	Onur Dinçer Expert, General Directorate on the Status of Women Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Affairs

Observer States

Holy See	Flaminia Vola Regional co-ordinator for Europe Migrants and Refugees Section of the Dicastery for the Integral Human Development Service
Mexico	Lorena Alvarado Quezada Assistant to the Permanent Observer Permanent Representation of Mexico to the Council of Europe Xadeni Méndez Márquez Director of International Affairs Jenny Tapia Hernández Deputy Director of Affairs for North America National Institute of Migration

Non member States

Morocco	Fatima Barkan Director of Women Ministry of Solidarity, Social Development, Equality and the Family
Tunisia	Hella Ben Youssef Advisor to the Minister Ministry of Women, Family and Seniors

Participant

Expert	Louise Hooper Expert supporting the work of the Drafting Committee
---------------	--

Observers

Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe (CCBE)	Nathan Roosbeek Legal Advisor Noemi Alarcon Velasco Chair of CCBE's Migration Committee
University Women of Europe	Anne Negre President
UNHCR Regional Bureau for Europe	Caroline Dulin-Brass Senior Community Based Protection Officer
UNHCR Representation to the European Institutions in Strasbourg	Andreas Wissner Representative to the European Institutions in Strasbourg Jutta Seidel Senior Legal Associate Denis Neselovskyi Trainee

Secretariat

Directorate-General of Human Dignity, Equality and Governance	Claudia Luciani Director
Gender Equality Division-	Caterina Bolognese Head of Division Secretary to the GEC Cécile Gréboval Secretary to the GEC-MIG Programme Manager, Gender Mainstreaming Adrienne Looby Co-Secretary to the GEC Laurène Thil Administrative Support Assistant Evrydiki Tseliou Administrative Assistant Coralie Charlet Trainee
Advisory Council on Youth (CCJ)	Lydia Siapardani Head of Media & Advocacy - Irida Women's Center Member of the Advisory Council on Youth - Council of Europe
European social cohesion platform (PECS)	Martina Farrugia Strategy Executive Office of the Chairperson Foundation for Social Welfare Services, Malta

European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT)	Aurélie Pasquier Adviser
Parliamentary Assembly, Committee of Equality and Non-Discrimination	Penelope Denu Head of Secretariat
Office of the Secretary General's Special Representative on Migration and Refugees	Carolina Lasén Diaz , Legal adviser Benoît Olry , Trainee
Interpretation, Travel, Events and Multimedia (ITEM)	Nicolas Guittonneau , Interpreter Clarissa Worsdale , Interpreter Lucie Morel , Multimedia Matthieu Zisswiller , Multimedia Catherine Vanoverbeke , Events

APPENDIX III

Dissenting opinion of the Delegation of the Russian Federation on the draft Recommendation on protecting the rights of migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls

The Delegation of the Russian Federation appreciates the work that has already been done by the Secretariat providing the revised draft Recommendation on protecting the human rights of migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women and girls. We also thank the Secretariat and the experts for taking into account some of our comments made at the previous GEC-MIG meetings.

It is however deplorable that despite the fact that the Delegation of the Russian Federation had submitted numerous amendments to the draft Recommendation in due time, many of them were not included into its final version.

The Delegation of the Russian Federation still holds the view that it is necessary to try to improve the text of the Recommendation and to find a compromise until the very end of the GEC-MIG discussion. Therefore, the decision of the Secretariat to take into account only those of our comments that, in the opinion of the Secretariat, can be accepted by the majority of the GEC-MIG experts, and to ignore all the other comments, seems unacceptable for the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

We also see no logic in the proposal to discuss only those paragraphs that have been amended by States, on the one hand, and the distributed text of the final version of the draft Recommendation, in which neither amendments nor "agreed paragraphs" were highlighted, on the other. This approach of the Secretariat at the final stage of the discussion negatively affects the effectiveness of the drafting process and deprives experts of the opportunity to reach a compromise on issues sensitive to their countries.

As a result, the final text of the draft Recommendation which the GEC-MIG is going to send to the GEC so as to be presented and discussed at the November GEC plenary session raises more questions than gives answers and contains a number of provisions upon which the Russian Federation cannot agree, in particular:

1. The referral to the relevant case law of the European Court of Human Rights in paragraph 6 of the Preamble is misplaced due to the fact that this paragraph deals with various treaties whereas judgements of the Court are binding only for the parties to the relevant cases. In other words, the Russian Federation proceeds from the fact that the practice of the European Court of Human Rights does not in itself create obligations for all Member States (other than those against which concrete judgments finding violations are rendered). The Court itself is not bound by its previous judgments when it interprets the norms of the ECHR in the context of specific proceedings.

2. Paragraph 10 of the Preamble is redundant, as the last phrase of the merged paragraphs 8 and 9 ("and other relevant documents related to migration elaborated within the United Nations") already includes the UN High Commissioner for Refugees "Guidelines on International Protection: Gender-Related Persecution ..." as well as other relevant UN documents.
3. There is no definition of the "social sex" in the Russian Federation, as well as in other legal systems in which the feature of the biological sex is fixed. The Russian legislation therefore does not contain the concept of "gender" and there is no commonly accepted definition of the word "gender" at the international level.

During the drafting of this Recommendation the Delegation of the Russian Federation consistently opposed the use of the word "gender" in the documents of the Council of Europe. Therefore, the Russian Federation understands the word "gender" used in this draft Recommendation as a complete analogue of "sex", the word combination "gender-based violence" as "violence against women" etc. The terms "woman" and "man" should thus be applied in their literal meaning and cannot be construed to include persons other than women and men respectively.

Taking this into account we still kindly ask the Secretariat to reflect the position of the Russian Federation relating to the word "gender" after its first mentioning (as a separate word or in a wording) in the text of the Recommendation in a footnote, reading:

"The Russian Federation expresses its position that in this document any reference to "gender" as a separate word and in all wordings as "gender-based, gender-sensitive" etc. should be considered as a sex-based concept".

The Delegation of the Russian Federation also opposes the use of the word combination "gender equality concept" in paragraph 14 of the Preamble.

4. During the drafting of this Recommendation the Delegation of the Russian Federation consistently opposed the use of the word combination "comprehensive sexuality education" in the draft Recommendation.
5. The Delegation of the Russian Federation stresses that neither the GEC nor the Committee of Ministers has the competence to determine or to give a new interpretation to international conventions.

It is therefore unacceptable to ensure "a gender-sensitive interpretation of the 1951 Convention" (as it is formulated in paragraph 52 of the Appendix). More than that the 1951 Convention already guarantees rights of all refugees without any specification.

The Delegation of the Russian Federation would like to stress here that this so-called gender sensitive interpretation is not commonly accepted in the international level.

6. At the time of the adoption of the “Recommendation CM/Rec(2015)1 on intercultural integration” the Representative of the Russian Federation stated that this document did not reflect a common approach of all Member States and reserved the right of his government to comply or not with the Recommendation.” At the time of the adoption of the “Recommendation CM/Rec(2019)1 on preventing and combating sexism” the Representative of the Russian Federation did not agree with a number of provisions of this Recommendation and in accordance with Article 10.2c of the Rules of Procedure for the meetings of the Ministers’ Deputies reserved the right of his government to comply or not with the Recommendation.”

We still kindly ask the Secretariat to reflect these reservations in footnotes in the text of the Recommendation (Paragraph 7 of the Preamble).

Taking into account the abovementioned the Delegation of the Russian Federation also reserves the right to provide additional further comments, as well as concrete amendments to the whole text of the draft Recommendation, as the work on the draft progresses.

The Delegation of the Russian Federation kindly asks the Secretariat to reflect its position in the final report of the 5 GEC MIG meeting.